Thursday, October 15th
7:15 pm – 9:00 pm

Opening Panel Session: Keynote Address

A Phenomenological-contextual, Existential and Ethical Perspective on Emotional Trauma

Speaker: Robert Stolorow, PhD
Introduction: Joseph Lichtenberg, MD
Chair: Eldad Iddan, MA

Abstract:
After a brief overview of the author’s phenomenological-contextualist psychoanalytic perspective, the paper traces the evolution of the author’s conception of emotional trauma over the course of three decades, as it developed in concert with his efforts to grasp his own traumatized states and his studies of existential philosophy. The author illuminates two of trauma’s essential features: (1) its context-embeddedness- painful or frightening affect becomes traumatic when it cannot find a context of emotional understanding in which it can be held and integrated, and (2) its existential significance- emotional trauma shatters our illusions of safety and plunges us into an authentic Being-toward-dead, wherein we must face up to our finitude and the finitude of all those we love. The paper also describes the impact of trauma on the phenomenology of time and the sense of alienation from others that accompanies traumatic comportment toward trauma is a form of emotional dwelling. He concludes with a discussion of the implications of all these formulations for the development of an ethics of finitude.
Friday, October 16th
8:00 am – 9:15 am

Panel Session I

We’ll Improvise It

Speakers: Gianni Nebbiosi, PhD and Philip Ringstrom, PhD, PsyD
Moderator: Steven Knoblauch, PhD

Abstract:
Our panel will be presenting our current ideas regarding the spontaneous generation of "improvisational moments" in psychoanalytic treatment. We will be addressing how the complexity of the field momentarily shifts from the "participant-observer" position that generally constitutes the asymmetry of the analytic relationship to a more symmetrical "participant-participant" position in which both parties are co-creating, that is co-authoring, a critically important narrative that neither alone would have come up with. The elaboration of this will entail examining improvisation as a process of bi-directional free-association engaging the unconscious' of both parties - occurring in both implicit and explicit modes of communication. The outcome of such mutually created "primary process" experiential moments is then available later for a kind of "secondary process" of mutual reflection of "What just happened?" and "What does it bring to our analysis?"

Learning Objectives:
At the conclusion of the presentation, the participant will learn:
1. What "improvisational moments" can effect in the overall process of psychoanalytic treatment;
2. A few "cardinal guidelines" essential to the facilitation of improvisatory exchanges between analyst and patient;
3. What constitutes having an "improvisational attitude" which is instrumental to playing with novelty and possibility in manners not so typically accessible to conventional analytic techniques.
Exhuming Our Ghosts: Why History Matters

Speakers: Ilene Philipson, PhD, PhD and Roger Frie, PhD, PsyD, R. Psych.
Moderator: Hazel Ipp, PhD

Abstract:
Fearing the Theoretical Other: The Legacy of Kohut’s Erasure of the Analyst’s Trauma, Ilene Philipson
Recently, a number of psychoanalytic authors have begun to chart new territory in understanding the ways in which the Holocaust has impacted theory construction since World War II. In these new works, it has been shown that through their own denial, dissociation, neglect, and disavowal, European émigré analysts and their followers created theory that was remarkably silent about trauma in general, and the analyst’s experience of trauma in particular. This article seeks to examine the ways in which Heinz Kohut’s struggle with his own Holocaust trauma may have influenced and may continue to influence self-psychology today. Specifically, it examines Kohut’s reluctance to allow for social, and hence possibly traumatizing, real world events to impact the individual and particularly the analyst in his theory construction.

Learning Objectives:
At the conclusion of the presentation, the participant will be able to:
1. Explain the ways in which his Holocaust experience may have influenced Kohut’s deep distrust of other psychoanalytic theories.
2. Assess the author’s claim that Kohut’s “tendency to omit or denigrate other schools of psychoanalytic thought has been absorbed and perhaps unwittingly transmitted” to self-psychological thinkers today.
Friday, October 16th
10:45 am – 12:00 pm

Panel Session II

Exhuming Our Ghosts: Why History Matters (continued)

Speakers: Ilene Philipson, PhD, PhD and Roger Frie, PhD, PsyD, R. Psych.
Moderator: Hazel Ipp, PhD

