LOS ANGELES PSYCHOANALYTIC BULLETIN

VOL. 4. No. 1 1986 JANUARY

INTERVIEW WITH: MAIMON LEAVITT, M.D. 3
by David James Fisher, Ph.D.

TWO PRESIDENCIES, 1970 and 1985 18
by Melvin Mandel, M.D.

BOOK REVIEW: 22
Decoding the Past: The Psychohistorical Approach
by Peter Loewenberg
Reviewed by David James Fisher, Ph.D.

BOOK REVIEW: 28
Recent Developments in Psychoanalysis: A Critical Evaluation
by Morris N. Eagle
Reviewed by Samuel Wilson, M.D.

THE TIME FOR A PH.D.
IN PSYCHOANALYSIS IS NOW! 37
by Jerald I. Simon, M.D.

IMPRESSIONS OF THE BION CONFERENCE 41
by Lee Shershow, M.D.

©L.A. PSYCHOANALYTIC SOCIETY & INSTITUTE

Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society / Institute

2014 Sawtelle Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90025

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Melvin Mandel, M.D., President
Peter B. Gruenberg, M.D., Past President
David Meltzer, M.D., Treasurer
Frederick Vaquer, M.D., Secretary
Seymour Bird, M.D., Director of Education
Morton Shane, M.D., Assistant Director of Education
Arthur Ourieff, M.D., Executive Councilor
Maimon Leavitt, M.D., Executive Councilor-Elect
Pamela Underwood, Administrator

LOS ANGELES PSYCHOANALYTIC BULLETIN

Editorial Board
Samuel Wilson, M.D., Editor
David J. Fisher, Ph.D.
Richard Fox, M.D.
Joseph Jones, M.D.
Les Kirschenbaum, M.D.
F. Robert Rodman, M.D.
Lee Shershow, M.D.
Jeffrey Trop, M.D.

EDITORIAL POLICY

The purpose of the Editorial Board is to publish a quarterly bulletin that will reflect a high level of scientific discourse in the field of psychoanalysis. While particular emphasis will be directed toward the psychoanalytic situation in Los Angeles, contributions from other national and international sources will be welcomed and encouraged. The editors will consider papers dealing with theoretical and applied psychoanalysis, reviews of psychoanalytically relevant books, reports of scientific meetings, essay reviews, brief communications and letters. Materials can be accepted for publication only on condition that they are contributed solely to the Bulletin.

All opinions expressed in the Bulletin are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society and Institute or its officers. All manuscripts, letters and business communications relating to the Bulletin should be sent to the Editor, Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Bulletin, 2014 Sawtelle Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90025. Manuscripts should be typewritten, double-spaced on 8½ x 11 paper.

Subscription Rates: $15 per year; $5 per issue.

INTERVIEW WITH: MAIMON LEAVITT, M.D.

Interviewed by David James Fisher, Ph.D.

Not everything is narcissism. Personal interviews can move beyond the self-congratulatory and self-aggrandizing into the realm of intelligent self-reflection.

Dr. Leavitt is well known to this community. He is deeply engaged in the life of LAPSI, and he has generously given his time and energy to teaching, supervision, and administrative work. He is deeply devoted to his wife and family. He finds renewed ease in solitude. His great joy is to trek in the wilderness and to hike in the Himalayas and High Sierras. His style of speaking is ironic, mildly self-deprecating; it is never sarcastic. During the interview, he wondered why anyone might be interested in his thoughts, appearing puzzled about his emergence and maintenance of a position of recognized leadership in our group.

The interview was conducted in two sessions, on October 26th and 27th, 1985, at Dr. Leavitt's stately but comfortable Westwood home.

INTERVIEWER

You're widely regarded as one of the "master clinicians" of the Institute. Four out of five candidates in my seminar selected you for analytic supervision. I wanted to work with you because of your clinical savvy, your listening abilities, your willingness to entertain a number of analytic perspectives without fitting the data into a preconceived, necessarily reductive framework. In your own development or education what accounts for your acumen in working with patients?

DR. LEAVITT

It's difficult to say. My first thought was a facetious one. Being a middle child, I probably would be oriented with the British middle group and therefore be somewhat eclectic in point of view. And having to both listen and evaluate in order to preserve a stance in the middle between opposing forces and find a clear path myself. You need to go back to the early sources. One thing that affected my outlook is a parental model. My father was a psychiatrist who was analytically oriented, although not an analyst. Originally he trained as a neurologist and alienist, but he developed his own broad perspective. He was also a learned and humane man with a broad vision, a perspective on humanity, who had tremendous empathy and care for people. He set a tone that affected us all. My mother was a very warm and responsive woman, and the family atmosphere was one that leant itself toward listening to other people, and having a certain respect for their lives, their expressions, and their beings. In the later years it was the exposure to good teachers. Humane students of the human condition. I was fortunate to be exposed first in my internship to Max Gitelson in Chicago, and then during a neurology residency, I also had the opportunity to study with several psychiatrists who were also psychoanalysts or dynamically oriented psychiatrists. My five years at Menningers exposed me to some of the brightest and most inspiring minds in American psychiatry in the 40's and beyond. They're now all figures in history — Bob Knight, David Rapaport, Merton Gill, Margaret Brenman and others. They were excellent analysts and thoughtful people.

INTERVIEWER

I want to raise another question about your clinical approach. Schematically, there are three types of psychoanalysts — the first are interested in building theory. Maybe David Rapaport would be a good example. Then there are those who are interested in the personality dynamics of their patients. I think of Anna Freud. And then those who concentrate on understanding the intersubjective and interpersonal process realm. Kohut or Winnicott come to mind. Would you accept the characterization of yourself as eclectic, but primarily oriented toward exploring the analysand's dynamics?

DR. LEAVITT

Yes. In general terms I would say so. The arena of the intersubjective is critical, and it is the area in which one can best come to know what the dynamics in the analysand are. The transference and countertransference must be used as the means towards this end. However, it takes a constant awareness and discipline to stay aware of this interactive area and to use it toward an understanding of what's going on intrapsychically in an analysand. Nevertheless, one can go too far in focusing only on that interaction, between the dyad, but particularly when analysts take the metaphor and view it as a concrete representation. The principal focus in the analysis should be the interaction within the dyad, but as the means to uncover the intrapsychic forces and conflicts in the patient.

INTERVIEWER

How did you originally decide to become an analyst?

DR. LEAVITT

The particular decision to be an analyst came at the very beginning of my psychiatric residency at Menningers. As soon as I was exposed to the thinking and point of view in Topeka, an analytically oriented position seemed the most fascinating, the most useful approach to understanding human nature. My previous exposures were in the Department of Psychology at Harvard when I was an undergraduate, and then at Bellevue during medical school. It became apparent to me that Freudian-derived psychoanalysis was closest to the heart of human beings as they lived and breathed and felt. I had to know myself better for personal reasons as well as professional. Six months after I began my psychiatric residency, when I was 25, I started my training analysis.

INTERVIEWER

Where did the name Maimon come from? I'm wondering if issues of Jewish identity are particularly important to you.

DR. LEAVITT

For my father, a scholar of Judaic learning, medicine, and philosophy, Maimonides, the famous physician, theologian and philosopher of the Middle Ages, was a household word. My mother had enough sympathy for a baby's slight shoulders that she shortened it to Maimon. The name was a mixed blessing: it was unusual, always mispronounced, and a burden amongst kids. I came to value the name for its implications and for what it meant in the family. It became part of my identity. I've always felt very much at home with the Jewish identity. I had some struggles with it because I was sent to Hebrew school for many years, which interfered with playing ball on the streets after school. My identification with the religious aspects of Judaism are mixed. I'm not strongly observant, but the sense of an identity with the traditions of Judaism is in my bones.

INTERVIEWER

Could you talk about your own perception of the reorganization of the Institute and your own role?

DR. LEAVITT

I came to Los Angeles after leaving the army during the Korean War at the beginning of 1953, and having completed most all my training previously, was not a member of a regular class here. I finished up here, and was graduated from the Los Angeles Institute. I was encouraged to participate in the affairs of the Institute and Society, and both taught a course in the Institute and became involved on committees of the Institute before my graduation. During the 50's matters went quite well, but by the late 50's and early 60's, there had developed a concern about the affairs of the Institute. There was a general perception that the Education Committee wasn't functioning very well; there were conflicts within the Education Committee which were interfering with the appointment of new training analysts, and while certain valuable things were being accomplished at that time, for example Greenson's effective new curriculum, the Institute seemed to be at a kind of impasse. Certain members of the Society felt excluded from the affairs of the Institute. At the time, authority was almost entirely vested in the Education Committee of the Institute, which was a small number of training analysts. Very few of the younger people were involved at all. People were excluded and alienated, and there was a sense of disaffection between the Society members at large and the Institute. The Institute appointed two new training analysts which was an indication for change, although some training analysts thought there was a misperception by the membership at large. A meeting was held of a group of concerned members, including myself; there was another committee that was also studying the status of psychoanalytic practice at the time. The Committee for Reorganization was a broadly representative group of people who subsequently evolved in different theoretical directions. At that time there weren't serious divergences on theoretical grounds; there was pretty much a classical orientation. There was some interest in the work of the object relations school, and a group gathered around Dr. McGuire, and studied Fairbairn, Winnicott, and others of the English school. But this was by no means a divisive issue, although inevitably some people looked askance. But it was considered an intellectual investigation. The reorganization occurred over a number of years with a tremendous amount of effort, bringing people together, coming up with some meaningful understanding of what the problems were and how to deal with them partly by an organic instrument, the new By-Laws, that would hopefully reflect changing conditions. We wanted a structure to lead to an open Society, that would hopefully preclude the previous difficulties. This is always a vain hope because every decade these issues reassert themselves. I was central to the reorganization as the Chairman of the Committee, though many people did yeoman work. My involvement was both complicated and facilitated by the fact that I went through the various offices of the Society during this time, and I also became Director of the Institute.

