From the President

In March in Durham, many of us gathered together “under one tent” to experience what proved to be a remarkable conference. In my previous column, I anticipated that participants would be more than satisfied with the caliber of the meetings. I believe we surpassed all expectations!

The conference, “Under One Tent: Psychoanalytic Insights, Identities, and Inclusions,” reflected a myriad of psychoanalytic voices and groups within psychoanalysis. The atmosphere throughout the weekend was warm and welcoming, encouraging participants to reflect on, as well as debate, divergent theoretical positions expressed by the presenters. Clinical social work values and practice have included the significance of the relationship and our understanding of race, class, gender, and sexual orientation upon each distinct individual. Our impressive plenary sessions, workshops, panels, and individual papers elaborated these perspectives in eloquent, dynamic, and moving ways. In fact, one plenary speaker received a standing ovation while other sessions moved people to tears as well as intensive conversation.

Our committees were well represented, with panel presentations that included the following: Jennifer Tolleson (Social Responsibility and Social Justice), “Money and Mayhem: The Clinical Hour and the Commodification of Helping”; Kathryn Bashum (Diversity and Otherness), “Shadows of Multiple Realities within Clinical Encounters: Interactions of Race, Gender, Sexual Orientation, Ethnicity, Class, Age, Religion, and Ability”; Jerry Floersch (Research), “Case Studies and Research: Opening a Conversation”; and Denia Barrett (Child and Adolescent Practice), “Including Parents as Partners in Psychoanalytically Informed Work on Behalf of Young Children.”

Our conference would not be complete without acknowledging and celebrating our members who exemplify excellence in practice and service. This year, the first of two awards for life-time achievement was given to Barbara Berger, a past president of the AAPCSW (then known as NMCOP). For those attending the luncheon, you will recall her humorous alphabet salad of acronyms for the various organizations that she has contributed to. The second award was given to Jay Williams, a long-standing member of AAPCSW as well as a respected professor at UNC School of Social Work (see photo on page 12). In addition, it was a pleasure to award Raine Gifford (NYC) and Yael Kadish (South Africa) the student/candidate paper awards. Diana Siskind received a recognition award for her outstanding contributions in the area of children and adolescents, as well as for her scholarly writings. Finally, we are proud to have presented our first International Recognition Award to Sonia Martins Seixas, for her leadership in promoting

Continued on page 12
Editor’s Word

Congratulations and many thanks to the North Carolina Psychoanalytic Society, the North Carolina psychoanalytic community, and to Bill Meyer, conference consultant, for hosting us at what I thought was an outstanding conference in Durham this past March. Many hours of planning and hard work by the conference chair and committee, program chair and committee, and so many volunteers from the North Carolina psychoanalytic community made this an enjoyable visit to Durham as well as a top-notch educational experience for us all (see the conference report on page 3). The magic of Southern hospitality was on full display and its effect is not to be underestimated. I had a smile on my face from the moment I arrived until the moment I left. Most of all, I had so much joy in spending time with old friends and meeting new ones. As always, I returned home with a new energy and enthusiasm for my work and for my profession. Thanks to all!

Don’t miss the follow-up article by Allan Scholom in the Social Justice column (page 4). Dr. Scholom’s original article from 1998 appeared in our last issue; this new article is a thought-provoking piece outlining his current thinking.

The Newsletter welcomes readers’ letters, articles, and opinions on topics of the day and clinical issues; book reviews; notices of or reports on conferences; and news of interest to our membership. We encourage social workers with an interest in writing to use the Newsletter as a vehicle for converting their interest into the writing process.

Thanks to all contributors to the issue—Karen Baker, Penny Rosen, Allan Scholom, and Diana Siskind.

A Brief History

Crayton Rowe conducted a survey of NYC psychoanalytic training programs in 1975. The results showed that while social workers were the highest percentage of graduates, only a small number were teaching or supervising. In May 1980, at a meeting of the Clinical Social Work Federation, Rowe founded the National Membership Committee on Psychoanalysis in Clinical Social Work and became its first president. NMCOP remained a committee within the federation for ten years before becoming an independent corporation in 1990. From the beginning, the aim of NMCOP was the achievement of parity with other mental health disciplines. In March 2007, NMCOP changed its name to the American Association for Psychoanalysis in Clinical Social Work to better reflect its standing and purpose. With members from across the country, AAPCSW has gained recognition for its educational programs, standard setting, and advocacy on behalf of clinical social workers practicing psychoanalysis or from a psychoanalytic perspective.
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A Report on the 2013 Conference

Planning a conference has an advantage of knowing what to expect, but experiencing it live is actually the more rewarding part. “Under One Tent: Psychoanalytic Insights, Identities, and Inclusions” was a success on many levels. Jonathan Lear, our first plenary speaker, started his presentation by associating to the theme “under one tent” on a personal level. This led the way for the other plenary speakers—Ed Tronick, Ralph Roughton, Mark Smaller, Mary Gail Frawley-O’Dea—to make personal references to the theme. They set the atmosphere, and each plenary presenter captivated the audience with his or her ideas that made us reflect on our theories, research, and practice, as well as revisit concepts through a contemporary lens.

From the start of the conference, we also addressed the political issue of North Carolina failing to pass the same-sex marriage legislation. In his “Welcoming Remarks from North Carolina,” Peter Perault informed us of the work that the North Carolina Psychoanalytic Society and others in the mental health community did to support same-sex marriage legislation as well as the work that lies ahead to change the laws in the state.

There is more to be noted, including the range of topics covered in the presentations: for example, psychoanalytic practice and theory, the analyst’s identity, trauma and loss, social justice, diversity, LGBTQ issues, work with children/adolescents, mother-infant studies, populations on the fringe, the disabled, research, and more.

Cultural activities incorporated in the planning afforded us an opportunity to socialize with colleagues and friends while familiarizing ourselves with Durham’s history: the walking food tour of downtown Durham and the opening reception at a restaurant in the American Tobacco Historic district, both scheduled on the day before the start of the formal educational part of the program. Infusing the arts into the program was an integral part of the conference. Saturday’s luncheon included music by Bach and Tchaikovsky, with violinist Sonia Hsieh and friends. The Blue Jean Ball at the Durham Arts Council on Saturday evening was another event with music—by the Kudzu Ramblers bluegrass band, including Sid Comer on the guitar, and by the Jazz Quartet, including Jerry Brandell and John Chiaramonte. Art related to the conference theme was exhibited both in a room that became our “art gallery,” with works by AAPCSW members Michael Jenkins, Stuart Perlman, and Karen Redding, and at a local gallery, Outsiders Art Gallery, that included artists on the fringe.

Jerry Brandell, editor of the Psychoanalytic Social Work (PSW), will dedicate two journal issues to papers presented at the conference. The authors were invited to submit their papers to the journal, which will undergo its own peer review process. To honor the twentieth anniversary of PSW, the publisher, Taylor and Francis/Routledge, hosted a reception at the conference.

This is just a sampling of all that was accomplished at the conference, and there are many people to thank for their participation, including program consultant Cathy Siebold, conference consultant William Meyer, hospitality chair Nancy Perault, AAPCSW president Karen Baker, the conference committee, readers, presenters, moderators, discussants, and many others. The Candidate Call for Papers co-chairs Diana Siskind and Susan Sherman awarded the two winners, Raine Gifford and Yael Kadish, who presented their papers at the conference. Yael came from South Africa to present. In the president’s column, Karen Baker notes the Lifetime Achievement Award recipients, Barbara Berger and Jay C. Williams (see photo on page 12), and the International Recognition Award recipient, Sonia Martin Seixas. Another noteworthy award was given to Diana Siskind, for her contributions to professional writing, particularly in child therapy.

Thank you all. Most of all—there is nothing that can rival Southern hospitality! See page 10 for a list of conference planners and participants.
The Social Justice column arises from the passions of some of our committee members and the larger AAPCSW membership. The Committee on Social Justice is hoping that the column can be dialogic and conversational, that is, encourage a reflective back and forth within the organization. Toward that end, we invite and encourage submissions of articles relevant to the committee’s mission (see below), as well as responses to articles that have been printed. Please contact Jennifer Tolleson, chair, if you are interested in joining us or with any submissions or ideas (jentolleson@comcast.net).

**Next issue:** Judy Aronson, PhD, on the sanctity of clinical time in a capitalist system.

**Challenging the System:**

**American Fantasies and Resistance to Real Reform**

Allan Scholom, PhD

It goes without saying that a civilization which leaves so large a number of its participants unsatisfied and drives them into revolt neither has nor deserves the prospect of a lasting existence.

—Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*

Freud’s main legacy will be in the application of psychoanalysis to community and social problems rather than to the treatment of mental illness . . . as he suggested more than once.”

—S. W. Twemlow and H. P. Parens, “Might Freud’s Legacy Lie beyond the Couch?”

