

#10. Douglas Maxwell:

First of all, Estelle, I want you to know that your group would be welcomed within the NAAP community. And Lynne, we at NAAP can really empathize with you as we have felt fractionalized and marginalized for more than 30 years. But we are here. I also want to thank you Lynne, as President of APsaA, since it was one of your institutes, New York Psychoanalytic, that 60 years ago refused to allow Theodore Reik the ability to psychoanalyze their candidates because he was not medical. That was 1948, more than 20 years after Freud had written “In Defense of Lay Analysis”. If they had accepted him, then he would have never founded NPAP and I, as a lawyer and art historian, would have never had an institute that would have allowed me to train to become a Psychoanalyst.

Rick, it might surprise you to hear that I agree with most of what you said, even with regard to standards. Of course where we disagree is over your dogmatic insistence on the rigidity of those standards. And you insist that it would be easy for us to become allies, all it would take is for us to capitulate, agree with you and follow what you say. What this prolonged battle has accomplished is to divert and squander valuable assets, financial and otherwise, away from the kind of endeavors that could enhance the reputation of our profession at a time when we all agree, it is as low as can be. What we’re doing is like having a boxing match in a ring on the middle of the Titanic. The ship’s sinking. Who cares who wins, rather we all lose.

Dr. Procci referred to the “next group of candidates” as being “psychologists, social workers, women and gays”. NAAP institutes have been training these kinds of candidates since its inception over 30 years ago. Let’s not stop there, NAAP institutes have been training lawyers, engineers, artists of all kinds, financial people and the list of diversity just goes on and on.

This weekend we have heard a lot about the deficiencies in the training regimen at the “traditional institutes”, APsaA institutes. That there is a rigidity that leads to one theoretical modality being taught at the expense of others: that the training analyst system works only to consolidate power to those on the in and disenfranchise those who don’t fit the right mold and are on the out, that psychoanalytic research is sorely needed. Well, this has been most enlightening for us since these are not problems that NAAP institutes face. As an example, I will use my Institute, NPAP, to illustrate. We teach courses in Object Relations, Relational theory, Self-Psychology, Ego Psychology, and the candidates are free to choose whatever theoretical orientation they are comfortable working with. As you have already heard from Sherman Pfeiffer, our Dean of Training,

NPAP has never had a 2 tiered training analyst system, rather any of our members can conduct the analysis of a candidate. And as for research, the New York Licensing Law has merely codified the existing practice of teaching research methodology, and as you have heard from the Modern Institute in Boston, they have always required research from their candidates.

Finally, a word about NAAP and legislation. There seems to be a misconception that NAAP is in the business of procuring licensing legislation all over the country. Nothing could be further from the truth, rather in 17 states, I believe, I could not practice Psychoanalysis because I do not have a license in some other mental health area. This we find abhorrent and will never accept. Psychoanalysis is not and can never be the subspecialty of another mental health profession and we will continue to promote its independence as a profession. But we are not in the business of procuring licenses, rather defending our existence as we have been forced to do in New York, New Jersey and now in Massachusetts where our member institute, The Jung Institute of Boston, discovered that they and the Modern group were being excluded from licensing discussions undertaken by other mental health organizations. We must and will support their efforts to be included in any legislation or otherwise. NAAP's policies have always been to promote inclusion and diversity and that shall always remain so. I think I will stop there.