THE NEW LIBRARY OF PSYCHOANALYSIS
General Editor: Dana Birksted-Breen

The Quiet Revolution in American Psychoanalysis

Selected Papers of Arnold M. Cooper

Arnold M. Cooper

Edited & introduced by
Elizabeth L. Auchincloss

PUBLISHED IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOANALYSIS, LONDON

The Quiet Revolution in American Psychoanalysis

This book brings together for the first time in one volume selected papers by one of the leading contemporary intellectual figures in the field of psychoanalysis, Arnold M. Cooper.

Cooper has addressed every aspect of American psychoanalytic life: theory, clinical work, education, research, the interface with neighboring disciplines, and the institutional life of the profession. In these papers, he both documents and critiques what he calls a 'Quiet Revolution,' following the death of Freud, in the way psychoanalysis is conceived: as a science, as a theory of mental life, as a treatment, as a profession.

Throughout his professional life, the process of change has fascinated Cooper. His own contributions to psychoanalytic clinical theory have changed our understanding of work with patients to include a greater appreciation of narcissistic and pre-Oedipal themes in development and of the human encounter embedded in the psychoanalytic situation. His progressive leadership in our educational and professional organizations has done much to promote change toward greater self-examination and tolerance of new ideas, and, indeed, to create the conditions that make change possible.

Above all, Cooper's unique ability to observe and reflect upon the process of change, recorded here in papers selected from over 150 written in the 50-plus years between 1947 and 2002, has helped make him the guide to whom psychoanalysts repeatedly turn to understand not only where, but even what, psychoanalysis is.

Arnold M. Cooper is the Stephen P. Tobin and Dr Arnold M. Cooper Emeritus Professor in Consultation–Liaison Psychiatry at the Joan and Sanford I. Weill Medical College of Cornell University, and Training and Supervising Psychoanalyst at Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research.

Elizabeth L. Auchincloss is Vice Chair for Graduate Medical Education and Professor of Clinical Psychiatry at the New York Weill Cornell Medical Center and Associate Director and Training and Supervising Psychoanalyst at the Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research.

THE NEW LIBRARY OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

General Editor Dana Birksted-Breen

The New Library of Psychoanalysis was launched in 1987 in association with the Institute of Psychoanalysis, London. It took over from the International Psychoanalytical Library, which published many of the early translations of the works of Freud and the writings of most of the leading British and Continental psychoanalysts.

The purpose of the New Library of Psychoanalysis is to facilitate a greater and more widespread appreciation of psychoanalysis and to provide a forum for increasing mutual understanding between psychoanalysts and those working in other disciplines such as the social sciences, medicine, philosophy, history, linguistics, literature and the arts. It aims to represent different trends both in British psychoanalysis and in psychoanalysis generally. The New Library of Psychoanalysis is well placed to make available to the English-speaking world psychoanalytic writings from other European countries and to increase the interchange of ideas between British and American psychoanalysts.

The Institute, together with the British Psychoanalytical Society, runs a low-fee psychoanalytic clinic, organizes lectures and scientific events concerned with psychoanalysis and publishes the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*. It also runs the only UK training course in psychoanalysis that leads to membership of the International Psychoanalytical Association – the body which preserves internationally agreed standards of training, of professional entry, and of professional ethics and practice for psychoanalysis as initiated and developed by Sigmund Freud. Distinguished members of the Institute have included Michael Balint, Wilfred Bion, Ronald Fairbairn, Anna Freud, Ernest Jones, Melanie Klein, John Rickman and Donald Winnicott.

Previous General Editors include David Tuckett, Elizabeth Spillius and Susan Budd. Previous and current Members of the Advisory Board include Christopher Bollas, Ronald Britton, Donald Campbell, Stephen Grosz, John Keene, Eglé Laufer, Juliet Mitchell, Michael Parsons, Rosine Jozef Perelberg, David Taylor, Mary Target, Catalina Bronstein, Sara Flanders and Richard Rusbridger.

ALSO IN THIS SERIES

Impasse and Interpretation Herbert Rosenfeld
Psychoanalysis and Discourse Patrick Mahony
The Suppressed Madness of Sane Men Marion Milner
The Riddle of Freud Estelle Roith
Thinking, Feeling, and Being Ignacio Matte-Blanco
The Theatre of the Dream Salomon Resnik
Melanie Klein Today: Volume 1, Mainly Theory Edited by Elizabeth Bott Spillius
Melanie Klein Today: Volume 2, Mainly Practice Edited by Elizabeth Bott Spillius
Psychic Equilibrium and Psychic Change: Selected Papers of Betty Joseph Edited by Michael Feldman and Elizabeth Bott Spillius
About Children and Children-No-Longer: Collected Papers 1942–80 Paula Heimann. Edited by Margret Tonnesmann
The Freud–Klein Controversies 1941–45 Edited by Pearl King and Riccardo Steiner
Dream, Phantasy and Art Hanna Segal
Psychic Experience and Problems of Technique Harold Stewart
Clinical Lectures on Klein and Bion Edited by Robin Anderson
From Fetus to Child Alessandra Piontelli
A Psychoanalytic Theory of Infantile Experience: Conceptual and Clinical Reflections E Gaddini. Edited by Adam Limentani
The Dream Discourse Today Edited and introduced by Sara Flanders
The Gender Conundrum: Contemporary Psychoanalytic Perspectives on Femininity and Masculinity Edited and introduced by Dana Breen
Psychic Retreats John Steiner
The Taming of Solitude: Separation Anxiety in Psychoanalysis Jean-Michel Quinodoz
Unconscious Logic: An Introduction to Matte-Blanco's Bi-logic and Its Uses Eric Rayner
Understanding Mental Objects Meir Perlow
Life, Sex and Death: Selected Writings of William Gillespie Edited and introduced by Michael Sinason
What Do Psychoanalysts Want? The Problem of Aims in Psychoanalytic Therapy Joseph Sandler and Anna Ursula Dreher
Michael Balint: Object Relations, Pure and Applied Harold Stewart
Hope: A Shield in the Economy of Borderline States Anna Potamianou
Psychoanalysis, Literature and War: Papers 1972–1995 Hanna Segal
Emotional Vertigo: Between Anxiety and Pleasure Danielle Quinodoz
Early Freud and Late Freud Ilse Grubrich-Simitis
A History of Child Psychoanalysis Claudine and Pierre Geissmann
Belief and Imagination: Explorations in Psychoanalysis Ronald Britton