At the core of whatever notion we may have as to the goodness of a civilization is how well it creates conditions for its citizenry to thrive. One essential measure of this is the economic possibilities a system offers its people. In this regard, we have heard over and again about the increasing economic inequality in the United States, inexorably accelerating over the past thirty years. Some have experienced more acute hardship than others. Although in terms of human history it is happening quite rapidly, we may not notice it in a day-to-day experiential sense. It is a little like the story of the frog placed in a pot of cool water. The water slowly comes to a boil, and the frog, not feeling the lethal changing of the water’s temperature, perishes. This is in contrast to the frog placed in hot water that immediately notices the high temperature, jumps out, and saves itself. We are the frogs being slowly boiled. Why do we not recognize that the water is boiling and act to prevent disaster? I will make the case that we are being boiled via socioeconomic reality and that, to varying degrees, we do not believe this is happening or that things are as bad as they actually are. In so doing, we will talk about the assault on our internal subjective
I will make the case that overcoming resistance to knowing is fundamental to changing the course of our circumstances. Knowledge is not only power but also a necessary condition to challenge the status quo.

We will address this challenge fundamentally at the large-group level, taking up what we will call societal or cultural fantasy/myth/illusion especially prominent in, but not limited to, the United States that constitute resistance to knowing. Fantasy is at the core of the psychoanalytic endeavor, the place where unconscious touches external reality. In a parallel way, it is critical to examine societal fantasies, centrally involved in the creation and perpetuation of emotional impoverishment and retraumatization. Of course, there are kernels of truth in these creations, but to the extent they go unquestioned (not deconstructed) we are left vulnerable to powerful societal forces that most benefit from their continuation. Correspondingly, for protective reasons, owing to past and current cultural trauma, our vulnerabilities create in most of us the need to remain absent from ourselves and thereby participate in our own exploitation. Self-awareness of one's actual (not imagined) place in the system, as well as knowledge of how and whose interests are served by it, are essential to knowing how to critique and how to change social reality.

Further, we will take up a number of such fundamental fantasies, including that we live in the most democratic of societies (as opposed to one where the information and ideas necessary for a truer form of freedom are severely limited); that there is such a thing as a free market (as opposed to a system where those in power make the fundamental rules); that the two-party system represents a real choice (as opposed to a structure that seriously constrains challenge to the status quo and those who most benefit from it); that the private sector is inherently more efficient and effective than the public (as opposed to a view that recognizes that the market does not necessarily work optimally, if at all, as in health care); that there is such a thing as big or small government (as opposed to the reality that size, as in number of people working in government, does not change with the party in power, but rather what matters is what government does with our resources, that is, whether policies favor corporations and or benefit the public); that the American Dream still exists (as opposed to the notion that it is an illusion that places responsibility, even blame, on those who do not “make it”); that American Exceptionalism is an expression of omnipotence used by those in power to exert power and by those not in power to feel powerful via identification with the aggressor; and, correspondingly, that we in the United States are beyond what happens in the rest of the world; and American Individualism as way of disavowing context, history, and responsibility such that little matters except what can be done on one’s own, leading to self-blame rather than outward protest. Lastly, we will consider the role of psychoanalysis as a force that can be of help in creating greater awareness of social reality, while mindful of Jung’s observation that “people can’t stand too much reality.”

Subjectivity is Everywhere—Organized or Underdeveloped

As Freud sets forth, we live in a system (although we will argue that the corporate capitalism of today is more dangerous in regard to the scope of its destructive direction) that has a dynamic of its own and is not fully planned or controlled, much as is the case with individuals. Of course, individual psychology is always unique yet always embedded in the social matrix. In a parallel way, cultures have fundamental dynamics. Too often we fail to recognize that culture is the product of human construction rather than god–given or an expression of human nature.

We need to be mindful that the personal and the political exist as two different realms enjoying mutual influence and sharing points of intersection everywhere. At times we map the world with psychoanalytic concepts alone, as if there were no distinct outside world and hence without sufficient appreciation for external forces (for example, cities emerged around rivers and Eskimos have fifty words for snow.) These kinds of distinct lines of development necessitate consideration of both lenses if our aim is to gain more in-depth understanding.

We will talk about forces that exist in relation to one another, wherein there are very significant power differences such that a few “win big” as against the vast majority (including the two-thirds of the world in poverty) who occupy varying but less advantaged social strata. From the point of view of outward reality, we will speak from the perspective of the 99%, who have suffered an inexorably increasing degree of economic deterioration, with a corresponding decline in standard of living, as compared to the 1%. While this is to some degree known, at least statistically, it exists to a far greater extent than is generally acknowledged and certainly goes underappreciated in its scope. I use the 99%/1% dichotomy as a way of differentiating winners and losers in our society—those who by
virtue of their economic and political power can and do, in the bottom-line words of Gordon Gecko, protagonist in the 1987 film Wall Street, “make the rules.”

From the vantage point of inner reality, we experience what we might call an expanding measure of emotional impoverishment. By this I mean the degree to which we are unaware of what is really “going on” in the outside world and that the consequences of not knowing is a symptom of trauma. In this regard we might consider how “whistleblowers” (like Wikileaks, Daniel Ellsberg, Bradley Manning, and so on) are treated by the 1%. Those who would reveal the “truth” are often persecuted and endangered. The degree to which we are without knowledge represents the degree to which true democratic processes are compromised. In this way our psychological states inevitably intersect with socioeconomic conditions. Thus, we may become co-opted or unwittingly collude with those who have hegemony, enabling their exploitation of us and our own self-exploitation. From this position, we can consider how to challenge the status quo by way of consciousness raising. This is where psychoanalysis can come into play: if we can delve into psyche, help heal trauma, and unearth deeper “truth” with individuals, why not with societies?

We must take seriously what we know to be so, namely, that there is resistance to knowing, that it is not simply a failure to have the information necessary to act. I speak here about resistance in the context of character—that the things that make us who we are also and necessarily hold parts of ourselves born of pain and trauma. It is fear of knowing that paralyzes us. This pertains to our cultural history as well as to the events that occur during our lifetimes. It may exist as Andre Green’s “negative,” Wilfred Bion’s “nameless dread,” Christopher Bollas’ “unthought known,” Judith Butler’s “loss of loss,” Stephen King’s “dead zone,” or in ghost stories or cultural silence (as in the “Great Hunger” in Ireland; see Michael O’Loughlin’s work). We know this in our clinical work and yet we often do not extend this knowing to the social world. That we tend to disavow history and the trauma contained within it even in psychoanalysis is evident in the work on “intergenerational transmission of trauma.” We give this longer and broader view of history a special name, as if it were a distinct area of interest as opposed to an intrinsic, critical part of the whole. This reflects our tendency to minimize, deny, and disavow, thereby insuring repetition of trauma.

I believe we in the psychoanalytic world are especially suited to do this analytic uncovering, having the requisite tools to become more conscious and, in so doing, challenge the way things are from within ourselves and in the outside world. No doubt what is most essential about the psychoanalytic perspective is our recognition of and respect for unconscious life, for motivation at the deepest level. Whether we think in terms of drives or object relations, self or relational psychology, we believe that there is a depth we can never fully grasp that always exists in relation to conscious experience. In contrast, on the social/systemic level, often we do not question trenchantly. Put starkly, we do not “follow the money,” economically speaking, who wins and who loses (as in wars, inequality, poverty, climate change, and so on) in the world. This is the fabric of our society. We live in, depend on, and are formed by its power relations and all their implications. Yet we shy away from looking at the bottom line for fear it may seem incomprehensible, horrible, and hopeless. Our effort to look deeply and in a constructive spirit at these realities can work like a good interpretation, where instead of feeling perplexed, unsettled, and numb, things make more sense. Amid the endless onslaught of daily disinformation, propaganda, and lies, a framework for organizing the data is orienting, leading to greater rigor in thinking and enhanced creativity of response.

In the words of Victor Wolfenstein (1998), “We must interpret the world in order to change it.” At root we must have a point of view, a frame of reference, from which to look at things in the larger world, just as we do with our patients. This involves our personal histories, our beliefs about what makes people tick and what makes the world the way it is, and our values (morality) as to how things should be. All this is intimately personal and as such requires that we reflect on where we come from. It is a kind of “organized subjectivity.” Some may do this from a religious or spiritual vantage point, others from an existential or political one or perhaps some combination of all. Whatever the approach, what is crucial is that we attempt to locate where our own resistance to knowing lies, in the hope of making room for new learning. Moreover, in doing so, we may see more clearly that resistance is involved in our view of the social matrix. Our fantasies and illusions, deeply buried in the dearest and most valued beliefs and institutions, are often difficult to identify and challenge.

