From the Director

Dan Jacobs, MD

Life passes into pages if it passes into anything.
~ James Salter

Our library is filled with those who put their psychoanalytic lives into words. Some, like Grete Bibring whose accomplishments we are celebrating in a new publication (see p. 2) were life-long members of BPSI. Others, like Arthur Valenstein and his colleagues, about whom Jim Barron writes in this issue, chose another path (see pp. 3-6). We vary in our theoretical approaches and technique and, sometimes, in the psychoanalytic societies we join. But we come together in the study of psychoanalysis, its history and current challenges, and in contemplation of its future. Our library is a quiet and beautiful place for such study, open to everyone.

A library and archive has its own life, ever changing, growing, and hopefully, expanding. Take note of the new books we have ordered (p. 8), of the new programs we are planning (p. 2) and the recommendations for reading made by our members (p. 2, 6, 7). The directions for further growth and outreach that our members suggested in responding to our survey, are excellent ones. We will keep you posted as to their implementation.

The addition of new members from PINE have made the library a busier place. Their presence is welcome as is yours. If we can help you in any of your analytic endeavors, please call on us.

Library News

Look for the Hanns Sachs Library table at the IPA Congress exhibit hall. The Library Committee members will share our news and recent publications, taking your orders for Grete Bibring: A Culinary Biography, Edward Bibring Photographs: Psychoanalysts of His Time, and Freud and Me books. The library is planning to facilitate many exciting projects in the next few years. We will be blogging about our authors and posting new videos of psychoanalytic events on our web site. The Library Committee is organizing a task force to review our book collection to make space for new acquisitions.

Please note our new schedule: we now keep the library open from 9:30am to 9:30pm on Mon-Thu, 9:30am-5:00pm on Fri throughout the academic year. Our summer schedule is Mon-Thu, 10am-8pm. Olga and Drew welcome you to come and enjoy our comfortable reading areas (photograph by Allen Palmer).
Meet the Author Series 2015-2016

**Grete Bibring: A Culinary Biography**

By Daniel Jacobs, Olga Umansky, and the Members of the Hanns Sachs Library Committee is out and available on Amazon this summer! Meet the Authors on **Tue, Oct 6, at 7:45pm** to learn how this project came about and developed into a book publication. The book tells a fascinating life story of our early member, viewed through the meticulous record of her dinner parties, discovered at BPSI Archives. Grete Bibring’s biography is accompanied by previously unpublished photographs, brief accounts of some of her guests’ lives, and 11 authentic recipes from her table.

On **Tue, Feb 9, 2016**, **Judy Kantrowitz** will talk about her new book *Myths of Termination: What Patients Can Teach Psychoanalysts About Endings*. Routledge, 2014. This work confronts and refutes the myths about the termination phase of psychoanalysis that are passed from generation to generation. It is a refreshing and insightful study that will be welcomed by psychoanalysts, psychodynamic therapists, such as clinical psychologists, social workers, and others trained or in training to do clinical work.

On **Mon, May 23, 2016**, **Ana-Maria Rizzuto** will discuss her new book *Freud and the Spoken Word: Speech as a Key to the Unconscious*. Routledge, 2015. In this work, Dr. Rizzuto contends that Freud’s focus on the intrapsychic function and meaning of patients’ words allowed him to use the new psychoanalytic method of talking to gain access to unconscious psychic life. In creating the first ‘talking therapy’, Freud began a movement that still underpins how psychoanalysts understand and use the spoken word in clinical treatment and advance psychoanalytic theory.

What Are We Reading?


In Freud’s Requiem, the philosophical disagreement between Freud and his companions—who may have been the poet Rainer Maria Rilke and his muse and former lover Lou Andreas-Salomé—becomes a prism through which to consider Freud’s creativity as a response to his own experiences, from his passionately curious, lovestruck teenage years to his death after a long struggle with cancer in 1939. Drawing on a variety of literary and historical sources—Homer, Shakespeare, and Goethe, as well as Freud’s own writings, including his letters—Freud’s Requiem is both an intimate personal drama and a spirited intellectual inquiry.” Matthew von Unwerth is the director of the New York Psychoanalytic Society library. He was the moderator at a recent BPSI program. – Recommended by Anna Wolff, MD