A Mind of One's Own: A Kleinian View of Self and Object Robert A. Caper
Psychoanalytic Understanding of Violence and Suicide Edited by Rosine Jozef Perelberg
On Bearing Unbearable States of Mind Ruth Riesenberg-Malcolm
Psychoanalysis on the Move: The Work of Joseph Sandler Edited by Peter Fonagy, Arnold M. Cooper and Robert S. Wallerstein
The Dead Mother: The Work of André Green Edited by Gregorio Kohon
The Fabric of Affect in the Psychoanalytic Discourse André Green
The Bi-Personal Field: Experiences of Child Analysis Antonino Ferro
The Dove that Returns, the Dove that Vanishes: Paradox and Creativity in Psychoanalysis Michael Parsons
Ordinary People and Extra-Ordinary Protections: A Post-Kleinian Approach to the Treatment of Primitive Mental States Judith Mitrani
The Violence of Interpretation: From Pictogram to Statement Piera Aulagnier
The Importance of Fathers: A Psychoanalytic Re-Evaluation Judith Trowell and Alicia Etchegoyen
Dreams That Turn Over a Page: Paradoxical Dreams in Psychoanalysis Jean-Michel Quinodoz
The Couch and the Silver Screen: Psychoanalytic Reflections on European Cinema Andrea Sabbadini
In Pursuit of Psychic Change: The Betty Joseph Workshop Edited by Edith Hargreaves and Arturo Varchevker
The Quiet Revolution in American Psychoanalysis: Selected Papers of Arnold M. Cooper Arnold M. Cooper. Edited and introduced by Elizabeth L. Auchincloss
Seeds of Illness and Seeds of Recovery: The Genesis of Suffering and the Role of Psychoanalysis Antonino Ferro
The Work of Psychic Figurability: Mental States Without Representation César Botella and Sára Botella

THE NEW LIBRARY OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

General Editor: Dana Birksted-Breen

The Quiet Revolution in American Psychoanalysis

Selected Papers of Arnold M. Cooper

Arnold M. Cooper

Edited and introduced by
Elizabeth L. Auchincloss

Brunner-Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
HOVE AND NEW YORK

First published 2005
by Brunner-Routledge
27 Church Road, Hove, East Sussex BN3 2FA

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Brunner-Routledge
270 Madison Avenue, New York NY 10016

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005.

Brunner-Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Cooper, Arnold M.
The quiet revolution in American psychoanalysis : selected papers of Arnold M. Cooper / Arnold M. Cooper; introduced and edited by Elizabeth L. Auchincloss.
p. cm. – (The new library of psychoanalysis)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 1-58391-891-4 (hardback : alk. paper) – ISBN 1-58391-892-2 (pbk. : alk. paper)
1. Psychoanalysis. 2. Psychotherapy. I. Auchincloss, Elizabeth L., 1951– II. Title.
III. Series: New library of psychoanalysis (Unnumbered)

RC501.2.C66 2004
616.89′17′0973–dc22 2004009620

ISBN 0-203-33708-5 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 1-58391-891-4 (hbk)
ISBN 1-58391-892-2 (pbk)

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

This book owes its existence to two people: Elizabeth Bott Spillius and Elizabeth Auchincloss. More than a dozen years ago, out of the blue, I received from Dr Spillius a detailed summary and brilliant critique of my then extant writings and the suggestion that they be compiled into a volume for publication. I had never had such a thought, although I probably did have such dreams. I responded with my usual reaction – feeling enormously flattered, feeling it didn't apply to me, and putting aside the whole idea. Liz Spillius was persistent and eventually I began to consider the possibility seriously. Succeeding editors Susan Budd and Dana Birksted-Breen at the New Library of Psychoanalysis continued to show interest in my work and eventually I thought I should take myself seriously.

Betsy Auchincloss has given me more of her time and intelligence than any human being deserves to receive of another and it is her devotion to the project that has finally created this book in spite of my dilatoriness, vagueness, self-doubts and hesitation. My publication doubts, fears and reluctance have been longstanding and many of the chapters of this book originally appeared as requested talks for symposia and were written to order, providing me the opportunity to express deeply held views which I might not otherwise have written down.

The encouragement of dear friends, most importantly the late Joseph Sandler, has been critical in my being able to commit any of my ideas to paper. This book also would not exist without the dedicated help of my wife Katherine Addleman and my extraordinarily able and cheerful assistants, Linda Pilgrim and Emily Tucker as well as Anna Weiss and Judy Mars. Dana Birksted-Breen and dedicated anonymous readers at the New American Library provided invaluable editorial advice.

I also wish to express a debt of gratitude to my many colleagues at Columbia Psychoanalytic Center, the Payne-Whitney Clinic, the American Psychoanalytic

Association, the International Psychoanalytic Association, and the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, who have nurtured and encouraged me throughout my career.

Arnold M. Cooper, MD
October 3, 2003

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this book is to bring together for the first time in one volume selected papers by one of the leading intellectual figures in the field of psychoanalysis in the last quarter of the twentieth century, Arnold M. Cooper. Cooper has addressed every aspect of American psychoanalytic life including theory, clinical work, education, research, the relationship between psychoanalysis and neighboring disciplines, and the institutional life of the profession. It is my hope that all readers, young and old, familiar and unfamiliar with Cooper's work, will find in this collection a thoughtful chronicle of where psychoanalysis has been as well as an inspiring vision of where it might be heading.