INTERVIEWER

In looking back on that period of time, you seem to have some pride in the accomplishments of the reorganization.

DR. LEAVITT

Yes. I do. I don't regard the new By-Laws as a monument, but the effort to both preserve the integrity of the Society and Institute and to protect the investment of members and candidates was a major task and a major accomplishment that I and other people shared in. In the course of it, we consolidated some ideas, approaches, and procedures that anticipated changes that subsequently went on around the country to a large degree. But we then became both the object of antagonism and fear of vested interests elsewhere. In particular, we broadened the involvement of faculty generally in Institute affairs and we opened up the issue of training analysts, appointments, and of questioning some of the longstanding procedures and myths around such educational matters.

INTERVIEWER

I'm not familiar with those By-Laws. Did the reorganization mean that training analysts stopped reporting on their candidates in analysis and that a democratization occurred in terms of how one became a training analyst?

DR. LEAVITT

Yes, on both scores. The idea of preserving the analysis as a therapeutic analysis was very much a point, and that the training analyst was not to be involved in the progression of the candidate in any administrative way. This was made explicit.

INTERVIEWER

You formalized the changes?

DR. LEAVITT

The democratization was certainly the point; the principal issue was to broaden the base, not allowing the organization to be administered totally from above by a small group of self perpetuating people. This was an attempt hopefully to maintain a selection, a process, to preserve some quality and discrimination but at the same time to broaden the base of both support and of responsibility to faculty. And indeed we entertained at times the idea that any graduated analyst should be able to conduct analysis of a candidate, and that the whole matter of criteria had become confusing and difficult to sustain. We played with various radical departures.

INTERVIEWER

The Fairburn building is regarded as not only a structure, but as a locus of power in the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society and Institute, in particular because of its interlocking committees and its personal relationships. The Fairburn building, the people therein, including yourself are perceived of as effectively controlling LAPSI as a whole. Is that a correct perception? If it is a correct perception, do you see any dangers in that?

DR. LEAVITT

The Fairburn building has certainly been referred to as the "Fairburn Pentagon", even facetiously by its inhabitants. There is a certain concentration in the building of people who were active in the Society and Institute over the years, who originally came together in the Fairburn building because they had been thrown together by their work on committees. Actually the building is more diffuse than that. There are a substantial number of people who aren't even connected with LAPSI. As to the idea of a caucus, one does not exist. However, it has been the case that a number of people, unfortunately all too small, has continued to be central in the administration. The extent to which it makes others feel excluded, or has unwittingly become a political influence, that is an unfortunate side effect. It is difficult to know whether it's a matter of imposed control or action by default. It's one of those convenient myths to talk about the building being a central point of operation. It is a handy place to circulate petitions.

INTERVIEWER

How much horizontal dialogue is there at the present hour among the senior training analysts? Not just in the Fairburn building, but in the entire Institute. Do you talk to one another, or are you just as isolated, lonely, overworked, and overextended as the rest of us in the community? And, how have things changed locally since Greenson died?

DR. LEAVITT

Well, I'll address the last first. Greenson, I think, was a great loss in many ways. He was such a stimulating person who insisted on dialogue and *colloquy,* and insisted upon people meeting for professional exchange. He was a very strong force. When he moved into the Fairburn building, he was very instrumental in stimulating discussion groups and presentations in the conference room in the building, which had fallen into less use for such purposes. There is a fair amount of such contact amongst people, primarily in the various ongoing study groups. I myself belong to a study group that's been going on for close to 20 years. We've stayed together, some people have joined, and some have left. But there's a core that's gone on. We meet every two to three weeks. Other such groups meet, often around some particular new area. One of the principal reasons for the Fairburn building was just to answer this question. Everybody felt so isolated and fragmented, and the only place you could have a daytime meaningful discussion was in Schwab's Drug Store on Bedford Drive. And of course, your patients were sitting at the next table. In this isolated work, it gave some sense of community and communication. We need more of it; our Society and Institute remain the principal vehicle to obtain this at all levels.

INTERVIEWER

The leadership of LAPSI has created its own style of authority, perhaps best characterized as the Laius complex; that is, the fathers won't encourage the sons and daughters to grow up. Natural succession of generations seems to be discouraged. There is an attitude toward non-ranking members of the Society and Clinical Associates of indifference, of mild contempt, or infantilization. Do you feel that there has been a difficulty in terms of leadership?

DR. LEAVITT

There must be a difficulty because of the difference in perspective between the leaders and a significant number of members and candidates, who experience the kind of situation that you've described. This is inevitable in any organization or any small society, and certainly in any student-faculty arena. There are special stresses in groups such as ours where there are issues of intensified transference, splitting of the transference, continuation of unresolved transference in the professional contacts that persist, when so much of our lives get focused on the Society and Institute. This is a real disadvantage in terms of involvement in the larger community. The Society and Institute is a place which people invest much of their aspirations, hopes, satisfactions, and that's the natural ecology. People here feel somehow that they are not being nurtured or offered the opportunity they need. Contention in ideas is too often experienced as derogation, limiting openness.

INTERVIEWER

The current leadership is widely regarded as lackluster. The leaders are seen as bureaucratic administrators, without charisma, without leadership qualities, that is, lacking vision, courage, capacity to inspire, and the ability to deal with existing problems, providing coherent direction, and taking identifiable stands. Would you accept that characterization?

DR. LEAVITT

I think it overstates the case, but there is some substance to it. We do not seem to have great leaders around with intellectual and professional stature, professional in terms of being outstanding contributors in their field. Our current leaders do not inspire admiration; they are not people who are seen as figures to be proud of to the outside world. Thus, there is a tendency for the operations to fall on the people who have willingness to work in the administration, to do the everyday jobs of teaching. Those who might bring more excitement and originality, have drifted into one or more small enclaves. Some of our fellows who are actively involved are stimulating and admirable people. We may not have any figures in our local scene with the stature of the few striking personalities of the past.

INTERVIEWER

What role did you play during the period of difficulty with the Kleinians in the early 70's? Was it one of mediator and conciliator?

DR. LEAVITT

I probably was so regarded. I would think of myself as a container. If we go back to the time of the reorganization, actually I came into the center of things at that time. I was President of the Society, Director of the Institute and Chairman of the Reorganization Committee. I was centrally involved in all these, and I saw myself as a facilitator. I had my own ideas about some necessary things, but the only way to hold the organization together was to try to get people to talk and achieve a consensus. We had extensive meetings at that time. We tried to get everybody's input; partly to get their input, partly so that people had a sense that they were participating in a program responsive to their needs. We had to maintain the dialogue, to modulate it, and get people to come together in some kind of formal way to get something done. I discovered the powers of parliamentary procedure as the only way to get a meeting to accomplish anything, and the power of a motion to focus discussion and gain action. When the issue about Klein was being debated, I was still much involved, and I saw no reason to fractionate over such an issue, and tried to mediate. I had my own differences on theoretical matters, which I still have. I consider myself more aligned with the main line classical orientation. I had many friends and esteemed colleagues who were on both sides of the issue. For example, I think a well-intentioned but poor tactical move, was when at the time of the first of the site visits (by the American Psychoanalytic Association) that we had, I insisted that all members of the Institute and Society have access to the visitors so that they would have a clear idea of what people were thinking. By opening up the opportunities for people of different orientations and some with disaffection to speak to the visiting committee, I thought this would contribute to a dialogue and give the visitors a balanced perspective. Unfortunately it gave an even more distorted view to the visitors, and accelerated the idea of using political means to advance theoretical ideas. That was probably inevitable. It was a good idea gone awry, because nobody really had the dispassion, the judgment, to really listen, not bringing in their own biases, including people from the American, some of whom were as biased as anybody I've seen here. There were a few who were not.

INTERVIEWER

Can you name names?

DR. LEAVITT

We had the very good fortune of having some people who came who were very wise people, people like Jim McLaughlin and later Joan Fleming.

INTERVIEWER

Could you say something about your perception of the Institute during the so-called Kleinian episode?

DR. LEAVITT

I don't think you can really understand the issues and Klein matters without going back to the time of the reorganization, and I suppose you have to go back even to the time of the split. There's a continuity, unfortunately. The reorganization already was reflecting an acute situation developing here. What followed also reflected the prior history.

