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THE COLUMBIA STUDENT UPRISING: 40 YEARS LATER
Introduction

Henry Schwartz

Before getting into these essays by our group of contributors, let me excerpt the history of the Columbia student uprising as recounted by Robert Liebert in his book *Radical and Militant Youth: A Psychoanalytic Inquiry*:¹

On April 23, 1968, a noon rally on the Columbia campus was followed by a march to the building site of the new Columbia gymnasium, where students tore down the fence surrounding the site and otherwise interfered with construction. One student was arrested. The other students then returned to Hamilton Hall, the main classroom and administrative-office building of Columbia College, and began a sit-in, detaining the Acting Dean of the college, Henry Coleman, in his office as hostage for the arrested student, whose release they demanded [along with six other demands]…. By sunrise the next morning, the white students had been evicted from Hamilton Hall, and the black protesters — about half the black students in the college — had emerged as a militant political group, with Hamilton Hall established as an all-black protest base. Over the next two days, white students “liberated” and occupied four other university buildings… By April 25, approximately 1,000 students were occupying university buildings…

On April 28, a group of counterdemonstrators, the Majority Coalition (MC), established a “blockade” around Low Library to bar the entrance of food and of other demonstrators. Faculty formed a cordon around the building to prevent overt clashes between the protesters and MC members…

¹ Liebert, 1971, p. 3–5.
In the predawn hours of April 30… the administration summoned the New York City police to clear the five buildings of the student occupants…

Among the results of the week of confrontation were: abrupt termination of college classes for the final five weeks of the semester, and cancellation of final examinations; considerable destruction of university property by police and students; at least one major act of vandalism, the deliberate burning of ten years of research notes belonging to a faculty member; the disruption of countless friendships, among students and faculty alike, over political differences; and acute polarization of white and black students.

I’m not sure anymore if it was the various reminders about the shocks of 1968 that were in the media last year, or the marvelous articles in Columbia, the newsletter from the university, but it got me wondering about those events, about our institute and society’s relation to those events, and about the broader question of what sort of relation psychoanalysis, in theory and practice, might have to such events. There has always been political conflict within psychoanalytic organizations, but history goes on around us every day on a larger scale, and we cannot help but participate in that history. It seems inevitable that history will enter our work, whether we know it or not. Has history become so rarefied by the time we enter a session, with all the other influences we find there, that it is irrelevant? Or is it that we are just not attuned to the ways it is present?

It did not take long to learn that in 1968 Robert Liebert, a Columbia analyst who died in 1989, had taken an interest in the student uprising. He explains in the preface to his book how he got involved:

I was speaking with one of the members of the Strike Steering Committee, whom I had known before that spring.

We talked of a critical issue in the negotiations – the striking students’ demand for “amnesty.”… I explained my view and even suggested some motivational explanations… I added a plea for the striking students to leave the buildings at this time… The young man listened attentively without interrupting and, when I had finished, said quietly:
It is you who are misperceiving events. If we compromise now we will go back to *status quo*, and the faculty will go back to *status quo*... If we leave now all will be lost. What started out as a gymnasium and IDA\(^2\) issue became a dream of a thousand people in those buildings of a Free University....

Here is Liebert interested, Liebert trying to use his analytic skills, and Liebert suddenly finding himself in the role of the analysand to the young man/"analyst" who "listened attentively without interruption." But then we hear the young man and quickly realize that he is not playing along in Liebert's drama. He has his own voice, and we recognize it — it is *our* own voice, wanting to make our dreams come to life. It is not at all difficult to understand how Liebert got pulled in. Unable to join the students in their dreams Liebert did the next best thing, using his training as an analyst and as a researcher to pursue his own dreams.

In psychoanalysis we analyze dreams, but what about when that dream is no longer an individual’s but has become a collective’s? And when the dream enters the realm of historical forces, and comes to represent external, social meanings rather than interior fantasies, does our theory still hold? There is the dream of the young man, but there is also Liebert’s dream. If he is analyzing the students, who will analyze him? Forty years later, having a chance to revisit their dreams, along with what our contributors recall of theirs, we feel invited to remember our own. When are we to stop analyzing and instead allow our dreams their life? In 1968 many felt the answer was clear — the time had come to let them live. Now what do we do with them?

Is Liebert writing a "prescription"\(^3\) for our behavior? He seems to be unable to stop himself when he brings his book to a conclusion, but the spirit of his book is different. It is the students who are his teachers, clarifying their actions and delving into their own motives. Liebert, fascinated by them, does little more than ask questions, listen to the answers, and try to tabulate them into reasonable categories. I do not know if it was this experience that

\(^2\) Institute for Defense Analysis, a U.S. Department of Defense enterprise that students wanted removed from campus.

\(^3\) Robert Michels’ (1971) term for the overreaching assumptions by analysts on how to respond to the students.
radicalized Liebert (who, from my limited contact with him, impressed one as anything but radical), or whether he came to the task already radical. In one of the closing paragraphs he tries to draw out the lessons he has learned, and in doing this he lets us know that he too is that young man:

Freud knew well that people cannot be cured in the consulting room alone. Man must be studied in the context of his society. Psychological health is an abstraction. To move toward its actualization demands social change. If man is to progress to a state of emotional freedom and begin to live with a sense of trust and community, the psychoanalyst must pioneer not only in bringing people to recognize what they fear — when they have become so “numb” that they do not even know that they are afraid — but also in elucidating the psychological process by which practices and institutions in our society rob us all of part of our humanity. I am speaking of the subversive role psychoanalysis should play, both as social commentator and in individual therapy. True psychological liberation requires not only that the patient become aware of repressed instinctual urges and their maladaptive forms of disguised expression but also of the ways in which he has been conditioned to collaborate in his own repression and to accept the social status quo instead of to dream of and work for what might be.4

On April 1, 1969, Robert Liebert presented some of his research on the Columbia student uprising to the APM. Clarice Kestenbaum served as the APM reporter of that meeting and we have reprinted her summary of it here. We invited others who had been present at Columbia during the takeover, or who had clinical experiences with anyone involved, to contribute to this section, and Dr. Michels was asked to provide an update to his article. This section is presented with thanks to all the contributors, in memory of Dr. Robert Liebert, and in honor of students and faculty on both sides of those events for having made their contribution to our collective history as they continue to do so.

4 Liebert, p. 251.
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On April 23, 1968 Columbia University parted with its image of the ivy-shaded halls of learning and for a week became the Bastille. Striking students took over five university buildings, including the President’s office, in a confrontation between students and administration. Black students, a separate, militant political entity, established Hamilton Hall as an all black protest base. On April 30 police ended the siege and a student strike shut down formal classroom activity for the remainder of the semester.

Chronicling the events of that momentous week, and interviewing fifty of the participants over the next few months, Dr. Robert Liebert, psychoanalyst and consulting psychiatrist of the Columbia College Counseling Service, became the biographer of “The Columbia Riot.” His presentation dealt with a discussion of some of the developmental, characterological, and situational factors that must be present to trigger a student into assuming a radical or militant position.

Dr. Liebert defined the student radical as one who no longer believes that existing institutions are capable of correcting the injustices in society, and whose tactics involve confrontation with those in authority by means other than those provided for in present codes of due process and traditional dissent.

Dr. Liebert based his observations on the following:

A. Personal interviews (non-structured, two to four hours long) with students drawn from all shades of the political spectrum, completed within three months after the strike.

B. 35 Term papers by students from the Department of Human Development on their reaction to the strike.
C. Written summaries of the dynamics of the reaction of 25 unnamed undergraduate students supplied by their therapists.
D. Observations on campus, discussion with family, administrators, students and therapists.

"Why do students confront their university, which is representative of the most enlightened institutions in contemporary American Society?" In response to this question, the speaker noted that the college serves as the transition from family to society. Looking at the Vietnam War, the death of the idealistic, integrated Civil Rights movement, Johnson as moral leader, assassinations and burned cities, and prison terms for refusal to serve in the armed forces, students came to regard the campus as the last bastion in their lives where there was any hope of exercising significant influence over the powers that directly affect them. The ills of Columbia and those of the larger American society were fused, and the Columbia crisis was seen as an attempt to halt the increasing passivity of the individual, the loss of individuality, and the dehumanization of man.

The students interviewed were products of their own unique developmental history and experience. Dr. Liebert viewed each one’s political beliefs and personal action during the rebellion as the outcome of four factors:

A. Individual character – the outcome of the particular parent-child interaction, ego organization and psychological adaptation, predisposing him to a specific kind of social and political view and commitment.
B. The specific value orientation – a reflection of the values inculcated in him by his family.
C. The external socio-political situation, in which the adequacy of existing institutions to meet the needs of powerless and oppressed peoples was questionable.
D. The nature of the "Radical Action," and the interaction between the type of stress inherent in it, and the defense mechanisms of the potential radical.

Dr. Liebert warned of oversimplification in treating radicals as a homogeneous entity. He contrasted idealistic radicalism with nihilistic radicalism. At the idealistic pole the student will (a) emphasize program; (b) avoid violence and disruptive tactics as a
source of psychological gratification; (c) empathize with the oppressed and powerless; (d) enjoy sources of pleasure and relatedness apart from political activity; (e) maintain a humanistic credo that he follows in his daily life.

In contrast, at the nihilistic pole the student will (a) offer no programs for constructive change; (b) focus his planning on violence and disruption as ends in themselves; (c) relate to people as pawns in a political struggle; (d) be totally obsessed by questions of politics and race so that other relationships and interests are precluded; (e) deny fantasies of “what might be” or rage at “what is” in order to maintain an essentially paranoid view.

In speculating about the commitment to radicalism, Dr. Liebert turned to Erikson for a developmental framework. The “rudiments of virtue” develop in childhood and are later integrated into a schedule of developmental stages with associated psychosexuality, psychosocial crises and cognitive maturation, ultimately serving as the basis for “virtuous” or “non-virtuous” character traits. Idealistic radicals were committed to such “virtues” as hope, will, purpose, and empathy, while nihilistic radicals embraced the “non-virtues” of cynicism, oppositionalism, random impulse gratification, and isolation.

Hope versus Cynicism

Hope, an indispensable quality of the idealistic, is the outgrowth of a positive encounter with “trustworthy maternal persons” during infancy, as formulated by Erikson: “the enduring belief in the attainability of fervent wishes in spite of the dark urges and rages which mark the beginning of existence.”

Dr. Liebert felt that most of the Columbia activists did have positive kinds of maternal care during infancy, and in spite of contempt for the nature of authority as exercised at Columbia, they had the hope that they would bring about a change for the better.

In other radical students, however, “the component of rage leads to the much more destructive orientation toward the university in political confrontation,” with the university bearing the brunt of the parent-directed rage. Non-hope yields to cynicism, which is reflected in their lack of concern for the personal consequences of their actions and at times becomes inextricably colored by paranoid perception.
Will Versus Oppositional

Erikson postulated that, out of the conflicts of the stage of mastery and control in late infancy, there emerges the balance between self-will and submission to the will of others. The outcome of the struggle over inner and outer control (i.e. excretory function) can lead to “shame” and “doubt.” Will is the unbroken determination to exercise free choice as well as self-restraint, in spite of the shame and doubt in infancy. The students had the capacity to initiate and sustain actions, harnessed with considerable self-restraint despite inner deterrents of guilt, shame and doubt (i.e. questioning the legitimacy of their authorities, disagreeing with parents).

In contrast, oppositional behavior as a dominant character trait may well impel one into the role of rebel. Because character traits associated with oppositionalism generally preclude acceptance into a good school, few Columbia students exhibited unbounded anger, extreme work and study procrastination, and argumentative classroom behavior. But fringe racial groups did contain a number of such students, some failing, who demonstrated these traits.

Purpose Versus Random Impulse Gratification

A sense of “real purpose” emerges out of the child’s play, and with family guidance the child learns to delineate “where play ends and irreversible purpose begins.”

Erikson formulates purpose as “the courage to envisage and pursue valued goals uninhibited by the defeat of infantile fantasies, by guilt and by the failing fear of punishment.” Dr. Liebert noted that this description captures the essence of the “instant” radicals, who pursued a tactic that was harshly realistic and largely successful in its achievement and who were not dissuaded by threat of suspension, arrests, beatings, or parental disapproval.

If the child cannot negotiate this transition from fantasy-dominated play to consensually validated purposeful orientation, he will be left with a propensity to seek random impulse gratification, a tendency that makes the extreme anarchistic wing of radicalism attractive.
Empathy Versus Isolation

According to Erikson, the capacity for empathy is determined by the nature of the mother-child relationship, although the trait does not emerge until latency when the child has the cognitive ability to abstract the experience of another as a separate entity. Out of the mutual accommodation of mother and infant comes empathy. Without the positive identification with the mother in preverbal years, the child develops the quality of isolation, that is, he can intellectually formulate the experience of another without any affective component.

Dr. Liebert found that among the healthiest, most idealistic radicals there were many who had a sense of isolation in their lives, and attributed it to an inconsistent early mothering experience with wide fluctuations, causing them to search for the lost bliss once shared with the mother and leaving them with a vague sense of deprivation. The speaker referred to Keniston’s study of families of young radicals that were generally warm, humanistic, and respectful of children and served as a model for expectation of social units outside the family. When life circumstances did not fit the family “ego ideal,” disenchantment followed. Dr. Liebert felt that it is the combination of empathy and personal deprivation that allows the student radical to feel deeply concerned for other truly oppressed and deprived people.

Family Value Orientation and Social Commitment

Character structure alone, Dr. Liebert emphasized, cannot account for radical commitment. Other studies have demonstrated that radicals have acquired a family value orientation, including high emphasis on justice, equality, service and conscience. The speaker presented a number of clinical examples involving white and black students to elucidate his point. The parents’ ethics were paramount, regardless of whether they themselves supported the students’ actions. He felt that where a discontinuity in moral and political values exists between son and father, the likelihood is far greater that the son will be at the radical end of the spectrum.

Activation of Radicalism

In addition to character structure and predisposing value systems, the “activation of radicalism” requires the individual to
conclude that the institutions and machinery for change are inadequate to meet the needs of powerless, deprived people.

Those students who occupied the President’s office felt entirely justified in revolting against anonymity, the “invisible man” whom no student ever saw. The violence of the police action in clearing the office of students served to expiate their guilt while reinforcing their sense of the righteousness of their cause.

Finally, the speaker noted that participation in radical action was facilitated by the unique experience of intense group intimacy and communal living, which served to strengthen peer group bonds. This was true for black students in particular, in spite of profound anxiety which he felt stemmed from the inhibition of assertion that has been part of the childhood training of blacks in white America. The experience, in the words of one black student “was the first in only seeing ‘black,’ of not shielding part of our personalities from white observation…it allowed one to ‘come alive’...it gave a sense of dignity and pride.”

The consequences of retaliation were far greater for black students than white. Blacks in particular understood the rhythm of an oppressive society, that repression begets protest, leading to even more repression. Dr. Liebert discussed the act of invading the President’s office as one which, although resonating with unconscious, unresolved oedipal feelings in all participants, was not primarily motivated by oedipal feelings. It was a highly dynamic operation involving intrapsychic factors, the state of affairs at Columbia as against the background of the nation, as well as the psychodynamic meaning of the form of the radical action.