In his 1986 paper, 'Psychoanalysis Today: New Wine in Old Bottles or The Hidden Revolution in Psychoanalysis,' presented as the Distinguished Psychiatrist Lecture of the American Psychiatric Association, Cooper suggested that in the half century following the death of Freud there had been 'quiet, largely unadvertised revolution in the way psychoanalysis is conceived.' This revolution, he argued in the mid-1980s, was still only partly acknowledged in the 'ordinary discourse of psychoanalysis.' In his view, evidence of revolutionary change could be found in every aspect of the psychoanalytic enterprise including our understanding of psychoanalysis as a science, our theories about mental life, our conduct in the treatment setting, and our organizational politics (Cooper 1986i).* While in many ways American psychoanalysis was a field mired in complacent adherence to a 'party line' handed down by self-appointed heirs to the father, it was quietly, without an open challenge to authority, being reinvigorated through critical review of its basic assumptions, reconsideration of the factors at work in psychoanalytic treatment, and, above all, greater tolerance of multiple and competing points of view.

* Cited publications of which Cooper was author or coauthor are listed in the Bibliography; other publications are listed in the References.

Throughout his professional life, the process of change has fascinated Cooper. His own contributions to psychoanalytic clinical theory have changed our understanding of work with patients to include a greater appreciation of narcissistic and pre-Oedipal themes in development and of the human encounter embedded in the psychoanalytic situation. His progressive leadership in our educational and professional organizations has done much to promote change toward greater self-examination and tolerance of new ideas, and, indeed, to create the conditions that make change possible. Above all, his unique ability to observe and reflect upon the process of change, recorded here in papers selected from over 150 written in the 50-plus years between 1947 and 2002, has helped make Cooper the guide to whom the profession has repeatedly turned to understand not only where, but even what, psychoanalysis is.

Arnold Michael Cooper was born on March 9, 1923, in Brooklyn, New York. His father, Morris Cooper (né Coopervogh), and his mother, Clara Aronow, met on Manhattan's Lower East Side; they had been born in villages within 50 miles of each other in Russian-ruled Ukraine. Arnold was the second of four sons.

When Cooper was less than one year old, his father quit his job as a cutter in a textile factory and moved the family to New Jersey, where he ran a grocery store in Jersey City and later a shirt factory in Elizabeth. The family settled for good in Roselle, New Jersey. This town was important in helping to shape Cooper's attitudes toward divisions and injustices that later carried into his professional and political life.

In 1930, Roselle, New Jersey was a small semi-rural pre-Revolutionary War town, with a population of fewer than 4,000. The town was sharply divided into a white, upper middle-class section of beautiful old houses with carefully tended gardens, and a mostly black, extremely poor area with a few immigrant Poles and Italians. The black population had been lured North during World War I as labor for a munitions factory in Elizabeth and now served as the house-maids, gardeners, etc. for the middle-class whites. Cooper recalls that his family was one of only two Jewish families in town. The sense of extreme distance between 'ins' and 'outs' was vivid in Roselle, providing a kind of sociology lesson made more meaningful by young Cooper's uncertainty as to where exactly he fit in. As a middle-class white boy, he belonged on one side of the fence; as a Jew, he was excluded like the blacks. His confusion was made more profound by his father's deep ambivalence toward their religion.

Morris Cooper was a talented and imaginative businessman who rapidly went on to build an extremely successful shirt-manufacturing business (later in partnership with his oldest son, Donald). As the shirt business prospered, Morris supported his own extended immigrant family as well as that of his wife. Later, in the mid-1950s, he started to buy orange groves and ranch land in Florida, and in 1959, having retired from the shirt business, he founded the municipal corporation of Cooper City, Florida, near Fort Lauderdale. While Cooper City

is now a thriving community, its development proved to be an economic disaster for the Cooper family as Morris wiped out the family fortune shortly before his death, paying off creditors to keep Cooper City alive.

By all accounts, Morris Cooper, though physically diminutive, was a larger-than-life figure given to unpredictable rages that terrorized his wife and children, as well as to effusive affection, often directed at his favorite son, Arnold. If these contradictory moods were hard for his son to understand, so was the choice of Roselle, New Jersey, as a place to make a home. It was difficult for Arnold to reconcile his father's wish to raise his children in a non-Jewish community with his demand that the family keep up strict religious observance, a demand that caused his children considerable distress in their school and social lives. It gradually became apparent to Cooper that while the family maintained ultra-orthodox religious practice in accord with the wishes of his maternal grandparents, his father was rather anti-Semitic and quite ashamed of his Jewishness. Shortly after Arnold's Bar Mitzvah, Morris Cooper announced that the family was leaving the poor orthodox synagogue to which they walked every Friday evening and Saturday morning, to join a new, more elegant reform temple in Elizabeth. Suddenly, it was all right to drive on the Sabbath. In response to this decision, and in keeping with a growing skepticism toward religion in any form, the 13-year-old Arnold immediately and permanently abandoned all religious observance.

While it is not hard to picture a young Arnold Cooper thriving in a struggle to make sense of his father's contradictory attitudes toward religion, it is harder to imagine him surviving a childhood that he describes as profoundly non-intellectual. In the absence of books or any exchange of ideas, Cooper immersed himself in playing the clarinet, sometimes up to four or five hours a day. He led the school marching and concert bands and later played first chair in the New Jersey All-State Orchestra. Weekend visits with his charismatic maternal Uncle Sut (Edward I. Aronow), who took young Cooper with him to explore New York City and the bohemian life of Greenwich Village, provided the first hints of a larger, more interesting world.

Cooper followed his older brother, Donald, to Columbia University where he began undergraduate study in 1940, partly supported by a music scholarship. Columbia University changed his life. While describing himself as too shy to talk to the professors, Cooper quickly found new friends among the native New York City boys, many of whom became lifelong friends. For the first time, Cooper began to feel that being Jewish need not mean being an outsider. He also began to feel that reading books and thinking seriously about ideas need not be 'sequestered activities engaged in by the odd few.' 'It had a profound effect on me,' he reflected later, 'that these guys were interested in literature, jazz, art, philosophy, sports *and* having a good time. It was the first sense I had of how many kinds of things there are in the world to be interested in' (Cooper 2002, in conversation with author). Being in college during wartime meant that

everyone was also interested in politics. A deepening friendship with his Uncle Sut, who among other things was the personal attorney for Earl Browder, the head of the American Communist Party, brought Cooper into even more conflict with his father, whose politics ran sharply towards the right. The experience of negotiating divided family loyalties in which emotional ties are complicated by ideology would resonate with later challenges. In the midst of it all, a friend suggested that Cooper read Freud.