INTERVIEWER

There is a perception of you as being a very careful man. Let's talk about Mike Leavitt as a psychoanalytic politician, and of your tendency to steer clear of major problems with the American Psychoanalytic Association. My *question refers in part to the site visits and to the Institute's relations with the psychoanalytic establishment on the East Coast. Please clarify that.*

DR. LEAVITT

I'm not clear about steering clear of the American. After the site visit report, I sensed that we were in a difficult position. I didn't know if we could mobilize ourselves properly. The report was an exaggerated and distorted one. The report painted a picture of more disruption that actually had been. There were difficulties but training had not suffered nearly as much as the site visit reported it. I may be biased, but I don't think the observers were so dispassionate. Some of them came feeling that Los Angeles was the new center of an infection that was going to destroy American psychoanalysis, and thus should be rooted out. I don't know if we would have taken on the American so strongly. We encouraged the American to serve as mediators because we were in such difficulty ourselves. We wanted more external help to diffuse the situation some and to promote a meeting of the minds. What subsequently happened was due to the efforts of some people. Mel Mandel was, for example, very hard working and effective in trying to bring about a resolution. These things do run their course too, and if you wait it out, the enthusiasms start to temper, and something else comes on the scene.

INTERVIEWER

How did theoretical differences contribute to the tension?

DR. LEAVITT

I am suggesting that a body of theory that focuses upon the most intense or violent and aggressive of primitive urges, may itself lead to the most regressed kind of behavior on everybody's part, in which there was a lot of primitive envy and rage manifested. Perhaps it was more than coincidental that we had a kind of turmoil, that the Kleinian view focused on, as going on in the intrapsychic life of an infant, that we go through just such a period ourselves. I see myself as someone who had a moderating influence. It's not so much a need to play it safe, as a feeling that somebody has to cut through the crap at meetings, and lay things out clearly and try to present a balanced picture of what's going on rather than everybody taking a biased position. I have that kind of a balance. It's perhaps foolish of me to say it, but I really don't particularly see myself as a political animal. I have never been involved in caucusing, planning, or arranging things behind the scenes. I find it difficult to remember who did what to whom and things of that kind. And yet I've obviously been in the center of the political arena. I wonder about my own role. My impression is that I am seen as fair and temperate. I entertain different points of view, try to sort them out, and listen and try to find a balance between ideological leadership and government by consensus.

INTERVIEWER

What is most "impossible" about being a psychoanalyst today in Los Angeles?

DR. LEAVITT

I think the hardest thing *today* for younger people is the uncertainties they feel surrounding the practice of psychoanalysis. It's a capacity to tolerate uncertainty, to live with ambiguities, which is central to the practice of psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysts must be able to tolerate not knowing, to be able to remain in a position of being curious and asking questions, wanting to find out, and being able to tolerate delayed closure, in fact to tolerate even non-closure, to stay with the question, as far as you can go. This has always been one of the most impossible of professions. I think today this kind of philosophical position, as well as active position, is intensified by the uncertainties about the future of medicine generally, the future of psychiatry, and the future of psychoanalysis more particularly, both in terms of economics and the opportunities for practice, and also, by the uncertainties about psychoanalysis as to where it is going in terms of its scientific development. Perhaps this is why any development that comes on the scene will have some problems, is so often seen as a savior or is dismissed as just another rehash. I think it's more intensified now though. The principal value of psychoanalytic training is for the training of the psychotherapist and analyst.

INTERVIEWER

It's curious that not one course is offered at the Institute in psychotherapy.

DR. LEAVITT

I think it is deplorable and think it reflects when psychoanalysis was seen as highly specialized, and when its applications could be left to other arenas, universities and elsewhere.

INTERVIEWER

Should a psychoanalyst allow his private social and political views to be known to the larger community? Should he have a public profile regarding human rights violations, or abuses of American foreign policy, or pressing social issues? Or should he maintain his anonymity, his impartiality, his stance as blank screen?

DR. LEAVITT

As a matter of principle, analysts should be no more circumscribed as citizens in the community than anybody else. The practice of their profession should not pose excessive limitations upon their rights and responsibilities as citizens to express themselves in social arenas. Obviously it can cause problems in transference, but that is grist for the mill, and there is truly no such thing as analytic anonymity in any base, particularly in the fishbowl kind of community that Los Angeles really is. Some kinds of discretion are indicated. As far as one's involvement in the social arena, I think anonymity is a mistake.

INTERVIEWER

What's your position on the training of nonmedical psychoanalysts?

DR. LEAVITT

It's obviously a difficult question. If you can identify your prospective analyst early enough, then the ideal would be a medical track with some particular alterations, such as a decrease of medical specialization and an increase of literary, sociological and psychological studies. But that's pie in the sky. A medical background has its particular benefit for psychoanalytic training. It has its disadvantagaes in some respects too. It adds a perspective on illness and health. It may prematurely impair the capacity for empathy. I don't think medical training is a necessity. Nor should psychoanalysis remain a medical specialty, eliminating others, and trying to remain within the mainstream of American medicine, as it's tried to do. There are other forces at work that make that a realistic impossibility. The criteria and guidelines for nonmedical candidates should require a high level of clinical preparation for such training. We must participate in the training of nonmedical people.

INTERVIEWER

Do you have any theory or conviction about psychoanalytic cure? What causes change? Is there any reliable way to test or verify for lasting personality transformation?

DR. LEAVITT

Changes do occur, can occur, and can be measured in a variety of ways. It comes about through the experience of analysis, which is a combination of knowing oneself in a cognitive, affective way, and of knowing oneself in the experience of a new and different interpersonal relationship. Aspects of identification, of identification processes, of discovering, rediscovering, getting into contact with already internalized parts of the self that have been hitherto unavailable, can lead to change. There is a mixture of insight and alteration of ways in which one perceives the world, one's internal self, through the mutual experience of a unique interpersonal relationship, with a particular disciplined effort, and a particular kind of human experience. This leads to alterations. Our expectations of those alterations vary but nevertheless they are very real, very substantial.

INTERVIEWER

Would you like to see the two psychoanalytic institutes in Los Angeles unified? Share one building, one library, one faculty and put aside what seems like a long adjourned dispute? Is there a principled reason to maintain two analytic groups?

DR. LEAVITT

I don't think there's a principled reason. There may be practical reasons to remain separate. First of all, overcoming the barriers to coming together. I'm not sure what's the optimum size for an analytic group. A joint group might be too big for its own good. It would be good to see them working in closer harmony, particularly at a time when analysis can use all the strength it can muster. The unified group might interfere with intimacy. It's a good idea to have as many secretaries, presidents, chairmen as possible, so everybody could feel useful and have some status. There would be considerable difficulties in getting together, for irrational reasons. I favor coming together; there is strength in numbers. The proposal about sharing the building should be entertained.

INTERVIEWER

Regarding generational conflict between analysts at the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic and your attitude toward the next generation of younger men and women, you've been quoted as saying, "Why isn't someone after my ass?" Could you clarify that?

DR. LEAVITT

It was a serious but jocular remark which I made at a public meeting. Things in the Society and Institute are relatively harmonious in that they are pleasant and perhaps quiescent. I mistrust that in one sense. The feeling exists that not much is going on, that people are not enthused. Our meetings are not as well attended as they should be. There should be more conflict and debate. You indicated in your previous questions that an old guard is perceived, once more, as a dead hand at the wheel. If that really is the feeling, then I am perturbed that nobody is trying to shove the dead old man out of the wheel house. Why aren't people becoming more active? Why is it when offices come up that you have trouble filling them? A few days before nominations are closed, the Nominating Committee will discover that no one had been nominated. This troubles me. We may not have nurtured our heirs . . . and yet there's real concern about bringing people along to maintain the organization. There are some very good people, but I'm concerned that there aren't enough of them over enough generations. Some people with the most potential for a variety of reasons have become unavailable. It's a good thing periodically to turn the rascals out.

INTERVIEWER

There is a statement attributed to Lacan that "The truth can only be half spoken". Can the truth be spoken at the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Institute?

DR. LEAVITT

It depends on who you talk to. There is something awry when people who have important things to express don't say them in our forum. They might speak it elsewhere because they fear the reception they will get here. And yet, criticism is what one expects when he presents new ideas, new attempts at truth. But is the criticism too harsh? Is it the wrong kind? Does it have a touch of envy? Something that gives it a different aura and discourages people? Or, are people more thin skinned than they used to be? Scientific meetings used to be exciting partly because there were strong opinions, fights and confrontations. A certain intensity of feeling adds fire. Is there something in the atmosphere that doesn't have the right quality of fight but is undermining rather than challenging? Perhaps the level of discourse has fallen down. Perhaps we've lost our best thinkers.

INTERVIEWER

We have touched on questions about your deep investment in psychoanalysis. You devote fourteen hours of your work week to service to the psychoanalytic community, in addition to your own private practice. What are your current reflections about psychoanalysis locally?