Abstract:

History Flows Through Us: Psychoanalysis and Historical Understanding, Roger Frie

Psychoanalysts have always been good at documenting the histories of their patients but less good at acknowledging the role that history plays in psychological experience. As a result, the study of history has traditionally been seen as distinct, if not entirely separate from psychoanalytic practice. Drawing on the work of the historian and psychoanalyst, Thomas Kohut, my talk will address the irreducible impact of history on psychological life. Kohut maintains that psychoanalysts cannot afford to ignore history or culture and that the psyche and history mutually shape one another in an ongoing process. Using clinical and narrative illustrations, I suggest that history impacts not only our development, but our understanding of ourselves, our perceptions of others and our choice of psychological theories.

Learning Objectives:
At the conclusion of the presentation, the participant will be able to:

1. Address the impact of history on psychological life. Assess the author’s claim that Kohut’s “tendency to omit or denigrate other schools of psychoanalytic thought has been absorbed and perhaps unwittingly transmitted” to self-psychological thinkers today.

2. Understand the ways in which psychoanalytic practitioners can apply historical understanding in their clinical work.
Sexuality Within the Clinical Relationship: “Why Can’t We Be Lovers?”

Speakers: Barbara Pizer, EdD and Lucyann Carlton, PsyD, JD
Moderator: Estelle Shane, PhD

Abstract:
This panel offers an exploration of the clinical process that the analyst and analysand must engage in order to discover the answer to the question, a question that emerges implicitly or explicitly within every analytic dyad, “Why can’t we be lovers?” This question, the presenters maintain, is intrinsic to every therapeutic process in a relational analysis, whether or not it is consciously acknowledged and whether or not it is verbally articulated or denied. This panel offers two clinical examples to demonstrate why the answer must be “no”; and, perhaps more importantly than the answer, to demonstrate the process, unique to each dyad, that the analytic dyad must engage to discover the feelings, meanings and impact on them when they understand and accept that the answer to the question is “no”.

Learning Objectives:
At the conclusion of the presentation, the participant will be able to:
1. Define and identify the difference between “descriptive rules” and “prescriptive rules” that guide the clinician in his/her work with a patient.
2. Define the potential therapeutic difference between a therapy where the analyst offers primarily interpretations of the patient’s feelings and a therapy where the analyst offers a relational response arising from the analyst’s own feelings to the patient’s feelings.
3. Describe the therapeutic process to be engaged with the patient to discover why the answer to the patient’s or the analyst’s question of “why can’t we be lovers?”
Saturday, October 17th  
8:00 am – 9:15 am

Panel Session IV

Making Ourselves Up- Stories in the Clinical Situation

 Speakers: Daniel Goldin, MA and Joye Weisel-Barth, PhD, PsyD  
Moderator: Terry Marks-Tarlow, PhD

Abstract:
The panel is about the stories we create in the clinical setting, and about many related issues involved in constructing, living in, and telling about relational space. We will focus here on the structures, functions, uses, and limitations of the stories we create. We suggest that the process of making stories is inherent in living in the world, in creating relationships, and in practicing psychoanalysis. We also suggest that our clinical stories are fictional because analytic relationships grow out of mutual verbal and non-verbal emotional exchanges that continually recede into the past. The act of interpreting, negotiating, and telling about those past exchanges requires translating them into words; and to find those words, the analyst and patient must use their imaginations to filter memories, associations, metaphors, and specific explicit and enacted moments of experience. This is the process of making fiction.

Learning Objectives:
At the conclusion of the presentation, the participant will be able to:
1. Understand some ways in which narrative competence emerges in early development.
2. Explore how different psychoanalytic theories generate meta-stories or genres. These meta-stories or theories, in turn, inform the personal autobiographical stories generated in analysis.
3. Explore how the analytic stories that we help bring into being may harden into genres that preclude or mask other plausible stories.
Saturday, October 17th
12:50 pm – 2:50 pm

Kohut Memorial Luncheon

Race, Place and Self

Speaker: Tessa Philips, PhD
Introduction: Charles Strozier, PhD

Abstract:
This paper is an exploration into how race, place and self-play a part in shaping the fate of theories and theorists. Kohut died in 1981 and since then his theories have spread and found their way into clinical and academic settings all around the world. I use personal examples and the Australian experience of self-psychology to illustrate these reflections. Along the way you will hear how Russell Meares played a pivotal role in taking Kohut’s ideas to Sydney Australia. Kohut himself did not reflect on race, place and self and I show how I used contemporary expanded versions of self-psychology to further my research into those areas.