Writing later about this first reading, Cooper wrote, 'I experienced a sense of instant revelation into myself and my adolescent miseries, into my friends, and into my world of politics and literature . . . Things seemed clearer than they ever had before' (Cooper 1998c). Abandoning half-formed plans to become an English teacher or to go to law school, Cooper decided to go to medical school with the goal of becoming a psychoanalyst. After graduating from Columbia in 1943 and spending seven months in the Army Special Training Program that sent young men to medical school, he began study at the University of Utah School of Medicine.

In the early 1940s, the School of Medicine at the University of Utah was a new four-year medical school with no department of psychiatry! While this might have seemed like an unlikely place for a future psychoanalyst to find himself, this young, relatively small school with the feel of the frontier provided Cooper with new opportunities both for independence and for collaboration with faculty, many of whom were only recently recruited from the East. They included Louis Goodman, chairman of pharmacology and physiology, and the hematologist, Maxwell Wintrobe, who was chairman of the Department of Medicine. Cooper immersed himself in the study of physiology under the direction of Mark Nickerson, publishing his first paper on the 'Effect of anti-reticular cytotoxic serum (ACS) on the healing of experimental wounds in rats' (Nickerson *et al.* 1946).

After receiving his MD in 1947, still focused on physiology and less sure of his earlier choice to become a psychiatrist, Cooper continued his training as a research fellow at Harvard University, studying liver physiology under the supervision of Charles Davidson at the Thorndike Memorial Laboratory at Boston City Hospital. Cooper published four papers with Davidson's group on Wilson's disease, amino acid metabolism, and the treatment of cirrhosis of the liver (Eckhardt *et al.* 1948; Faloon *et al.* 1949a, 1949b; Cooper *et al.* 1950). 'I was interested in amino acid metabolites that I thought might affect the sensorium in Wilson's disease,' Cooper said, looking back. 'Of course I was wrong; we knew nothing yet about the role of copper. However, my experience in the laboratory was terrific preparation for clinical training' (Cooper 2002, in conversation with author). Between 1948 and 1950, Cooper did a two-year internship in Internal Medicine at the Columbia-Presbyterian Hospital in New York City. In 1950, returning to his original interest in the mind, he began three years of psychiatric residency training at Bellevue Hospital in New York City.

His third year of residency training was spent as night admissions physician at Bellevue.

In 1952, Cooper began psychoanalytic training at the Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research, from which he graduated in 1956. Since 1954, he has maintained a private practice as a psychiatrist and psychoanalyst in New York City, while developing an academic career. By 1971, he had advanced to the position of Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons, and Adjunct Professor of English in Columbia College where he originated and ran The Program for Psychoanalytic Studies for undergraduates. In 1974, he joined the full-time faculty of Cornell Medical College as Professor and Associate Chairman for Education. In 1992, he became the Stephen P. Tobin and Dr Arnold M. Cooper Emeritus Professor in Consultation–Liaison Psychiatry at the Joan and Sanford I. Weill Medical College of Cornell University. This chair was endowed by the father of an adolescent boy who died of a malignant melanoma while in analysis with Cooper. The professorship was created by the boy's father to honor the relationship of the young patient and his doctor.

Cooper returned to New York City in 1948 in time to enjoy the post-war explosion in the cultural life of the city. New friends included poets, painters, musicians, and scientists in addition to many future psychoanalysts. In contrast to the upheavals going on in the arts, however, American psychoanalysis in the 1950s was characterized by its growing rigidity. The most powerful psychoanalytic institutions were controlled by an autocratic elite that sought to perpetuate itself by encouraging orthodoxy rather than creativity and by punishing 'dissident' thinkers. The 'official' position of psychoanalysis in America during the 1950s included a version of scientific/psychoanalytic positivism which asserted that psychoanalysis was the basis for a 'general psychology' and that the psychoanalytic situation alone provided sufficient scientific proof to establish the validity of its theory. Theories of the mind had become codified in the scientistic vocabulary of American ego-psychology, which spoke with confidence about distributions of drive energy and the nature of instinct. Theories of technique had became codified in a mechanistic vocabulary that described analysis as consisting of a single technique characterized by interpretation of clearly definable resistances and transference 'distortions.' While revolutionary forces were at work, they were operating behind the scenes.

Cooper quickly established a reputation as an outstanding clinician from whom other clinicians sought consultation for their own work and help for their friends, family, and often themselves. Immersion in clinical practice formed the basis from which all his other professional and academic activities emerged and to which he demanded that all other activities ultimately contribute. Simultaneously, and in line with his undergraduate realization of 'how many things there are in the world to be interested in,' Cooper's involvement in non-clinical activities has been intense. Throughout his professional life, his career has

been characterized by immersion in scholarship, education, and organizational work and by a demand that all aspects of professional life support the pursuit of new knowledge. He also led a diverse intellectual life outside of his work, which included passionate engagement in literature and the arts, and playing the clarinet in a variety of groups. Cooper's wide range of interests supported his demand that psychoanalysis maintain strong connections with the larger world of ideas.