DR. LEAVITT

When I went to Topeka, I found the Menninger Foundation to be a most vital place, and I developed a strong sense of community, of family, of it being an intellectual home as well as having social attributes. I carried this kind of feeling over into the analytic milieu in Los Angeles. I continue to feel not only a commitment to psychoanalysis but to the psychoanalytic community, the milieu that fosters psychoanalysis and the practitioners and contributors to it. In some ways too much of my life has been focused in it, but it nevertheless has been, after my own family, my next greatest commitment. I fear my family has sometimes felt that the order should be reversed. It obviously offers gratifications to me as well. It's worth maintaining despite the vagaries, the difficulties with the people and the issues involved. My interest in psychoanalysis is closely connected to family interests because of my father's vocation as a psychiatrist. I have a memory I recall of being 10 or 11 years of age, when my father asked me to return his borrowed books to the Kings County Medical Library. I stopped off in the Childrens Museum Park in Brooklyn and took advantage of the opportunity to look through the volumes of Freud, searching for the dirty parts, perhaps still a hopeful quest. My interest began early and was entertwined with my own identity formation.

INTERVIEWER

Could you express some of your ambivalence about yourself as a leader?

DR. LEAVITT

That's a pertinent point, and it is reflected in personal dilemmas about the commitment of time and energy, but also about sometimes holding back from taking a still more active position about certain things. I have my crises of commitment, pull back, and then sometimes let some things go that I would love to be more involved with. A personal difficulty for myself and for others involved in the affairs of the Institute is doing an adequate job during the ten minute breaks, or to find other time to do it. There is always a conflict of interest between the Society and Institute, work, family, other intellectual and physical pursuits and when you have fairly catholic interests, as I do, one is in constant conflict about it. I do feel that for whatever reasons, I have had somewhat a unique position at times. I am regarded as an influential and moderating influence, particularly when such is needed. I have a strong philosophy about psychoanalysis and about an organization such as ours, and I have strong principles about such things as commitment, integrity, the seeking to know, to learn, to endeavor, to arrive at truths, whether it's in scientific or in interpersonal areas. These include tolerating and moderating the more impassioned and extreme positions, particularly when the passion is not devoted to scientific investigation but the promulgation of dogma and the convictions of the true believer.

INTERVIEWER

What for you is controversial within contemporary psychoanalysis and along what lines would you like to see more research?

DR. LEAVITT

What needs more pursuit, obviously, is what truly belongs in the analytic process, and what goes on, not just unconsciously, but what goes on in the actual interactions phenomenologically. I am struck by the disparity between people's professed theoretical positions and what you then hear when you listen to taped sessions. Peoples' theoretical views influence their interventions, style, and technique, but nevertheless there are considerable discrepancies between what people do and what they think they're doing. The whole question of what the nature of the therapeutic process is, what constitutes a meaningful intervention, in what way it has effects upon the analysand — these need to be investigated by some kind of raw data; it should be approached from the point of view of what happens in the interaction, and what happens with the analysand. No single point of view is sufficient because none are so uniquely effective. If we pursued psychoanalysis from different points of view, we might be better able to develop a unified field theory, a way of determining further the critical elements and the therapeutic effects of analytic intervention.

INTERVIEWER

Is there anything you might want to add?

DR. LEAVITT

I am most concerned about what can be done locally to bring various colleagues into a new commitment. We need to reflect if we are meeting our mutual needs sufficiently, and if we are doing all we can to encourage a commitment to analytic work and to facilitate and nurture the minds and spirits of the people involved, to particularly encourage the younger people, who are the promise of the field. We should not take premature refuge in the excuses about the medical-economic pressures upon us or feel powerless about the American, or the threats of lawsuits, or where psychoanalysis stands *vis-a-vis* medicine. We need a kind of excitement and vitality and engagement with our work, which our work is still capable of arousing in all of us. And we must not lose heart or wait with baited breath for some savior to come and show us a new road.

INTERVIEWER

You're one of the most beloved members of the community, and you operate as that nurturing person, that committed, engaged, vital, and caring person that you're calling for. You have in your own individual way fulfilled what you've actually called for. I suspect that is why you're so deeply and widely loved in the community. If you'd like to comment on that, you can, and if you don't I'll understand that also.

DR. LEAVITT

I'm pleased that you think so. To answer the question, you should address yourself to those who ostensibly feel that way about me. If it's so, it's not so much that it's something I have sought after or one should seek after. It happens because an individual is seen to represent one's own longings and best self. You would have to ask people what in themselves they find of a positive nature that they find reflected in me. I can only say that, if it's so, it's because an effort to be caring, fair, and appreciative must still be values that are well regarded.

Society was housed until 1976. Since the offices contained only a meeting room and library, along with a small office, few classes or committee meetings could be held there. As a result, seminars were generally held in the homes or offices of the leaders, as were many committee and Board meetings.

I recall quite clearly our efforts in 1970-71 to purchase property on which we might build our new home. We were within a few minutes of completing arrangements to begin escrow on a major property near Bundy on Olympic; we broke off when last minute shifting by the seller provoked mistrust in our Board. Later on we almost purchased the entire property of the Brentwood Academy, in partnership with the then School for Nursery Years. Our attorney delivered his opinion that there was too much risk of members' monies, and another fine buy went down the drain. From that experience I learned of the need to limit the impact of attorney judgments. A few years later, in another's presidency, our building site was purchased, and the work completed under the watchful eyes of Leonard Rosengarten and Mark Orfirer in particular, along with help from many others.

So we come to 1985. Same organization, same core membership, with some differences. A number of vital and esteemed members have died, others have reached life membership status. And there are a large number of members and clinical associates who have come to us since 1970, many of whom we count among our rising and future leaders.

Some changes stand out in my mind. Gone are the terrible divisions of the 1970's. The Kleinian issue dissolved around 1978. The currently competing theoretical set, the self-object or Kohut movement, is interestingly led by a number of past Kleinian leaders and followers. The Kohutians stand apart from the classic position, but the Society appears able to handle the differences better. Members disagree over theory and technique, but we seem able to speak to each other reasonably, with personal and professional respect.

And of course we have been living in our award winning and most attractive house these nine years. It has become 'home' to the Society and Institute. Virtually all business is transacted from our offices, and almost all seminars are taught in our classroom-library. We have modernized and computerized our office procedures to the limits of our current means, and our library has grown and now includes the R. R. Greenson Audio-Visual Center and a very respectable collection of writings.

But another kind of change, less desirable, is palpable. The part of the spirit of the 60's and 70's which said that psychoanalysis was valuable enough to fight over is missing. We no longer feel on top of the world of psychiatry and psychology as the most knowledgeable and best trained psychoanalysts on the block. Instead, psychiatrists press for 'remedicalization', appearing to mean a return to pharmacologic forms of treatment, while psychologists, social workers and MFCC's press us from the psychoanalytic and psychotherapeutic side. We are beset.

Worse is the sense of confusion, hurt, and depletion which afflicts so many of our members, culminating in defeat of their spirit. They want to retain identity with psychoanalysis as a practice, but are not at all sure that organizational psychoanalysis is for them or that clinical psychoanalysis will survive. There is concern that any organization which spends excessive time and energy fighting defensive struggles will, over a period of time, demoralize its members and deplete its resources. You must look forward if morale is to be maintained.

Likewise,on our home front. Quite a few members are willing to serve our Society/Institute in various capacities. But far too many are interested in other organizations and activities, and are difficult or impossible to recruit for Society or Institute responsibilities. Conversations while recruiting lead me to conclude that too many members feel our Society to be a lost cause. The pessimists tend to feel either that while they identify as psychoanalysts, our organizations provide them with little and they see no purpose in expending energies in their service; or that the field is dying, that psychoanalysis will not survive, and they are looking for other professional identities and interests.

That is different from the way things stood in 1970. Then, it seemed that while there were signs indicating the possible end of the 'golden era of psychoanalysis', there was a prevailing feeling of a future worth fighting over.

Is it fantasy that there may again be such a future? Has the wheel of fortune turned to where psychoanalysis is on another upward trajectory? It is becoming evident that there is an increased interest in dynamic psychiatry on the part of residents locally and elsewhere in the country. There is also a boiling interest in psychoanalysis among the non-psychiatric population identified with the humanities, from which we are officially isolated. Problems of medical identity and our insistence on maintaining very high standards of entry into the training program, as well as the highest quality of education in that program, have so far served as barriers between that ferment and our organization. When our relationship to that non-psychiatric world is resolved we hope to find that our insistence on high standards will pay off in the continued quality of our future educational program and in a high level of intellectual and clinical achievement among our members and trainees.

BOOK REVIEW

Decoding the Past: The Psychohistorical Approach

by Peter Loewenberg

Reviewed by David James Fisher, Ph.D.

Peter Loewenberg is the Jackie Robinson of psychohistory. Robinson broke racial barriers, Loewenberg crossed disciplinary ones. Like Robinson, he has taken a great deal of flack in entering the big leagues.