In the Archives

Perspectives on the PINE BPSI Split

Over the past year, along with 29 other former members of PINE, I joined BPSI. Soon after Dan Jacobs invited me to join him on the Library Committee, I became aware of the richness of the library archives – a collection of documents, photographs, letters, interviews, committee reports, recordings, and other primary sources. The archives provide a unique window into the history of psychoanalysis in Boston, including the history of our psychoanalytic organizations. We owe a debt to Sanford Gifford who was passionate about supporting the BPSI library in general and its archives in particular over many years until his death in 2013. Gifford’s letters and emails have themselves been incorporated into the archives.*

Given my long association with PINE as candidate, faculty member, and as immediate past-president, I was excited about the opportunity to explore the archives and to learn more about the tensions and conflicts during the early 1970s leading up to the formalization of the split in 1975. As analysts we are acutely aware that our memories are dynamic, that we are continuously (re)constructing the past, and that we are unconsciously drawn toward “selected facts” that shape our narratives. My readings of the various texts in the archives therefore inescapably reflect my embeddedness in the fields of both organizations and my subjective “take” on the split. With those qualifications in mind, I will summarize some of the complex intertwining environmental factors, personalities, and events contributing to the split and then present the personal “voices” of several of the key players and observers.

Some of the conflicts** were endemic in many of the societies and institutes belonging to the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsaA), while others were unique to BPSI. The post-war enthusiasm for psychoanalysis in American culture had started to wane, and the surrounding environment was becoming less favorable for psychoanalysis with the emergence of new medications and competing shorter-term, less expensive treatments. With fewer patients seeking analysis, Training Analysts (TAs) enjoyed clear economic advantages. Grants for psychoanalytically oriented research were starting to dry up, and positions available for psychoanalysts within hospitals, clinics and departments of psychiatry were decreasing.

In 1973, BPSI was a large organization with 250 members. Within BPSI there were no clear divisions along theoretical lines as occurred in the British Psychoanalytical Society (followers of Melanie Klein versus followers of Anna Freud). There were, however, significant power struggles between the Institute and the Society, and between the Education Committee (EC)/TAs and non-TAs. Many members of the EC were fearful of what they perceived as the intrusion of the Society into their domain and of the resulting loss of autonomy in running the Institute.

Many members of the Society felt that they were being excluded and marginalized, and they were looking for more meaningful roles within BPSI. The criteria and procedures to become a TA were not transparent, and there was the perception and not infrequently the reality that those in favor were “tapped” to become TAs, fueling discontent in the ranks of mid-career and senior analysts who felt their pathways to becoming TAs were blocked. Candidates were in “reporting” analyses that influenced their status and pathways to becoming TAs were blocked. Candidates were in “reporting” analyses that influenced their status and progress in the Institute and stirred up feelings of insecurity and mistrust.

In an attempt to diffuse the tensions and bridge the differences between Institute and Society, the EC accepted the recommendation of a specially appointed Ad Hoc Committee to establish the part-time paid position of Dean. In the fall of 1971 James Mann began his ill-fated tenure as Dean. He proved to be a divisive figure, and the EC acted unilaterally in May 1973 to discontinue the position of Dean, exacerbating the tensions between Institute and Society.

In my view, there was a growing sense among a subset of senior analysts that BPSI had become too big, complex, bureaucratic, bogged down in committees and unproductive meetings, too diffuse in its interests (in hospitals, departments of psychiatry, academia), and too broad in its outreach (psychotherapy programs, consideration of operating a low-fee clinic). In other words, they felt that BPSI was going off course and was losing its focus on practicing and teaching clinical psychoanalysis. Although I did not find specific archival evidence, I surmise that they felt drawn toward an ideal, bordering on idealization, of an earlier time in psychoanalysis, perhaps best represented by the Wednesday Psychological Society (a small group of passionate followers of Freud) that met in Freud’s apartment in Vienna beginning in 1902 and that eventually became The Vienna Psychoanalytic Society in 1908.

(continued on page 4)
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James Barron, PhD

Reflecting on the events leading up to the split, Gifford sent an email in January 2009 to the BPSI librarian, Olga Umansky. In his email, titled Intro to PINE Split, he emphasizes the discontent with the “tyranny of the EC,” perhaps most strongly experienced by those who would eventually leave BPSI.