In addressing the issue, I will first speak autobiographically with the hope that this will be a point of connection with others. Having grown up in a familial
If we can delve into psyche, help heal trauma, and unearth deeper “truth” with individuals, why not with societies?

world that led me to look for a better home outside, I was looking for the proverbial external solution to an internal problem. However, as we know, one can never really leave home (history). We have to figure out how all of this comes together—the inside and outside world. To that end, I sought my private unified field theory of existence, driven by a need to understand life in the face of an ungrounded sense of emotional reality. One of my earliest memories was a desire to be a doctor, hardly unusual growing up Jewish in Brooklyn during the 1950s. In particular, it was my dream to discover the cure for cancer, a grandiose but structuring fantasy, which stayed with me until I dropped out of premed in college. This speaks to the dual nature of fantasy—on one level, adaptive and organizing, on another, a way of coping with the underlying trauma that necessitates omnipotence and distortion. For me a primary consequence has been an approach to life from the point of view of outsider and critic, fixer, and savior. Naturally my views will reflect that, and I am aware that some who read this may be troubled. Nevertheless, I write this in the spirit of consciousness raising and with the conviction that the reality that makes sense is usually better than the unreality that doesn’t. There is also a problem of wanting to say much in a limited space—like a premature or excessively extensive interpretation with a patient. However challenging this may be, as I’m trying to speak at the level of the air we breathe, I like to think confronting fundamental ways of viewing “reality,” is in keeping with the psychoanalytic mission as a revolutionary force meant to transform society. Freud put this forward many times, as have others before and after. At the very least, we must consider that the analytic position, even in the consulting room, must include a questioning voice. We must be “critical” of the way our patients (and we) live their (our) lives lest we do them (and ourselves) no good. After all, they come to us because things are not going as they had hoped.

While we may be able to utilize a critical stance (we usually call this investigating or exploring) clinically, we may minimize or dissociate this stance from the political or outside realm. Often we limit the scope of questioning. Lynne Layton (1999) has been a leader in discussing the tendency in the United States to split off personal from political. We might say the personal from the historical is similarly disavowed. Christopher Lasch described it as the disappearance of the world as an object. Nancy Hollander’s (2009) exhaustive political and psychological analysis of oppression throughout the Americas is a beacon in this arena. Barbara Ehrenreich (2010) has written eloquently of the American way of sealing off reality as a kind of compulsive need to be optimistic or look on the “bright side.” This manic defense against knowing functions as a kind of cultural collusion that may at some level help us to feel a sense of belonging as “Americans.” Such splitting/dissociation may also provide a sense of pleasure, even joy, as we feel we have triumphed over painful parts of experience (Hoffman, personal communication). In any case, banishing the negative substantially limits emotional well-being by keeping us in the dark. Likewise, it functions to maintain the status quo, a circumstance that serves the interests, at least economically speaking, of those in power.

In this spirit, it is worth addressing how mental health professions in the United States are organized in such a way that devalues a questioning stance and thereby deters consciousness raising and protest. From an economic vantage point, in terms of compensation (no doubt the major way in which status is accorded in the culture), psychiatry with its emphasis on the biological sits at the top. Psychology, which centers around the individual, comes next, followed by social work, with its focus on the social/societal. Thus, the profession with a history of involvement in social justice is not accorded the stature (at least economically speaking) it merits. It is no surprise that I teach the class Psychoanalysis, Politics, and Culture at the Institute for Clinical Social Work, a graduate school in Chicago with a strong commitment to social justice.

We reside in both realities—psychic and social. To live as well as we can, we need to examine our fantasies, myths, and illusions. Moreover, because who we are, individually and collectively, inevitably and ubiquitously informs clinical work, there is further benefit to broadening and deepening our understanding. In so doing, we might think in terms of holding or containing different, at times conflicting, points of view (as in voting for Barack Obama while at the same time realizing the limits of
electoral politics in the United States). We can and must live with the gap between what is possible in the current milieu and what we would like to happen that may be more revolutionary.

Let us turn our attention back to interpretation, particularly the context or stance from which we view the subjective realm. I refer here to our beliefs, theories, and ideals about what makes people and societies tick. Some of this of course is unconscious, and all of this is historical. Personally, I am drawn to explaining human experience from the point of view of “nurture” (in contrast to “nature”). This means looking toward the personal and social, as distinguished from the biological, for the relevant sources of influence and change. One’s stance vis-à-vis nature/nurture has enormous political implications. Viewing the world in terms of nurture, I believe, more readily leads to a notion of social structure and change that is more firmly in the hands of human beings to determine. In the words of Abraham Maslow, “The issue is not what kind of society does human nature permit, but rather what kind of human nature does society allow for.” This has led me to a more expansive view of human possibility. Of course, there is biology/nature and the limits it imposes, although even those boundaries we now know are influenced by human experience (epigenetics, early trauma, and so on). By comparison, the position that privileges “nature” constrains by definition human/social potential and is inherently conservative (see Walls 1997 for a brilliant analysis). In psychoanalysis we see this as a contrast between the hermeneutic/expressive and objectivist/essentialist points of view, the former more fully aligned with expanded human possibility.

Only from the late 1930s to the late 1960s, a time of social upheaval followed by economic abundance, has “nurture” been dominant over explanatory theories privileging “nature” in that discourse. In essence, when there is less available both in material resources and personal possibility, “nature” is used as a rationale for inequality, a regressive way of looking at things (as in “There’s nothing much to be done since it’s nature’s way”). In a review of the politics of the literature, Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi (1981) concluded that psychologists’ views of economic inequality were determined by political orientation—conservatives interpret data to mean that innate differences in ability (primarily IQ) are causal, while leftists see social conditions (poverty, unemployment, discrimination) as central.

Similarly, Philip Cushman (1995) incisively analyzes the metaphorical “war” between Melanie Klein and Harry Stack Sullivan in the mid-twentieth century. Klein locates the sources of human distress inside the psyche, largely inborn and formed early (within the first year), while for Sullivan the social world is always present and crucial. Sullivan’s was “the road not taken.” Klein’s road, the road taken, can be viewed as a splitting off of the social world, so as not to be considered a source of influence in the formation of the mind. Within the psychoanalysis that grew up in the United States, environmental factors were ignored or unduly subordinated to inborn influences. This line of development likely facilitated unimpeded social and economic growth of a psychoanalysis unthreatening to the social fabric, which speaks to the power of the dominant political/economic classes in determining morality and subjectivity. The critical point is that ideology and politics are ubiquitous, certainly more present than we realize.

When we interpret our patients’ experiences of the world, we bring our politics with us, whether acknowledged or unknown. Our purpose here is twofold—first, to offer a presentation of some “facts” about the world and, second, to offer an interpretation of these data. Of course, the “facts” I present are selective and based on my view however inevitably limited. This is what we offer our patients—our beliefs and convictions born of experience and knowledge—as we struggle to see more clearly despite the discomfort this may cause. As indicated, my own view is from the position of critic of the status quo, consistent, I believe, with the early revolutionary spirit of psychoanalysis. It is in contrast to the position of adaptation and conformity to the status quo that has largely dominated the field in this country over the last
fifty years (see Tolleson 2009 for a tour de force on this). The latter, in the form of our nonparticipation in the cultural life of the United States, has contributed mightily to our professional and cultural marginalization.

It is important to define terms, to say what I mean by the status quo, as this will be a point of departure for facts and arguments to follow. I find it most useful to look at inequality in all its forms in terms of who gains or loses in corporate capitalism. We will look primarily at socioeconomic class, as this speaks overarching to the haves and have-nots in our society, but of course gender and race are crucial as well. Most important, the analysis is from the bottom up, in other words, from the point of view of the vast majority. This, of course, is the position of psychoanalysis—to follow the patient’s associative process, in a collaborative and deep examination of the forces influencing inner and outer experience, to bring about the greatest change. It will be useful, even if incomplete, to speak in terms of the 1% versus the 99% to keep the focus on the fact that there are winners and losers. After all, we must approach the critical issues with a point of view in mind in the face of a mass media crafted and operated to represent the point of view of the powerful and privileged (e.g., Fox News, but nearly all mass media outlets).

Capitalism has created powerful tools and methodologies necessary for generating the greatest wealth of goods and services the world has ever seen. The unasked question is, Who benefits, and at whose expense, from capitalist methodologies of wealth generation? This gets us to the problem of the way goods and services are inequitably distributed. The issue of human need has never been fundamental but, rather, left to the market to be addressed. Karl Marx offered a methodology to analyze class society from the point of view of emancipation, material and subjective, from the bottom up. Historically, all empires, all systems of societal organization are superseded by what follows (capitalism followed feudalism which replaced slavery).

This is a critical point in challenging the status quo. We must examine fundamental fantasies about the world before we can change it. An overarching illusion is that the “invisible hand of the market” or “free market” will somehow take care of us. I doubt the two-thirds of the world’s population living in poverty would take comfort in this. For those more fortunate who may accept the status quo much as the air we breathe, there is a kind of “supernaturalism” (Bhattacharya, personal communication) or god-like aura operating such that we do not question the way things are. Undoubtedly, we are familiar with patients coming into therapy thinking their childhoods were fine, wanting a minor tune-up around the edges, “if you please.” We would certainly look at this with skepticism, and yet, typically, we do not question the “system” with the same rigor or confidence. Similarly, we examine collaboratively the ways our patients live their lives and usually have a vision and hope for them—if not, we would not be of much use. Why do we rarely bring the same zeal to our critique of the status quo?