In conclusion, Dr. Liebert discussed the sense of urgency propelling the “post Hiroshima generation,” which experienced two wars in Asia, the Cuban crisis, summers in Watts, and the threat of nuclear war. Unlike their parents’ generation, who were reared in a childhood climate of progressive but gradual improvement, this generation wants desperately to effect a change now. Dr. Liebert noted that Erikson, Kardner, Keniston and Lifton have encouraged us to abandon the concept of a timeless fixity of character structure and to understand “identity” as “process” forces. The psychoanalytic movement must come to grips with this or run the risk of becoming obsolescent and irrelevant.
DISCUSSION

The first discussant, Dr. Willard Gaylin, complimented Dr. Liebert on his intelligent observation and bright theoretical study. In Dr Gaylin’s opinion, because Dr. Liebert did not adhere to a strictly analytic model in his gathering of data (serial interviews, use of transference, reporting of dreams) the paper was more an example of superb reporting than psychoanalytic research.

The second discussant, Dr. Hugh Butts, considered the paper a scholarly effort to bring psychoanalytic insights to social issues. However, he felt that Dr. Liebert was understandably more attuned to the dynamics of white students than to those of black students and lacked a true understanding of the racist society to which black students are exposed from birth. He felt that “while developmental dynamics are crucial to both black and white student activists, external reality and racist institutions carry a greater valence for black than for white students.”
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My Private Columbia

William Glover

When I arrived at Columbia College in 1964 freshmen were given beanies and competed in a rope pull with sophomores. In spring of the year I graduated, 1968, we engaged in another contest, this time pushing between protestors occupying university buildings and those opposed to them. These contrasting images bookend my years at Columbia and portray the immense changes that occurred and shaped those of us who were there.

I came to Columbia from Nebraska on the Greyhound, and recall first seeing the city as we drove through the Jersey wastelands, like the opening scene in Midnight Cowboy. My father was a career army officer and although we moved a lot I had never been to New York. I wanted very much to experience life in the big city. I was thrilled to be in New York, but my fears soon outweighed my thirst for the new and I created a life much like what I had come from by joining the crew team and a fraternity. In retrospect the mounting turmoil over Viet-Nam was part of what intimidated me. In my first week at Columbia there was a violent demonstration against marine recruiters on campus right outside my dorm.

My father, as an army officer, had been involved in the run up to the war. During high school he was stationed in Hawaii and worked for the Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command, Admiral Harry Felt, arranging military assistance in Viet-Nam. The January 6, 1961 TIME magazine cover article on Admiral Felt has a group photograph of his staff that includes my father. There was a great deal of cognitive dissonance for me between the values of my military family and the strong anti-war sentiment at Columbia.

A joke I like to tell is that while I was at Columbia in the 1960s I was a member of an underground paramilitary organization — called Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps. I attended Columbia on a Navy scholarship and was part of the small NROTC program there. I say underground because after my freshman year
we never wore uniforms or held the customary weekly drills, in order to avoid confrontations with the anti-war movement on campus. Our only activity was a course in Naval Science each semester held in a hard-to-find classroom in the basement of Butler Library.

I majored in Government and followed the debate over Viet-Nam. A course in Spring 1968 on the crisis in Viet-Nam, by a TV correspondent whose name I can’t recall, was an eye-opener. I became convinced that the war was militarily unnecessary but remained on the sidelines politically. I was due to be commissioned in the US Navy upon graduation. I listened to friends who were opposed to the war but didn’t trust the self-righteous demagogues who led the student protests. During the occupation of Low Library I aligned with the Majority Coalition blockading the protestors occupying the President’s office. We weren’t particularly supportive of the university’s involvement in the war or the proposed gym in Morningside Heights (the reasons for the protest), but were mainly opposed to the occupation of the campus by the radicals and their allies from off campus. I recall walking by Hamilton Hall one day and feeling highly offended when I saw through a window a student I knew rummaging through the desk of Henry Coleman, the Acting Dean, who was held hostage during the occupation. Coleman was my advisor and a good guy. There was a lot of pushing and shouting and both sides became inflamed and more than a little exhilarated by the conflict. My fraternity held coffee hours for the police and I remember how incredulous the working class cops were that students privileged to attend this Ivy League school would act like this.

No one was surprised when the bust came. The police were out of control, but I saw the protestors provoking the police on many occasions. After the bust I went into avoidance and went with a friend on a jaunt to the Kentucky Derby. Immediately after graduation I was commissioned an Ensign in the US Navy and by the fall I was serving on the USS Canberra providing gunfire support for Marines in I-Corps. Witnessing the war first hand led me to conclude that the Viet-Nam war was not only unnecessary, but an immoral war that I could not participate in. This crisis of conscience led me to become a conscientious objector. This wasn’t an easy thing to do as a regular Navy officer, but that’s another story.

I was reminded of those days a few years ago when my daughter’s high school history teacher invited me to participate on a
panel discussing the Viet-Nam war. One of the other guests was David Harris, the war resister. Reminiscing about his ‘60s heydays he monopolized the discussion, portraying himself in heroic terms and exhorting the students to share his political philosophy. I was reminded of why I had distrusted many of the anti-war leaders. Like John McCain, Harris seemed stuck in the past, still making his living off the Viet-Nam war. I spoke to my daughter’s class about my own path, from being the loyal son of a military family unquestioningly serving his country to becoming an active duty conscientious objector. The experience was traumatic in ways but also initiated a course of truth seeking and self-discovery that eventually led to my becoming a psychoanalyst. I encouraged the students in my daughter’s class to learn to think for themselves, to thread their way between competing arguments and persuasive demagogues and decide for themselves what to believe, something that I began to learn to do at Columbia in 1968.
Clarice Kestenbaum

On the morning of April 30, 1968, I was in my Upper West Side office when I received a telephone call from a distraught patient — my second analytic control case. Mitch (not his real name) was a twenty-one year-old Columbia University senior, several weeks from graduation. He had recently been accepted into Columbia’s post-graduate fine arts program on partial scholarship.

“I’m in the President’s office, and the police are storming the building — should I jump out the window?” I was momentarily stunned — what would my supervisor say or do? My hesitation lasted only a fleeting minute. “What floor are you on?” I asked. “The first floor.” “Then jump and we’ll talk about it tomorrow.”

What was Mitch thinking? Would he lose his scholarship, or be placed on academic probation?
The events preceding the university takeover have been well documented in Robert Liebert’s book, *Radical and Militant Youth*, a psychoanalytic inquiry into the causes of the 1968 student rebellion at Columbia. On March 27, 1968, over 100 members of Students for a Democratic Society entered Low Library to petition President Grayson Kirk to sever ties with a military research organization, The Institute for Defense Analysis. Because the demonstration was a violation of a ban on holding such meetings indoors, six SDS students were placed on probation (“The IDA Six”). A second grievance involved the construction of a gymnasium in Morningside Park. Black students, members of the Afro-American Society, protested what they considered discriminatory practices, and together with SDS students decided to “liberate” Hamilton Hall. On April 24th, 200 students broke into the Low Library and occupied the president’s office, Mitch being one of them. In addition to Hamilton Hall, three other buildings were occupied.

As Dr. Liebert noted, “The ills of Columbia and those of the larger American society, were fused.” He contrasted the “idealistic radicalism” of most of the members with “nihilistic radicalism” of those who refused to negotiate, to compromise, or offer solutions to the multiple problems.

Mitch was on the idealistic side of the spectrum, believing that the country was failing its people and was ethically and morally wrong.

Leaving the scene along with dozens of others as the police were storming the library was, I thought, a wise personal decision. (He really didn’t need my help.) Mitch spent the next three years pursuing his doctorate and eventually took a position in an academic institution out West. I am in yearly contact with him. He remained deeply committed to civil rights, the feminist movement, and other liberal causes.

The Columbia riots were not my only dealings with the SDS and repressive government tactics. In September of 1971, Nixon’s “plumbers” broke into the Beverly Hills office of Dr. Lewis Fielding, the psychiatrist who was treating Daniel Ellsberg, in search of damaging information about Ellsberg, who was working for *The RAND Corporation* as a Vietnam expert.

In 1967, Ellsberg had been asked to participate in a top secret study of classified documents regarding the Vietnam War, later known as “The Pentagon Papers.” Dismayed, even horrified by the cynicism and hypocrisy he found, he leaked the documents to The
New York Times in June of 1971. Dr. Fielding was not the only psychiatrist whose privacy was invaded during the Nixon administration. That same year, the office I shared with my former husband, Michael Stone, was ransacked. Nothing of value had been taken, including drug samples in the medicine cabinet. Patients’ charts had obviously been searched, some left helter-skelter on the floor and desk.

The charts of my three SDS students had been removed from the files and sloppily returned, out of place; Michael’s experience was the same. We believed the charts of his SDS students had been photographed. (Both of us subsequently developed a fool-proof method of note taking: concealment. His by writing in Sanskrit or private symbols, and mine by having the worst handwriting that even a pharmacist could not decipher.)

We believed Americans were very close to losing their civil rights. Shortly afterwards, on June 17, 1972, the Watergate was burglarized and history was made. America had lost its innocence.

Dr. Robert Liebert was a dear friend and colleague who died too young. He was a true humanitarian who had much to teach us. He found that most of the students he interviewed for his still-timely book were sensitive, intelligent, and idealistic, and were responding to deep societal problems in the microcosm of the university. He urged his psychoanalytic colleagues to confront the relationship of the psyche to the political and social realities of our time.
Thirty-nine years ago I presented my first paper at The American Psychoanalytic Association, afterwards published in The Journal of The American Psychoanalytic Association (1971). It was on the student uprisings of the late 1960s, of which I had a privileged
view, serving at the time as a psychiatrist at the Columbia University Student Health Service. My major thesis, with which I still agree, was how little our psychoanalytic theories offered in helping us to understand these events. Ethics, politics, sociology and history all seemed more relevant. I was particularly critical of those who had offered facile Oedipal interpretations of sons rebelling against their fathers.

My own experience with individual students, along with that of my colleagues — perhaps particularly Bob Liebert, who consulted at Columbia’s counseling service and knew the leaders of the student rebellion — was that the students were much more often expressing the values that their parents embraced, but on which their parents had been reluctant to take action. The students felt that they were doing good, had little internal conflict, and found much support in family and family surrogates, such as young faculty. The enemies were more distant — the government, the school administration, “society.” The behavior had dynamics, as all behavior does, but the highly varied and individual meanings it had for each of the students offered little assistance in explaining the social phenomenon.

Today, looking back over the thirty-nine year interval, it isn’t clear that the student uprising had much effect. We have seen major changes in the lives of other groups for which organized protest seemed to be crucial —blacks, women, gays — but those are lifelong roles, while students are only passing through a stage. Psychodynamics haven’t changed, or if they have, it is because we are toying with new theories, not because people are any different. Psychoanalysts haven’t changed much either. They are still quick to point out Oedipal themes and other universal dynamic patterns in social and political phenomena, with the suggestion that this somehow explains them. In 1971 I quoted Freud (1931) on the issue:

Precisely because it is always present, the Oedipus complex is not suited to provide a decision. ... The situation ... in a well-known anecdote might easily be brought about. There was a burglary. A man who had a jimmy in his possession was found guilty of the crime. After the verdict had been given and he had been asked if he had anything to say, he begged to be
sentenced for adultery at the same time — since he was carrying that tool on him as well. (p. 252)

His argument remains valid.

Because of the intense passions with which they were associated, and because they involved our friends and ourselves, many of us were intrigued by these events and tried to study them. For me the most important lesson we learned was the limits of our method and the boundaries of the domain to which it is appropriate.

REFERENCES

In 1968 I had my first professional job as a psychologist, as Director of Research at The Center for Research and Education in American Liberties at Columbia University. The Center was a joint project of the law school and the educational psychology department at Columbia’s Teachers College. I was to do the statistics and research design. Our project was aimed at making education in civics courses more effective. It was well funded by the United States Office of Education to the tune of half a million dollars for a two year project. That was a lot of money at that time. There was already concern that people did not believe in the Bill of Rights or understand the Constitution and that the high schools were falling into anarchy.
To give you an idea of how things were in those days, our Center was headed by a famous civil liberties law professor. I was still a graduate student, just finishing my dissertation, but experienced in research design and statistics; I took every course offered in statistics at Teachers College with Rosedith Sitgreaves, who was the statistics editor of the journal *Science*. She was pleased to have another woman who loved statistics as her student. I also took all of the offerings in research design including a course in test development with Thorndike, the primary test developer of the time. I thought I was qualified to do the work of developing a test to determine why young people were not learning civics and why they were so opposed to the “system.”

At an initial interview with the foremost educational psychologist of that day, Professor John DeCecco, I was told that my credentials were impressive, but that I would know whether I got the job by the end of that week. I waited with much angst. At the time I had three children attending Agnes Russell School, the lab school for TC and Columbia. They could only continue there if I got that job. And I would be working just across the street. I could even meet them for lunch — if I got the job. On Friday afternoon I got a call from Professor DeCecco. He said that I could have the job because no one else had applied! All I had to do was pass an interview with the law professor who ran the place. Could I come down now? Yes. I caught the bus and was there in ten minutes. I was 33 years old, but felt as eager as a teen applying for her first job. The law professor had my resume on his desk as he interviewed me. “I see you have three children. How do I know you won’t get pregnant on me?” “Oh,” I said, “you use a condom.” Realizing the civil rights implications of what had just been said, the man blushed and said: “Okay, you’re hired.” I never saw him after that except at large meetings.

Meanwhile, the streets were crowded with police, reporters, TV crews, sightseers and students with placards. I was afraid for my children, who had to pass this chaos on their way to their elementary school. I worried that they were hearing that they were part of the “system” and that they were getting an elite education while the other kids in the Columbia neighborhood had to go to the run down, overcrowded, unsafe public school. The student strike in
that way was a strike against me and my family. How could that be, when I was a strong supporter of integration and human rights? How could this be, when I had organized an inter-racial art show in then segregated Petersburg, Virginia, when I had marched on Washington with a bus full of black people from Hopewell, Virginia? How did I and mine get to be the enemy?

I was interested in psychoanalysis and had seen its efficacy for myself; I was in analysis for a writer’s block that had stalled my dissertation. Together with John DeCecco, I wrote a structured interview based on the Flanagan Critical Incident Technique. Each interviewee got a chance to describe an incident in her or his own life that seemed to raise a problem in American liberties. Then the interview protocol led to an analysis of how and why this was problematic. This required an interviewer for each classroom of students. So I hired 37 interviewers, mostly graduate students in psychology, sociology, anthropology, theology and education.

The interviewers were themselves rebelling against the draft and, I now think, against the authoritarian atmosphere on campus that had been accepted by the ex-GIs who dominated the student body during the 1950s. These 1960s students had grown up in a time of less desperation than the Depression kids or the World War II kids. They were used to more openness and thought they knew what freedoms they were entitled to have. When the campus erupted that spring we had already gathered a great deal of data. The interviewers were now coding the data for inputting on the punch cards that fed the giant computer of those days. The coding was boring, and preparing the cards was even worse. I was in constant fear that the coders would either destroy or ignore the interview protocols. And some of them did. But the sample was so large that the data destroyed did not affect the study.

A story about a professor who had years of his data destroyed terrified me. Would all of our work be ruined? Locking the office at the end of each day and opening it each morning, I would pat the piles of papers and punch cards as if to reassure myself that they were safe. I was torn between empathy for the students and fear of their possible violence. It was terrible. At the same time I was afraid for my own children. Would the police protect them? Some of the college students believed that the kids in the lab school were having an unfair elite education while the neighborhood’s poor black children were being given an inferior
one. Of course the Columbia students were themselves having an elite Ivy League education. And as a believer in the civil rights activism of the early 1960s, and a marcher for equality and against the war, how could I not side with the students? It was a terrible dilemma. It was ironic. I was having a critical incident happening just as we were studying those of the high school students.

