

#1. Lynne Moritz:

COMMENTS ON “HATE AND LOVE IN PSYCHOANALYTIC  
INSTITUTIONS”

When I have finished my term as President of the American Psychoanalytic Association (in 6 months, 2 weeks, and 1 day), I will count myself as an expert on being hated.

I don't think it's me. I think, rather, that it's me as a representative of an organization that people love to hate.

Why is the American hated?

- 1) For injuries, slights, and rejections committed in the past. (Just last night I heard about an injury to a group committed 70 years ago—an injury by a very different organization than the American is now.) These mostly occurred to groups outside the American who felt hurt by exclusion.
- 2) For injuries, slights, and rejections committed in the present. For its arrogance and continuing hurts. These occur both in groups outside the American and among our own Members. Yes, some may be a result of our “superego complex” and the organizational form that derives from it and preserves it. But some may also be from good, old-fashioned transference--disappointments in one's training analysis and/or one's institute, disappointments in certification and TA appointments, professional practice disappointments, life disappointments of all kinds—displaced to, and blamed on, the American.
- 3) For the appearance of power.

Folks, it wasn't me!

I would even go so far as to muse that this conference was born partly from a covert agenda to punish the American--not to bring us together really, but rather to stabilize and strengthen the fact of our separateness. Some may even hope to do harm to the American, to weaken its influence. Why do I guess such a thing? Many things. But partly, from the deep ambivalence toward the American that was revealed in the many missteps toward us by the organizers in the weeks leading up to this conference. (Just one example, verifiable by anyone, is the fact that, for all those tables of literature outside bearing the proud brochures of each separate group, there is not one scrap of paper here from the American.)

I'm sorry. I think this is misguided. We do not need our separateness strengthened. We analysts are, in fact, a tiny group—perhaps 10,000 of us altogether in a country of 300 million. Splintering, fractionizing, fractious-izing, to me, is a sure path in the wrong direction.

Weaken, dismantle the American? I would say, be careful what you wish for.

Let me tell you what we do.

The American Psychoanalytic Association will soon celebrate the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its founding. We are the most functional psychoanalytic organization in the world. We embrace 3400 members, including psychoanalytic professionals of all stripes. We publish the premier psychoanalytic journal of the world; we are the co-originators and co-owners of PEP, a psychoanalytic research instrument as well as a web presence for disseminating psychoanalytic ideas; we hold two scientific meetings per year, which draw participants from around the world; we have 135 committees, where Members are invited to deeply consider topics of their interest over years; we house a paid public relations staff for psychoanalytic promotion in the press; we provide highly successful federal lobbying activities and regularly supply expert testimony for federal and state legislative efforts to confront destructive forces and improve and protect the climate for psychoanalytic practice in the United States; we fund psychoanalytic as well as interdisciplinary research and provide seed money to encourage young researchers and innovative projects; we have developed and administer an ethics code for psychoanalysts; we participate with all mainstream psychoanalytic organizations; we engage neighboring professions; and we provide Member benefits ranging from professional liability insurance to health insurance to Member listserves to society and individual assistance and support.

The central gem of our functioning is, and always has been, our educational system. Our 26 approved institutes, 3 provisional institutes, and 2 new training facilities, all on the Eitingen model, have training responsibility for almost 1000 candidates. One might say we exist to support our institutes, each with its unique local character. The American has accredited institutes for almost 60 years, and this function is perhaps our proudest service. No institute enjoys the rigors of preparation for this every-seven-year, top-to-bottom scrutiny, but the collegial intention, the collective wisdom and creativity of the visiting teams, and the genuine spirit of cooperation, sharing experiences, and helpfulness has created a long track record of good will on both sides. Our Board on Professional Standards, consisting of two fellows from each

institute, bears responsibility for the evolution of our professional education. Just 3 years ago, in a strategic planning survey, our members overwhelmingly voted professional education as our Association's number 1 priority, research as number 2, maintenance of standards as number 3. No other Association activity or function even approached the importance Members placed on these three. Above all else, we are committed to professional excellence.

We do these things. Other groups do not. In fact, I suspect, you count on us to do them. Dare I say, if there were not an American, it would be necessary to invent one.

Let me respond just briefly to Jurgen Reeder's address. I appreciate this work very much because of the chance it has given us to think and to question. As much as I have played with Dr. Reeder's theme of hate as a theme (and managed to say some true things in the process), all of us know that the reason we have agreed to gather here is love—love for the profession that we all embrace.

Much of what Dr. Reeder says rings true, and I believe his proposals for change deserve our careful attention. There are some basic issues, however, with which I disagree from my perspective as an organization leader in this overburdened profession. A few bullet points:

- I disagree that we must re-examine our ethos BEFORE we confront the world. We are in the world and of the world, and the world is moving fast. What we have to offer is essential, and we cannot withdraw and then expect to be accepted back. Both needs must be answered.
- I believe that we must not abandon, but rather cultivate, our professions of origin. Our individual credibility illuminates a path for others to follow.
- Dr. Reeder's tone seems wrong to me; he speaks of psychoanalysis like a depressed patient. He says, psychoanalysis . . . :  
“ . . . subserviently looks for confirmation of its hypotheses from neuroscience”  
“ . . . despairingly subjects its practices to the rigors of evidence-based investigation”

I believe, in fact, that he ignores a confluence of evidence flowing from multiple fields and validating our work. For us to fail to participate in that exciting explosion of knowledge or to lay claim to our rightful

contributions to that knowledge would be most serious lapses in my view.

- I think Dr. Reeder disregards and undervalues the vital, ongoing contributions of psychoanalysis to other fields. For instance, psychiatry and psychology sorely need us. We ground them in that part of a view of human life that they are drifting away from.

Furthermore, we have many in our profession, and we are respectful of their varied talents and expertise--people widely distributed across a multitude of fields. Among our analysts are those who would have little interest in the matter of examining our ethos; their interests and hard-won skills are elsewhere. For instance, many have served long and won their wings as researchers, as teachers, as professionals in organizations, in legislatures, in teaching institutions. They are in positions of leadership and influence. They must be helped and supported to assist us--not stopped--while we take stock.

For many reasons, I take this moment in history as a time of urgent opportunity. Yes, let's examine our ethos. But yes, let's attend to our world. Our world is fast changing. As a people and a culture, we are in turmoil. Signs of the strain are everywhere—the extraordinary rise of the moral majority, fundamentalist religions, alternative health treatments, magical thinking of all kinds—all represent people in search of a solution. This is a backlash, I believe, to that turn of history that increasingly promotes our culture of greed, violence and alienation, industrialization of health care, dehumanization of workers, life in cyberspace. In truth, the need in the world for what we offer is real and pressing. We must be there, and be there with the real stuff.

People search through a void for a center that holds. We try to be a center that holds.

Join us. Come with us. Help us.

We need your talents. We need your strengths.

We need one voice.

We need common cause.

Help us—help me!—heal the wounds. Help us find a way.