The remote background had been the dissatisfied upper-middle analysts who felt they had been overlooked for appointment to Training Analyst (which meant automatic membership in the Education Committee). The broader issue was the tyranny of the EC (an Institute body) and the lack of other appointments in the Society …

An interim remedy had been the creation of a paid, part-time clinical director, James Mann to “put a human face” on the grim, impersonal EC, as it was seen by candidates and younger members. Dr. Mann’s subcommittee on Social Issues, etc. did not attract many members and his appointment was not renewed by the EC. This resulted in protests by younger members, a year or more of Meetings of the Whole, that is Society and Institute, which were tedious and not very productive.

PINE’s manifesto in early 1974 was an attempt to break this impasse, and its somewhat ambiguous aims included a small-sized Institute, informal collegial relations between faculty and candidates, and above all a minimum of committee-structure, in contrast to the slow-moving behemoth of the EC. The emphasis was on “adventure,” liveliness and innovation, but also with elements of a return to the earlier European years of psychoanalysis, when societies were smaller … The early proposals from PINE also emphasized possible dual membership, i.e. belonging to both PINE (a training institute) and BPSI.

In other words PINE members would continue to belong to the Boston Psychoanalytic Society, share its library and some seminars, like child-analysis, which PINE lacked the faculty to teach.

On March 12, 1975, Joseph Nemetz, in his capacity as chair of the EC, wrote a letter to the BPSI candidates and society members in which he decries the growing movement to form a separate institute. Nemetz emphasizes the suspicion held by some TAs that an expanded role for the Society members would damage psychoanalytic education.

One unfortunate outcome of last year's ferment has been that a group of Training Analysts, distressed by the possibility of further pressure in the future from Society members for greater participation in Institute matters and fearing this as a danger to the quality of psychoanalytic education, are seeking to establish a new institute in Boston called PINE … Based on our understanding that the issue of Institute autonomy was a major one, some of our members, who had originally been passionately devoted to the active inclusion of more Society members in the policy-making aspects of candidate education, became persuaded of the wisdom of maintaining and guaranteeing autonomy for the Institute and of establishing autonomy more definitively for the Society. Specific recommendations to establish these constitutionally will be presented to the members in the future … The outcome of these struggles is not at all clear, and under the best of circumstances we may be beheaded for some very rough times. It seems to us that we cannot afford the luxury of adding to the dangers that confront us by a fragmentation of the resources, energies and creative capacities …

Soon after Nemetz’s letter, Arthur Valenstein resigned as president of BPSI when he failed to generate widespread support for a “live and let live” two Institute/one Society solution to the growing organizational crisis. On March 31, 1975, he sent a letter to the entire membership describing the reasons for his resignation:

As some of you may recall, when I took office as President of the Boston Psychoanalytic Society and Institute last April I explicitly stated that I had “many misgivings and doubts that I would be able to carry through my office successfully, under the circumstances of the politicized organizational crisis” that had already been the main order of business for a year, overshadowing the scientific and educational life of your Society.
Nonetheless, I expressed my intention of doing my best consistent with values and ideals for psychoanalysis which I held and still hold. I had thought it possible that a measure of equanimity might return and endure despite differences in point of view and position, including even so controversial a matter as the One Institute – Two Institute issue. There was a real possibility that it could lead, in fact, to two Institutes in Boston, as now appears to be the outcome. Throughout my term as President, I have continued to hope that were this to come about, as much mutuality and reciprocity as was feasible might prevail, rather than an unremitting power struggle. As I see it, this will be the consequence of a determined intention to defeat the development of a second Institute. Such a struggle, however it may be decided, will, in my opinion, leave a residue of irreconcilable ill feeling on both sides, and force a mutually exclusive choice of organizations upon those members who sincerely wished to serve both.

Dissension in this regard continues to run high. I, as President of the Society, apparently have represented relatively few of the members in considering that it would be both more realistic and constructive to come to a “live and let live” policy. The one versus two Institute issue does not appear to be resolvable in the form of a single Institute, which in structure and function would be acceptable to both factions. The alternative possibility, which might avert continued conflict and which I favor, namely the evolution of two autonomous Institutes which might co-exist and cooperate insofar as possible, apparently is not endorsed by most other officers of the Society – Institute …

Therefore, with considerable sadness for the present state of affairs, I am regretfully resigning as President of the Boston Psychoanalytic Society and Institute, effective April 7, 1975.