And, like the incidents reported by the students, the conflicts I was having were leading to new understanding. I had to reason out what was causing the intensity of the feelings on campus, just as I thought about the intensity of my own feelings. The Columbia students were facing the draft and the possible loss of their lives; painful wounds and illness from living in jungles; the certain loss of some years of schooling, as well as separation from their families and from women they might love, and deprivation of sex. Above all, they were protesting at not having the opportunity to determine their own choices, their own lives.

As a result of our interviews John and I wrote a book together that led the way for the conflict resolution paradigm for high schools in the 1970s. The book illustrated the high school students’ need to participate in the governance of their own lives and their awareness of the responsibilities that that would entail. It is my hope that we made some difference.
Everyone is Young Once … 1968 through a Glass Grayly

Barbara Stimmel

How much do I know
To talk out of turn?
You might say that I’m young,  
You might say I’m unlearned.  
(Bob Dylan, 1963)

A great deal has been written about the 1960s and the culture of the young (most of whom are now in their 60s). This era has been pored over and dissected through the long lens of the telescope of time. Whether disparaged or idealized, misunderstood or “gotten”, it has dominated so much of subsequent American culture. It is very inviting for a psychoanalyst to apply her essential way of thinking about human behavior to times, places, and events, but this too often results in a caricature of sound clinical thinking. This is the temptation for me when I try to find words to describe one of the most tumultuous, terrifying, and thrilling historical realities of which I was a part. I am speaking of the protests and riots which took place on the Columbia campus in 1968.

I was an undergraduate student at General Studies, taking courses as well in the College and the Medical School. I was an out-of-phase person on a campus which embraced me fully; I knew people all over campus and I loved Columbia. There and elsewhere, faculty were conducting teach-ins to help create structures where thought and analysis could perhaps hold sway, as the world continued to spin out of control. The shock waves from John F. Kennedy’s assassination continued to roll over us and Martin Luther King had just been killed before our eyes. TV relentlessly confronted us with war and death in ways guaranteed to disrupt shared naïve perceptions that sanity prevailed.

One irony of this time was that, while those of us who opposed the war turned our backs on and scorned the soldiers caught in fighting it, we simultaneously and increasingly embraced the underdog and the abused closer to home. We foolishly, and shamefully, mistook the cogs for the machine, thereby bringing everlasting disrepute on our honorable intentions. Back at home, we at Columbia were provoked and fired-up by the expansionist plans the university was imposing on those who lived right next door. BURN IT DOWN! This was H. Rap Brown railing against the gym which would invade Harlem, allowing entry to just some of its residents, and that through a separate door.

What we couldn’t and wouldn’t see was that those fighting this god-forsaken war half a world away might as well have come
from right next door. The protests against the arrogance of the university, including its involvement in The Institute for Defense Analysis — WE WON’T STUDY WAR NO MORE — unleashed such complicated choices and chances among us that we soon were united in futile but compelling action aimed at those who would not take us seriously. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia, who actually wrote a letter protesting the war, was a despised stand-in for our war-waging, bomb-dropping President, Lyndon Johnson, who agonized deeply and ineffectually over the war. So much for the black and white hats we thought different ones of us wore, when most things were, deep down, a muddled shade of gray.

I had already been seriously involved in protesting the war, in the time-honored tradition of political dissent, via the press. Some fellow undergraduates and I created and published a campus newspaper, the ICV (Independent Committee on Vietnam), patterned after the newsletter of I.F. Stone, the great journalist-radical of our time. Stone studied Greek in his advanced years and his idea that one could and should always be learning, informed his every move. The I. F. Stone Weekly was a true forerunner of our most powerful, political blogs; the ICV faithfully followed suit.

We published news, commentary, opinions, and frustration. We tried to distribute the ICV off-campus but our resources were limited and our sophistication slim. In the midst of all this, it is not surprising that some of us fell under the sway of the SDS (Students for a Democratic Society), the SAS (Students for an Afro-American Society), and the YSA (Young Socialists Alliance). They were exceedingly radical, while we mostly were not. But their passion and their convictions were infectious; the heady combination of fighting injustice and creating change was an extraordinary elixir, and it still is.

In the midst of all this I one day found myself with a gun pointed at my back by a member of the NYPD SWAT team, called to campus by the enraged, increasingly ham-strung administration. The Pigs were sent by the Parents and the Children were astonished. It is important to note that the Children came in all ages and sizes and that the Parents included those young enough to be the Children. Identifications crossed chronological lines which in turn blended ideological currents. Needless to say, this radicalized me, and I was never again the same.
I continued on — WHAT DO WE WANT? PEACE! WHEN DO WE WANT IT? NOW! — recoiling from tear-gas at the Pentagon while taking over the streets of D.C., marching through a phalanx of hostile mounted police and hecklers in hard hats on Whitehall Street as we tried to shut down the selective service station, pelted and spit upon in Lincoln Park while a corrupt convention occurred behind closed doors. Yet these surreal battles, fearsome and fraught with mutual rage and misunderstanding as they were, somehow didn’t produce the heartbreak I felt when my own NYC police on my own beloved campus turned against me and my friends. It made no sense. Protest was how our country started. We believed we were throwing tea on to 116th Street and Broadway, into the lap of Alma Mater, and at the face of an insensitive administration.

Just a few months later Bobby Kennedy was murdered — he who had stood on the roof of a car in lower Manhattan at an impromptu street rally, where he brought people to tears, as we joined his and each other’s hands, jumping for joy because it seemed really possible that our world would, or could, somehow be restored — and Nixon became the president; we knew we were doomed. And then, more impossible than we could ever imagine, Kent State blew up.

Outside in the distance, a wildcat did growl,
Two riders were approaching,
The wind began to howl...
(Bob Dylan, 1968)

In 1968 I was studying in an idiosyncratic context in an increasingly idiotic world, but I was not alone. For example, although my co-editor on the ICV was a Columbia College undergraduate, five or six years younger than me (a divorced woman of 23), we were true compatriots. I lived alone, supporting myself through merit scholarships, academic loans, and babysitting, meandering through space and time. Mark lived on campus, his tuition paid by family, decidedly on-track in the long developmental line from nursery through college, career plans firmly in place. But we both, as did so many others, subsumed our differences and marched forward on the printed page, on the campus, and in the streets. It seemed to us that we had no choice;
in some way we were doing the bidding of our better natures. We were often afraid, sometimes confused, but almost always determined.

I could tell you much about my own history and conflicts, with their coalition of compromises, and how they surely had an impact on where I stood those days at Columbia. But that would be an inadequate exercise, failing to do justice to the myriad marchers, mourners, and misled, among whom I was but one. It would describe little about the swirl of events which caught so many of us in the same net of madness and greatness. Undoubtedly, our individual characters and psychology had to dictate to some extent why we were there and why we made our choices to become involved. Yet at the same time, the extraordinary diversity among us would make such an analysis shallow. When you next see a revival of HAIR, listen to the nasal twangs in “Masters of War,” rediscover “Fear and Loathing on the Campaign Trail,” finally read a Thomas Pynchon novel, or even reread a timeless paper of Freud, and don’t forget that sometimes culture provokes human behavior and in ways which give one hope. In the end, individual personality structure is often strikingly uninformative when it comes to explaining political activism and the decision to rise up in protest against those in power and their misbegotten aims, hurled at the people like so many thunderbolts.

I have been “in power” myself since then, but I am still something of an anti-establishment radical at heart. This does not seem to me a contradiction, rather the result of accepting that I was now over 30 and taking responsibility was my only recourse. The greater complexity of meaning and possibilities in making the world work, of course, became increasingly clear. How could they not, without figuratively blowing myself up in a Greenwich Village brownstone while building bombs, in a frantic and crazy attempt to destroy the government? Nonetheless, I have hung on to my refusal to compromise when asked to grant legitimacy to an unjust war, a corrupt government, or the lies of those around me. That small revolution of swarms and storms of protesters at Columbia, which took place on an urban college campus almost half a century ago, helped shape how I think, vote, and even dream today. Having been there, it was inevitable that I would find myself on the same streets in 2003, as millions of us, all over the world,
marched in a futile attempt to be heard by a deaf and dumb government.

In the summer of 2008 my son trekked across Vietnam, by bike, on foot, and alone. But I was with him every step of the way as he wrote from Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh city (our Saigon), Hue, Danang, Ha Long Bay and China Beach. He left a different kind of American imprint on a country which once gave his mother the impetus to leave her imprint, among millions of others, on the streets of America, as we marched our way out of adolescence and young adulthood into the bittersweet years in which we became the Parents of the next generation of Children. Would that we could do better...

After these many years, I look back on the calls to brave action and to dangerous stupidity that resounded during those decisive days at Columbia University. Although Grant Park radiated a resplendence this past November which we could only hope for in 1968, I believe that most of what we hoped would change hasn’t, that time is running out, and that the sober recognition of this reality is what passes for wisdom in later years. But the genius of youth, infused with quixotic passion and idealism, is fueled by the seductive future which falsely offers the transcendent promise of the vast expanse of forever. So, we wish for the young in particular, who in 2008 believed in their power to create change, that their dreams come to pass and they are protected from unjust wars rather than being led foolishly into them.

One mundane truth in life might be that, if she simply keeps her eyes open, a young woman in any era won’t miss the watershed events which could carry her across the threshold, thereby granting the possibility of leaving her mark in the room. The young woman I was 40 years ago hopped on to the barricades — an act which unfurled a life-long attachment to the transformative truth of standing up and being counted. And much as in the profession I love, those spring days of 1968 helped me believe in my power to create change while banging into the limitations of my voice.
Wayne Myers dead? That’s an oxymoron for you!

For the twenty-five years I’ve known and loved Wayne, I could not imagine anyone more alive. Even on his hospital bed as he gasped for air with every muscle of his failing body, Wayne’s hand was warm to the touch. His eyes sparkled as they always did with deep affection and undying mischief. Only partly hidden by that breathing contraption, his smile invited us into the sweetness and truth of his being. I see him still and feel enveloped by him now. He is still with me on the salt lake flats of Turkey; on a boat drifting by the funeral pyres of the Ganges, at the newly opened Bouley when Tracy served as his designated diner because he was yet again on one of those dramatic diets of his; beckoning us up the stairs in his and Joanne’s beautiful home on Seventieth Street; across from me listening intently to my confessions and complaints before tendering his infallible wisdom. Only at the end did he seem to have needs of his own. “It hurts,” he confided to me as he took off his mask to kiss me on the lips. “I scream in silence,” he whispered to Joanne just before he could no longer speak. Imp and sage, Wayne was always and remains for us who knew him altogether alive.

Wayne’s and Joanne’s was a storybook romance. It began just about forty years ago today when, after a mere six days, he proposed to this beautiful, loving and elegant, then twenty-three year old woman, marrying her on March 23, 1969. (Wayne had wanted to make it to their fortieth anniversary, as he had done for his seventy-seventh birthday on December 13, but fell just short of this mark, which all of us will celebrate in his conspicuous absence.) They nurtured, protected, adored each other for a virtual lifetime in one of the most intimate marriages I have ever seen. Joanne, husbanded by her husband, became an attorney during those years and is now Director of Public Affairs at The Carnegie Council.

Wayne was a wonderful father. He and Joanne reared two brilliant and devoted children who were with him at his death: first Tracy, a lawyer now at Warner Brothers, and then Blake, a partner
at GLS Hedge Fund. Wayne lived to see them, inspired by their parents, marry true and accomplished partners — Harris and Susan, respectively. They gave him his delicious grandchildren: Wyatt, Charlotte and Sophie. The family as a whole is Wayne's legacy — he lives on emblazoned in the memories of his worthy inheritors. Bravo, Wayne, a triumph of triumphs!

And what of Wayne the thinker, the professional, the contributor, above all, the healer?

From The Bronx High School of Science, Wayne somehow found his way to Arkansas where, like the Clintons I suppose (with whom he had little else in common), he began a remarkable career. Graduating Phi Beta Kappa from its university in two years, he went on to Columbia P& S, completing his residency at Cornell/New York Hospital, in between serving in Korea. It wasn’t enough for Wayne to serve as a staff psychiatrist there. At twenty-eight, a doctor, he took over as battalion commander. In the process, he managed even to fly a plane and, with some undeniable difficulty, crash-land it. Sayonara, “Captain Tiger” (Wayne’s nom de guerre).

He’s been flying high ever since, “hawk to the hens,” in the words of Breuer describing Freud. Somehow Wayne, who, according to Joanne, “always ran everywhere so that he wouldn’t miss anything,” lay on the couch long enough to graduate from The New York Psychoanalytic Institute in 1969. He defected to Columbia, where his clinical and didactic gifts became evident in his chairing the Admissions Service and serving as a Training and Supervising Analyst. (He concluded his half-century at Cornell as a Clinical Professor Emeritus.) My wife Ann, who was his candidate supervisee, recounts tales of Wayne’s insight, ingenuity, depth and, most of all, respect in guiding her through the turbulent waters of beginning to do real analysis. And, yes, like other couples here, spanning the decades, Wayne fixed us up! Wayne seems to have signed off on all the major decisions in my life — at least the right ones.

By all accounts “the fastest pen in the West,” Wayne was also extraordinarily humble, even reticent about the extent and breadth of his contributions to psychiatry and psychoanalysis. I had heard and read numbers of his spare yet probing papers; I had even collaborated with him in editing a book on psychoanalytic psychotherapy some twenty years ago. But, preparing for this occasion, surveying his C.V., I was staggered by the array of clinical
and other gems laid out before me: five professional and trade books, including his daring *Shrink Dreams*, which was a New York Times notable book in 1992; 48 chapters and articles in premiere psychoanalytic and psychiatric journals; 49 reviews, letters and commentaries, numerous interviews and other contributions in the popular press and media. Those are just the numbers. The scope of his work is unparalleled, as may be evident in this all too brief sampling of the wealth of subjects he illuminated: the impact of real life primal scenes, interracial analysis, testicular problems, imaginary companions and mirror dreams, impotence (Wayne hardly spoke from personal experience here), beating fantasies, older patients and counter-transference problems, Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*, altered states, sexual addiction.

“Stop there, stop there,” Wayne would admonish me, and so I must. The point is that while some of us crowed about all our weighty words, Wayne, outstripping us, kept mum about his. I think many of his colleagues, beset at times by their shortsightedness and self-absorption, did not fully grasp the depth, precision, and humanity of Wayne’s far-ranging intellect. What’s more, he did it all for the fun of it. Wayne loved to read and write. It was exuberance and not ambition that drove him.

Nowhere is a psychoanalyst more important than in his consulting room with his patients. Born great — endowed with empathy, sympathy, intuition, perspicacity, and emboldened with vast knowledge — Wayne was a great analyst. I know because I shared cases with him and saw his work firsthand. Of course, it is a practitioner’s patients who provide the most accurate and heartfelt testimonials. We’ve heard one. And now I would like to quote from a woman patient’s cell phone message Wayne received on his sickbed in Memorial Hospital last week — just one among many tributes he received in this way:

I feel so strange not to be talking with you. I don’t expect you to answer this message but I wanted to tell you I am thinking about you and I hope you’re feeling better or at least that you are comfortable.

Thank you again for so many years of your incredible generosity and wisdom and everything you’ve done for me. And I wanted to say that my life has been a million times better than it would have been without you. And knowing and
working with you for all these years? The best thing that EVER happened to me in my life! I think you’re the wisest, most caring, most generous, funniest, most brilliant and fascinating and courageous person I’ve ever met, and you’ve taught me more than anyone else I’ve ever known about how to live. So I hope I’ll have a chance to speak to you and see you again but I know you may not be up to speaking right now and I don’t expect an answer to this call. I just wanted to say thank you and that I feel blessed for the time we’ve spent together. And there’s no one on Earth who comes close to you. And I feel like the luckiest patient in the world to have you as my doctor. And I’m going to try to live up to that privilege and make the fullest use of what you’ve taught me from this moment on. So at least I got to talk to you on Monday. So bye for now and I hope you have a really good night. Bye bye.