The answer lies in the realm of societally induced fear and trauma, which may be unnamed and in a sense impossible to reach except to name the place where something must have been. I do not believe we have to change this approach, whether analyzing individuals or larger groups. In the later regard when there are societal groups operating that are being influenced by the massive propaganda of the mainstream media the level of awareness of differing ways of thinking is severely constricted (see Herman and Chomsky’s masterpiece, The Manufacture of Consent [1988]). To put this in context, in the United States we now have about two thousand conservative radio talk shows. Compare this with the fifty or so liberal ones. How does this square with the myth of the liberal media? Yet the beat goes on . . . assaulting us with distortion in the guise of getting “both” sides of the story. How are we to arrive at informed opinions (a truer democracy) if we do not have the necessary data? To this point, Bryant Welch (2008) talks about the phenomena of “gas-lighting,” after the 1944 movie where a husband tries to drive his wife crazy by destroying her sense of reality.
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Karen Baker (AAPCSW President), Terrie Baker, Samoan Barish, Barbara Berger, Judy Ann Kaplan, Molly Kiefer (Hospitality), Beth Lansing (Student Volunteer Committee), Kathy Likens, Susan Bokor Nadas (Faculty Liaison), Lois Ostrow, Joan Rankin (CEUs), Karen Redding (Exhibits), Mary Beth Tobin, Christy Tronnier (Student Volunteer Committee).

Student Volunteers
Ozanne Armstrong, Rosie Benzonelli, Suzanne Brown, Davina Callahan, Peter Cianci, Christine Coatney, Deborah Goff, Jessica Hallberlin, Whitney Hoback, Tammyra Jovel, Amanda Klein, Elizabeth Kunreuther, Matthew Mitchell, Shirley Parker, Julie Parker, Peter Reich, Heather Jo Ross, Brianne Sampson, Marcella Wagner, Julia Wessel, Sara Wilder, Rose Wilson, Sara Yates.

Readers (Call for Papers)

Plenary Speakers
Mary Gail Frawley-O’Dea
Jonathan Lear
Ralph E. Roughton
Mark Smaller
Ed Tronick

Presenters
Theresa Aiello, Judith Aronson, Carl Bagnini, Elissa Baldwin, Denia Barrett, F. Diane Barth, Kathryn Basham, Janice Berry-Edwards (also moderator), Joan Berzoff, Jerrold Brandell, Daniel Buccino, Leslie Cardell, Fanny Chalfin, Carol B. Cohen, Sally D. Comer, Elizabeth A. Corpt, Heather Craigie, Andy Dunlap, Joyce Edward, Sharon K. Farber, Sheila Felberbaum, Kari Fletcher, Jerry Fleorsch, Raine Gifford, Renee Goldman, Paul D. Hays, Robert E. Hooberman, Miriam Jaffe-Foger, Michael P. Jenkins, Liz B. Johnston, Yael Kadish, Joel Kanter, Harold Kudler, Judy Levitz, Jeffrey L. Longhofer, Rebecca S. Mahayag, Kerry Malawista, C. Mark Massullo, Teresa Mendez, William Meyer, Janet Migdow, Laura D. Miller, Faye Mishna, Cathleen M. Morey, Jill Newberger, Renee Obstfeld, Cathy Orzolek-Kronner, Louis Pansulla, Peter Perault (also moderator), Stuart Perlman, Renee Prillaman, Karen Redding (also moderator), Arlene K. Richards, Shoshana Ringel, Judith Rosenberger (also moderator), Lynn Rosenfield, Crayton E. Rowe, Ellen G. Ruderman, Avgi Saketopoulou, Naomi J. Schlesinger, Erika Schmidt, Cara Segal, Anne Segall, Susan B. Sherman (also discussant), Cathy Siebold (also moderator), Diana Siskind, David Smith, Elise Snyder, Brenda Solomon, Lucille Spira, Alan J. Stern, Carolyn Stevenson, David Strauss,
The Jazz Quartet
Musicians
to—Sonia Martin Seixas
Lifetime Achievement Awards
Anne Marie Dooley.
Molly Kiefer, Patricia Macnair, Susan Bokor Nadas,
Velia Frost, Judy Ann Kaplan, Richard Karpe,
Michael De Simone, Carole Dubber, Sally Fine,
Janet Burak, Judy Byck, John Chiaramonte,
Steven D. Bennett, Barbara Berger, Deborah Bunim,
Jay C. Williams, Wendy Winograd, Peter Wood.

Moderators
Margaret Arnd-Caddigan, Samoan Barish, Judith Batchelor,
Steven D. Bennett, Barbara Berger, Deborah Bunim,
Janet Burak, Judy Byck, John Chiaramonte,
Michael De Simone, Carole Dubber, Sally Fine,
Veila Frost, Judy Ann Kaplan, Richard Karpe,
Molly Kiefer, Patricia Macnair, Susan Bokor Nadas,
Adriana Passini, Michele Rivette, Helen Steinberg,
Sylvia Teitelbaum, Jay C. Williams, Ashley Warner.

Discussant
Anne Marie Dooley.

Awards
Lifetime Achievement Awards to—Barbara Berger
(presented by William Meyer), Jay C. Williams
(presented by Anne Segal).
Professional Writing Award, particularly in Child Therapy
to—Diana Siskind (presented by Susan Sherman).
Candidate Call for Papers Winners—Raine Gifford,
Yael Kadish (presented by Susan Sherman and
Diana Siskind).
International Recognition Award to—Sonia Martin Seixas
(presented by Richard Karpe).

Musicians
The Jazz Quartet—John Chiaramonte, Jerry Brandell,
Tyler Leak, Ben Palmer.
The Kudzu Ramblers—Sid Comer, Julie Elkins,
Jan Johanson.
Tchaikovsky/Bach music—Sonia Hsieh,
Lindsey Harkness, Ann Stuart-Moore.

Artists
Michael Jenkins, Stuart Perlman, Karen Redding,
Cher Shaffer, Eddie Hayes, Ed Woltemate,
Small Boy Bob Bullock—artists exhibiting at the
Outsiders Art Gallery (Pamela Gutlon, owner).

Tours/Opening Night
Taste Carolina Gourmet Food Tour.
Tyler’s Restaurant and Tap Room (Opening Night).
From the President, continued from page 1

clinical social work and psychoanalysis in Brazil. Congratulations to all.

It is here that I would like to thank our inspiring plenary speakers, presenters, and moderators who participated in the conference. Our appreciation goes to conference chair Penny Rosen, NC consultant Bill Meyer, and program consultant Cathy Siebold, as well as to the entire North Carolina contingent, who made this conference so enormously successful.

Prior to the opening of the conference, we had our in-person board meeting, which was lively and productive. After much deliberation, the board decided that annual membership dues will be increased to $85, beginning January 2014. As the organization continues to develop and grow, so too do our expenses.

In our previous newsletter, there was a brief article by Dr. Pamela Trevithick on the Group for the Advancement of Psychodynamics and Psychotherapy in Social Work (GAPS) and the Journal of Social Work Practice. Dr. Trevithick is the chair of GAPS. It was a great pleasure to have her in attendance at the board meeting as well as the conference. She is exploring the possibility of a reduced journal subscription fee for AAPCSW members.

It also pleases me to announce that Judith Aronson has accepted the leadership role as chairperson for the Education Committee. This committee has expanded and has been restructured to include the CEUs, the Teacher’s Academy collaboration with ApsaA, regional conferences, the National Study Group, and PEP.

Since our organization has established additional committees, it became necessary to take a fresh look at the study group and to integrate it into our larger, changing organization. The function of the study group may not necessarily change, but in the coming months the board will continue to reevaluate its purpose.

Our vibrancy as an organization is dependent on the contributions of many. John Chiaramonte continues to work steadfastly toward the goal of increasing our membership and providing valued benefits that we enjoy as members. Our newsletter is surpassed by none, as it continues to demonstrate excellence in content and acumen due to the efforts of Donna Tarver and Ashley Warner.

Joel Kanter has been helpful in setting up separate listservs for New Professionals and the Child and Adolescent Practice Committee as well as moderating our general listserv. The AAPCSW website continues to improve due to the efforts of Richard Karpe, his committee, and Web designer Olivier Massot.

It was an absolute treat to see so many of the area chairs at the conference. Our strength and vitality as an organization would be greatly diminished were it not for the many hours devoted to organizing and promoting educational programs at the local level. We owe a debt of gratitude to Velia Frost, Rita Cahn, Joan Rankin, Karen Redding, Kathy Buirski, Judith Aronson, Susan Bokor Nadas, Marybeth Atwell, Sally Fine, Marilyn Palasky, Wendy Winograd, Deborah Bunim, Penny Rosen, Janet Burak, Terrie Baker, Bill Meyer, Lee Whitman-Raymond, Jennifer Tolleson, Joel Kanter, Susan Marks, and Amy Ferlazzo. BIG applause goes out to all.

I am continuing to bask in the success of our conference and the vibrancy of our organization. I hope you are too.
AAPCSW Member Book Discounts
For member discounts on books, visit www.inquiringbooks.com. If you have a question or are looking for a
difficult-to-find title, please call Inquiring Minds Bookstore at 845.255.8300.

AAPCSW Member Journal Discounts (Journal prices vary for institutional subscriptions)

From Taylor & Francis:
Psychoanalytic Social Work • $16 for two issues/year (reg. $103)
Smith College Studies in Social Work • $24 for four issues/year (reg. $76)
To order, fill out form below. Please enclose a check made out to Taylor & Francis or provide credit card information and
signature. Mail to 325 Chestnut Street, Suite 800, Philadelphia, PA 19106. Or call 800.354.1420 (toll free), then press 4.
Outside the US, contact Customer Service at tf.enquiries@tfinforma.com. Include discount code AAP 01.

