

Jane Hall

Welcome to our second ecumenical conference.

We are here today to continue mending the splits of our dysfunctional psychoanalytic family. Since its beginning psychoanalysts have been splitting into different schools. Much of this phenomenon has been caused by exclusionary practices and closed minds, starting with AA Brill who came to America in 1911 and medicalized psychoanalysis against Freud's wishes.

Although Brillism lives on in the minds of a few, it has greatly diminished along with racism in America, allowing psychologists, social workers, and others to enhance the profession. In fact, the power of the American Psychoanalytic Association, still trying to recover from its early reputation, has been vastly diminished in that Psychoanalytic Education is available and licensable in many other free standing institutes. Many of the sponsoring organizations for this meeting have been formed because of exclusionary practices but it is a tribute to psychoanalysis that it has continued to branch out. Today there are more independent institutes than there are APsaA affiliated institutes across the country. I believe that Karen Horney was the first to declare independence. It is my understanding that NAAP, an umbrella organization for many institutes, also

came into being due to exclusion. And Theodore Reik, a colleague of Freud, due to his exclusion by the American formed NPAP. Freud's paper "On Lay Analysis" was written in support of Theodore Reik. NYFS and IPTAR branched off from NPAP and so you see the family tree has and is growing as we speak. We have Kohutians, Lacanians, Bionians, Kleinians, Freudians, to name just a few, and soon there will be Fonagians, Greenbergians, and maybe even Martians contributing ideas.

The idea of ecumenicalism is what this conference is about. Mending the splits by respecting each other must be our first priority. So much energy is spent on intra and inter society disagreement that little is left for the real work we need to do: involving and interesting the community and the undergraduate programs - beginning in high school.

Civil discourse and respectful exchanges will take us far. Freud, as we know, could change his mind. Why can't we? Hubris is this field's biggest enemy. When we all really grasp with genuine humility that the human brain, heart, and soul are unbelievably complex; that each human being is unique; and that there really is no one answer or even approach that fits all – we will have made a giant leap. Open mindedness is what we need to teach our candidates.

Psychoanalysis can only grow as we learn to cooperate and listen to each other and to our patients with sensitivity and open ears.

Debates over issues such as frequency and couches divert us from delving deeper and broadening our knowledge and our ability to educate. Insularity is our enemy just like it is in the real world. We need to thoughtfully 'get out of the box' before it turns into our coffin.

Now is the time to build bridges. Why not attend each other's meetings so that we can thrive on new and different ideas instead of feeling safe and secure within our own sects. We have so much to learn and so much to share. I can imagine each member of our keynote panel attending a meeting outside his or her particular theoretical home. How about you in the audience? No one has a corner on this market! (pause) The closed mind is a dead mind. Cooperation among all those who are concerned with keeping psychoanalysis alive and well can only strengthen our goal. We may differ and debate but we can listen too. How many of us are able to say something like: "That's an interesting idea, let me think about it" or "Can you tell me more because I never considered that way of seeing it" or "you have opened a door in my thinking."??

One bridge building technique is to take a moment, right now, to say hello to a person sitting near you who you don't know. -----

Then, at the coffee breaks and lunch, please do the same. Try not to sit with just your friends. That is the only assignment. We rely on audience participation. All voices are welcome –There are standing mikes in both aisles.

Our keynoters are truly special and have stimulating things to say.

In alphabetical order let me introduce: Please see formal credentials in the program.

Henry Friedman from Boston – an analyst known for his keen wit, earnestness, and forward thinking and whose lively spirit challenges us all to get out of the box.

Ted Jacobs who with his gentle and often wry humor, has opened up our thoughts about the analyst's inner experience among other things. I see him as a renaissance man for all seasons.

And last but certainly not least, Paola Mieli, founder of Après Coup who is warm, lively, lovely in spirit, and erudite. As a Lacanian analyst she will bring a different focus for us to ponder.

After lunch we will have two round table discussion groups. Thank you to Jonathan House and Arlene Kramer Richards for moderating.

Before turning it over to Henry, I want to thank the organizing committee: Ann d'Erecole, James Fosshage, Jennifer Harper, Kenneth Eisold, Kimberly Chu, Arlene Richards, Lila Kalanich, Sam Herschkowitz, and my co-chair, Arnie Richards. Last year Judy Logue brought us an awesome panel. Due to illness she cannot be here today and we wish her speedy recovery.

Special thanks to Tamar and Larry Schwartz –and Ray -- whose hard work on logistics made this possible.