Against this background, Cooper's career as a psychoanalyst was shaped by his lifelong involvement with his home base, the Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research. The Columbia Center was founded in 1942 when the maverick Hungarian psychoanalyst, Sandor Rado, led a splinter group away from the New York Psychoanalytic Institute with a mission that included the reform of psychoanalytic theory, the forging of closer ties to the university, and the development of psychoanalytic research. All aspects of the original Columbia mandate had a profound effect on the development of Cooper's career. In his written reflections on 'The impact on clinical work of the analyst's idealizations and identifications' (Cooper 1998c), published as the first paper in this collection, Cooper discusses the emotional and intellectual influence of his attachment to Columbia and its founders (including Abram Kardiner, George Daniels, Aaron Karush, David Levy and Lionel Ovesey), who were on the one hand revolutionary from the point of view of mainstream American psychoanalysis, and on the other hand intensely autocratic in their own right. Training in psychoanalysis at Columbia created unresolvable tensions around questions that lie at the heart of Cooper's work, such as the scientific status and the language of psychoanalysis, the role of research in psychoanalytic inquiry, the proper setting for psychoanalytic education, orthodoxy versus heresy and nihilism, and the implications of 'insider' versus 'outsider' status in professional organizations.

From the outset, Cooper involved himself in the efforts of the Columbia faculty 'to restore psychoanalysis to the more important findings of Freud concerning the core of psychic life' (Cooper 1998c). The goal was to delineate essential psychoanalytic concepts in a language free from the mechanistic, pseudo-scientific, and clinically irrelevant superstructure of classical Freudian metapsychology as codified in American ego-psychology. His first psychoanalytic publications (Karush *et al.* 1964; Cooper *et al.* 1966) described his efforts with Aaron Karush, Ruth Easser and Bluma Swerdloff to develop the Adaptive Balance Profile, an instrument designed to standardize the information gathered in initial interviews of patients with the aims of both clarifying concepts and conducting research in psychoanalytic process and outcome. While the project ultimately collapsed as the questions raised by the investigators outstripped the research methods and funding available to them, it was evidence of the lasting impact of Cooper's early research training and it marked the beginning of his lifelong commitment to the idea that psychoanalysis can progress only if it includes systematic study of its theory and technique. Later, during the 1980s and 1990s,

Cooper conducted research with Barbara Milrod, Fred Busch and Theodore Shapiro on the study of psychodynamic psychotherapy in patients with panic disorder, which resulted in the publication of one of the first ever manuals of psychoanalytic psychotherapy suitable for research (Milrod *et al.* 1997).

Shortly after completing psychoanalytic training, Cooper joined the faculty of the Columbia Center where he has taught and supervised continuously since 1956. His first teaching assignment was to design a seminar on the work of psychoanalytic 'dissidents' who, at the time, included Jung, Horney, Adler, Reich, Klein, Sullivan, and others. His initial reading of these authors evoked an airy dismissal of their ideas, but as Cooper studied them more seriously, he began to take an interest in ideas that did not appear in the versions of psychoanalysis with which he was familiar – neither the prevailing orthodox analysis of ego-psychology nor the 'adaptational analysis' of Columbia's founding group. Preparation for the course on dissidents ignited his longstanding interest in the boundaries as well as the politics of psychoanalytic theory-making. Cooper became a training analyst at Columbia in 1961. From 1970 to 1977, he was Chairman of the Curriculum Committee. The Cooper curriculum, as it was called, was organized around a set of core psychoanalytic concepts presented from the point of view of a contemporary critique. Reading of 'the dissidents' was encouraged; unthinking adherence to the canon was not.

Early in his psychoanalytic career, Cooper became interested in the work of Edmund Bergler, a brilliant intellectual figure whose abrasive personality and originality led to his being largely banished from official analytic publications. In Cooper's opinion, Bergler's emphases on pre-Oedipal development, the importance of narcissism in individual development, the role of the superego, and the broad use of various masochistic defenses, were significant precursors of Kohut, Kernberg, and other innovative psychoanalysts. Cooper's own development of these themes is a significant part of his work. His papers on the varieties of narcissistic–masochistic character and their many clinical presentations have had a major influence on young analysts.

Beginning immediately upon graduation from Columbia Psychoanalytic, his commitment to teaching and his concern with issues related to education have marked every aspect of Cooper's career. Cooper is known as a brilliant classroom teacher as well as a gifted supervisor. In the course of his long and varied career as an educator, his students have included undergraduates, graduate students, medical students, psychiatry residents, students of psychology and psychoanalytic candidates, among others. He has been invited to serve as a visiting professor or educational consultant to many universities and psychoanalytic institutes and has won many awards for teaching. Cooper's influence on his many individual students as well as on the institutions where he worked and over which he presided will be a huge part of his legacy. In one of his earliest papers on the subject, 'Some suggestions for the education of psychoanalysts' (Cooper 1983c), he stressed the point that psychoanalytic education has placed too much

emphasis on training and not enough on education. This theme has dominated his thinking on the subject, as he has repeatedly stressed the importance of educating psychoanalysts capable of independent thinking, critical analysis, and the generation of new knowledge. Cooper has vigorously advocated a university model of psychoanalytic education where interdisciplinary study and opportunities for research are offered in addition to traditional training in clinical psychoanalysis (Cooper 1999).

The founders of the Columbia Center imagined that psychoanalysis would be enriched through maintaining ties with the university; Cooper has spent much of his professional life working to strengthen those ties. In 1957 he was invited to give a set of lectures entitled 'Twenty Years after Freud' as part of the prestigious Columbia University Lectures series. Having been planned for an auditorium that could seat 40 people, the lectures had to be moved to accommodate hundreds of students. In the 1960s, with the backing of Columbia professor and literary critic Lionel Trilling, Cooper founded the Program in Psychoanalytic Studies at Columbia University and later, with Columbia Professor of English Literature, Steven Marcus, the Seminar on Psychoanalytic Thought at Columbia University. The Columbia college program, one of the first such university-based programs in the world, was the spawning ground for many future psychoanalysts. From 1984 to 1994, Cooper chaired the Committee on University and Medical Education of the American Psychoanalytic Association, a committee he had formed when he was president to explore ways to deepen ties between psychoanalysis and the broader academic world. His own enduring interest in art, music, and literature added depth to his belief that psychoanalysis and the humanities have much to learn from each other. Throughout the 1980s and the 1990s, Cooper continued to co-teach a graduate seminar at Columbia on Psychoanalysis and Literature with Marcus. Over the years, he offered versions of this seminar to medical students, psychiatry residents, and psychoanalytic candidates. He has also worked continuously to find ways to offer in-depth psychoanalytic education to non-clinicians interested in applying psychoanalytic concepts to other disciplines.