From Springer:
Clinical Social Work Journal • $42 per annual edition, published in four issues
To order, fill out form below. Please enclose a check made out to Springer Science and Business Media or provide credit
card information and signature. Mail to Springer Science and Business Media, Society Services Department, 233 Spring
Street, 7th floor, New York, NY 10013. Include discount code AAP 02.

From Mental Health Resources (MHR):
Eastern Group Psychotherapy Society Journal • $50 for four issues/year (reg. $55)
The Annual of Psychoanalysis • $35 (reg. $39.95)
To order, fill out form below. Please enclose a check made out to MHR or provide credit card information and signature.
Mail to MHR, 44 West Bridge Street, Catskill, NY 12414. Or call 877.647.0202 (toll free). Include discount code AAP 03.

From William Allanson White Institute:
Contemporary Psychoanalysis Journal • $56 for four issues/year (reg. $70)
To order, fill out form below. Please enclose a check made out to Contemporary Psychoanalysis or provide credit card
information and signature. Mail to Contemporary Psychoanalysis, P.O. Box 465, Hanover, PA 17331. Include discount
code AAP 04.

From Sheridan Press:
Psychoanalytic Quarterly • $83 for four issues/year (reg. $92.50)
To order, fill out form below. Please enclose a check made out to Psychoanalytic Quarterly or provide credit card in-
formation and signature. Mail to Psychoanalytic Quarterly, P.O. Box 465, Hanover, PA 17331. Or call Matthew Baile at
800.617.1932, or e-mail psaq@tsp.sheridan.com. Include discount code AAP 05.

From Sage Publications:
Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association (2010) • $121 for six issues/year (reg. $148)
To order, fill out form below. Please enclose a check made out to Sage Publications or provide credit card information and
signature. Mail to: Sage Publications, Inc., c/o Customer Services, 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, CA 91320. Or, call
800.818.SAGE or 805.499.0721, or e-mail journals@sagepub.com. Include discount code AAP 06.

Journal Order Form • AAPCSW (Please use a separate form for each publisher address)
Journal Title(s) ____________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
AAP Discount Code _______________________________________________________
Last Name ___________________________________ First Name _________________________
Address _____________________________________________________________________
AAPCSW Member Number ____________________________

Payment
■ Check enclosed (see above for make-check-payable-to information)
or ■ Credit Card: ● Visa ● Mastercard ● Amex
Card Number ___________________________ Expiration Date _______________________
Signature ____________________________________________________________________
Area Representatives’ Corner

Southern California / Orange County
Reported by Karen K. Redding, PhD, LCSW, Area Chair

The Orange County chapter of AAPCSW continues to offer seminars in the spring and fall, as we have since our “birth” as a chapter in 2006. We generally hold our seminars in the lovely and intimate home of our treasurer, Ann Stern, MFT, where a light lunch is served and participants have an opportunity to meet and mingle.

The Orange County chapter of the AAPCSW consists of a committee that includes myself as area chair; Barbara Manalis, LCSW; Paula Clark, MFT, secretary; Ann Stern, MFT, treasurer; Judy Friesen, LCSW; and Karen Smirl, MFT. We generally meet several times a year and plan the two seminars, which offer continuing education units to a wide mental health audience.

In the past year, we hosted Sheila Felberbaum, LCSW, from New York to present her play and paper, *Truama Ties*. I served as the discussant and AAPCSW members from our chapter served as actors. It was held at the USC School of Social Work in Irvine to allow for a wider audience and exposure of psychoanalytically informed practice to MSW graduate interns. This program was extended, for those interested, to an afternoon session on creative writing. Felberbaum and Ed Kaufman, MD, served as the facilitators. Eight clinicians participated in this program, and it was very favorably reviewed.

Our first program for 2013 was held June 9, with Barbara Manalis, LCSW, presenting “A Certain Sensibility: The Visual Organization of Experience.” This autobiographical paper is aimed at the exploration of how the nature of early attachment influences identity, with a special emphasis on creativity. On October 12, I will be presenting “Integrating Practices of Psychoanalysis and Mindfulness: Becoming Mindful of What?” (which I also presented at our national conference in Durham this past March). Marjorie Schulman, PhD, will serve as discussant.

Nevada
Reported by Marilyn Palasky, PhD, LCSW, Area Chair

Tim Hamilton, LCS, and I met with six other practitioners to form a planning committee; we named our pilot project “The Symposium on Mental Health in Las Vegas.” Interested in presenting grass roots information from our own experiences in the field, we put together a speaker’s list of professionals, friends, and co-workers. We aim to create an informational exchange, a public education forum, designed to resolve resistance to learning and improve the practices relating to Mental Health in Las Vegas. 2012 events included the following:

Symposium #1: “Best Practice in Mental Health—Las Vegas” was held on July 30. Speakers and topics included Marcia Cohen, BS, RN, APN, medication and mental health; Tish Diskin, MSW, LSW, the outcomes of practice—why do therapy; Lillian Norton, MD, LMFT, gestalt psychoanalysis; Lisa Linning, PhD, dialectical behavioral therapy; Rick Halgren, BS, DC, CICE, chiropractic and mental health; C. Ht Layne Keck, owner Capstone Institute of Hypnotherapy; Michelle Nard, MSW, LSW, and Tara Baker, MSW, LSW, best practice case work and case management; and Sharon Harris, LMFT, best practice in managed care insurance. The presenters spoke informally and answered questions during their sessions.

A small portion of the Aliante Hotel and Casino Ballroom was partitioned off and set up with a podium and video screen. Breakfast for all, lunch for the speakers and six continuing education units were granted for the whole day’s attendants.

Symposium #2: “Best Practice in Parenting—Las Vegas” was held August 25. It included a section of ethics. Our learning objective was to add new information about parenting to the field of mental health, cultivating it from students, friends, and practitioners who are working in Las Vegas.

Symposium #3: “Modern Psychoanalysis and Ethics” was held on November 3. We divided the day into two learning objectives: first, to clarify the psychodynamic terms of transference, countertransference, resistance, and joining. Senior clinician Gerald M. Fishbein, PhD, was our keynote speaker. Second, to finding new perspectives on ethics as it relates to treatment. A panel of practitioners spoke briefly about ethical questions in their own practice while addressing and discussing questions from the
audience of forty people. Everyone came together for the final assessment of learning and new information. The Nevada State Board of Social Work Examiners requested and received a complete “Verification of Learning” for this day.

The Board of Marriage and Family Therapists granted 16.5 continuing education units for “Symposiums on Mental Health in Las Vegas,” as did the Board of Social Work Examiners for the year 2012. Our symposiums for 2013 do not yet have event dates, and we are meeting to assess our overall plans. We anticipate an event for the first weekend of November 2013.

Rhode Island
Reported by Lee Miriam Whitman-Raymond, PhD, MFA, Area Chair

Our spring workshop, “Creative Analysis,” by George Hagman, was a great success and gave me an opportunity to introduce AAPCSW to more members of the community. I know of at least one new member who joined at that event.

Book & Film
REVIEWS

Have you published a book or chapter and would like to see it reviewed? Contact book and film review editor Diana Siskind: Dwsiskind@aol.com or 212.787.6669.

Aims & Purposes of the AAPCSW

- To represent and protect the standing and advancement of psychoanalytic social work practitioners and educators.

- To provide an organizational identity for social work professionals engaged in psychoanalytically informed practice.

- To promote and disseminate the understanding of psychoanalytic theory and knowledge within the social work profession and the public.

- To effect liaisons with other organizations and professions who share common objectives for social work and the advancement of psychoanalytic theory and practice.

- To advocate for the highest standards of practice and for quality mental health care for the public.

- To promote and disseminate the understanding of psychoanalytic theory, research, and knowledge within the social work profession of and to the public.

- To bridge social work and psychoanalytic discourses by integrating concerns for social justice with clinical practice, and conceptualizing psychoanalytic theory and practice within its broader social-political context.

New Professionals Mentorship Program
Seasoned professionals (eight or more years post-license) working with new professionals, giving guidance and direction to help with career development and career enhancement.

Contact Sally Fine  402.330.4014
Member News . . .

Lana M. Ackaway, LCSW-R, CASAC, has resumed working one-on-one with LCSWs to explore stumbling blocks to full-time private practice. Her depth-oriented work involves assisting with personalized niche development. Two of her more recent clients have successfully been able to leave “mangled care” and expand private practice opportunities. Ms. Ackaway is respectful of boundary issues for those individuals who are presently working in therapy. Find more information at LanaAckaway.com.

“Tensions of Marriage: Love, Cooperation, Capitulation, Annihilation,” by Velia Frost, LCSW, was published in the March issue of the Clinical Social Work Journal. The title of the special issue, celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the journal, is “Embracing Culture and Creativity in Psychoanalytic Thought.” Velia is grateful to the AAPCSW for supporting her work since she began to formulate her ideas in 1991.