(John Ross delivered these remarks at the memorial service for Wayne Myers at the Frank E. Campbell Funeral Chapel on January 18, 2009.)
INTRODUCTION

As if combining private practice and analytic training weren’t challenging enough, Vaia Tsolas, a clinical psychologist and third-year candidate at Columbia, decided to start a psychotherapy clinic in the Bronx in her spare time. I asked her to write a personal account of the tumultuous but gratifying process of conceiving and opening Rose Hill.

WK
Opening a Small Mental Health Center: Ideals and Pragmatics

Vaia Tsolas

My father was the owner of a small family business in a rural area of Greece, which he inherited from his father, and his father from his father and so on, for many generations. He always advised me to stay away from the private sector, emphasizing the aches and pains of taking care of one’s own business. Well, as might be expected I suppose, years and years after my immigration to a different continent, I found myself wagering against my father’s advice by opening my own businesses, first a private practice and, not too long after, a small mental health center in the Bronx.

When I was invited to write about this last enterprise, I found the project challenging. My initial excitement that someone might be interested in reading about my experience in opening Rose Hill Psychological Services, was quickly overshadowed by a couple of factors. First of all, I found myself wondering: “What, really, is there to write about? You take the same risk in doing something like this as you do with everything else in life. You may be afraid, but you give it a chance because, despite the fears, you believe that it might work and so you invest a part of yourself in it.” Perhaps the mundane nature of this type of thinking explains why, when I set out to research it, I found an almost total lack of psychoanalytic literature on the topic of opening a practice. The second factor that left me so doubtful about being able to write anything worth reading about this experience had to do with the journalistic nature of any such account. Everything I had written before this had some type of theoretical framework, some technical axe to grind; but this seemed at first like little more than the who, when, where and how of opening a small business.

But as I sifted through such thoughts, I began to realize that both my specific doubts about the idea and the challenge to articulating it emerged from the familiar tension between ideals and pragmatics that drew me to psychoanalytic training in the first place. Psychoanalytic candidates, I am sure, hold no monopoly on this jaw-grinding tension. Listening to the Presidential debates, for
example, brought me back home, with my father’s voice still echoing in my ear: “Yes, this sounds good but how are you going to apply it?” For that matter, isn’t a similar struggle between subjective idealism and workaday pragmatism involved in a businessman’s daily decision-making or the artist’s struggle between the aesthetic and the sale of his art? I imagine that this is something that never goes away; for example, even well established psychoanalysts and training analysts might sometimes feel anxious when the conflict between power/profit/prestige and value/belief/ideology gets activated from the blind side of counter-transference. I hope that this account of my own experience in opening Rose Hill Psychological Services and dealing with such tensions might be relevant to most readers, regardless of their level of experience.

When I started my analytic training at Columbia I was still working at the Counseling Center at Fordham University as a supervising psychologist. The work was exciting and rewarding, especially for a candidate looking for an eager population of bright, motivated and insightful patients. But soon after I started to get a taste of working psycho-dynamically with this population in moderately long term therapy, Fordham felt the need to comply with the fiscal demands of the real world, as well as the guidelines established by other schools; the approach to long term treatment started to change and a 12 session limit eventually became the standard of Counseling Center practice. As a result, most of the patients who qualified for insight-oriented psychodynamic work had to be referred out after they had reached this limit. And, as also happens in the world outside the University, many, if not most, of these patients were at risk of not following through with the referral recommendation, for financial as well as for logistical reasons (such as having to travel from the Bronx to Manhattan).

This change was understandably challenging for a candidate who not only believed fervently in the benefits of long term intensive work, but who was also looking for psychoanalytic cases for her training, not to mention thinking of building a private practice. And so the scene was set: starting from an idealistic desire to provide such patients with an affordable and psychoanalytically oriented treatment, as well as a measure of greed and ambition, I asked the question: “Why not quit Fordham and open my own place right next to it?”
I do not know how much of residency training is devoted to building and taking care of the business side of opening a private practice, but based on my own experience and discussions with my peers, I can say with some certainty that psychology graduate schools ignore the topic almost completely. I had approved of this omission, at least in part because of the paternal business transferences I have already mentioned; hence being in a “helping profession” superseded the bricks and mortar of building a business. Of course I was forced to deal with this misconception to some extent when I opened my private practice, but as a candidate and junior clinician it was relatively easy to invoke comforting clichés such as: “I am not good at promoting myself” or: “It will all fall into place. I just have to give it some time.”

But once I made the decision at least to explore the idea of opening a Mental Health Center in the Bronx, I realized that the learning curve was going to be a steep one. The extent of my “private sector” experience had been the opening of my private office. As huge an undertaking as that had seemed at the time, it was really more like land-squatting, involving little more than picking a location from among the few that I could afford, furnishing an office, printing business cards, and telling a few friends and acquaintances that I was “in business.” Since that was my model, I naively set off to imitate it for the mental health center in the Bronx. The first step was easy enough. I knew the location. I knew that I wanted the office to be within easy walking distance of the Rose Hill campus of Fordham, but I had no idea what that really meant since I had little knowledge of the surrounding area. “No problem,” I thought and went right to Craig’s List to type in the Fordham area of the Bronx. But what was I looking for? When I opened my office it was easy. All I had to do was type in “psychotherapy office” and dozens of possibilities popped up on the screen.

No such luck this time; nothing at all in the Fordham area and only a few part-time offices in other parts of the Bronx that I’d never heard of. Even if I had found something, my vision wasn’t about opening another private office in the Bronx; I had a whole mental health center in mind, a place where I could bring together a small group of like-minded, psycho-dynamically oriented clinicians to do the kind of long term psychoanalytic work that the “business-oriented” University environment had rejected. It would be a place
for training and psychoanalytic inquiry, with a conference room, a well-stocked, wood-paneled library, computers wired into PEP, and enough offices to house us all in comfort. What do you type into a Craig’s List search for that — utopia maybe?

After a few weeks of stress and strain, I had done enough leg work to settle on the “Little Italy” section of the Bronx, a lively, ethnically diverse area with lovely shops and restaurants a couple of blocks south of Fordham and about the same distance west of the Bronx Zoo. I had also done enough brain work to realize that the space I was looking for wasn’t going to come pre-packaged. I was going to have to find space that I could convert into therapy offices. This time Craig’s List didn’t fail me quite as much. When I took “psychotherapy” out of the search the pickings were still meager, but sufficient for me to set out on my hunt. After dozens of miserable missteps, including a dentist’s office in which the rooms were so tiny that she must have hung her patients from the ceiling, and a euphemistically designated “hair dresser’s salon” that smelled unmistakably of formaldehyde, I was about to give up hope when I spotted a listing for “unfinished office space.”

After a week of negotiations with a twenty-something, Fordham graduate, Bronx real estate entrepreneur, I acquired the keys to 1,200 square feet of second floor rental office space. It consisted of one huge room with eleven foot ceilings, featuring hundreds of dangling wires and exposed pipes, nice bamboo flooring, a long brick wall bedecked by a full length wall to wall mirror and four lovely windows gazing out at East 187th Street. And now the real work was about to begin! Focusing on the pragmatics of building and decorating the offices actually seemed to take care of my initially overwhelming anxieties, almost stifling the “What the hell am I doing?” and the “Is this some kind of grandiose enactment?” Fortunately, I didn’t have to bear all this fear and excitement entirely on my own. I shared my burden with my husband and close friends, without whom I might well have caved in.

Reflecting back on the first couple of months, I remember that at times I couldn’t decide what was more frightening; the pragmatic aspects of investing private funds and taking such a tremendous risk to develop a business, or coming face to face with my own ambition, greed and narcissism, which definitely seemed to be among the components of this decision. Whenever I could muster enough composure, I idealistically reminded myself that I was doing all of
this in order to be able to circumvent the managed care world and still provide affordable care for Bronx residents and students who could not afford private fees. But, not surprisingly, this idealistic mantra also rendered even more challenging the pragmatics of the initial stages of developing Rose Hill Psychological Services. At whatever time of day or night my anxiety resounded: “How are you going to do this without grant money” and: “What happens if you open the doors and no one comes?”

“Start small and let’s see how it goes,” has been a leitmotif that I have never abandoned, whenever in my life I have needed to deny the risks and potential consequences of any number of otherwise terrifying decisions. In this particular decision, however, after going through the whole process of learning about opening a business and actually incorporating, when I finally signed the legal papers as the president of a professional corporation, I couldn’t fool myself any longer. I had to admit that what I was doing this time was something much larger, riskier and more unconventional than what I had done before in opening a private practice.

My graduate school training may not have taught me much about HVAC and soundproofing, but it is amazing how quickly these foreign words (and I guess more foreign to a foreigner like myself) became part of my working vocabulary. And even in the turmoil of what became an almost endless task of construction, the tension between the ideal and the pragmatic arose on an almost daily basis. I learned quickly that aesthetics and the actual carpentry of framing out the therapeutic space carry price tags that escalate rapidly as we tilt toward the ideal. But I also learned that for me there would be no value in the enterprise if its beauty and therapeutic integrity were compromised. So I eventually had to admit that my little mental health center was going to end up costing a good deal more than I had anticipated and, consequently, that it represented a much greater risk than I had realized, as my father’s admonitions echoed in my mind with every additional expenditure. But when the construction was finally done, I was thrilled by the finished product; four lovely little offices, a storage/records area, and a spacious and comfortable waiting room.

Of course, there was one detail that we hadn’t attended to; we had no real need for the offices or the waiting room because we had no patients. And having overspent my budget on the construction part of things, I didn’t have money to squander on hit-or-miss
attempts to advertize the new venture. Somehow the frustrations
and anxieties of opening a private practice seemed inordinately
amplified when it came to the new center. Logically, it was easy
enough to remind myself that the long term investment and risk
involved in the entire scope of training made the limited amount
that I had spent on Rose Hill seem relatively paltry; but, perhaps
because of the warnings I had failed to heed, such logic did precious
little to palliate my anxiety. And so, conscious of every penny of the
cost, we set about the task of letting it be known that we existed.

Fortunately, we appeared to have made a good decision, at
least in principle. Once people began to hear about the place, the
word spread quickly, without requiring any formal advertising to
speak of. And once the word spread, we began to get phone calls. At
first they only trickled in, but after a few months the calls gradually
became much more frequent.

Despite the fact that patients (mainly students at first) started
coming through our doors on a daily basis, confirming our place as a
genuine mental health center and giving us confidence that we were
offering not only good, but also necessary, services, there were many
moments in the past year when anxiety about survival overshad-
owed optimism and hope. Naturally, with the stresses of the current
financial crisis, these anxieties persist. To take one example, just
recently Con Edison discovered they had only been billing us for
one half of our space and presented us with a huge bill for the
balance, as well as a demand for a big deposit. Because of such
unpleasant surprises, I made the decision to turn to insurance panels
and hired someone to help us become part of the managed care
world. We had attempted to avoid this through adopting a sliding
scale fee structure (which we still maintain) and found our
therapists willing to help out by moderating their own expectations
for reimbursement; but patients, and their parents (in the case of
students), often balked at fees that exceeded an in-network co-pay.

The insurance panel part of our experience would require a
paper of its own, and even that might not do justice to the surreal
nature of the endeavor. This abridged version can only mention
endlessly convoluted follow up with both our employees and the
many insurance professionals, as well as trying to make sense of
innumerable decisions and declarations that, when all is said and
done, don’t leave much room for logic. All in all, this aspect of the
undertaking may have proved less fruitful, more stressful and “insane” than any other stage of developing the Rose Hill center.

Throughout this process, however, I often wondered why I was consuming so much valuable time to get on insurance panels when I had initially found so many good reasons to avoid them. Had it been just to soothe my anxieties and to feel more confident about our future survival, or was I re-adjusting our ideals for Rose Hill out of a desire to prioritize affordable care for a wider range of patients? There is of course no simple answer to this question, just as there is no one answer to the type of question I have asked myself in treating so many patients: “Am I saying this for me, to take care of some unknown counter-transference anxiety, or am I saying it for the patient?” But is it enough to resort to the usual response: “I am sure it is both,” perhaps merely to avoid the impossibility of answering the question?

In retrospect, I suspect that I was, and still am, struggling to sort out in my head the dynamic tension between building and maintaining the business of a mental health center, and developing its character. Managing this tension involves a perpetual sequence of adjustments along the way in order to achieve anything approximating optimal growth. For the moment at least, Rose Hill Psychological Services leaves more than enough room for trial and error, in the same way that one learns how to be a parent for the first time. It remains suspended between flourishing and surviving, with respect to its ideals, its pragmatics and the dynamics of the relationship between the two.
A TRIBUTE TO GEORGE GOLDMAN

Roger A. MacKinnon

The annual George S. Goldman Award was presented at the candidate graduation in June 2008. I had spoken with George a month earlier by telephone and learned of the progress that he had made after a stroke that occurred the previous summer. He had suffered blindness in one eye and compromised vision in the other. How easy it would have been, at age 101, for him to give up hope, feeling that he had lived a long, healthy life and that there was no point in fighting on. Not so with George. He opted for home therapy and had the stroke rehabilitation team come to him, rather than face inpatient admission under those circumstances. His voice was strong, his mood good, and his mind clear. In addition, his memory was remarkably good for his age.

After giving this brief report I was approached by Henry Schwartz, editor of the APM bulletin. Since people had felt moved and inspired by the brief report and wanted more information, he asked if I would conduct an interview with George to be published in the bulletin. I agreed to approach George and seek his cooperation. He was now unreachable by telephone, which the family had turned off for incoming calls, fearing that he would fall as he rushed to answer it. A personal letter was the next step, and we finally made contact in the fall. His first response was: “Aw shucks! There isn’t that much to say about me.” I quickly pointed out how much it could mean to his children and grandchildren, and so he agreed to do it for them. We scheduled our first interview but lost time figuring out how to record it until I decided to try the old fashioned way of verbatim notes.

As the reader has probably guessed, George had been my training analyst in the 1950s and later we became friends. As this interview progressed, from his career to more personal topics, I told him of my marriage to Cynthia earlier in the year and the unusual way that we met. After his usual warm congratulations, he responded: “Let me tell you about the unusual way that Jeanne and I met. I was practicing in New York City for some years and on week-ends I went to visit family in Bridgeport where I grew up. I
started dating this gal and it wasn’t going anywhere so she introduced me to her wonderful cousin who sang in night clubs. I called her and we made a date for dinner. It was late winter and after a few months we were dating seriously. She had been spending summers singing in summer camps and as summer approached she informed me she had a job offer for that summer. After some thoughtful deliberation, I said: ‘Don’t take the job.’

George Goldman and Jeanne Gordon were married on June 11, 1941 and lived happily together until her death on February 17, 1998. She had been a Broadway and New York City opera singer, a poet, and an artist. They had two daughters, Kathryn and S. Amber Gordon, and grandchildren Meredith and Nicholas Estren, as well as numerous nieces and nephews. They owned a summer house in Saltaire on Fire Island which became a focus for family fun and pursuit of his hobbies, which included photography and woodworking.

I was aware of George’s interest in photography because photographs that he had taken were displayed in his office and waiting room. I had already taken up the same two hobbies myself. My analysis was interrupted for two years to serve as a navy psychiatrist and it was in 1954, when I returned with a newborn daughter, that I frequently encountered his infant daughter, Amber, in her carriage coming out of the brownstone at 51 East 92nd Street, the first floor of which was his office. I concluded (wrongly) that the new baby was a granddaughter. Post-analytic knowledge corrected my distortion. Yes, that made him a new father at age 48; not so unusual today.