Cooper has always believed in the special importance of the ties between psychoanalysis and psychiatry. While immersing himself in psychoanalysis, he never lost contact with the psychiatric world. His first jobs after residency had included serving as Assistant Attending on the inpatient Female Adolescent Service at Bellevue Hospital and director of the Vanderbilt Clinic Community Service at Columbia-Presbyterian Hospital. In 1974 he was appointed Professor of Psychiatry, Associate Chairman for Medical Education and Director of Residency Training at the New York Hospital–Payne Whitney Clinic of Cornell University Medical Center – a full-time academic position. The Cornell Department of Psychiatry in the late 1970s was undergoing a major renaissance under the Chairmanship of Robert Michels. Cooper's leadership in education from 1974 to 1988 established the Cornell program as one of the most

prestigious centers for psychiatric residency training in the United States. Cooper demanded that his residents strive for the highest level of excellence in both brain-based and psychoanalytically oriented psychiatry, establishing Cornell as a center for balanced clinical training in an era of increasing biological reductionism in psychiatry. He also demanded that his residents develop their potential for scholarship, research, teaching, and leadership.

During the 1970s, American psychiatry underwent a complete revision of its nosological system sparked by the rise in biological psychiatry and the need of a growing research community for clearly defined diagnostic categories. This revision culminated in 1980 with the publication of the 3rd edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-III) by the American Psychiatric Association. The strategy behind the DSM-III was to use only observable phenomena in the construction of diagnostic categories with the aim of improved reliability necessary for research. In its effort to be 'theory-neutral,' the DSM-III specifically eliminated all psychoanalytic concepts (such as neurosis or conflict) from the new diagnostic system. From the vantage point of his position as an educator in psychiatry and a member of the DSM-III Ad Hoc Advisory Committee of the American Psychiatric Association as well as the Ad Hoc Committee on DSM-IV of the American Psychoanalytic Association, Cooper was in an ideal position to introduce psychoanalysts to the newly revised psychiatric nosology as well as to represent psychodynamic principles in the ongoing work of revision (Frances and Cooper 1980, 1981; Koenigsberg *et al.* 1985) As a preeminent psychoanalyst in the world of psychiatry during the explosion of brain science beginning in the 1970s, Cooper was led repeatedly to consider areas of overlapping interest such as the influence of neurobiology on psychoanalysis, the theoretical and clinical issues raised by combined medication and psychoanalytic therapies, and the question of how to integrate psychoanalytic and brain-based perspectives on such clinical phenomena as panic disorder (Shear *et al.* 1994; Busch *et al.* 1995; Milrod *et al.* 1997). In 1988 he served as President of the New York County District Branch of the American Psychiatric Association, and in 1992 he was appointed one of two Deputy Editors of the *American Journal of Psychiatry*, serving until 2003.

As Cooper became more involved in academic psychiatry, he also become more active in organized psychoanalysis. In 1974, he became the first psychoanalyst from Columbia to hold a major position at the American Psychoanalytic Association when he was appointed Chairman of the Program Committee. Cooper had had little involvement in the administrative workings of the 'American' prior to his chairmanship of the Program Committee – an appointment made by George Pollock, then President, in response to a challenge to end the freeze-out of Columbia graduates from significant positions in the organization. Between 1974 and 1978, he instituted changes in the national meetings which challenged the traditional boundaries of the organization. These changes included seminars on non-psychoanalytic research topics of interest to

psychoanalysts as well as workshops on psychoanalysis for non-psychoanalytic allied professionals. Cooper's leadership was characterized by a dramatic increase in the number of papers submitted for review by the committee as well as an insistence that the program include papers by analysts whose views were challenging to the mainstream. This demand that the American Psychoanalytic Association keep new dissidents such as Kohut and the self psychologists within the fold marked a major step forward in the development of the American Psychoanalytic Association as an organization dedicated to promoting scientific discussion rather than policing thought.

Cooper's imaginative and progressive leadership of the Program Committee propelled him to the presidency of the American Psychoanalytic Association in 1979. In this position, and in the face of fierce opposition, he worked hard to bring an end to the near-absolute power wielded by a self-perpetuating, insider elite which controlled the organization by ignoring existing by-laws. The leadership of the Board of Professional Standards, under the guise of its educational function, had arrogated to itself the intellectual and gate-keeping functions of the organization while leaving the Executive Council with the task of business management. Cooper undertook to remedy this state of affairs, beginning an effort, which turned out to be a ferocious battle, to restore a proper balance to the organization by enforcing by-laws that required that the Board report to the Executive Council. In addition, he demanded that the Board develop new nominating procedures so that the Chairman of this powerful committee could no longer appoint his own successor.

Cooper also insisted that rules be followed that supported open membership of all committees and set term limits for editorial positions at the *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*. He championed full membership status in the American for all graduates of institutes, regardless of certification. Above all, he continued to insist upon open discussion of dissenting ideas. Cooper's talent for and joy in deep friendships with colleagues and others were crucial in supporting him through difficult periods. In later years, as Vice President of the International Psychoanalytic Association, as a member of its Program and Education Committees, and finally as North American editor for the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* (1993–2001), Cooper continued to work to insure that all our professional organizations allow for debate of our most controversial ideas.

Cooper's active involvement and creative leadership in these many professional organizations has gone hand in hand with his emergence as perhaps the most distinguished and insightful critic of the psychoanalytic enterprise as a whole. It has been in this role that he has served not only to catalyze but also to document the quiet revolution in psychoanalysis. As he has made clear, this revolution has been the result of clinical experience, research into psychoanalytic process, and a new openness in our organizational life. However, as he has also argued, it must be understood in the context of our relationship to a changing world. The list of revolutionary forces discussed in his work includes:

developments in the philosophy of science; progress in the field of psychiatry; advances in the fields of neuroscience, anthropology, ethology, infant observation, linguistics, and literary theory; and changes in the surrounding culture that have affected the expression of human suffering, the experience of authority, and the overall influence of psychoanalysis in the rest of the intellectual world.