His detractors have accused him of doing bad psychoanalysis and writing bad history. Psychoanalytic practitioners have questioned the depth of Loewenberg's clinical acumen, have been skeptical of his use of clinical data, and have been quick to remind him of the obvious, that the dead do not free associate, joke, dream, or provide us with slips of the tongue the way analysands do on a couch in an analyst's office. Analysts seem reluctant to admit that a specialist from the humanities or social sciences can achieve a subtle and incisive grasp of therapeutic issues. Historians, for their part, have been unacquainted with or put off by a psychoanalytic perspective. Only recently, and quite selectively, has historical training included an immersion in psychoanalytic theory and practice. Most historians trained in America lack a Freudian cultural formation; thus they are ill prepared to entertain psychoanalytic methods of inquiry and argumentation. Historians suffering from facticity, the fetishism of facts, cannot accept the untraditional forms of verification that go along with psychoanalytic interpretations of history. They are offended by analogical forms of thinking. They distrust speculative leaps about what *feels* right as opposed to what can be demonstrated conclusively did happen. In two professions so ostensibly committed to the comprehension of the past, it is not surprising that mainstream historical and psychoanalytic thinking tends to be conservative, deeply resistant to interpretative and methodological innovations. For more than fifteen years, Loewenberg has bucked misrepresentation, misunderstanding, suspicion, and downright contempt of his work. Like Jackie Robinson himself, he has persevered, achieving a kind of begrudging respect and legitimacy in both communities.

As a pioneer, Loewenberg has staked out new, often unexplored territory on the border of psychoanalysis and history. Borders make people uncomfortable. They require a toleration for uncertainty. They cry out for a new language and a new mode of conceptualization. He is the first *fully* trained professional historian, with distinguished academic credentials, also to receive *full* psychoanalytic training at an accredited institute of the American Psychoanalytic Association. Loewenberg writes history as a practicing clinical psychoanalyst, as someone who has been trained in the slow, comprehensive and rigorous ways of psychoanalysis. His analytic training was largely opposed by senior historians both in his field and his own department, many of whom considered psychoanalysis unscientific, unfalsifiable, esoteric, and most egregiously of all "unhistorical." Thus, he trained at considerable risk to his standing in the historical profession. The Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute did not warmly embrace him; they were cautious and deliberate about training him, and presented him with a myriad of obstacles in making progress toward graduation. Many members of the psychoanalytic institute resented and envied him, raising questions about the pertinence of training candidates outside of the medical/psychiatric fields. There have been other analysts who have been well grounded in historical methodology and historiography, even articles and books produced by the proverbial history buffs. Likewise, several generations of psychohistorians have existed, varying in enormous degrees of wildness and speculative zeal, often guilty of imposing a rigid theoretical model on their material. A minority of psychohistorians — Frank Manuel, Peter Gay, Maynard Solomon — have been thoroughly psychoanalyzed and have read their sources astutely in the light of their textured knowledge of psychoanalytic theory. But none to my knowledge have possessed the dual training, thus bringing to his research projects a twin competence.

Decoding the Past brings together the fruits of Loewenberg's labors, and consequently provides us with an opportunity to write a preliminary assessment of his contribution. His education as a psychohistorian, every bit as arduous, and in certain ways more emotionally taxing, than Ph.D. programs in major research-oriented universities, has definitely limited his time for writing and research. Nor can he take off for lengthy stays in Europe because of his psychoanalytic practice. While this may have diminished the quantity of his scholarship, it has not hurt the quality nor the significance of his ground-breaking perspective. The volume consists of eleven essays, four of which are previously unpublished (a paperback edition just issued by the University of California Press includes an autobiographical preface). Subtitled *The Psychohistorical Approach,* Loewenberg has extended the boundaries of meaning in historical scholarship. He has done so with a good deal of modesty, with clear prose, with a modulated passion akin to analytic tact, and with meticulous attention to documentation and evidence. He makes no grandiose claims about his methodology. He is seldom messianic or polemical.

Loewenberg's psychohistory would be more accurately understood in the plural — approaches. He has mastered a vast armamentarium of psychoanalytic theoretical perspectives and insights, beginning with Freud's classical model of instinctual drives and defenses, borrowing generously from the ego psychologists and Eriksonians who pointed to the adaptive as well as neurotic aspects of defenses; he is well aware of post-Freudian advances, including the multiple perspectives opened by the English object relations school and the current study of creative and pathological narcissism undertaken by Kohut and the practitioners of self psychology. While aware of the contributions of Melanie Klein, he has not incorporated her ideas and techniques in his studies, except for a brief reference to Bion's work on group dynamics. Just as the psychoanalyst who works with patients with vast differences in psychopathology, presenting symptoms, and life experience has to be equipped with a flexible assortment of therapeutic tools and conceptual frameworks, so too must the psychohistorian come prepared to decipher the past by relying on a full assortment of psychoanalytic perspectives. Without multiple ways of understanding his subject, the historian will not be able to comprehend historical figures, mass movements, and seemingly irrational phenomena. In offering his readers plausible interpretations, not definitive truths or dogmatic assertions, Loewenberg remains consistent with modern historiography that is non-reductionistic and opposed to one-dimensional causal explanations. Loewenberg, in short, has written a compelling form of history which reveals the underlying emotional and psychic factors which influence historical action, or inaction. Given his clinical training, he is particularly attuned to the emotional lives of his subjects, to their early childhoods, to periods of crisis, to thoughts and fantasies they expressed about their bodies, members of the opposite sex, parents, authorities, and an assortment of transference figures. Loewenberg's psychohistory is informed by a sensitivity to latencies, to the deeper layers of psychical meanings and unconscious conflicts in the lived experience of men and groups.

Loewenberg the psychoanalytic historian wrote this volume with two caps on, straddling two dissimilar universes of discourse, speaking to two different audiences. This is ultimately a strength and a weakness. He has intelligently and discerningly penetrated the interface of history and psychoanalysis. He has neither psychologized history nor historicized psychoanalysis. He never argues that the psychological "code" is the only code, or key determining agency of the historical process. Loewenberg is particularly adept at situating his case studies — whether of Austrian luminaries, Nazi leaders, or Nazi followers — in their proper historical contexts, that is, with a full awareness of political, social, and economic realities and of the powerful role of culture on events and human choices. Psychoanalysts are at their most naive, most inadequate, when they speak of "reality considerations," "circumstances" — the so-called out there, outside of the intrapsychic realm, outside of the analyst-analysand interaction.

Loewenberg grasps the subtleties of his era, primarily the 1890's to 1945, while appreciating the emotional conflicts and psychological nuances of individuals and generations with limited options.

Loewenberg has not, however, found the ideal kind of language which effectively bridges the disciplines. That language has yet to be invented. Preferably, it will be in plain, felicitous English, which describes unconscious activity, impulses, fantasies, and conflicts in a manner comprehensible to a literate audience. When Loewenberg's narrative flows into analytic sections, they resemble paragraphs extrapolated from professional psychoanalytic journals. These journals are not celebrated for their prose. The psychoanalytic sections of his essays are saturated with technical language and jargon. There is no question about Loewenberg's grasp of often elusive psychoanalytic terminology. He opts for this language as a short hand, to avoid lengthy expository passages. This may please his audience of analysts, while alienating his readers in the human sciences. He does not use inflated verbiage to cover confused or mystified thinking. Scientific language, to be sure, lends authority; Loewenberg may have chosen an intellectualized, somewhat remote way to present his material in order to demonstrate to the analytic community that he was sufficiently well-versed in psychoanalytic constructs and sufficiently well-removed from his research, akin to clinical detachment. He might have risked being more personal, disclosing his own empathic immersion in his subject material and methodology, in a style adopted by Erikson in *Gandhi's Truth* (1968), without a loss of clarity, scholarly balance and seriousness, and insight. A more visceral approach might have alerted his readers to a more authentic way of arriving at psychohistorical modes of thinking. Perhaps in his subsequent writings, he will be less concerned about following the accepted academic and psychoanalytic style of discourse, and will be at liberty to find an idiom more appropriate to his theme, closer to his own personal voice.

In two of his "Austrian Portraits," the study of Victor and Friedrich Adler and of Otto Bauer, Loewenberg makes compelling use of both psychohistory and the history of psychoanalysis. Here intellectual history and psychohistory converge, and the convergence is illuminating. He documents "Dora's" identity as Ida Bauer, sister of Otto Bauer, one of Austrian Social Democracy' key leaders. (Dora's identity has been well known to insiders in the psychoanalytic movement for decades, most especially by those trained by the Vienna Psychoanalytic Institute.) Because of the recent flap over works by Masson and Roazen, the issue of disclosure and of access to documents has become controversial. Loewenberg's application reveals that such knowledge can open up vistas of understanding. He uses his sources critically and tastefully, without a prurient interest, with a sensitivity to confidentiality, with no hidden agenda of embarrassing psychoanalyst or analysand. If Kurt Eissler has played the role of self-appointed watch-dog of the Freud Archives, and Anna Freud the role of super-ego of the analytic community (including its history), then Loewenberg's example provides a persuasive counter. Denying competent psychoanalytically trained researchers access to the sources, keeping the archives closed, will ultimately work to the detriment of the psychoanalytic movement; it raises rather than resolves questions, suggesting unrealistic anxiety or cover-up; and it implies that the history of psychoanalysis exists independently of responsible forms of critical inquiry.

In Loewenberg's most successful chapters he displays a sensitivity to the emotional tone of a text, to the affects either disguised in phrases or words, or hidden between the lines. The William Langer essay, the least well realized in the book, somehow lacks an emotional or intellectual resonance, as if this family, American milieu, individual and his particular dilemmas remained inaccessible to the author. Having mastered a form of psychoanalytic reading of his sources, his study of Herzl draws on diaries, autobiographical novels and short stories, and letters. Loewenberg performs a sounding on Herzl, not an attempt to unearth and answer all the secrets about the founder of modern Zionism. A psychodynamic perspective on Herzl shows a rather marked oscillation between his dismal self-regard and swelling omnipotence, which resulted in a blurring of the boundary between fantasy and reality, ideas and people, action and dream. Without denigrating his achievement, Loewenberg's portrait humanizes and demythicizes Herzl, places him in a particular time and place, and fleshes out the inner dimensions of his life history.