George’s unexpected death, on November 8th 2008, brought the interviews to an end, so other methods were required to fill out the picture of who he was and how he worked therapeutically, something Henry Schwartz advised would be of interest to readers. Much like Sandor Rado, George Goldman viewed analysis as a form of treatment and his focus was concentrated on the here and now. He did work with the omnipotent, omniscient transference, particularly when it became a resistance. “Why don’t you explain more, why do I have to figure it all out for myself?” was my frequent complaint. He sat at the side of the couch, instead of totally out of sight at its head, and was visible if one twisted one’s neck sufficiently. He clearly believed that analysis was a two person experience and that the real person of the analyst played an
important role. This had also been the opinion of Sandor Rado, who had been his first analyst, a fact that he shared with me when I was trying to figure out my analytic family tree. Rado had supervised my first and second cases. One day George told me (after my analysis had ended) that his “real” analysis occurred later with Edith Jacobson.

At the end of each analysis he held a cocktail party at his home for his supervisees and other former analysands. Spouses were in attendance, curious to see where so much of the family budget had gone. Training analysts generally charged fifteen dollars a session in the 1950s, but George charged candidates twenty dollars. This fact gave me confidence to keep my fees near the higher end of the spectrum for my entire career. Thus the higher fee for my training analysis paid off in the long run.

It is of interest to study the memories that analysts have more than fifty years after completing their training analysis. Several impressions of George remain with me. One day I began the session telling him the story of a classmate who described that he had cried in a session that day. With no hesitation he replied in a warm understanding tone: “He must have felt very badly about something.” I was speechless but deeply moved. Another day, in mid-analysis, the analytic clinic secretary stopped me as I came out of class at 1:15 p.m. to advise me that Dr. Goldman would like a ride downtown to his office. I was quite surprised but pleased as I had a 2:00 p.m. appointment with him. I understood that he trusted me, first, to be comfortable with him and, second, to keep out of his personal territory and to conduct myself as I would with any senior faculty member. It was an important experience. A third story took place near the end of my analysis when I asked if he would put me on his referral list after we finished. He replied with an interpretation that I was looking for a basis for a continuing dependent attachment to him. That didn’t really click since my father referred me more than enough patients, so I asked George to send the overflow to my classmate and friend, Mort Aronson. Not long after my analysis terminated, I saw a patient in consultation who needed a senior analyst and could afford a full fee. I immediately called George Goldman and said: “I have a patient to refer to you who is quite interesting and can afford your full fee.” George responded: “How much do you think that is?” “Forty dollars”, I answered. He accepted
the patient and I had an “ah ha” moment. I understood that what I was seeking was recognition as a colleague.

For additional sources of information I spoke with his daughter, Amber Gordon, on several occasions. She was most helpful, and both she and Eric Marcus gave me permission to go through George’s three inch thick academic file that he had never found time to clean out. I spent several hours separating out documents that would be of interest to his family from those that should be discarded, as well as those that should be kept for future use at the center. I thank Joan Jackson for all her help in this regard.

I would now like to quote from a beautiful article written by Fred Lane, M.D. for the *Bulletin of the Association for Psychoanalytic Medicine*, Volume 10, Number 4, June 1971.

At the end of June 1971, Dr. George S. Goldman will retire from his position as Director of Columbia’s Psychoanalytic Clinic for Training and Research after tenure in that position which began in 1961. Dr. Goldman received his medical training at the Yale University School of Medicine, and his psychiatric residency training at Boston Psychopathic Hospital, Stony Lodge, in Ossining, New York, and Hillside Hospital in Glen Oaks, New York. He obtained his psychoanalytic training at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute, and lays claim to the historical distinction of being the first official psychoanalytic candidate of the newly established institute, the first psychoanalytic institute in America. When Dr. Sandor Rado was brought to the United States from Berlin by the New York Psychoanalytic Association to head up the Institute in 1931, Dr. Goldman became Dr. Rado’s first assigned analysand. This pioneer position has characterized Dr. Goldman’s psychoanalytic career. Some time after the period of his psychoanalytic training from 1931 to 1935, Dr. Goldman became part of a study group which included, among others. Drs. S. Rado, A. Kardiner, G. Daniels, D. Levy, J. Millet, C. Binger and R. Frank. This nuclear group, together with others, ultimately established the Columbia Psychoanalytic Clinic, an event which took place while Dr. Goldman was in military service from 1942-1946. During World War II, Dr. Goldman was one of a small group who pioneered the establishment and operation of mental health hygiene consultation centers in
Army training camps. These centers represented an early attempt to apply some principles and techniques of community psychiatry. Also of interest during his military stay was his assignment to develop army psychiatric films, during which Dr. Goldman made two such films, “Shades of Grey” and “Let There be Light”, dramatically documenting the therapeutic approach of military psychiatry at the time. The latter film was made in association with John Huston as film director. Following his military and cinematic career, Dr. Goldman returned to the private practice of psychiatry and psychoanalysis and resumed association with the newly formed Psychoanalytic Clinic for Training and Research in 1948, as a psychoanalytic teacher and Training and Supervising Psychoanalyst. In addition, he was associated with Hillside Hospital as a long standing member of its medical board. He continues the association with Hillside Hospital to the present time as consulting psychiatrist. In addition, he taught at the Long Island College of Medicine, now New York Downstate Medical Center, rising to the rank of Assistant Clinical Professor in his three year association with that Institution. Dr. Goldman has been a member of the faculty of the Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons since 1948 and became Clinical Professor of Psychiatry in 1961. In addition to his many teaching, training, and administrative duties, Dr. Goldman has written scientific articles, edited, and contributed to psychoanalytic writings of the Columbia psychoanalytic group frequently over the past twenty years. He has encouraged publication of the current concepts of faculty members so that the clinical and theoretical approach of the Columbia staff members would be clearly available to colleagues in the psychoanalytic and psychiatric fields. For instance, “Developments in Psychoanalysis at Columbia University” edited by Drs. Goldman and Daniel Shapiro, and based upon the proceedings of the Clinic’s Twentieth Anniversary Conference, presented a broad spectrum of recent clinical, theoretical, research and applied psychoanalytic work as carried out by staff members who were graduates of the Psychoanalytic Clinic.

Dr. Goldman assumed leadership at the Psychoanalytic Clinic in 1961, dedicated to the aim of strengthening the
faculty as a whole and as individuals by an increasing recognition of their capacities and of opportunities to contribute. Of particular concern, at the time, was Dr. Goldman’s intention to increase the authority and activities of individual committees in the governing of the Clinic and to encourage the faculty to greater voice and influence in determining policy and direction in the development of the Institute. During his tenure this intention was largely realized, and the morale of a mature faculty is by now firmly established. In addition, Dr. Goldman has participated in the expansion of the faculty, and has had particular influence in developing and encouraging communication and exchange with the wider extra-mural psychoanalytic community. In the past five years, the Columbia Clinic has benefited from and enjoyed newly instituted visiting professorships, whereby distinguished contributors and scholars in the psychoanalytic field have had appointments of a year’s duration, with teaching assignments with candidates at all levels of training and with the faculty as a whole. In addition, Dr. Goldman has encouraged and brought about a greater dialogue between candidates and faculty with consequent improvement in general morale during the educational vicissitudes of this decade. A spirit of intellectual ferment and inquiry has continued and flourished under his directorship.

On his retirement as Director, Dr. Goldman will continue his association with the Clinic as Special Lecturer and as Supervising and Training Analyst. He will also continue in private practice in New York where he lives with his wife, Jeanne. As Jeanne Gordon, Mrs. Goldman has been active in opera, musical comedy and the concert stage. Her creativity has also given rise to much sensitively expressive poetry, publication of which is hoped for. Dr. Goldman has long been an amateur carpenter and his handiwork has been especially useful in their vacation home on Fire Island. He thinks that he may now have time to give some attention to their house in the city. One daughter is currently a graduate student in sociology at Columbia and his second has recently married.

Dr. Goldman will be succeeded as Director by Dr. Aaron Karush in July 1971. As Dr. Karush is the first Director of the Clinic to have himself received his psychoanalytic training at
the Columbia Clinic, Dr. Goldman notes with swelling pride and personal satisfaction that he has now seen the Clinic come full circle in its establishment and development, and that it has now “fully come of age.”

Although not one of the three official founders of the center, George was a member of the first faculty in 1947. He was active in the New York area, serving on the staff of Hillside Hospital (and as president of its medical board), Mt. Sinai, New York State Psychiatric Institute, Jewish Family Welfare Society, Long Island College of Medicine and the Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research. Two of his training analysands, John Weber and Roger MacKinnon, subsequently served as Director of the Center.

To add another perspective, I would like to quote from a lovely letter written by Ethel Person, M.D., during her directorship, arranging to secure for him a Columbia trustee’s appointment as Professor Emeritus of Clinical Psychiatry.

When George S. Goldman retired as Clinical Professor of Psychiatry fourteen years ago, no effort was made to have him designated Professor Emeritus. This appears to have been a simple oversight since he has a long record of having made outstanding contributions to the Department of Psychiatry and the Analytic Center. For these reasons I would like to strongly recommend that he be proposed for appointment as Professor Emeritus at this time.

George was born in Bridgeport, Connecticut in 1906, and graduated from Yale and from Yale Medical School in 1929. He interned at Babies and Children’s Hospital in Cleveland, took his residency at Boston Psychopathic Hospital and at Stony Lodge, and began the private practice of psychiatry in 1933. He graduated from the New York Psychoanalytic Institute in 1936 and for many years was active at Hillside Hospital where he was President of its Medical Board. From 1942 until 1946 he was on active duty with the U.S. Army Medical Corps and was discharged with the rank of Lt. Colonel.

When he returned from the war he began his affiliation with Columbia and was appointed training and supervising analyst. In 1961 he became Clinical Professor of Psychiatry and
Attending Psychiatrist at the New York State Psychiatric Institute. For the next ten years he was Director of the Columbia Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research and since 1971 he has been a Special Lecturer in Psychiatry. Except for the years in which he was Director of the Center, Dr. Goldman has served as a volunteer and unpaid faculty member.

From the beginning of his association with Columbia, Dr. Goldman worked on many key educational and administrative committees. He was for many years a member of the Executive Committee of the Psychoanalytic Center, and while he was Director of the Center he also served for ten years on the Executive Committee of the Department of Psychiatry as well as many other committees at the Medical Center. Candidate selection has been a particular interest of his, and his experience and counsel have been highly valued in this area for the past fifteen years.

Aside from Columbia he has maintained an active psychiatric life with other organizations. He served as President of the Association for Psychoanalytic Medicine from 1959 to 1961, after having served as Chairman or member of many committees in that organization over the years. From 1972 to 1981 he was on the Ethics Committee of the New York District Branch of the American Psychiatric Association. For many years he represented Columbia on the Board on Professional Standards of the American Psychoanalytic Association, and currently he is a member of the Ethics Committee of that organization. In 1983, he received the George E. Daniels Merit Award from the Association for Psychoanalytic Medicine, an award which was described by Dr. Daniels himself as “…designed to honor those of its members who have made outstanding contributions in teaching and clinical research in psychoanalytic medicine, or who have done signal service to the Association, or members who have significantly influenced or contributed outstandingly to the field of psychiatry at large.” For 1985-1986 Dr. Goldman is President of the New York Psychiatric Society. I think these appointments reflect the way he is regarded by his peers locally and nationally, as a man of utmost integrity whose wisdom and judgment are frequently and gratefully sought.
It is characteristic of George Goldman that the candidates’ welfare was always foremost in his mind during his most active years at Columbia, and his exertions on the candidates’ behalf, together with his teachings, occupied a major portion of his attention and energies. He focused on clinical teaching, emphasizing the difference between psychotherapeutic and psychoanalytic techniques. He was always a popular and respected supervisor, as well as a training analyst who was frequently sought out for his acknowledged clinical skills.

George Goldman’s published work is also characterized by his consistent interest in the treatment and understanding of the patient. Of some 19 titles in which he participated, all have practical and clinical focus. While he was in the Army he did a study of adult male enuresis, wrote on the psychology of sick call and the psychiatrist’s job in war and peace. Later he was interested in the differential diagnosis of organic and psychogenic disturbances, and he published a follow-up study of patients discharged from Hillside Hospital. He wrote on the techniques of therapy, on therapeutic communication between marital partners and on the psychodynamics of schizophrenia. A respect for the patient comes through in everything which he wrote, a genuine and non-judgmental attempt to understand and to use that understanding on the patient’s behalf. While realistic about the limitations of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy, his approach was usually optimistic and always humane.

His most unusual contributions to “the literature” were the movies in which he played a large role as technical advisor during World War II. “Shades of Grey” and “Let There Be Light”, directed by John Huston, were dramatic and moving documentaries about the psychiatric treatment of World War II soldiers, and their impact and reputation are not diminished to this day. When he left the Army in 1946, he was appointed Neuropsychiatric Consultant to the Surgeon General and awarded the Army Commendation Ribbon with the Citation for his “outstanding contribution as Technical Advisor in the production of the remarkably successful psychiatric film ‘Let There Be Light’ and the development of the Surgeon General’s psychiatric film program.”
I hope this letter will help to bring to life the details which can be found in George Goldman’s curriculum vitae. An emeritus appointment for this dedicated and distinguished faculty member would correct an unfortunate omission of longstanding.

CONCLUSION

George Goldman was an unusual person in so many ways. His clinical understanding, quiet but strong and creative leadership, his warm and friendly manner, and the generosity with which he gave himself, were always characterized by modesty. When he closed his practice he and Jeanne Gordon Goldman moved to McLean, Virginia to live the remainder of their lives in the apartment that they had built in their daughter’s home. He and Jeanne had their own entrance. There they basked in the family warmth and were closely involved with their grandchildren’s lives. After Jeanne’s death George continued to drive his car up to the time of his stroke. He enriched the lives of all who were involved with him and he will be greatly missed.

Thank you George Goldman!
George Makari’s *Revolution in Mind* (2008) is a book I wish I had read before my analytic training began, and which I believe should become an integral part of the teaching of Freud’s work. *Revolution in Mind* challenges the notion that Freud developed his theory in relative isolation, revealing Freud as deeply embedded within his scientific culture, and often challenged and spurred to further theorizing by a disparate group of followers. Understanding Freud’s work requires some knowledge of the contributions of Ribot, Charcot, Bernheim, Brentano, Helmholtz, Fechner, Stekel, Jung, Adler, Rank, Ferenczi, and Abraham, among others. This is background knowledge that most candidates are unlikely to have, and to engage with Freud in a sophisticated manner it helps to have a work such as *Revolution in Mind* to provide historical and ideational context.

*Revolution in Mind* reveals Freud struggling to eliminate subjectivity in order to achieve a method for the scientific study of the mind. Freud began his work at a time when the scientific community was engaged in active debate over whether the scientific study of the mind was possible. In order to establish psychoanalysis as a field of scientific study, it was essential to separate subjective factors from objective judgment. In 1855, August Comte had described the following disquietingly familiar situation:

> After two thousand years of psychological pursuit, no one proposition is established to the satisfaction of its followers. They are divided, to this very day, into a multitude of schools, still disputing the very elements of their doctrine. This interior observation gives birth to as many theories as there are observers.
Comte insisted that for a field to be truly scientific, a separation between the observer and the object of study was essential. He dismissed the study of the mind as ultimately unscientific, and recommended a focus on overt behavior and phrenology as the only methods likely to allow for objectivity. Even at the time of his recommendation however, phrenology had fallen into disrepute. So how was one to study the mind scientifically? Théodule Ribot proposed a three-pronged method. The mind could be studied objectively through a study of the linkage between thoughts, or “associational psychology”, heredity, and the study of psychopathology. Ribot’s method opened the door for the study of mind as a science.