Throughout his career, Cooper has been called upon repeatedly not only to explain to us where we are, but to help us chart a course in this sea of change. Among his gifts has been his uncanny ability to know where we have been, delineate new challenges, and point the way toward progress. His is a wisdom that is based on the ability to see clearly. In several of his papers, Cooper cites Gertrude Stein's (Stein 1935) essay on 'contemporaneousness' which suggests that individuals always live their lives in the culture that existed twenty years earlier. In her view, it is only the artist that has the ability to see the present. Cooper is an intellectual with an extraordinary range of interests, an accomplished amateur musician, and a great lover of the arts, but I doubt that he would ever characterize himself as an artist. Nevertheless, we discover in these selected papers that Cooper shares with Stein's artist the ability to see into the heart of the times.

The organization of the book

This collection of Selected Papers has a simple structure. This Introduction is followed by a relatively recent paper, 'The impact on clinical work of the analyst's idealizations and identifications,' originally delivered as part of a panel on the same subject at the International Psychoanalytic Association meeting in Toronto in 1998. This paper is placed alone at the beginning of the book because it tells the story, in Cooper's own words, of some of the many people, ideas and events that influenced his long and varied career. The rest of the collection is divided into four parts. The papers within each part are arranged chronologically.

Parts I and II focus on larger issues of trends in psychoanalytic thought. The papers in Part I, 'The quiet revolution,' delineate (even as they are occurring) the far-reaching changes in American psychoanalysis during the last quarter of the twentieth century. In many cases, these changes have not been openly acknowledged until recently when pluralism has become a more or less accepted fact of psychoanalytic life. The papers in Part II, 'Challenging the boundaries of psychoanalysis,' describe the ways in which non-psychoanalytic disciplines such as neurobiology, infant research, and psychotherapy have shaped contemporary psychoanalysis, forcing us to reexamine what we know and even what we are. The last paper in this section presents a broad vision for psychoanalytic education based on a deeper commitment to the pursuit of knowledge through strengthened connections to the larger universe of ideas.

Parts III and IV focus more on clinical aspects of psychoanalysis. Part III, 'Vicissitudes of narcissism,' includes five papers which explore a variety of clinical syndromes in relation to the problems of narcissism. Some of these papers present Cooper's view of what he calls the 'narcissistic–masochistic character,' described by him for the first time. Others offer a fresh look at syndromes with a long history in the psychoanalytic literature. Part IV, 'The analyst at work,' presents Cooper's views of changing theory and technique in psychoanalytic practice. Detailed case presentations provide a window into the clinical world and a glimpse of how 'the quiet revolution' has affected the patient–analyst pair at work.

Elizabeth L. Auchincloss
September 9, 2003

1

THE IMPACT ON CLINICAL WORK OF THE ANALYST'S IDEALIZATIONS AND IDENTIFICATIONS*

Psychoanalysis has been a profession in which overt idealization and identification have perhaps been more prominent and problematic than in any other profession. I thought that it might be of some interest in our time of theoretical plurality and, I hope, creative uncertainty, to give some account of my struggles to achieve some peace of mind as a working psychoanalyst. I never had difficulty over the question of whether I was a psychoanalyst, because if I wasn't an analyst then I wasn't anything, but I have had tremendous problems over whether I was the right kind of psychoanalyst or a good enough psychoanalyst.

It will help to give some background of my analytic education. It began when I was a student at Columbia University and someone suggested I should read Freud. I dutifully read through the then available Brill translation. Like so many others of my generation, I experienced a sense of instant revelation into myself and my adolescent miseries, into my friends, and into my world of politics and literature. This was a new way of seeing and understanding, an affirmation of my previously unvoiced conviction that more was going on than I was privy to, a primal scene fantasy, if you wish. Things seemed clearer than they ever had before. I asked a friend of mine what one had to do to become a psychoanalyst and he said you have to go to medical school. I had never thought of going to medical school. At times I had thought of law, sociology, or English literature, but I had no clear direction. With some difficulty I managed to go to medical school after the Army, thinking this would be the start of my analytic career, but it so happened that the medical school I went to had no department of psychiatry at that time. This turned out be something of a blessing, because I became

* This paper was presented as part of a panel with the same title at the 87th Annual Meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association in Toronto, Canada in 1998.

involved in physiology and did a research fellowship before my internship. My ideals and convictions about the merits of empirical research crystallized at that time, and have been a core of my psychoanalytic being, as I never gave up on the idea that psychoanalysis could contain a truly scientific vision without sacrificing any of its humanist core.

My first attempt at analysis began shortly after graduation from medical school while I was doing a research fellowship in Boston. I knew I needed an analysis for personal reasons, and although psychoanalysis still fascinated me, I was uncertain that anyone as neurotic as I felt myself to be could help other people. I thought I would probably pursue a career in clinical research, which I enjoyed and seemed pretty good at, rather than risk an analytic career. I had no money or connections but eventually was directed to a recent graduate of the Boston Institute who was being supervised by Beatta Rank and he wanted a fourth supervised case. I was in analysis with him for eight months before moving to begin my internship in New York City. The experience was extraordinarily painful. Each session was excruciating. I found myself tongue-tied and he was entirely silent. I had read just enough to convince myself that this was how analysis had to be, and any lack of progress merely proved the depth of my pathology – a secret I already knew. The discomfort was compounded by my doing this analysis secretly – I didn't dare tell the directors of the Thorndike Lab that I was in analysis, convinced that they would throw me out. To this day I am not sure whether that was a paranoid fantasy, or sound realistic judgment. In later years I came to know my first analyst in the American Psychoanalytic Association and discovered that he was a nice, friendly person, rather rigidly bound to an orthodox view of analytic technique. During one meeting he came over to me to report that he had just successfully analyzed a schizophrenic patient 'using no parameters.' I was mildly stunned by his pride in such an unlikely venture but I better understood my first attempt at analysis. Almost two years after my first analytic effort, during a medical residency, again for personal reasons, I began another analysis, again without informing my medical chief; I began this time with a rather eminent New York analyst who had himself been a patient of Freud's. To my astonishment this man was responsive and talkative and I began to feel a new confidence blossoming in me. When I complained to my second analyst that he lacked the austerity of my first analyst, and that perhaps this was not authentic analysis, he told me of an incident that occurred during his analysis with Freud. During one session as he lay on the couch, he began to boast about his uncanny capacity to guess people's ages. Freud found this interesting, whereupon he rose from his chair, left the office to go into the family rooms and returned with the family photograph album. He sat down on the couch next to his analysand and began pointing to various photographs of his relatives in the album, asking 'How old is this one? How old is that one?' Clearly, Freud's curiosity took precedence over any rules of technique. I began to have some idea that perhaps psychoanalysis consisted of more than abstinence.