Loewenberg is extremely competent in depicting and scrutinizing generational conflict. The essay on Victor and Friedrich Adler is an ingenious illustration of father-son hatred and love. Within psychoanalytic circles it has become strangely unfashionable to employ Oedipal forms of interpretation. Loewenberg is no such slave to the fad. He argues that Fritz's assassination of the Prime Minister of Austria in 1916 can be understood as a displacement and acting out of aggressively murderious urges toward his own father. Most historians operating on a cognitive level, oblivious to the logic of the unconscious, might fail to grasp the symbolic significance of such an act of murder.

The chapters on Otto Bauer and on Heinrich Himmler illustrate Loewenberg's craft at building historical character portraits. Personality factors in Bauer's case at least partially account for how and why a prominent Socialist leader put the brakes on social revolution, refusing to unleash the masses in a counter-assault on Austrian Fascism. Bauer's various forms of denial, avoidance, and intellectualization clarify his adoption of passive political tactics, and underscore how personality reinforced a defensive political strategy in order to stop effective action. In the Himmler study, Loewenberg depicts a depressed, unfeeling, frightened adolescent boy unable to integrate his unconscious sadism, cruelty and severely regressed tendencies into a coherent identity. For Himmler identification with Hitler and incorporation of the anti-Semitic ideology and demonology had healing effects, while leading to horrendous consequences for European Jewry. If it would be erroneous to generalize that all Nazi leaders had a schizoid personality structure with overt oral and projective mechanisms, Loewenberg's portrait gives us pause to reflect on political leaders, past and present, who overvalue toughness and who depreciate and deny affect.

Loewenberg's Nazi youth cohort analysis is nothing less than a *tour de force.* This is first-rate generational analysis of followers, an evocative, historically skrewd account of the mass psychology of the led. Cohorts are groups or collectivities who share a momentus generational experience, a traumatic episode like world war, revolution, emigration, depression, or economic dislocation. In describing the common experience of those recruited to the Nazi Party, Loewenberg draws on socio-economic, demographic, and psychological forms of research. For German youth who came into consciousness in the late 1920's and early 1930's, unemployment became the massive trauma. Millions of men and women found themselves helpless, confused, psychologically disorganized and fragmented. They were receptive to irrational appeals and simplistic explanations for their difficulties. It is not surprising that a clever mythomaniac like Hitler could easily fill the political and emotional vacuum, and makes sense that his message of racial violence, revenge, and national honor could easily sweep away this generation so desperate for security. Loewenberg adeptly shows how the Fuhrer's personality and ideology could simultaneously tap into the cohorts' longings for both paternal and maternal care.

In conclusion, Loewenberg has skillfully used and seldom abused the psychological "code" in history. The ensemble of his book testifies not only to the need for systematic, professional training by the psychohistorian in both the disciplines of history and psychoanalysis, but also to the creative possibilities of such new modes of investigation and knowledge about the past. Since there really is no history, only historians, each with a point of view, a polemicist might argue that all history is psychohistory, in that it involves the unconscious and conscious mind of the historian. Loewenberg addresses political conflict, ideological formation, and the apparently illogical contradictions in the historical process without the psychological blinders of most of his academic colleagues and with an historical consciousness which his psychoanalytic colleagues lack. In this sense, his psychohistory is profoundly modern, profoundly in touch with the temper of our post-Freudian era. His work is also a nuanced extension of the hand to all of us to understand the past by grasping the multiple psychic layers of meaning buried there, if we would only learn to look.

BOOK REVIEW

Recent Developments in Psychoanalysis: A Critical Evaluation

by Morris N. Eagle

Reviewed by Samuel Wilson, M.D.

Ever since Freud started the science of psychoanalysis, each age of practitioners and theorists has had their revisionists. In Freud's day, certainly June, Adler, Rank and Ferenzi, as well as others, are known in this regard.

In the modern era, Fairbairn, Mahler, Modell, G.S. Kline, Gedo, and Kohut have all either added or subtracted to Freud's basic scaffolding of mental and psychological functioning.

In *Recent Developments in Psychoanalysis: A Critical Evaluation,* Morris N. Eagle, Ph.D., leads the reader through a perplexing maze of psychoanalytic theorizing in an attempt to cull out that which is essential and scientifically verifiable. Dr. Eagle is a professor and department chairman of the Psychology Department at New York University. He received his Ph.D. from New York University and was a visiting scholar at Cambridge.

Eagle's over-riding preoccupation is the place of object relations theory within the main body of psychoanalysis. In the second chapter, "Object Relations and Freudian Instinct Theory", he presents a clear and succinct review of Freud's instinct or drive theory as it is represented by his metapsychology. He disagrees with those who would claim that to disagree with the primacy of drive theory is equivalent to an extirpation of the biological bedrock of psychoanalysis. Citing the work of Bowlby, Harlow, Emde, Stern and others, Eagle presents a strong research based case for the genetic propensity in the human organism to function with primary attachment behavior. This need is not seen as an out-growth of the need for the object as primarily providing instinctual gratification.

Eagle views the recent developments in psychoanalysis as representing attempts by different theoreticians to come to grips with what a gathering collection of experimental and experiential data seems to point to as a need to expand and/or revise Freud's basic libidinal energy — drive reduction model. He sees these developments as classifiable in four categories, all representing challenges from within psychoanalysis. The first group consists of those such as Mahler, Kernberg, and Jacobson who have attempted to preserve Freud's basic instinct theory and combine it with a recognition of the importance of object relations and the self. The second group, exemplified by the early writings of Kohut and by Modell, propose a "two factor" theory of analysis in which both instinct theory and object relations and self theories are accepted as representing theoretical perspectives applicable to different sets of phenomena, i.e., neurotic vs. narcissistic. The third group, exemplified by Fairbairn, Guntrip, G.S. Klein, and the later Kohut involved an outright rejection of Freud's instinct theory with a thorough going replacement of it by a psychology of object relations and/or the self. A fourth category is set aside for Gedo's epigenetic hierarchical theory which bears certain similarities to both Kohut's and George Klein's formulations. A separate category altogether is reserved for the work of Sampson and Weiss and their collaborators who have formulated a new theory of therapy which is best characterized, according to Eagle, as an "up-dated and sophisticated ego psychology".

In reviewing the work of Mahler, Eagle cites recent evidence which indicates that the infant is probably never in an undifferentiated state from the mother, and that psychological and biological birth is synonymous. What is felt to be the most notable contribution from Mahler's work is the strong empirical support that her central formulations, especially those dealing with separation-individuation, receive from a wide body of research outside the psychoanalytic context. This data indicates that those formulations do not depend on the concepts of libidinal energy and drive gratification, but are more meaningfully understood in terms of attachment behavior.

In discussing Modell's "two factory theory" an attempt at integration of instinct and object relations theory, Eagle takes exception with "piecemeal patching" of Freudian theory which he feels results from a confusing intermixing of two points of reference. Eagle does not believe that psychological phenomena related to object relations and the self can be adequately explained by reducing them to id-ego concepts. Modell's main contribution lies in his realization that the original Freudian id-ego paradigm is severely challenged by object relations and self phenomena.

Kohut originally postulated a two factor theory, in which a psychology of the self was seen as a compliment to traditional id-ego psychology. The former was felt to apply to those individuals whose symptomatology represented deficient psychic structures resulting from arrested development. The latter applied to the more traditional neurotic or neurosis resulting from various methods that the ego uses to escape from the awareness of this incompatibility. As Holt has pointed out (1976), Freud was quite successful in explaining symptomatology and conflict in terms of different wishes and aims, rather than as drive and structure. Eagle feels that it would benefit psychoanalysis to emphasize the cognitive-affective structures underlying wishes and aims that motivate human behavior. Such a focus would expand the understanding of possible motivating factors beyond the limitations of sexual and aggressive drive derivatives. Eagle sees little evidence to support the notion of two different types of pathologies, one based on intrapsychic conflict and the other on developmental arrest. He sees them as complementary. He cites the work of Gedo (1979, 1980) and G. Klein (1976) who propose that the pursuit of self integrity and self organization is a super-ordinant aim for all people. Such pursuit encompasses elements of both developmental arrest and intrapsychic conflict.

In discussing the different therapeutic methods based on the developmental versus intrapsychic conflict models, Eagle falls prey to the same type of unsupported declarations that he criticizes in others. He states that it is likely that the salutary effects of therapy have mainly to do with ameliorating unrealistic anxieties and unresolved conflicts rather than with addressing developmental failures or deficiencies. While this possibility exists, Eagle does not share with the reader any reason to so believe, except that he and others that feel like him have declared its veracity. The only evidence he cites in this regard is that of the Mount Zion group (Weiss, et. al.) who have provided experimental data which shows that all patients seek "conditions of safety" in the treatment situation with the hope that the therapist-patient combination will not repeat earlier traumatic experiences. They have found the belief that patients seek to repeat or attain in the transference, gratification for infantile wishes, to be an inaccurate description of the patient's experience.