Lisa Halotek, LCSW, board member of the Los Angeles Area AAPCSW and senior candidate at the Los Angeles Institute and Society for Psychoanalytic Studies, will be presenting her paper “Twisted Bits and Scattered Pieces: Primitive Work When the Container Is a Sieve” at the International Psychoanalytic Association’s International Psychoanalytic Studies Organization Conference in Prague this summer.

Susan A. Klett, LCSW-R, BCD, NCPsyA, was the keynote speaker at the 44th Annual Education Conference of the New York State Society for Clinical Social Work, held Saturday, May 4, 2013, at the Nightingale-Bamford School (NYC). The title of her presentation was “Shattering Trauma: Recovering andRepairing the Self Through the Therapeutic Process.” Four afternoon workshops followed, led by Noah Clyman, LCSW, ACT; Ellen S. Daniels, LCSW-R; Gwenn A. Nusbaum, LCSW, BCD, CGP; and Dr. Steven A. Weisblatt.

On February 21, 2013, Bill Meyer, MSW, BCD, presented “Oedipus and Me: Does a Psychoanalytic Perspective Have Relevance in a CBT World?” for the Duke University Medical Center, Department of Psychiatry Grand Rounds.

Luba Shagawat, MSW, LCSW was inducted into the National Academies of Practice (NAP) as a Distinguished Practitioner and Fellow at a gala membership banquet on April 6, 2013, in Arlington, Virginia. In attendance were Allen Du Mont, vice president of membership and chair of the NAP Membership Committee, along with NAP members Virginia MacIntosh, Denny McGihon, and Sharon Payne. The National Academies of Practice was established over twenty years ago in recognition of the need for interdisciplinary collaboration in healthcare. Social work is one of the ten disciplines represented at this prestigious organization. For more information about NAP, visit www.NAPractice.org.

Billie Lee Violette, MSW, PsyD, is a member and past chair of the Northern California AAPCSW who has recently had two articles published. She is a personal and supervising analyst at the Psychoanalytic Institute of Northern California, where she is active on committees and she is the co-chair of the Group Therapy Training Program at the Psychotherapy Institute of Berkeley. She practices in San Francisco and on the Peninsula in Burlingame. See “Group Process and Problems in Psychoanalytic Education,” Contemporary Psychoanalysis: Journal of the William Alanson White Institute 48, no. 4 (2012); and “Silence in the Clinical Hour: A Time to Speak,” in Contemporary Clinical Practice: The Holding Environment Under Assault, ed. Ellen Ruderman and Carol Tosone (New York: Springer, 2013).

What’s Your News?

Graduations, presentations, publications, awards, appointments, exhibits, and so on are all items the AAPCSW membership would like to acknowledge in the Member News column. Feel free to include a photo, if you like.

Ashley Warner, MSW, BCD, Assistant Newsletter Editor
85 Fifth Avenue, Suite 934, New York, NY 10003    awarnerlcsw@gmail.com
... and New Members

From H Mari P Grande, LCSW-R, NCPsyA, LCAT, MFA: “Hello. I’m a new member of AAPCSW and glad to be part of this community. I have a full-time private practice in Brooklyn Heights; I love the work, as it keeps me forever learning and growing. My background includes mostly teaching and some agency work with children and adults. My practice now includes individuals, couples, and families. Originally, I came into the field as an artist, moving into art therapy, then clinical social work, all the while studying to become a psychoanalyst.”

From Liz Johnston, PhD, LCSW: “Hi. I am a new member and I am excited to join AAPCSW. The two conferences I have attended have been wonderful—the presentations were outstanding, and I met so many intelligent, interesting people. Since presenting at the last conference, I have been intently writing my dissertation, “Critical Illness in Older Adults: New Insights from Mixed Methods,” which I successfully defended at Smith College School for Social Work on May 2. I am elated to be a PhD but also am looking forward to catching up with normal life (like planting a garden) this summer. I am a LCSW in private practice in San Luis Obispo, CA. I also teach two courses in social work at California Polytechnic University in San Luis Obispo. In my practice, I specialize in clients with medical illness, addiction, and trauma. I received my MSW from Smith College, so my approach is mainly psychoanalytic, but I also utilize EMDR for trauma processing.”

Danielle Kasprzak is an MSW student at the University of Minnesota and an acquisitions editor at the University of Minnesota Press, where she acquires books on film, media, and digital culture. She’s been interested in psychoanalytic theory for a number of years and currently runs a psychoanalytic reading group in Minneapolis that covers everything from Bion to Freud to Foucault.

New member Jeff Shively, LICSW, graduated with his MSW in 2006 from the University of St. Thomas/College of St. Catherine in St. Paul, MN. He worked for six and a half years as a clinician at Relate Counseling Center in Minnetonka, MN, where he also completed his postgraduate training. He started a part-time private practice in June of 2009, which has now grown into a full-time practice. He currently sees patients ages sixteen and over. He works frequently with men with mood disorders, anxiety disorders, an relationship concerns.

Louis Straker, MSW, LCSW-C, is a licensed clinical social worker from Baltimore, MD, who has ten years of experience in the mental health field. He obtained a BA in psychology from the College of New Jersey in 2003 and received his MSW from the University of Pennsylvania in 2009. Louis’s areas of specialty include trauma and PTSD, mood disorders, relationship issues, family conflict, and anxiety disorders. Currently, Louis works with children with visual impairments in a private school setting. He also works as an independent practitioner with a faith-based clinical practice, providing psychotherapy to children/adolescents, adults, couples, and families. Louis has training in various treatment modalities, including psychodynamic therapy, trauma-based therapies, and cognitive behavioral therapy.

Working with Children, Adolescents, Their Parents

The Newsletter welcomes your submissions pertaining to child and adolescent practice, as well as to working with their parents. Submissions should be 800–1000 words and e-mailed to the column editor (kembaker1@comcast.net) as an attached Microsoft Word file. Next submissions deadline is September 15.
To think outside the box, to stand apart from the dominant culture, is no small feat. The anxieties operating herein can reach to our core at the psychotic level. It may involve calling fundamental “realities” into serious question. We might say that we are in a constant state of regression and continually being retraumatized by the lack of reality, leaving us more dependent on those in power (sort of a Stockholm syndrome) for our informational food. Whatever we think a democracy is supposed to look like, it is hard to imagine a model without most citizens knowing what is really going on in the world.

The Realities By the Numbers and Beyond

To begin, let us consider the matter of intentionality. In using the term status quo or referring to the 1%, I am not talking about a small group of people sitting around the table deciding how to maintain control, though there are examples of exactly this. As Gordon Gecko put it in Wall Street, “We don’t do anything; we own everything. We make the rules.” The top five “too-big-to-fail” banks in 2011 held 56% of US assets ($8.5 trillion), up from 43% five years ago. Their collective power is still operating such that they continue to receive about $85 billion a month from the Federal Reserve to purchase their “toxic assets.” The Business Group on Health did set about trying to prevent the country from having a single-payer system (improved Medicare for all—the only way we can have a clinically and economically workable health care system) in the 1970s and they are still at it, with obvious success. Also, there are the billions of dollars given annually by corporations to influence our elected officials and the 1% (all of whom are in the 1% economically, but not all identified with it), before and after elections.

Let’s take the case of Walmart, the world’s largest private employer (2 million people), paying its “associates” less than $9 an hour, on average. A third of Walmart’s employees work less than twenty-eight hours a week and therefore do not qualify for benefits. In many states the largest group of Medicaid recipients are Walmart employees. Each employee costs taxpayers an average of $1000 a month in public assistance. This is in sharp contrast to General Motors, who a half-century ago was America’s largest employer. Its full-time workers earned an average of $50 an hour in today’s dollars, including health and pension benefits.

Why? One major reason involves the attack on labor unions. We have gone from 33% of private sector unionized workers in the old GM era of the 1950s to about 7% today. Last year, Walmart earned $16 billion profit, most of which went to its stockholders. This amount is more than the combined earnings of the bottom 40% of American workers. Recently, Walmart announced it is cutting employee work hours, further limiting eligibility for health care and forcing many more workers onto Medicaid (which we pay for through taxes). Others will be left with no coverage at all.

We are describing the dynamics of a system wherein, according to Milton Friedman, the major philosophical voice of modern capitalism, the essential purpose of the corporation is to insure profit for its shareholders. Mitt Romney enthusiastically asserted in the second presidential debate that taxes on capital gains and interest (the way the 1% earns most of its money) would not go up in a Romney administration, and that, by implication, we the 99% should be pleased about this. The fact that he believes this speaks to class identification, conscious and
unconscious, and how close we were to having a president out of touch with the reality of the citizenry (the 99%).