The problem of subjectivity remained, and scientists of the mind were apt to have the rug swept out from under them, as illusory notions of objectivity were shattered. This was the fate of one intrepid explorer of the mind, Jean-Martin Charcot. A great believer in the power of meticulous observation, Charcot mapped out “stages” of hysterical attacks. He then turned to hypnotism, which he understood as a state particular to hysterical patients. Hysterical patients could be hypnotized because of a physiological disruption caused by abnormal heredity. He then went further. He came to view hysterical symptoms as the product of self-suggestion while in a hypnotic state. It was a fateful turn. He had established a role for psychic causation. Mind could affect body! For example, the idea “I can't move my arm” led to a hysterical paralysis. How this could occur remained unclear, but degenerate heredity was held responsible.

Charcot was soon accused of having lost his objectivity. Hippolyte Bernheim discovered that hypnotic states could be induced in normal subjects. Furthermore, suggestions took hold even in the absence of hypnotic states. The mind was wide open to suggestion all the time! Charcot had unwittingly suggested his stages of hysterical attacks to a legion of patients. The stages themselves were a kind of group hysteria. Charcot’s legacy was then further tarnished by the fall of degenerate heredity as an ultimate explanation, one that lost favor with the discovery that general paresis of the insane, a diagnosis of epidemic proportions, was caused not by heredity but by syphilitic infection.

Bernheim’s critique of Charcot reopened the question of how one could conduct a scientific study of the mind. If the mind was
constantly open to the suggestions of others, even unwitting ones, there could be no distance between the scientist and his subject. Freud acknowledged the reality of Bernheim’s findings, but attempted to preserve the study of the mind. He argued that the real object of study should be the intra-psychic conditions that allowed suggestion to take root. One could therefore take the necessary scientific distance from these intra-psychic conditions that were presumed to underlie Bernheim’s interpersonal phenomena. Thus Freud staked out the intra-psychic as the object of focus for the psychoanalyst.

The scientific community of Vienna was not especially receptive to Freud’s ideas. Sympathetic to Comte’s critique, prominent Viennese researchers focused on brain dysfunction, and mind was at best an epiphenomenon. Psychic causation was dismissed as impossible. Brücke conceived of the mind as functioning entirely by way of reflex action in which incoming excitation traveled along sensory neurons and was discharged along motor neurons. This model later influenced Freud’s topographic model, as developed in Chapter 7 of *The Interpretation of Dreams*. One of Freud’s mentors, Theodor Meynert, further developed this line of thought, describing how human psychology resulted from the brain’s organization into higher and lower reflex systems. However, in ascribing different mental functions to differing brain systems, Meynert had simply translated the language of mind into the language of brain. Joseph Breuer, in *Studies on Hysteria*, returned the focus directly to the mind, independent of the brain: “If instead of ‘idea’ we choose to speak of ‘excitation of the cortex’ the latter term would only have any meaning for us in so far as we recognized an old friend under that cloak and tacitly reinstated the ‘idea’”.

Contrary to the prevailing opinion, Freud posited the mind as an etiologic agent. *Studies on Hysteria* focused on memory as the cause of hysterical symptoms. Later, he found that unconscious wishes breaking through into consciousness in dreams, slips, and jokes demonstrated the power of the psyche. Focusing on the psyche was one thing, but the unconscious psyche once again raised the issue of objectivity in a pressing manner. How could one really know the contents of another’s unconscious mind? Wouldn’t the observer merely read into the other his own projections? Early in his theorizing, Freud had emphasized that the unconscious realm was ultimately unknowable. As he sought to delineate its contents,
psychosexuality emerged to ground the unconscious mind in the biological. Sexuality was a basic motivational structure that was part of man’s endowment as a biological creature. Further, Freud argued that the study of perversions, myths, and “primitive” cultures gave a direct view into the unconscious that could be used to cross check clinical findings.

With the establishment of an analytic community, psychic causation was essentially regarded as a given. However, the issue of subjectivity arose once again as alternate visions were developed. In the absence of any clear way to decide between competing theories, debate shifted from which theory was correct to whether a theory was consistent with established theory. Psychoanalysis would not have as many theories as observers, because conflicting observers would be shown the door. One after another, dissenters were exiled from the movement. Interestingly, time after time, with Stekel, Bleuler, Adler, Jung, and others, innovations were vehemently disputed, then quietly assimilated following their creators’ departure from the movement.

Within the movement, the analyst was conceived of as a mirror, reflecting back nothing but what the patient brought to sessions. Anything brought to the session by the analyst was seen as a counter-transference difficulty. In seeking to establish the movement as a science with a definite group of findings, Freud was in danger of creating a monolithic, cult-like group of followers. Makari argues that this did not take place, and suggests that Freud’s willingness to radically alter his theory opened up the community. The introduction of an aggressive drive after years of insisting on the primacy of the libidinal drive, along with Freud’s development of “I” psychology (a more experience-near conceptualization), divided the community, as there were suddenly several Freudian theories for analysts to decide between.

With the spread of analysis across the globe, and the development of alternate paradigms by Klein, Lacan, Kohut and others, the analytic community has become increasingly diverse. Today Comte’s critique of psychology strikes me as equally applicable to analysis. Freud attempted, to my mind in vain, to eradicate subjectivity, to “ground” analytic theory and establish objectivity. Sensitive to the charge that the mind-reader reads his own thoughts into the object of study, Freud grounded his study of the unconscious in psychosexuality. Today, I believe that, across
theoretical divisions, we are more accepting of the inextricable nature of the subjectivity of the analyst. But we still long for grounding, when case reports are offered as evidence, and objective studies are looked to as guides to specific clinical interventions. I believe the message of psychoanalytic history is that subjectivity cannot be eliminated because subjectivity is the very object of study. As such it will unswervingly reemerge to sweep the rug out from under any illusions of objectivity to which we cling. Analysts can never escape the charge that they influence their object of study; their individual theoretical preferences are inextricably woven into the fabric of their subjectivity. The issue is not that objective study of what goes on in analyses is impossible; clearly it is possible, and in fact essential. But science cannot eliminate the subjective. As a human encounter, the analytic situation will always be a subjective experience and must be embraced as such.
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INTRODUCTION

The series that the Bulletin has been presenting under the guidance of Fredric Busch has been exploring the ways in which psychoanalysis has been influenced by scientific information from outside the confines of the discipline. The series is examining the relationship between psychoanalysis and psychiatry, reviewing several bridging areas, including neurobiology, pharmacology (Busch, 2006a), research (Busch, 2006b), diagnosis, and the treatment of specific disorders. Busch (2005) reviewed the work of Columbia’s founder Sandor Rado, who believed intensely in an interdisciplinary dialogue that would both evaluate and possibly validate the basic foundations of psychoanalysis, and also contribute to the evolution of the discipline. There followed three papers (Busch, 2006b; Rutherford et al., 2006; Busch, 2007), discussing the current state of outcome research in psychoanalysis and other psychodynamic forms of treatment. It remains an open question as to the feasibility of outcome research on psychoanalysis itself, although there are reports of successful research into the outcome of more time-limited as well as long-term psychodynamic psychotherapies. Busch (2006b) views these studies as more practicable in our present state of research capability, and possibly as paving the way to research in psychoanalysis. Most likely the answer to that question will come from attempting to do outcome research in psychoanalysis, and assessing its feasibility. Columbia is initiating such a project, a carefully considered approach arising from collaboration of some of the best minds in the research world. The description of their impressive project has been distributed to the Center faculty, and
it seems that if anything can succeed, given our present state of knowledge, this one might. And regardless of the outcome, the amount of data that it will generate will be extremely valuable to the field. It is clear, however, that this project, and others like it, will take a long time — in my view an argument for starting a well-conceived study sooner rather than later. In this paper I want to explore another direction that is already being taken and which can yield fruits in the interim, during the lengthy course of outcome research, namely, interdisciplinary scientific studies. This approach is developing in parallel with outcome research, and if we maintain open communication between the two endeavors, they may well nourish and enhance each other.

THE MUTUAL INFLUENCES BETWEEN PSYCHOANALYSIS AND OTHER SCIENCES

Let me mention two papers I have written which demonstrate the value of interdisciplinary studies. One is a study of the possible effects interdisciplinary scientific efforts have had on the practice of psychoanalysis (Olds, 2006a). This was written as an answer to the proposition, widely voiced in psychoanalytic circles, that research about the brain and mind carried out in other disciplines is irrelevant (Pulver, 2003), and even harmful or dangerous to psychoanalysis (Blass & Carmeli, 2007). The study of other disciplines goes at least back to Freud, who made use of classical mythology and literature, anthropology, neurology, and the clinical realms of hypnosis and suggestion theory. In our current theorizing we have newer disciplines, including neuroscience, cognitive psychology, primatology and evolutionary psychology, as well as theoretical models such as connectionism and dynamic systems theories. Among the fields that we can conclude have had some effect on psychoanalytic practice are: psychopharmacology, which is frequently combined with dynamic treatments including psychoanalysis; understanding of cognitive variants such as ADD and autistic spectrum disorders; the increased awareness of trauma in forming personality and pathology; and the possible use of dynamic systems models in understanding complex brain phenomena. There is important new thinking derived from development models, particularly those emerging from the work of Bowlby and his successors studying attachment systems. And from the cognitive
neuroscientists, the discovery of the mirror neuron has potential implications for psychoanalytic technique.

In another paper (Olds, 2006b), I took a concept of some interest in psychoanalysis, identification, and explored what has been learned in other sciences that could be relevant to it, as well as useful for psychoanalysts to know about. The sciences I appealed to were: genetics and the variations in gene expression; cognitive psychology and the study of memory systems; animal behavior research and the phenomenon of imitation; infant development research and attachment-related attunement and imitation; and the neurobiology of the mirror neuron with its implications for empathy, imitation and transference. Identification is a phenomenon about which analysts have long been expert, but it is one that we could learn even more about by integrating the results of other sciences.

So here we have two approaches, one describing the effects of other sciences on psychoanalysis and its practice, and another attempting to explicate a complex psychoanalytic term using information from other sciences. In both cases it seems that psychoanalysis, long reluctant to look outside its boundaries, has absorbed a mass of information from other sciences and clearly stands to gain conceptually in the future. Furthermore, we analysts can in return contribute to the general fund of knowledge.

INTERDISCIPLINARY EFFORTS AT THE CENTER

At Columbia Rado’s spirit has lived on, often in the face of antagonism from the psychoanalytic establishment. We see it in the works of Kardiner, Karush and Ovesey and, more recently, in the writings of Arnold Cooper, whose seminal paper, “Will neurobiology influence psychoanalysis?” (1985), was one of the first major statements about the importance of our connection with the brain sciences. It was certainly influential in focusing my interests in this direction.

In recent years, Columbia has continued its leadership role in the integrationist arena. In the academic curriculum a major undertaking at Columbia has been an advanced theory course that has been evolving over the past 15 years. This course attempts to integrate analytic theory and practice with information from other sciences. For some years this has been the most ambitious course of this sort in the country. Recently we sent our curriculum and
reading lists to other institutes, where there is growing interest in this educational effort. In addition we have had a successful Reading Group of senior faculty, which has taken up many of the issues from neighboring sciences, including the biology of memory and affect, semiotic models of mind, theories of consciousness, dynamic systems models, “evo-devo” theories, gene-expression research, and mirror neuron research. These integrating efforts have been on a parallel track with the development of neuropsychoanalysis, the discipline behind the International Society for Neuropsychoanalysis, which was founded in 2000 by Mark Solms and Edward Nersessian, and is now led by Solms and the neuroscientist Jaak Panksepp. The Society is a growing organization with annual meetings in three continents, and with monthly lectures at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. These lectures, mostly by eminent neuroscientists, have been popular and successful. It has a fledgling journal, the bi-annual *Neuropsychoanalysis*, of which I am a co-editor. The term “neuropsychoanalysis” has taken hold, having the definition of something like “neuroscientifically informed psychoanalysis.” Our Director, Eric Marcus, has recently formed a Division of Neuropsychoanalysis within our Center. This division will continue the educational work we have already been doing, and it may also explore ways in which analysts and researchers could more fruitfully collaborate in the conduct of research.

**AN ANALOGY TO CARDIOLOGY**

The integrative efforts thus far have been mainly aimed at theoretical and educational goals. In advancing theory we have been working somewhat in parallel with the branch of philosophy called Neurophilosophy by one of its early writers, Patricia Churchland (1986). The philosophers, themselves dealing with the higher functions of the mind, began to see the need to understand the underpinnings of mind, and their effort, like neuropsychoanalysis, is a growing endeavor. We may be approaching the point where there is a body of brain science that can serve as a theoretical foundation for our new discipline and its clinical practice. In many professions, learning this foundation is part of developing from a technician to a professional, who has maximal flexibility and creativity in clinical work and who can contribute in
research and scholarship to the evolution of the profession. We see this in medicine with respect to basic sciences, and we see it in psychology with respect to research methodology, psychological theory, and brain science. As mentioned above, we still face considerable opposition to this evolution, as though psychoanalysis were a special field, where dualism must be maintained and where the normal scientific responsibilities do not hold.

To take an example from another medical field, consider cardiology. Cardiologists have much understanding of cardiac function at the phenomenological/organismic, the anatomical, the physiological, the molecular, and even the atomic levels. They have some knowledge of the supra-organismic level such as the social and environmental factors involved in the heart’s health and function. There are still many things they do not understand, e.g. some complex catastrophic events they are trying to comprehend using chaos models. But none of the levels are viewed as contradictory, and the whole system is considered to be the basis of the competence of a good cardiologist, especially one who will be able to have new ideas, do research and contribute to knowledge. There is no way in which we can consider cardiac function as somehow divorced from the physical cardiovascular system, with a life of its own — a kind of “substance dualism.”

We can draw certain parallels between cardiology knowledge and brain knowledge. In brain/mind study a similar hierarchy of conceptual levels exists, and none of the levels need be contradictory, although the levels have contradictory gaps. Moreover, some schools espouse a functional dualism, so that the highest brain functions, mainly the symbolic, socially interactive ones, have been considered independently of the rest of brain function. This way of thinking tends to dismiss the relevance of interdisciplinary studies, claiming that the analyst’s only interest is in the output level, the symbolic expressions of the organism in its environment. The brain function underlying it is considered irrelevant and is left for others to study. This approach is actually quite similar to the behaviorist idea that the only thing worth studying is the output, the behavior; there is no point in trying to look

1 This example is excerpted from the Interim Report: Committee on Scientific Interdisciplinary Studies, written in 2001, when the Center set up a Committee to organize our interdisciplinary activities.

2 A good example of this recently is the Blass and Carmeli (2007) paper mentioned earlier.
inside the “black box.” This might be similar to a phenomenological cardiologist saying: “All we need to know is cardiac output functions and the technical means for dealing with them. The only question in heart failure would be: What are the output parameters and how can we change or improve them? There is no need to study the anatomy and physiology of the cardiovascular system.” The interdisciplinary approach holds that a more inclusive, multi-level model could and should be used for the maintenance of an analytic institute as a professional, academic institution and not as a “trade school.”