Eagle also cautions against the adultomorphization of infancy in which early areas of normal development are characterized as later stages of psychopathology. Adult pathology is more than just the persistence of normal infant developmental processes. Quoting Rubenfine (1981) Eagle notes that we are never justified in using "creative fictional constructions" about origins of pathology in the first year of life to serve as data for theorizing about early psychological development. Eagle then sheds doubt on the nature of the evidence supporting ideas of early developmental arrests as well as the presumed effects these alleged arrests have on subsequent development. He reminds us, for example, that the data underlying Kohut's formulations is derived from adult analyses and so is vulnerable to the inherent limitations of such observations.

As Peterfreund has warned, "When complex biological systems regress or break down they do not necessarily do so in a manner that retraces the normal developmental sequence". For example, a man aphasic from a cerebral-vascular accident is not in the same state as a normal two month old who cannot yet speak. Eagle calls for a more specific theory of developmental defects and normal development and decries the use of crude analogies to earlier periods of development. Even if this is done, it is his conviction, again unsubstantiated, that these defects will be firmly intertwined with dynamic conflict.

In the third section of the book Professor Eagle takes up the form of the previously discussed theories. He concerns himself with the clinical theory-metapsychology debate; the identification of psychoanalysis as a hermeneutic discipline, the status of data derived from the clinical situation, and the dual states of psychoanalysis as both a treatment and a theory of human behavior in personality development.

Eagle views the conflict between metapsychology and clinical theory as a pseudo-issue. For example as soon as one has empathetically defined a phenomena, and then asks why is he experiencing it, one has departed from experience near clinical theory to a higher level of abstraction not dependent on empathy.

Freud addressed this larger challenge when he attempted to understand the empirical relationship between a neurophysiological event and a feeling, wish, or aim. The deeper theoretical account was his metapsychology. Eagle agrees with Schafer and others who have found grave fault with the essence of Freud's metapsychology. They allege that it has proven to be virtually unverifiable by observation. They contend that it has not measurably increased the explanatory value of the clinical data from which it is derived and has never been integrated in any meaningful way with this empirical data. They feel that Freud's metapsychology has not lent itself to verification by empirical testing. Eagle does believe that Freud was correct in seeking such a deeper explanation for the phenomena that he was observing. Pure clinical theory without metapsychology of some sort is probably illusory. To postulate an unconscious is to go beyond the purely clinical. Certainly the self psychology of Kohut, in particular the assumption that a self defect arises from a deficiency in self object mirroring responses is a type of metapsychology, not itself dependent on empathy or introspection. What one may empathically attune to is based on one's own subjective experience which of course involves one's theories. These issues of the epistemic status of clinical data are forthrightly addressed by Eagle in chapter 14. He uses a variety of aposite and compelling anecdotes to illustrate the continued practice of psychoanalytic writers who constantly cite authorities whose similar claims are made as a way of ordering their data and confirming their assertions, all without other supportive evidence. All analytic data is contaminated by the subjective world of the observer and impregnated with his theory.

More recent contributions than those cited by Eagle, by analysts such as Gill with his emphasis on the here and now transference to the analyst, and

Brandchaft and Stolorow's focus on the intra-subjective field are attempts to address and correct these inadequacies.

Eagle calls for more vigorously conducted outcome studies on the nature of change in psychoanalytic treatment. He contends that the present interest by analytic theoreticians in hermeneutics is ill advised. He believes that this trend may result at least in part from despair in dealing with the issues of reliability and the criteria for knowledge when applied to psychoanalytic explanations. A large part of the problem may lie in the continued, and according to Eagle misguided, use of the individual case history as the means evidence, as did Freud, for theory confirmation. For Eagle there is a truth to be found, if only the researcher can look in the right place.

While it would be hard to contend that sexual and aggressive impulses are not rooted in biology, Professor Eagle puts forward the argument that the move from attachment to individuation and selfhood is also an invariant aspect of human behavior equally as universal and biologically grounded. He cites aspects of the work of Mahler, Kohut, and Fairbairn which indicates that the main aspect of object relatedness is to develop self integrity and independence rather than to provide a focus for instinctual investments and gratifications as Freud proposed.

Eagle proposes an interesting addition to traditional psychoanalytic explanations for the presently seen increase in problems of individuation, autonomy, and selfhood. Citing the Japanese psychiatrist Doi, he notes that the shift in society from one in which the value of community, intimate bonds, and a feeling of belonging predominate, to one in which more distant and formal associations are the norm, may result in mothers seeking psychological need satisfaction from their offspring. This may result in the children being more prone to difficulties in separation-individuation and self pathology.

In making the point that object relations are the bedrock of human psychology Eagle attempts to reconcile the views of Kohut and Fairbairn. He states that the very activities and abilities that Kohut sees as narcissistic and as relatively autonomous of object relations —ambitions, values, and ideals — are inherently object relational in nature. As evidence for this assumption he cites an earlier paper of his which asserts that values, interests, and ideas serve vital object relations functions. In this instance I believe that Eagle misses the distinction that Kohut makes in regard to self object functions as related but not equal to object relations per se.

While pointing out that Kohut attempted to develop the psychoanalytic understanding of narcissism, Eagle does not fully grasp Kohut's concept of the self object as it applies to both narcissistic and object relations. By definition a self object depends on both a self and an object for its formation. I do not believe that Kohut was describing an objectless or primary narcissistic state as did Freud. It would then be incorrect to say the Kohut's narcissistic line of development implies that objects are not important for psychic functioning, although admittedly this is at times not so clearly explicated by Kohut.

Eagle cites Winnicott's concept of the transitional object as a means of further bridging the gap between self object function and true object. He draws from Winnicott's essay on "The Capacity To Be Alone" (1965) in which feelings of self cohesion are tied to internalized affects, associated with real object experience. The result is an ego sense of cohesiveness which can then be generalized to the non-human aspects of the transitional object and later to cultural interests, ideology and value systems. These may then provide a soothing connection to the original good enough objects.

In discussing the current quest for a superordinant matrix from which to explain the thrust of human behavior Eagle points to two ironies. The first being the repudiation of assuming a metapsychological stance while simultaneously embracing ones own covert metapsychology. The second irony involves the attempt to stay closer to the clinical and experiential while actually deviating further. In the latter instance, a more traditional causal approach does not claim to explain the matter of behavior, only the mechanisms that cause its occurrence. Those claiming a superordinant motive must concoct a more elabaorate structure to explain how what appears to be caused by a specific motive is, in fact, a reflection of some higher ordering principle.

In summary Eagle feels that psychoanalysis is for the present stuck with the more complex situation of a multiplicity of specific motives which interact with one another. Any uniformity must be found not in the realm of other aims and motives, but at another level of discourse, that of processes and mechanisms.

In the final summing up chapter Professor Eagle concludes that in order to most correctly represent our expanded knowledge of psychoanalysis we must adhere to a theory that both alters and expands the traditional views of id and ego. Returning to the more literal translation of "wo es war, soll ich werden" (where it was, there shall I become). This more closely approximates Roy Schafer's notions that in psychoanalysis we should work to transform what is impersonal and disowned into what is personally owned. This is in contrast to more generally predominant ideas regarding the need for the ego to become more dominant and controlling of the seething cauldron of id desires. If we can expand the idea of id to include a legitimate biological substrait, the seed of certain universal and vital biologically based needs and propensities, that due to temperamental and environmental factors are more or less represented as conscious aims and desires, we need not view such a system with the type of pessimism that is often reflected in analytic theorizing. Such needs and propensities, according to Eagle, include sexual and sensual experiences, attachment, object seeking and relational needs, and needs for self integrity and self esteem.

The obvious and main reason for conferring a Ph.D. is to convey to the public that psychoanalysis is a scientific field requiring study, training, investigation and intellectual development worthy of a doctorate degree, and that the individuals who hold this degree have earned it by meeting the necessary requirements as established by a recognized, legitimate institution of higher learning. This is the purpose of a Ph.D. in any field. The curriculum and educational process of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Institute as currently constituted meets the legal requirements of the State of California for this purpose. In my opinion a Ph.D. in psychoanalysis is not only very appropriate from an academic point of view but is long overdue.

I have heard several arguments in opposition to the conferring of the Ph.D. by the Los Angeles Institute. For purposes of discussion, I will address several of these.

Argument 1. Psychoanalytic training is not equivalent to a university Ph.D. program.

Response 1. In my opinion this view is quite incorrect. The amount of study, effort and time devoted to psychoanalytic training is greater than in many other academic Ph.D. fields. The work with patients in analysis can be considered original clinical research and study. It is certainly not our view that nothing new can be discovered from the analysis of patients or that analysis is only a technical process requiring training. Training is necessary in all scientific methodologies. Analytic training contains the elements for predoctoral work in all other fields. The candidate has to learn concepts and techniques, be supervised, and be able to satisfactorily demonstrate his knowledge, present his findings, and be examined by recognized authorities in the field. All of this already takes place in the training program of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Institute.