Feelings about PINE’s “secession” from BPSI were intense. Gifford, in his email to Umansky, recalls it as a complicated, stormy period:

In the tumult over [the Board on Professional Standards of the American Psychoanalytic Association] allowing PINE to secede, a BPSI faction was obsessed with “opening the floodgates,” i.e. that PINE would create many less experienced training analysts. This proved not to be the case; it was years before PINE appointed one [new] TA.

In a February 13, 1976 letter to Robert Gardner whose creativity and initiative spearheaded the formation of PINE, Gifford questions the need for PINE to form its own society that would offer scientific meetings:

I would foresee an intelligent discussion of this far down the road, after a few courses have been taught and a few more candidates gathered together. Personally I would question the need for a second Society, still cling[ing] to my perhaps Utopian hope for two institutes dwelling peacefully within the bosom of one scientific society. After all, the Scientific Meetings of BPSI are still the only peaceful and sometimes interesting gatherings with colleagues that we have left. [It was not until 1991 that PINE formed its own Society.]

In an interview with Murray Cohen on March 12, 1999, Gardner recalls his frustrations and hopes at the time of the split:

BPSI was getting entirely too large for my taste and character, and I really believed that there was room for more than one institute [in Boston], that there was room for smaller groups where … more intimate discussions could take place … where you’re not a member of a large organization [spending] all your time holding together fragmenting forces.

In selecting these excerpts from the BPSI archives, I have tried to capture the motivations, memories, interpretations, and powerful affective experiences of some of the participants in the events surrounding the split. From our vantage point 40 years later, we continue to make meaning and to metabolize these events individually and collectively.

(continued on page 6)
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(continued from page 5)

*In many ways the writing of this article was a collaborative effort. I wish to thank Malkah Notman for bringing Joseph Nemetz’s letter to my attention, Olga Umansky for helping me make effective and efficient use of the archives, Bernard Edelstein, Dan Jacobs, Catherine Kimble, and Anna Wolff for their feedback, and Phillip Freeman for his careful readings of earlier versions and his wise editorial suggestions.

**For a more detailed description of the structural and political conflicts and power struggles within many of the APsaA institutes and societies at that time, see Douglas Kirsner’s volume, Unfree Associations: Inside Psychoanalytic Institutes, originally published in 2000 (Process Press) and updated in 2009 (The Library of Object Relations).

In the Archives

Recent Inquiries

John Baker, PhD, Professor Emeritus of Art History from the Massachusetts College of Art is working with Heinz Hartmann’s letters recently acquired by BPSI. Judith Haran, MD, a psychiatrist from Worcester, MA, contacted us with research questions about Boston psychoanalytic scene in the 1930’s and 1940’s for the fiction she is writing. A British writer, Julie Greer, has requested a copy of the group photograph from the IPA Congress in Oxford, 1929, for the biography of Barbara Low. Another researcher from England, Roger Willoughby, PhD, has been looking for photographs and documents reflecting development of psychoanalysis in Great Britain before 1939. A longtime friend of the BPSI Archives, Nina Bakman from Zurich, requested a copy of Grete Bibring’s portrait for her forthcoming article about Grete Bibring and Anna Freud.

Recent Internship Projects

In the spring of 2015, an archival student, Anna Dorste, processed eight cartons of new Sanford Gifford papers, looking for unique materials and organizing newly discovered workshops, transcripts and letters. Anna holds a B.A. in English Literature and German Studies from the University of Arizona and is working toward her Master of Library Science degree at Simmons College.

Jennifer Montgomery, our summer intern, continues the Gifford project. In addition to being an archival student at the Simmons College GSLIS, Jennifer is a filmmaker and a professor of film for many years. She holds an M.F.A. degree in Art from the Bard College and B.A. in Studio Art Painting from the Wesleyan University.

What Are We Reading?