**ADDRESSING DUALIST VIEWS OF PSYCHOANALYSIS AND NEUROSCIENCE**

There are a number of reasons for the malaise afflicting psychoanalysis. One is the lack of outcome validation mentioned earlier. Another is the discipline’s lack of a theoretical infrastructure. These problems put even the teachers in institutes at a disadvantage. The current generation of students in psychology and psychoanalysis is used to integrationist explanations of psychiatric phenomena, and finds these explanations compelling. This is largely because there are ever more multi-level explanations available, and these explanations make complex psychological phenomena more understandable. In other words, students’ previous education has prepared them for integrationist models, and the attraction to a dualistic approach is weaker than in earlier generations. The contorted, unfalsifiable theories of early psychoanalysis are seen as confusing and out of touch with the larger scientific reality. This problem can be remedied. Our concepts will be easier to teach, and analysis can then stand on a much firmer foundation.

That said, we understand that many people do not accept that there is a homology between the brain’s output and that of other organs, such as the heart. They argue that other organs put out “physical emissions” which are not considered “meaningful” in the way that brain outputs are. Other organs make bile, excreta, physical flow phenomena, but not meaning. There are at least three problems with this argument. The first is a practical one. There is actually a two way street, in that not only do brain changes alter mental output, but mental changes — as in therapy — also alter the brain (Gabbard, 1998). The other two problems are more theoretical. One is that most body organs operate on delicate
homeostatic feedback systems, so that within each system there is a kind of “meaning” in phenomena such as blood glucose level, urine constituent levels, or hemodynamic parameters. The meaning is usually that there is too much or too little, so the system corrects to maintain homeostasis. These are simple systems, but arguably meaningful systems all the same. Hence the comparison with cardiology made above. The second problem, which is a more complex one to describe, is that these homeostatic mechanisms can be viewed as a subcategory of the larger semiotic universe, which is at the heart of all biology (Olds, 2000). A discussion of semiotics is outside the scope of this essay, but we might summarize it by saying that the brain is the semiotic organ par excellence, producing meaning-outputs such as language, gesture, cultural signs of all kinds, and the whole of society’s ethics, laws, customs, family systems, and countless more. My argument here is that whenever you create a dualism between a meaning-producer and its meanings, be it a brain or a kidney, you create a non-scientific situation. You go back to the black box idea, which was the fatal flaw of behaviorist fundamentalism, and now of psychoanalytic fundamentalism.

The dualist position is that the brain is physical and can be described and explained in biological, materialistic terms, while the mind is mental and can only be realistically considered as a source of meanings, which have a trivial or irrelevant connection to brain. Some dualists think that the mind may require the brain in order to function, but that it is useless to look into the ways mind events might interact with brain events. Meanings relate to other meanings; to connect them to the brain is reductionism, which is considered a bad thing. This term is probably an unfortunate one, having implications of negativity, or reducing, even subtracting. The term is quite inaccurate and misleading in the current environment in which we try to integrate various biological levels to form multi-layered explanations. No one would say that anxiety is “reducible to” amygdala activity. Mental phenomena are connected with the brain in complex and indeed mutual ways. There are many two-way connections, so that mind events may cause brain events and vice versa. Some phenomena are so complex and indeterminate that dynamic systems and connectionist models are the only suitable explanatory devices. For example, depression may alter the pattern of free associations, while these in turn may ameliorate or aggravate depression.
THE IMPACT OF THE INTEGRATIONIST MODEL ON THE FUTURE OF COLUMBIA AND PSYCHOAANALYSIS

Let us at least tentatively accept the above argument that the brain is the organ of the mind, and that psychoanalysis should concern itself with neuroscience. If we do accept it, what does the developing picture of psychoanalysis look like? It would seem that we have several intellectual tracks leading to the future. First is the clinical training track, which is involved in teaching and developing skilled and creative psychoanalysts. This has long been and still is the raison d’être of the whole enterprise, and one that I would argue will ultimately depend on a solid theoretical base. Second, there is the classical analytic theory track, which studies psychoanalytic models of mind by relating clinical phenomena and organizing theories. This may be scholarly, e.g. reviewing literature, refining concepts, or re-organizing our basic models. It may make use of information from research. It has been the backbone of teaching theory during most of our history. Third is the currently developing neuropsychoanalytic and interdisciplinary theory track, which advances psychoanalytic theory by integrating information from the mass of research being done by sciences outside of our field, but relevant to brain and mind. Fourth, there is traditional psychodynamic research, which correlates or otherwise relates diverse clinical phenomena and psychological theories; analyzes transcripts of analytic material to reveal patterns and developmental trends; or does outcome studies using the many psychological tests that are available. Fifth, and most recently emerging, is neuropsychoanalytic research of the sort referred to above. In this endeavor we relate a psychological phenomenon to a brain entity such as the amygdala, the hippocampus, or pre-frontal cortex, relate brain systems to each other, and provide neurological and psychological explanations for brain and mental processes. Usually, this research requires brain-probing equipment such as MRI, PET, MEG, EEG, and no doubt hardware yet to be invented. However, it would also include clinicopathological research in the tradition of nineteenth century neurologists such as Broca and Wernicke, whose work depended on autopsy studies.3

3 This indeed is where Mark and Karen Solms began their neuropsychological careers (Kaplan-Solms & Solms, 2000).
And where do we go from here? We have a goldmine of riches at Columbia, much of it untapped, and we have not even determined how best to utilize it. In the realm of neuropsychoanalysis we will continue our teaching, which is being studied and possibly emulated in other institutes. We work to present interdisciplinary material in a way that is relevant to clinical work. Perhaps surprisingly, this has become easier as the research has become closer to clinical work. Our reading group will continue, and we hope that other groups may start up. Earlier I had suggested that we might set aside money to support interested candidates to attend neuroscience meetings. This is still a possibility, if funds become available.

Now that the research effort is going forward, it would be useful to have additional faculty participation. For example some interested faculty or candidates could attend meetings of the research group. If this became unwieldy, it might be better to have regular presentations of research to larger groups, or to classes of candidates. It is often said that analysts should do more research. However, research is not an amateur sport, and in this technology-heavy research, very few traditionally trained analysts have the tools to participate directly. Our research group is clearly gaining steam, and we cannot really predict, much less try to prescribe, how it will eventually relate to the Center. It will be a challenge for clinical analysts to maintain an open dialogue with the research team, lest it become an isolated and mysterious group behind closed doors. If the excitement and creativity, and even the drudgery, of research can be at least visible to the rest of the Center, that could be good for morale, good for the advancement of practice, good for recruitment, good for fundraising, and basically very interesting.

But does this mean we should become a research institute and leave psychoanalysis behind? Definitely not! All five of the tracks mentioned above are stocked with strong-minded and creative people, who will advance their varied interests. The neuro-imaging research is a novel element, which may indeed add something to our culture. But the Center with its curriculum and supervision will continue as one of the best educational institutes for clinical psychoanalysts. The Center’s place in the psychoanalytic world will remain illustrious, and the role of our faculty in the medical school will remain crucial. In my view, the eventual result will be that psychoanalysis will stand on an ever-stronger clinical, scientific and philosophical foundation.
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Prejudice in the Counter-transference

Jonathan House

INTRODUCTION

What follows is a version of a presentation given in January 2009 to a discussion group on prejudice which meets annually at the Winter meetings of the American Psychoanalytic Association. The aim of the presentation was not to make a contribution to the theory of prejudice, nor even to give an account of my thinking on the subject, but rather to present a series of more or less related elements — concepts, fictions, provocations and clinical tales — which would stimulate and frame a discussion of prejudice in the counter-transference. Thus, although I try to enrich the theme with each added element, there is no attempt at coherence or at any clear development of a position. For this written version I have made some changes, most importantly in the brief clinical material for the sake of confidentiality, but I have not tried to achieve a coherence that was absent in the initial presentation.

This topic contains a number of tensions, between different terms and concepts. Two of the tensions, which are linked, are:

CLINICAL SITUATIONS vs. SOCIAL or POLITICAL SITUATIONS and

INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOLOGY vs. CULTURE, GROUP PSYCHOLOGY and POLITICS.

Any discussion of this topic must start from and thus emphasize one side of these tensions, but a full discussion cannot avoid the other side of each tension, or, if you prefer, of each contradiction, or the pole of each dialectic.

* * * * *
As this presentation will conclude with a clinical situation concerning prejudice in the counter-transference, I shall give you some personal information by way of two fragments that say something about me. The first is a passage from John Berger’s book *Hold Everything Dear* (2007). John Berger has been an influence on my thinking since long before I started analytic training. Now in his 80s, Berger is well known for his writing on art, for his novels, short stories, poems and essays and for the films he has written. This excerpt from *Hold Everything Dear* was written in November 2001, nearly two months after the attack on the World Trade Center. As you will see, he asks the question “What makes a world terrorist?” and offers an answer.

**SEVEN LEVELS OF DESPAIR**  
(November 2001)

I would like — simply as a story teller — to add a few short remarks to the current debate.

Being a unique Super-Power undermines the military intelligence of strategy. To think strategically one has to imagine oneself in the enemy’s place. Then it is possible to foresee, to make feints, to take by surprise, to outflank, etc. Misinterpreting the enemy can lead, in the long run, to defeat — one’s own. This is how sometimes empires fall.

A crucial question today is: what makes a world terrorist and, in extremity, what makes a suicide martyr? (I speak here of anonymous volunteers: terrorist leaders are another story.) What makes a terrorist is, first, a form of despair. Or, to put it more accurately, it is a way of transcending and, by the gift of one’s own life, making sense of a form of despair.

That is why the term suicide is somewhat inappropriate, for the transcendence gives to the martyr a sense of triumph. A triumph over those he is supposed to hate? I doubt it. The triumph is over the passivity, the bitterness, the sense of absurdity which emanate from a certain depth of despair.

It is hard for the First World to imagine such despair. It is not so much because of its relative wealth (wealth produces its own despairs), but because the First World is being continually distracted and its attention diverted. The despair to which I refer comes to those suffering conditions which oblige them to be single-minded. Decades lived in a refugee camp, for example.
The despair consists of what? The sense that your life and the lives of those close to you count for nothing. And this is felt on several different levels so that it becomes total. That is to say, as in totalitarianism, without appeal.

To search each morning
to find the scraps
with which to survive another day.
The knowledge on waking
that in this legal wilderness
no rights exist.
The experience over the years
of nothing getting better
only worse.
The humiliation of being able
to change almost nothing
and of seizing upon the almost
which then leads to another impasse.
The listening to a thousand promises
which pass inexorably
beside you and yours.
The example of those who resist,
without appeal.
To search each morning
being bombarded to dust.
The weight of your own killed,
a weight which closes
innocence for ever
because there are so many.

These are the seven levels of despair — one for each day of the week — which lead, for some of the more courageous, to the revelation that to offer one’s own life in contesting the forces which have pushed the world to where it is, is the only way of invoking an all, which is larger than that of the despair.

Any strategy planned by political leaders to whom such despair is unimaginable will fail, and will recruit more and more enemies.
The second fragment concerns something said by my friend, Udi Aloni. Udi is an Israeli filmmaker who has described himself as a messianic secular Jew. His latest film, Forgiveness, had a short run in New York a few months ago. The film is deeply informed by psychoanalysis.

The movie tells the story of David Adler, a 20-year-old American. He is the son of Henry, an Auschwitz survivor who first moved to Israel and fought to create the state but then moved to the USA to become a famous composer. Against his father’s wishes, David moves to Israel to join the IDF. In a frightening situation he shoots and kills a Palestinian child by mistake, becomes mute, and is committed to the mental institution that sits on the ruins of Deir Yassin.

This is an actual mental hospital. On April 9, 1948, a Jewish militia entered the Palestinian village of Deir Yassin and killed over 100 villagers, men women and children. Soon afterwards, a mental hospital was built on the ruins. The first patients to be committed were Holocaust survivors. A legend says that to this day, the survivors have been communicating with the ghosts of the village.

Jacob, a patient in the hospital, is the inverse counterpart of David’s father, and they battle each other over David. Jacob is also an Auschwitz survivor who, after the war, went to the USA and had great success there, but then went mad and was sent to Israel for hospitalization. In the hospital Jacob is called Muselmann, which is what they called the weakest people in Auschwitz. The ones on the verge of death. The ones beyond despair. Jacob himself explains: “When we saw the living dead lying on the ground, we called them Muselmann. It means ‘Muslim’ in German.” Muselmann tells David to listen to the ghosts that are haunting him, that they have something important to tell him.

There is a moment when David’s father, who has come from the USA to take David home, falls asleep on a bench outside the hospital room in which David is sleeping, while the Muselmann watches over him. For some (psychotic?) reason Muselmann had set up candles around David’s bed but had then fallen asleep in his chair. A candle has fallen over setting fire to David’s bedding. The father is woken by a dream in which David walks up to him and says: “Father, don’t you see I’m burning?” The dream is that which introduces the most famous chapter of Freud’s most famous book. And then there is the dog called Zizek. Wit and playfulness are combined as a device for Aloni’s powerful and serious film.
During the US opening of *Forgiveness*, I had the luck to be at a screening at which Udi spoke. Of course he addressed the occupation. As I recall, he said that for him, any discussion of the occupation had to be based on unconditional solidarity with the Palestinian people. In this, Udi spoke for me.

* * * * *

Henri Parens was a founder of the Prejudice Discussion Group at which this talk was originally given. He introduced and elaborated the concept of Hostile Destructiveness. George Awad, another early member of the group, wrote a chapter in *The Future of Prejudice: Psychoanalysis and the Prevention of Prejudice*, edited by Henri Parens, Afaf Mahfouz, Stuart Twemlow and David Scharff (2007).

George was my friend and also, until his untimely death, the only Palestinian psychoanalyst in North America. In his chapter George cites Henri’s definition of “Hostile Destructiveness” and goes on to define prejudice as entailing feelings, opinions, and attitudes that are:

- Formed beforehand or without knowledge;
- Preconceived;
- Unreasonable.

He writes: “… prejudgment is central to the definition of prejudice. However, this definition stresses the unreasonableness of prejudice. Such unreasonableness is formed ‘beforehand’ and is a value judgment… These definitions raise two intriguing, if not troubling questions: Can one group reasonably judge and justify Hostile Destructiveness toward another group? And can Hostile Destructiveness be achieved without prejudice?”

* * * * *

The second bit of conceptual framing comes from Steve Portuges’s article “The Politics of Psychoanalytic Neutrality”. Now this is a bit of a “coup” for your après coup, a bit of seduction, because the article is currently in press and will be published in the *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*.

Portuges asks the question: should analysts talk to their patients about politics? About social reality, about political reality?
He answers yes. Portuges develops several interesting and novel themes. He contrasts the notion of “psychoanalytic neutrality” with the notion of “psychoanalytic self-control.” He asserts that psychoanalysis is an “emancipatory social practice.”

End of seduction! I will invoke only his question about talking politics in the consulting room.

* * * * *

Here are three fictions: two scenes and a summary of a short story. I did not create them but I have altered them. As you read them, please notice your reactions.

**Ramallah, December 2006, at a check point**

Young men with guns, soldiers in an occupying army, are manning a check point. At this check point the job is neither dangerous nor interesting. The soldiers are bored. Perhaps they have been drinking. They amuse themselves by humiliating those waiting to cross. They make an old man kiss his donkey on its ass in front of his children. They select women and men and force them to dance together, making them into ridiculous-seeming couples — a tall young woman with a short old man, etc.

**Letter from Hamburg, 1938**

Dear Hannah,

I have now received your letter, in which you tell me that you’ve done everything necessary to enable me to stay with you in Brooklyn. Also the maestro accepted me to be his student. So I thank you for everything. And it will strike you as rather odd when I proclaim this news to you — and make no doubt about it, I feel no hesitation at all, in fact I am pretty well positive that I have never seen things so clearly as I do now. No, my friend, I have changed my mind. I won’t follow you to the land of “tall buildings and lovely faces,” as you wrote. No, I’ll stay here, and I won’t ever leave.