Argument 2. Academic psychiatry will not recognize or appreciate a Ph.D. given by an analytic institute.

Response 2. It is true that a university doctorate degree has more academic standing than one from a professional school. This certainly applies to the field of psychology but universities do not offer comprehensive training and degrees in psychoanalysis. The academic backgrounds of individuals graduating from analytic institutes associated with the American Psychoanalytic Institute are usually of very high quality. Regarding academic acceptance, this is a very individual matter. Some academic psychiatrists and others reject psychoanalysis as a science; others have respect for it. Those academics who do appreciate psychoanalysis and are aware of the extensive work and high standard of training will not discredit a Ph.D. given by an analytic institute. Others who proudly display, along with their M.D.'s, their Ph.D.'s in physiology or pharmacology (which may have been obtained in only two or three years) will just have to get used to the idea! In any case we should appreciate our own value and not be inhibited by pejorative attitudes and limited appreciation. If we don't consider our work and field worthy of a Ph.D. why should anyone else!

Argument 3. The Ph.D. isn't necessary; the M.D. is sufficient — the important thing is how you think and feel inside — an analyst shouldn't need such external recognition.

Response 3. Psychoanalysis is not recognized as a medical specialty. Certification in psychoanalysis has no meaning to the public or the medical profession. The M.D. is a sufficient credential for a general practitioner of medicine, not for the usually 10 to 15 years of additional study and training of the psychiatrist - analyst.

While I would certainly agree that the most important contribution of psychoanalytic training is how one thinks and feels inside and in one's work, I do not agree that there is no need for professional recognition. The desire for recognition is both natural, and often practical as well as necessary. Excessive need for recognition is pathological but so is the need to avoid it. An elitist attitude of splendid isolation or "it's up to the individual to make his own way," serves our professional identity very poorly. From my perspective as an academic psychiatrist and as a teacher and supervisor of psychiatric residents for over 15 years, I have no doubt that a Ph.D. degree from an analytic institute would be respected as a teaching credential. Given a choice, most psychiatrists seeking analytic training would choose an institute offering a Ph.D.

Argument 4. Psychoanalysis is a clinical field, not a Ph.D. field.

Response 4. The above argument really displays a very narrow view or a resistance to change. One need only read Freud's introduction to *Instincts and their Vicissitudes* to appreciate the scientific basis of psychoanalysis. To view psychoanalysis as only a clinical field is to overlook its magnificent contribution to psychology and other fields. Freud certainly did not want psychoanalysis to be a sub-specialty of psychiatry, but a science in its own right. Even if considered a clinical field, it should be noted that Ph.D.'s are offered in clinical fields such as clinical psychology, social work, nursing, and other fields of study not nearly as sophisticated or intellectually demanding as psychoanalysis.

I know that when the Ph.D. in psychoanalysis is seriously considered, the question will arise, who should receive the degree and what should be the requirements. I think the degree should be given to all graduates of the Los Angeles Institute and if legally possible, honorary degrees to those graduates of other institutes who are members of our Institute. It is difficult enough to graduate from our institute, and increasing the demands and requirements for the Ph.D. would be discouraging. Furthermore a two-tier system in which some graduates receive a Ph.D. and others do not, would be devisive and counterproductive to the points and purposes raised in this essay. Standards and requirements can always be revised in the future. It is essential not to make this important step any more complicated than necessary.

I believe the Ph.D. in psychoanalysis will go a long way in decreasing the lack of recognition of our field and the isolation from and to some degree the understandable antagonism felt toward us by our non-medically trained colleagues in psychoanalysis. Perhaps the crux of the resistance to the Ph.D. proposal is the fear that the institutes will lose their medical-psychiatric control if psychoanalysis is considered a Ph.D. field. I believe that the medical-psychiatric perspective will continue to have a dominant position even though inevitably there will be more non-psychiatrists receiving training at our institute and becoming members of the faculty. Thus far the mix has been very enriching. Historically the major conceptual and power struggles in the field of psychoanalysis and our institute in particular have not been between psychiatrists and non-psychiatrists. I do not see why this should change in the future. In any case the conferring of Ph.D. degrees does not necessitate revolutionary changes in the structure and philosophy of our institute and its emphasis on the training of psychiatrist-analysts. Evolution is necessary for survival. We should be an active part of this evolution.

IMPRESSIONS OF THE BION CONFERENCE

BY LEE SHERSHOW, M.D.

Objective:

200 mental health professionals gathered together at the Miramar Sheraton Hotel in Santa Monica on October 12 and 13, to lovingly honor, discuss, and criticize the life and work of Wilfred Bion. Three original papers were delivered by notable international experts on psychoanalysis (Clifford Scott, Ramon Ganzarain, and John Wisdom). Nine local analysts presented position papers or acted as discussants, seven of whom were members of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society and Institute. Most of the presentations were excellent, and they contained both theoretical and clinical material. In addition, Dr. Albert Mason performed admirably as moderator of the entire 2 day conference, and contributed his own synthesis of Bion's work. This meeting provided a valuable educational opportunity for the growing community of mental health professionals interested in serious psychoanalytic study, and the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society and Institute should feel justifiably proud to have sponsored this conference on Bion.

Subjective:

1. Out of 180 people in attendance, only 33 were affiliated with LAPSI (8 presenters, 18 other Society members, and 7 clinical associates). The other 155 were various mental health professionals, and most were not analysts and not MDs; the audience was clearly a non-LAPSI crowd. Some questions about these numbers:

   a. Why so few members? No interest in Bion? Old politics? Too expensive? No interest in week/end conferences?

   b. The 155 non-analysts reveals a tremendous interest in analysis among non-MD therapists. They out-numbered us 5:1, and most of them remained for the entire conference, until Sunday afternoon. All this suggests they are really hungry for quality conferences on psychoanalysis. Who is feeding this hunger? What makes some people, even some analysts, say that analysis is dying?

2. There was an air of C-L-A-S-S at this conference, in the witty and smooth way Dr. Mason moderated, in the respect for diverse points of view shown by all presenters, in the friendly and sympatico nature of the crowd, and even in the high quality of food and drinks. The coffee breaks and the Saturday afternoon cocktail party were especially enjoyable. They felt like gatherings of old friends and colleagues, enjoying time together after a period of hard, productive work.

3. Bion had the power to stimulate creativity and productivity in those analysts who had close personal contact with him. This was brought home powerfully in 2 ways during the conference:

a. Due to an unexpected technical problem, Dr. Ganzarain's presentation had to be delayed until Sunday, so after Dr. Scott's presentation to begin the conference, every other speaker for the rest of Saturday was from the Los Angeles area. Seeing so many analysts, who I know, respect, and admire, demonstrating their own enthusiasm and love for Dr. Bion, created a powerful and happy feeling in me.

b. The last presentation Saturday was the playing of exerpts of audio recordings of Dr. Bion's public speeches here. Hearing his voice, his words, and the cadence of his speech reminded me of his original and unique personal magnetism. This impression was reinforced by a panel of Drs. Carson, Grotstein, and Paul, who shared their own personal affectionate and powerful impressions of Dr. Bion. It also reminded me of Dr. Scott's poignant closing statement: "The jewel must die, I'm sorry he's dead."

4. Now, in retrospect, I do realize there is a danger in such magnetism: it can motivate grandiose idealization of Bion, something he would despise and repudiate. This fact was commented on by many people. We were constantly warned to be challenged by his ideas, not idealize the man. Nevertheless, the danger of hero-worshipping continues. If I could try to put it into Bion's words, we must not project good parts of ourselves (concern for patients, belief in being open-minded, eschewing memory and desire,) into Bion, and then projectively identify ourselves with him. To be true to the spirit of Bion, we must take even his ideas with skepticism, we must strive to forget even his theories while we work, and we must constantly strive to achieve his sacred state of ignorance, nullity, or zero saturation. This point was described by Richard Edelman at the end of the conference, as he remembered how analysis with Bion would constantly change focus just when he thought he understood something; he said it "spins you around", until you had re-arrived at confusion.

5. The single most lasting image from the weekend: Bion as a young tank commander in 1917 during World War I, under fire from the enemy, somehow keeping his cool and learning to tolerate terror and chaos. This experience then became for Bion a paradigm, strengthened by his Kleinian

training: an analyst, during a session with a group or a psychotic patient, under fire from hostile and omnipotent projections, somehow keeping his mind unsaturated. In this paradigm, then, psychoanalysis is viewed as a *battle*.

But, what if Bion had never served in World War I? What if, for example, he had been a conscientious objector? What sort of paradigm might that have generated? How much are paradigms related to non-analytic life experiences anyway . . .?

6. Final observation: On Monday morning, after the Bion Conference, upon arriving at my office, I found the ghost of Dr. Bion sitting at my desk. It said "good, you're finally here, I've been waiting. Bring in the first patient! I can't wait to see what happens." Thereafter, throughout the day, it would sit quietly and listen to my patient's material, and whenever I made an interpretation it would look at me, pause, perhaps raise an eyebrow, and say "Well, you see, what you said wasn't too bad . . . But, what else is going on?" Fortunately — no, unfortunately — with each day's passage the ghost became more faint; today I could hardly hear it at all.