The concept of dissociation has occupied a marginalized position in psychoanalytic thinking, one reason being its association with severe psychological trauma. In The Dissociative Mind, Dr. Howell convincingly argues and demonstrates that dissociation is ubiquitous and fundamental to all mental functioning, and that it exists on a continuum. Dissociated self-states often remain undetected in clinical work because we fail to recognize or adequately appreciate them. In the first part of her book Howell provides a comprehensive, accessible and fascinating investigation into the history and use of the concept of dissociation. Starting with a fresh look at the works of Freud, Janet, Ferenczi, Sullivan, and Fairbairn, and then moving on to more recent psychoanalytic writers such as Bromberg, Donnel Stern, Lyons-Ruth and others including recent neurobiological and neurophysiological research, she offers a new theoretical synthesis of these works with dissociation as the cornerstone. Dr. Howell is a psychologist and psychoanalyst, an adjunct clinical associate professor for the NYU Postdoctoral Program. ~ recommended by Rita Teusch, PhD

(continued on page 7)

Recently there has been an uptick in interest in the stories of Stefan Zweig, a world-famous Viennese author and friend of Sigmund Freud. Perhaps this renewed regard for Zweig was prompted by the success of the film The Grand Budapest Hotel which was based on one of his novellas. Freud and Zweig were mutual admirers and maintained what Freud called "an irregular correspondence" after both were forced to emigrate from Austria by the rise of Nazism. Zweig's novel Beware of Pity betrays an unusual understanding of Freudian psychological analysis. As the title suggests, it is the story of a man who is caught in an emotional choke hold by the guilt-inducing manipulation of a disabled woman and her father. Anton Hofmiller, a young military lieutenant, befriends a local millionaire, Herr Lajos von Kesfalva, and inadvertently insults his partially lame daughter Edith. Motivated by pity for her and fearing for his reputation, Hofmiller tries to repair the injury to the young lady, but finds himself ever more deeply in her thrall. His well-meaning but tragically wrong-headed plot to restore the petulant Edith to health, and thereby free himself from the Kesfalva clutches, leads to terrible consequences. The novel reads like a case study of emotional blackmail, revealing the complicated repercussions of behaviors motivated by pity. The psychoanalytic reader may find it a bit overdone but emotionally resonant and a fun read. ~Recommended by Shari Thurer, ScD


In “Integrated Treatment of Eating Disorders,” published in 2008, Kathryn J. Zerbe, M.D., a training and supervising analyst at the Oregon Psychoanalytic Center, and a nationally and internationally recognized expert on eating disorders. Integrated Treatment of Eating Disorders is beautifully written and impressive with regard to its scholarly range and clinical helpfulness. It satisfies many clinicians‘ desire to be educated about eating disorders and become more comfortable and compassionate when treating these patients, who, as a group, have the highest mortality rate of all psychiatric populations. The book is divided into three parts: Part 1: The Stages of Treatment of Eating Disorders (Opening phase, Middle phase, Termination). Part 2: Treatment of Eating Disorders over the Life Cycle. (Adolescence, Adulthood, Later Life). Part 3: Special Issues in the Treatment of Eating Disorders (Sexuality, Managing Transference and Countertransference, Assessing Outcome and Resiliency). Throughout these chapters, Zerbe discusses relevant eating disorders research, provides numerous clinical case examples, sample dialogues, and easy-to-read tables and charts summarizing important clinical tips and helpful recommendations. I highly recommend this extremely readable and interesting book to everyone interested in learning more about eating disorders and their psychodynamic treatment. ~Recommended by Rita Teusch, PhD


Sixty years ago, a group of prominent psychoanalysts, developmentalists, pediatricians, and educators at the Yale Child Study Center joined together with the purpose of formulating a general psychoanalytic theory of children’s early development. The group’s members composed detailed narratives about their work with the study’s children, interviewed families regularly and visited them in their homes, and over the course of a decade met monthly for discussion. The contributors to this volume consider the significance of the Child Study Center’s landmark study from various perspectives, focusing particularly on one child’s unfolding sense of herself, her gender, and her relationships. It is a great pleasure to read this vivid account of multidisciplinary family research of a half century ago. Despite differences in current approaches, the data of observation are rich and revealing. The work is well documented to clarify its aims of “learning whatever possible about psychological development.” The full contributions of each member of the team representing different fields have yet to be culled. However, as presented, one steps into the rich working life of psychoanalytically oriented researchers. ~Recommended by Anna Wolff, MD
New Books

The following is a list of books recently acquired by the Hanns Sachs Library:


In the Library

Library Membership is available for non BPSI members. As a Library Member, you are entitled to free bibliographic searches, can borrow books, make book purchase recommendations, and use PEP Web and current journals in the library at no extra cost.

For more information please email

library@bpsi.org