Learning Objectives:
At the conclusion of the presentation, the participant will be able to:
1. Recognize how race and place play a part in shaping theories and theorists.
2. Give examples of how being embedded affects what can know and not know
Saturday, October 17th
3:00 pm – 4:15 pm

Panel Session V

MindBrainBody in Psychoanalytic Theory and Practice: A New Understanding

Speakers: Judith Pickles, PhD and Judith Rustin, MSW
Moderator: Doris Brothers, PhD

Abstract:
The panelists assume that basic processes of cognition, affect, and human intersubjectivity are deeply and inextricably embodied and embedded within a dynamically emergent system. We use bodybrainmind as one word to convey that experience is always an integrated whole with continuous feedback loops of mutual influence among all three dimensions of a person in interaction with his/her environments.

We will highlight an appreciation for the complex information systems often running out of awareness in the biology of the bodybrainmind. We will propose rediscovering the lost art of sensing the body in the therapeutic process, the importance of movement, and the importance of intuition and intention in working with our patients, as well as the importance of affective touch in our patients’ lives and in our own lives.

In the service of these efforts we will address some links between the neurobiology of the body and its interconnections with mind, with specific emphasis on the importance of embodied self-awareness, unpacking what constitutes implicit experience and the usefulness of the concepts of mirror neurons and shared circuitry as an embodied basis for empathy. We will address how this awareness expands our capacity to attune relationally to our patients. The aim of the panel is to show how these ideas can be woven into and integrated within psychoanalytic practice.

Learning Objectives:
At the conclusion of the presentation, the participant will be able to:
1. Expand awareness of their own embodied communications and those of their patients and explore how these communications may be used to enhance the therapeutic experience.
2. Describe elements that constitute implicit experience and how these aspects of experience can be accessed and utilized in the here and now between patient and analyst.
3. Describe the concepts of mirror neurons and shared circuitry as an embodied basis for empathy.
Sunday, October 18th
11:00 am – 12:15 pm

Panel Session VI

Multidisciplinary Knowing:
Commensurability and Incommensurability Among Theories and Persons

Speakers:
Peter Maduro, PsyD, JD and William Coburn, PhD, PsyD

Discussant:
Donna Orange, PhD, PsyD

Abstract:
Embedded in a multidisciplinary world, self-psychology inquires more progressively than ever into other disciplines interested in human subjectivity as sources of distinct and useful knowledge. Continental philosophy, Buddhism, literature, sociology, gender studies, neuroscience, infant-parent research, and complexity theory are among them. However, these questions arise: Must there be commensurability between and among the scientific paradigms of psychoanalytic self-psychology and other disciplines in order to validly integrate their findings? Does incommensurability on the level of scientific paradigm represent a radical constraint on valid inter-disciplinary research, or can it be addressed? Additionally, is there an analogue between these questions and the problem of disjunctions within and between different persons’ central organizing principles, or explanatory “paradigms”? These are among the central questions with which this Panel is concerned.

Learning Objectives:
At the conclusion of the presentation, the participant will be able to:

1. Recognize and describe at least two (2) central aspects of the “scientific paradigms” foundational to psychoanalytic self-psychology, on the one hand, and at least two (2) other disciplines that also have human subjective emotional experience as the object of their study (e.g., Continental philosophy, neuroscience, infant-parent research, complexity theory).

2. Compare at least two (2) central aspects of psychoanalytic self-psychology’s “scientific paradigm” with corresponding aspects of at least two (s) other disciplines that study human subjectivity and demonstrate whether and why these aspects are commensurable, or incommensurable, with one another.

3. Critique perspectives on the importance of commensurability to valid inter-disciplinary research within psychoanalytic self-psychology scholarship, and explain why, in the audience-member’s view, he or she believe commensurability on the level of “scientific paradigm” is, or is not (as the case may be), essential to such valid inter-disciplinary research.