Having considered the economic system, the infrastructure that organizes life in this country, we will proceed to the matter of class and the two-party political system. The Republican Party talks about “class warfare.” Essentially this means that those who favor raising taxes on the 1% are dubbed class warriors seeking income redistribution from the top down, a very bad thing. Such a breathtaking assertion should get the award for “reaction formation of the year.” My point is not to exonerate the Democratic Party, whom we might see as a kinder, gentler version of the same class hegemony. Barack Obama did in fact continue to bail out the banks at our expense, adopt a Republican plan for health care reform (Massachusetts now has the highest per capita health care costs in the country—this largely profits the insurance industry), has subverted climate control efforts put forth by other countries, authorized the use of daily “drone” attacks killing innocent civilians, and so on. Income inequality has actually increased under Barack Obama—the top 1% captured 93% of all income growth in the United States from 2009 to 2010, versus 65% under George Bush from 2002 to 2007. In the words of former labor secretary Robert Reich, “To think of Obama as anything other than centrist is laughable.” This is a further commentary on how far to the right the country has moved.

Furthermore, it was Bill Clinton who ended “welfare as we know it.” Likewise, he signed the free trade agreements that resulted in the loss of millions of jobs. Because of the ways treaty rules were written, neither labor nor the environment were protected. The free market did not write these rules—those who gained economically were its authors. Within our current system, we do not hear much about, nor can we realistically elect, individuals who have significantly differing views of the world, be they socialist, libertarian, green, or otherwise. In the 2012 election, we did not hear about controlling global warming, cutting the military budget, helping the poor and the besieged working class, of raising corporate taxes and cutting loopholes. What we did hear about was cutting the deficit, especially in relation to social programs, which leads to privatization. Bill Maher casts our two-party system as the “center right and the crazies.” Nevertheless, we are told, and may believe, that “liberals” abound in great force.

Our two political parties tap into critical fantasy dimensions deriving from appeals to deeply engrained familial experiences—big-government Democrats, who at worst are intrusive and controlling and at best helpful and compassionate, versus small-government Republicans, who are at worst abandoning and blaming and at best fostering individualism and freedom. Of course, they both spend approximately the same amount of money; Bush actually outspent Clinton. In relation to government, the notion of big versus small is nonsense—it is just a matter of how the money is spent (whether on war or social programs, for instance). Such demythologizing is crucial to an understanding of why we persist in our beliefs about what these parties stand for in contrast to what they actually do.

Let us now return to the “facts” to illustrate the assault on reality—what is actually happening. The top 1% is taking in about a quarter of the nation’s income every year and controls about 40% of its wealth. Twenty-five years ago the corresponding figures were 12% and 25%. Their incomes have risen more than 18% over the last decade, while those in the middle have seen their incomes fall. The wealth gap between the richest Americans and the typical family more than doubled over the last fifty years. In 1962, the top 1% had 125 times the net worth of the median household. In 2010, that number had reached 288. The median household had its net worth drop to $57,000 in 2010, down from $73,000 in 1983 (it would have been $119,000, had wealth grown equally across households). This is despite the fact that many more households now have two wage earners (from 20% in 1960 to 70% in 2010), in part because women want to work, in part because they have to. In the report “Social Justice in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development” (Bertelsmann Shifting Foundation 2011), consisting of measures of social justice based upon poverty, income inequality, preprimary education, and health, the United States ranked twenty-seventh out of thirty-one countries. The bottom line is that the United States is the most “unequal” country, in terms of real disposable income, among twenty-four high-income countries (Brandolini and Smeeding 2006).

The American Dream has been an illusion (or a nightmare) for decades. Notably, the term was defined and popularized by historian James Truslow Adams in a 1931 book. During the Great Depression, the myth of the American Dream offered ordinary people something to hold on to at the same time that it facilitated those on top keeping hold. This is not to say that the United States did not at one time offer hope and possibility to immigrant
populations, and at times still may. However, the fantasy that we live in the “promised land” does not square with current reality. The continued use of the term functions as an assault on our sense of reality and impedes knowing the extent of the deterioration of our standard of living. Such a lacuna in our perception only serves the interests of wealth and power.

How does history fit in to our discussion of societal illusions and fantasies? The foundational importance of history in the psychoanalytic mission, unfortunately, is generally lost or eliminated from our examination of America’s past. After all, we are a nation built on the genocide of Native Americans (more than 9 of 10 million in North America after 1492), on the enslavement of millions for hundreds of years, on the exploitation of immigrants and children and women, on myriad imperial wars (we dropped two atomic bombs), on massive environmental destruction, and so on (see Howard Zinn’s A People’s History of the United States). This is not to imply that our history is uniquely or especially dark, for other empires before us have done much the same. What is important is the disavowal of our history from our sense of ourselves (American exceptionalism). Without a consciousness of it, individually and collectively, we leave too much behind to know which way is forward. As we know so well, those who forget (split off, dissociate, repress) the past are condemned to repeat it. In what ways and to what extent this will happen we cannot know.

In truth, class warfare exists, but it is a war waged by the top 1% against the vast majority. This situation is not unique to the United States. The profits of the world’s one hundred wealthiest individuals last year would be enough to wipe out world poverty (Oxfam International 2012). It is worldwide and has been accelerated by the so-called free trade agreements, which have allowed corporations to profit wherever they can find the cheapest labor (were there minimum wage and environmental protections, this would not be the case), hastening the loss of jobs here and in Europe. It is no wonder that there is a wave of “austerity” efforts affecting Europe much as the hysteria over “deficits” is operating here. Many have called this the Crisis in Capitalism.

Simply put, this refers to the ever widening gap in economic inequality brought on by the corporate imperative to increase profit by decreasing costs via lowered wages and higher unemployment. Overall this has resulted in reducing the purchasing power of individuals and families. As wealth accumulates in the top 1% there is less money for the 99% to spend, causing greater efforts by the “corporatocracy” to lower wages and reduce the work force. This leads to a vicious circle wherein the great majority have fewer resources to buy, diminishing how much can be sold and with economic decline as a consequence. It is systemic and destructive to life on earth. From a psychoanalytic perspective, we would call this a symptom. In socioeconomic terms, it is a symptom of the inherent problems of the global economic system. It was Marx who first introduced the idea that capitalism contains intrinsic self-destructive forces.

Let me illustrate with a current political-economic example. We have recently been bombarded with the notion of a “fiscal cliff,” owing to the so-called deficit. In fact, the deficit is actually shrinking from 10.1% of GDP in 2009, to 9% in 2010, to 8.7 in 2011, to 7% in 2012. Debate centers on how much to tax and cut. Democrats are ready to cut but not as much as Republicans. The deal so far involves about $60 billion a year in slightly higher taxes on the 1%. Since we take in $2 trillion a year in taxes and are currently spending $3.5 trillion (the difference is borrowed), this debate is hardly meaningful except insofar as it is used as an assault on what the 99% get (Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, etc.). Of course, these programs are called “entitlements,” as if to say they are unjustified, like something for a spoiled, overindulged child. In reality, they have been fully paid for by our taxes over the course of our lives. The terms of discourse distort our vision and obfuscate realistic assessment, often leaving us in an affective state of powerlessness and despair.

The terms of discourse distort our vision and obfuscate realistic assessment, often leaving us in an affective state of powerlessness and despair.
increasing concentration of power at the top and a corresponding powerlessness for the 99% in real and emotional terms. The elimination of any meaningful consideration of reality from the public discourse seriously compromises any notion of democracy.

Where does health care fit in this discussion? Health care is in the vanguard, as the biggest industry in the country (nearly $3 trillion spent last year) and a negative model where the many are hurt and killed for the profit of the few. Nearly forty-five thousand Americans die every year for lack of health insurance (see the Physicians for a National Health Program website for a vast and disturbing array of data about the United States in comparison to other countries). Obamacare will leave tens of millions uninsured and scores of millions underinsured. At the same time, virtually nothing will be done to control costs, with the consequence that we will pay more while getting less and less for it. When we talk about costs, we are speaking in relation to the system costs—administrative (many workers doing a great deal to make care harder to get, which has helped keep unemployment lower but results in individuals having to spend much more for health care), stockholder profit, advertising and marketing, debt repayment from mergers/acquisitions, and executive compensation compared to the money spent on delivery of care. A conservative figure of 31% for these system costs is often cited. This is in contrast to the cost of single-payer systems, typically less than 10% (Medicare is in the 3–4% range). Thus, we can see that the private for-profit health insurance industry is largely responsible for high costs and therefore fewer resources to spend. It is, in essence, an unnecessary middleman bleeding the citizenry. Next are drug companies, whose prices are not controlled the way they are in countries with single-payer systems. As a result, drugs cost about one-third to one-half more here. Last year, there were over 4 billion prescriptions written, about thirteen per person in the United States. Another important advantage of single-payer systems is that competition and thereby duplication (all or most hospitals currently offer all or most services) is minimized, thus saving money. In health care, the “market” not only does not work, it is the problem.

On a macro level, a clearer picture of the situation emerges when we consider that the United States spent 17.4% of GDP on health care (Commonwealth Fund 2012), in contrast to thirteen other developed nations with single-payer systems (an enhanced Medicare for all) that averaged 9.5%. This is almost double, while per capita spending was $7960 versus $3182, far more than twice as much. Premiums have more than doubled over the last ten years, as have out-of-pocket costs, all growing at a rate of more than three times faster than inflation. Nevertheless, outcomes from life expectancy to infant mortality continue to deteriorate. This is not surprising given that we get fewer services (including outpatient visits, hospital days, and surgeries) at greater cost per capita than those received in many single-payer systems around the world. There is a common myth that an aging population is one of the main drivers of health care cost escalation. This is false, as all developed countries have aging populations (even older than the United States, given greater life expectancy) with less cost.