**Returning to Tigre**

It is 1976 in Tigre, Argentina. There is only one way out of town, which has been effectively surrounded, and that is the sea; by boat one can escape north-east to Uruguay. A young married couple, leftists, are unprepared. The husband has been out and the wife momentarily leaves their house to look for him, leaving their baby in his crib. At
that very moment the army attacks from three directions. The fleeing crowd literally pushes her toward the sea and she cannot return for the infant. She runs into her husband and they escape together.

It is 1996. The couple has been living in Spain. Political conditions have changed and, although the government is still essentially what the army had imposed, it is possible for them to return as tourists to visit their old home. They find almost nothing changed. It seems that after they escaped their infant son was discovered and, together with the house, he was given to an older couple who had no children — the aunt and uncle of a high-ranking army officer. They had raised the baby as their own and, of course, with their right-wing politics. The adoptive father had died. The adoptive mother, home when the couple arrives, recognizes them because her “son” looks just like his biological father. She is a warm woman who has known trouble and clearly empathizes with the couple. The son will be home soon. Now 20, he was told about his parents and the circumstances of his adoption when he was 16. He arrives and the couple discover he is a right-wing officer, who is part of, and completely identified with, the very division which was (and still is) waging war on leftists.

BEFORE TURNING THE PAGE, PLEASE CONSIDER YOUR REACTION TO EACH OF THESE THREE FRAGMENTS.
WHAT FOLLOWS ARE THE FICTIONS WITHOUT THE CHANGES I IMPOSED ON THEM.

December 1940, a check point at the Warsaw Ghetto (*The Pianist*, Roman Polanski)

Young men with guns, soldiers in an occupying army, are manning a check point. The soldiers are bored. Perhaps they have been drinking. They amuse themselves by humiliating those waiting to cross. They force women and men to dance together who seem like ridiculous couples — a tall young woman with a short old man, etc.

**Letter from Gaza, 1956** (Kanafani, 1998)

Dear Mustafa,

I have now received your letter, in which you tell me that you’ve done everything necessary to enable me to stay with you in Sacramento. I have also received news that I have been accepted in the Department of Civil Engineering in the University of California. I must thank you for everything, my friend. But it will strike you as rather odd when I proclaim this news to you — and make no doubt about it, I feel no hesitation at all, in fact I am pretty well positive that I have never seen things so clearly as I do now. No, my friend, I have changed my mind. I won’t follow you to the land of “greenery, water and lovely faces,” as you wrote. No, I’ll stay here, and I won’t ever leave.

**Returning to Haifa, 1970** (Kanafani et al., 2000)

It is 1948 in Haifa. There is only one way out of town, which has been effectively surrounded, and that is the sea; by boat one can escape to Syria. A married couple, Palestinians, are unprepared. The husband has been out and the wife momentarily leaves their home to look for him, leaving their baby in his crib. At that very moment British withdraw abruptly and without warning, and the Zionist forces attack from three directions, literally pushing the Palestinian residents of Haifa into the sea. Caught up and pushed forward by the crowd, the wife cannot return for the infant. She runs into her husband and they escape together.

It is 1968. The couple has been living in Ramallah (60 miles away). Political conditions have finally changed and now, for the first time, it is possible for them to return to Haifa and to visit their old home. They find almost nothing changed. It seems that after
they escaped their infant son was discovered and, together with the house, he was given to older couple, survivors from Poland. They had raised the baby as their own and, of course, as a Jew. The adoptive father had died. The adoptive mother, home when the couple arrives, recognizes them because her “son,” David, looks just like his biological father. She is a warm woman who clearly empathizes with the couple. The son will be home soon. Now 20, he was told about his parents and the circumstances of his adoption when he was 16. He returns and the couple discovers he is in the IDF — utterly identified as an Israeli and viscerally anti-Arab.

* * * * *

Of course it is the comparison of your reactions to the altered and the un-altered fictions that will be most interesting. Now for the clinical bits.

Joe

Late 30s, worked in finance. Quite ill. Proud of his virulent prejudice toward Catholics and Jews, blacks, Hispanics and foreigners quite generally. There was a session from the third year of treatment which I have presented before. As you will correctly assume, it was work I am proud of. Joe was late. He explained that, while moving his bowels, he had been reading a New Yorker profile of Harvey Weinstein and “lost track of time”. But he made a slip and first called him Harvey Fierstein, and then corrected himself. He described Harvey Weinstein as a “A bully. A scary, big, fat Jew who intimidates people.” In the course of the session I was able to interpret to him that I was the “bully”, the “scary, big, fat Jew”. It was a powerful moment. But it got better when we got to the Harvey Fierstein transference and identification. He saw Harvey Fierstein as “even worse” and ended the session by saying:

He’s a real nightmare! Worse than an intimidating fat Jew. A cross-dressing, homosexual, total nightmare Jew. They made fun of him on Saturday Night Live. The character who was imitating, mocking him would say: “I just want to be loved. Is there anything so terrible about that?” (Laughs). I’m like that — lying on the sofa: “I just want to be loved.”

Although Joe was perhaps the most prejudiced, racist patient I have ever treated, and although he correctly thought that I was
Jewish and that my politics were liberal, I did not have much trouble in the counter-transference in relation to his prejudice. I am proud of my work with Joe and have presented it elsewhere. On the other hand, consider my work with Sam.

**Two moments with Sam**

Sam had been in analysis for many years, during which he found love, a new and satisfying career, got happily married and became a fine father to his twin sons. When we terminated we were both pleased with the work. Years later he came back for weekly psychotherapy, on and off. Although our work is informed by our years of analysis, the sessions are more avuncular than analytic.

A couple of years ago his mother died and his father, an older man, was compelled to retire. He was devastated by the double loss. Sam has never been religious but as a child he treasured going to synagogue with his father and continues to go, from time to time, with his wife. Sam is a liberal and was an Obama supporter. One week last year he came in with “good news”: his father’s spirits had lifted because of discovering something meaningful to do. He was going to go down to Florida to campaign among elderly Jews on behalf of John McCain, believing that any Democrat, especially Obama, would be bad for Israel. Sam told me the story with a wry smile; he rolled his eyes and shook his head. I nodded and returned the wry smile, silently acknowledging the irony.

Shortly thereafter came the Israel Day parade. Sam is a secular Jew but unsurprisingly, if perhaps in an automatic way, he is a Zionist. Sam spoke of taking his children to the parade and of teaching them about the founding of Israel and so forth. He was not referring to teaching them the history as I understand it. He was not teaching them about the Nachba. I thought: “How awful, another generation indoctrinated in lies!” He must have read it on my face. Or close enough. Sam said something like: “Do you think it’s a bad thing to encourage them in that direction?” I was flustered. I don’t recall what I said but something along the lines of indicating that while I might have a different point of view, of course there was nothing bad about what Sam was doing. We moved on and away from the topic. We have not returned to it.

* * * * *

With that clinical snippet I ended my talk, saying that I welcomed not only theoretical commentary on prejudice in the
counter-transference, but also supervisory comments on situations like that with Sam.

Susan Lazar gave a great discussion and then there were excited comments from and conflict among the group, which included Zionists and anti-Zionists, a survivor (Anna Ornstein) and the only Saudi psychoanalyst in the world. In short, I felt happy that my provocations had served their intended purpose. But you, dear readers, will have to provide your own excitement.
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THE COLUMBIA PSYCHOANalyTIC FELLOwSHiP: SHAping IDEAS AND shARiNG INTERESTS
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As early career psychotherapists and trainees, we have heard tell of a time when psychoanalysis prevailed in psychiatry as the predominant model of the mind and modality of therapy. To paraphrase one of our supervisors: “It was a given that every bright and intellectually curious young psychiatrist would pursue analytic training.” Times have changed, and now even psychodynamic psychotherapy—already different from psychoanalysis itself—competes for attention with four other modes of therapy in which graduates of psychiatric residency must demonstrate proficiency. No wonder, then, that the level of psychoanalytic education provided to the typical resident can scarcely do justice to such a complex and rich field of study.

Nonetheless there is a subset of today’s trainees for whom the psychoanalytic approach remains uniquely compelling, rooted as it is in a comprehensive and systematic theory of mind and behavior, and affording as it does the opportunity to understand another in such depth and detail. For those of us who sense the power of this approach, there can be frustration in wanting to learn more, with little structured opportunity to do so within our training programs.

For these reasons, we are fortunate that this year the Columbia Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research instituted its Psychoanalytic Fellowship, offering a unique opportunity for a small number of highly qualified applicants. The authors of this brief essay are among the lucky few who were selected as the inaugural fellows. As such, we are immersing ourselves more deeply in psychoanalytic thinking, and are honored to participate in the vibrant intellectual community of the Center.
One of the pleasures of the fellowship lies in its crossing, as does psychoanalysis itself, the traditional disciplinary boundaries between medicine and psychology. In doing so, it allows for a richer exchange of ideas between these two fields, which have so much to say to one another and yet all too often lack a common locus for dialogue. This year’s class includes four psychiatric residents, one recent graduate of a psychiatry residency, and two doctoral candidates in psychology. We have valued the opportunity to share with each other the different perspectives afforded by our collective backgrounds.

At the core of the fellowship are two seminar series: Why Psychoanalysis? and Great Ideas in Psychoanalysis. The latter was created specifically for the fellowship. Once a month, Dr. Jane Rosenthal, the director of the fellowship, is our gracious host as we read and discuss a paper presented to us by a senior member of the Columbia faculty. Readings are chosen as a vehicle for teaching a fundamental psychoanalytic concept. This fall’s topics included narcissism (presented by Nate Kravis); a psychoanalytic understanding of trauma (Ellen Rees); and a taste of Freud in his essay on Jensen’s Gradiva (Deborah Cabaniss). After a presentation by the guest speaker, we share our reactions to the paper and proceed to refine our understanding of the concepts through general discussion.

Part of what makes these meetings so stimulating is the presenter’s connection to the papers we read, in some cases because he or she is its author. In other instances the chosen reading represents a personal favorite, fondly revisited by the presenter over the years, finding, as we have been taught, new meaning with each rereading. In the coming months we look forward to discussing the analytic pair (Elizabeth Auchincloss), and research in psychoanalysis (Stephen Roose), and finally to revisiting narcissism (Sharone Ornstein).

Why Psychoanalysis?, a long-standing and popular monthly seminar, makes a wonderful complement to the Great Ideas seminar, as it presents detailed clinical material in the exploration of a particular idea. We are grateful to Dr. Deborah Cabaniss for hosting these events and to both Dr. Cabaniss and Dr. Justin Richardson for their wonderful teaching. If Great Ideas teaches the theory, Why Psychoanalysis? illuminates the practice—providing a rare glimpse to those of us not yet in training of the lived experience of analyst and
analysand as they together strive to make meaning and gain understanding. It is one thing to study the concept of resistance; it is another to see its polymorphous presentation and to hear an analyst describe the ways she does or does not confront it at any given juncture. This detailed clinical material brings psychoanalysis alive and shows its subtlety and power; it indeed answers the question Why Psychoanalysis?

In addition to attending these two longitudinal seminars, each fellow is assigned a mentor with whom he or she meets regularly to discuss particular interests in more depth. This more personal interaction rounds out the fellowship experience and provides individual guidance for the year’s teachings, as well as stimulating future aspirations. Finally, the fellowship afforded us entry to the winter meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association, where we were able to glimpse the wider world of American Psychoanalysis.

We are delighted to have had this opportunity to meet both esteemed faculty members and future colleagues, and to learn from and with each other. As a part of this inaugural Columbia Psychoanalytic Fellowship experience, we look forward to hearing updates about the program from future fellows!

**POSTSCRIPT**

Thanks to Drs. Soffer and Deckel for contributing this description of their experiences in this inaugural year of the Psychoanalytic Fellowship. The editors of this section hope that future issues of the Bulletin will continue to include essays relating to this important early-career fellowship. Along those lines, one of our ideas is that the fellows will ultimately be afforded the opportunity to work together on a research project or other paper to be published in forthcoming issues of the Bulletin.

Finally, we would like to append a list of this year’s fellows, including her/his field, school of origin, and particular interests.

Garrett Deckel

Garrett Deckel recently graduated from psychiatric residency at the Mount Sinai School of Medicine, having previously received her medical degree from the University of Pennsylvania and her
doctoral degree in the Philosophy of Mind and Ethics from Princeton University. Having recently worked as an attending at the Bronx VA, she has been synthesizing her interest in psychodynamics, personality disorders, and trauma, most recently leading a dialectical behavioral therapy group for patients with borderline personality disorder. She remains interested in the overlap between psychiatry and the philosophy of mind.

Wendy Moyal

Wendy Moyal is currently a third year resident in psychiatry at the Weill Medical College of Cornell University, where she is active in administrative work in the outpatient department and Graduate Medical Education Committee. Having completed her medical training at Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, she has been exposed to psychodynamic perspectives from early in her training. This summer, she will begin training in Child and Adolescent Psychiatry at the NYPH Columbia-Cornell Program, where she hopes to gain insight into the origins of psychopathology, especially related to maternal-infant relationships. Wendy is also interested in international health, with work experience in Chile, the Dominican Republic, and Thailand.

Jen Pula

Jen Pula is currently a fourth year resident at St. Luke’s-Roosevelt Hospital Center. Her interests include psychoanalysis, trauma, addiction, and history. She has a background in community psychiatry and community organizing, and is currently involved with resident training and administration. She has been described as someone whose inspiration to seek analytic training has evolved naturally and organically from her experience with analytic supervisors and clinical work.

Jen Schneider

Jen Schneider is currently a fourth year graduate student in clinical psychology and a PhD candidate at Fairleigh Dickinson University. She is pursuing her dissertation research into the psychosocial functioning of children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy,
and next year she will be completing her internship at the Denver VA Medical Center. As she has traversed her graduate training, she has found that psychodynamic work consistently proves to be a primary interest, and she has expressed the hope that her experience in the Fellowship will enrich her knowledge of analytic theory.

Jocelyn Soffer

Jocelyn Soffer is currently a fourth year and Chief Resident in psychiatry at the Mount Sinai School of Medicine, having previously received her medical degree from Yale University, writing a thesis on “Portrayals of SSRIs, Personality and Self-Concept.” Next year she is to begin a fellowship in child and adolescent psychiatry at the New York University Child Study center. She comes to us having received enormous praise for her capacity to bridge the psychological, biological, and psychodynamic dimensions of patients. In addition to her wide-ranging academic accomplishments, she has an extensive background in classical music and choral singing, from the Dessoff Choir to Lincoln Center. She hopes to synthesize these multivarious approaches and accomplishments through psychoanalytic study and practice, further informed by a particular interest in neuro-endocrinology.

Michelle Sonnenberg

Michelle Sonnenberg is currently an advanced doctoral candidate at Adelphi University’s Derner Institute. She has an abiding interest in psychodynamics, and she recently presented her research on the interpersonal dependency implications of arrogant/entitled and depressed/depleted narcissistic individuals at the American Psychological Association’s Division 39 meetings. She plans to expand her research on narcissism as the focus of her dissertation.

Oliver Stroeh

Oliver Stroeh is currently a fourth year resident in psychiatry at Columbia University / New York State Psychiatric Institute and is soon to begin a fellowship in child and adolescent psychiatry at the
Columbia and Cornell Universities / New York Presbyterian Hospital combined program. He has had a long and abiding interest in bioethics and is an accomplished athlete as well. He hopes to pursue psychoanalytic training in the future, as he feels that the highlight of his residency training experience was his introduction to psychodynamic psychotherapy.
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