How can this be? The most direct explanation is that it is exactly the for-profit forces driving the corporate takeover in health care in the 1980s and ’90s (see Scholom 1998) that are responsible. In reality, what we have is not so much a system but rather a patchwork of largely corporatized exploitive profit centers. If our outcomes are far worse and expenses far greater, and if the services we offer are at best on a par in aggregate (although vary
enormously by income group, with those at the bottom faring far worse), then what is left but the costs and profits of the system itself to blame. An associated myth is that employers pay the major share of health care costs. The actual number is 20%, with the government paying 60% (through our taxes). We pay the other 20% out of pocket. In 2006, more than one-third of every tax dollar collected (about $1.2 out of $3.5 trillion at the federal, state, and local levels) went to health care. For a family with a household income of $50,000 (about the US median) more than 25% (premiums plus taxes) goes for health care, with about 10% (over $5000) spent through taxes alone for various government-funded healthcare programs (Harrison 2008). In effect, in the United States we are paying for a great deal more health care than we are getting, with a lot poorer outcomes. While we are paying for universal coverage, we do not receive it. In contrast, all of the developed and much of the developing world have acknowledged that health care is a right, not a privilege of wealth. This is the humane and economically viable solution.

It is important to note that there is an injurious relationship between adverse societal conditions and health. The influences of lifestyle (as in stress, eating, and sleeping), socioeconomic status (as in poverty), and environment (as in exposure to toxins in what we eat and breath) all negatively affect mental and physical health. Estimates of these forces reach into the 60–70% range. Simply put, Americans work more hours per year than any other industrialized country (137 more than Japanese workers, who are next), are sleeping less (falling from 7 hours in 2001 to 6.7 in 2012 during weekdays, with 50–70 million people suffering from sleep disorders, according to the Centers for Disease Control), and eating more (in 1962 the obesity rate was 13% for adults and had grown to 35.7% by 2010, the highest in the world, according to the CDC). Further, there were over 200 million prescriptions written for antidepressants, 70 million for anxiety, and more than 19 million for erectile dysfunction, all of which are symptomatic of the elevated levels of stress we face living in the United States today.

In an exhaustive study, the National Research Council and the Institute of Medicine (2013) concluded that the citizens of the United States suffer poorer health than those of nearly every other industrialized countries (seventeen total). We are at or near the bottom in most of the categories, including life expectancy for males, the lowest of all. Our situation had been deteriorating since the 1970s, with women particularly adversely affected. “We were stunned by the propensity of the findings all on the negative side—the scope of the disadvantage covers all ages, both sexes, all classes of society,” wrote the chair of the panel. In analyzing the causes, the report indicted adverse economic and social conditions as well as public policies and social values.

In sum, we can fairly conclude that the status quo is both harmful and deadly to our health, and getting worse. It is not surprising to find this in a society that is fundamentally organized around economic values and interests (which largely benefit the 1%) over the well-being of its citizens. Some call the current economic system corporate capitalism, in view of the domination of these entities (actually, it was Karl Marx who named it capitalism, in recognition of the power of capital/money.) This surely was not what Adam Smith had in mind when he warned of “the conspiracy of the masters,” the merchants and manufacturers, able to control state power for their own ends. Dwight Eisenhower warned of the “military industrial complex.” Pope Benedict (2013) denounced “the prevalence of a selfish and individualistic mindset which also finds expression in an unregulated capitalism and various forms of terrorism and criminality.”

How is mental health and psychoanalysis relevant? In an overarching sense, we need be mindful of the ways in which corporate profits control systemic factors. The health insurance and pharmaceutical industries are central. At root, the use of “medical necessity” (a term invented by the insurance industry) insures profit by usurping the power to decide what services are to be paid for (the less reimbursement, the greater the profit). Managed care has been the primary vehicle for the exercise of this power to maintain control and profit.
So-called evidenced based treatment and its dark brethren, “pay for performance” and “accountable care” organizations (a “capitation” model, like an HMO, wherein the less care provided results in more profit), are the current covers for denying care and thereby increasing profit. “Evidenced based treatment” represents the misuse of science and the professions for corporate gain. Psychiatry with its near exclusive reliance on the use of drugs and psychology with its creation of “empirically validated treatments” limit valuable therapeutic possibilities. This represents a triumph of the biological and mechanistic over the social and subjective. No matter that these sorts of treatments in the longer term do little good at best (see Shedler 2010), they allow for corporate profit via exploitation of intraprofessional rivalries (drug-oriented psychiatrists over talk therapists and academic psychologists over clinicians) and of course an unknowing public. The assault on mental health may also be seen in the reducing of expenditures via managed care throughout the 1990s. Currently, of the 23% of the US population in need of services, 60–70% are unable to get help, primarily due to cost.

**Whither Psychoanalysis**

Psychoanalysis is, after all, “a dangerous method” meant to help see reality, interior and external. It is in the interest of those forces of the status quo that profit from the persistence and pervasiveness of our societal fantasies and illusions to support their continuance. Otherwise they stand to lose in the face of a more enlightened public. To be sure, from a methodological standpoint, addressing the issue of resistance to knowing is at the heart of what we in the psychoanalytic world do. We are rooted in appreciation of and respect for the critical importance of history (especially early development) in the creation of unconscious forces that motivate us. We know a great deal about the inevitable problem of hierarchy, whether it is in a family or a society, and how this can lead to the distortions of reality from which we all suffer. We know that history cannot be cheated. We experience daily what happens when it is lost (repressed, dissociated, etc.). We are committed to bringing as much reality as possible into our lives with the belief that this will make life better. However, the problem resides in our notion of what reality is or, more properly, how we view what reality ought to be. Is it some variant of “making it” in the world as it is currently constructed, or are we also tasked with a responsibility to develop a vision of the way the world ought to be, based on humanistic values?

If so, we ought have a point of view about political reality with a vision of a better world. In essence, we are talking about values and subjectivity. If we believe in human freedom, do we not have a responsibility to develop a position as to what kind of social/economic system would best promote this, just as we hold a vision for ourselves and our patients? In this spirit, some may find guidance in the methodology of Karl Marx: “To each according to his/her need, from each according to his/her ability.” Whatever our image of the future (we undoubtedly would all prefer Star Trek to Mad Max), being as clear as we can about what it is, based on our experience and convictions, will leave us less vulnerable to the influence of the prevailing ideologies/mythologies that surround us.

Psychoanalysis is young and on very unstable ground in our current political and economic climate. Insecurity and marginalization have resulted from our services being devalued (as is depth psychotherapy in general). This is despite the evidence of hundreds of offset studies showing that as therapy utilization increases, people get less physically sick. Mental health services produce cost savings, which is real prevention. However, the problem is also within, as we have failed to sufficiently recognize that our social location and theorizing have hurt us. Our isolation from vigorous relation with the cultural mainstream, as in our relative invisibility on public issues like health care, violence and privacy, limited low-fee services and community outreach, and so on, has been harmful and diminishes our relevance. On a conceptual level, when we put forth theories that do not take sufficient account of the place of history and sociopolitical context, we undermine our influence and efficacy by splitting off sources of knowledge that could better guide our clinical work and contributions to society.
To be relevant and have broader and deeper impact, we need a more fully developed perspective on the world around us, a more defined sense of what psychoanalysis is and should be, not only as a method of treatment but moreover as a force for social justice. In reclaiming our revolutionary past in the spirit of early activists like Fromm and Reich and Fenichel, or perhaps in today’s world locating ourselves as a source of morality and democracy (Winnicott calls the family the first place we learn about democracy), we will have far more to offer our society. When we work with patients, we offer hope and a vision of a better life through the emotional freedom gained from self-awareness. Social context is inextricably interwoven. Ultimately, we are required to have a moral position—what we believe to be good or bad. It behooves us to have as fully developed an understanding of our world as possible, inside and outside, so we can do this.

Psychoanalysis is inevitably a moral discipline. One way to enhance our social contribution would be to have a website and publication devoted to analyzing current events from varying psychoanalytic points of view. Such outreach could engage a public as well as professional audience and thereby increase our usefulness and relevance. It might also give us an opportunity to connect with one another, to educate and organize around social justice issues. We know a great deal about how people change and, most notably, overcome resistance. We have much to offer about how to contain conflicting and complex feelings, as we work in incremental ways toward making important change. Surely this is what is needed today. We can even dare to ask the question, Is the “system” of today the best we can do, or is something better possible, however uncertain it may be, that we ought strive toward? If we do believe that the “truth” will set us free (or at least freer), surely this is a challenge worth rising to.

Allan Scholom, PhD, is a clinical psychologist and psychoanalyst. He is the secretary of the board of the Chicago Center for Psychoanalysis and chair of the Professional Affairs Committee, is on the faculty of the Institute for Clinical Social Work, and is the founder and chair of the Illinois Coalition of Mental Health Professionals and Consumers. Dr. Scholom has published and presented extensively on issues relating to the interface of psychoanalysis and politics. He has been in private practice in Chicago for more than thirty-five years.
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