After three years in medicine I decided that my initial instinct was correct and I took a psych residency and applied to analytic school. I was accepted at both the New York and Columbia institutes, and was told that Columbia would accept my ongoing analysis as a training analysis, while New York told me I would have to begin again with a different training analyst. It tells you something of my state of mind that I made no attempt to investigate what the differences were between the institutes. I was aware that my interviewers at Columbia seemed interested in the fact that I had done physiology research and had published some papers, while my New York interviewers never broached the topic. I didn't know analysts or analytic candidates, except for one friend who was a candidate at New York, who told me they were all the same and I might as well go where I didn't have to start a new analysis. I took his advice. I had no idea that Columbia was considered somewhat renegade, tainted by culturalism, and lacking real analytic vigor, and that, in fact, Columbia was on a campaign to abolish the metapsychology that was dominant at the time.

I went through a period of great uncertainty during my years as a candidate at Columbia and for long afterwards. My first reaction to the teachings of Rado, Kardiner, Ovesey, and others at Columbia had been rather contemptuous, believing, since I had no difficulty understanding what they were saying, that they must be simplistic. That couldn't be psychoanalysis. Rado's use of everyday language in psychoanalysis was distressing to me. Words such as pride, hope, welfare emotions, and self-assertion (rather than aggression) led me to think I was back in literature or sociology rather than in the science of psychoanalysis. Although it made sense to me, how could family and couples therapy be a part of an analytic curriculum since 'real' analysts didn't do that? In contrast, the language of ego psychology held a fascination for me because it seemed as if it might be science, I found it difficult to understand, and it seemed to be the way all psychoanalysts spoke – except for those relative outsiders in my institute. At the same time libido economics seemed clearly a dead end and the language of instinct theory seemed hopelessly outdated biologically. I reflected the uncertainty of my entire institute as we wavered between trying to enjoy the comfort of being part of the mainstream as it was reflected in the American Psychoanalytic Association, or sustaining our courage to continue the battle that Rado, Kardiner, Daniels, Karush, and Ovesey had begun. In their view, they were fighting to restore psychoanalysis to the more important findings of Freud concerning the core of psychic life in the struggle to find an emotionally acceptable adaptation to inner conflicts within the constraints of biology, culture, and the experience of care-taking persons. Moreover, the interest of Columbia's founders tended to be more in present functioning than in the infantile past. For many years, I vacillated between feeling that I was not a real analyst because I could not comfortably adapt to mainstream ego psychology, and rather angrily feeling that the excitement of psychoanalysis was being strangled by the hold of the so-called classical analysts.

As I and my institute generally hovered in uncertainty, Kohut stole our thunder with his vigorous presentation of self psychology, Kernberg brought Kleinian object-relations before us, Schafer put hermeneutics at the center of psychoanalytic discourse, and Sandler, the first Turner Visiting Professor at our institute, spoke of the centrality of safety, and the representational world – concepts we knew of but had not thought through very carefully. I remember at the time being reassured that I felt quite at home in Sandler's way of thinking, but also reproaching him for not knowing that much of what he was telling us was part of the way Rado thought of psychoanalysis. He had never read Rado's later work. I mention all this because for me it was part of an ongoing personal struggle to reassure myself that my way of thinking psychoanalytically wasn't totally eccentric. I thought I had a knack for deciphering my patient's hidden messages, and for what later was called empathic attunement, and some of my patients seemed to change significantly, but I was never certain that I did deep analysis as the so-called orthodox did. The tone of certainty of their writing and theorizing was entirely foreign to my own experience, and until quite recently I wasn't sure that they didn't know something vital that I didn't. It's possible that they did, although I think it is now clear that the world of orthodox self-assurance has collapsed. Of course, I am aware that significant aspects of my vacillation about belonging and rebelling are attributable to my personal history, but one shouldn't dismiss the tenor of that era.

I would like to tell you of some of the experiences that helped sustain my analytic enthusiasm during years of doubt. Central, of course, were the sheer excitement and interest of Freud's ideas in his writings and in the writing of other innovators, my continuing analytic work with a large variety of patients, and the powerful friendships with some of my teachers, colleagues and students. I am not going to talk much about these, because these are universal experiences of psychoanalysts. I will focus upon some idiosyncratic events. Coming across the works of Edmund Bergler early in my career, while still a candidate, was a great influence on me. His emphasis on masochism and his description of what he called the mechanism of injustice collecting, or the oral triad, instantly created a sense of recognition in me – no doubt because I qualified as a reasonably high-level injustice collector. Bergler gave a description of clinical behavior that I was able to spot in my patients and in myself with very little difficulty. The oral triad – a term that Lewin later used for an entirely different purpose – consisted of: first, provoking or misusing a situation in which one could feel aggrieved; second, responding to the feeling of injury with what Bergler termed pseudo-aggression, an amount and kind of anger that is designed to aggravate an already difficult situation, inflicting more harm on oneself than on the purported adversary, and which is unconsciously aimed at trying to prove to one's superego that one is not really pursuing self-damage; finally, feeling defeated and deprived, and lapsing into a state of enormous self-pity and depression with feelings of 'this only happens to me.' Bergler was in the traditions of Strachey and Rado in

attributing the difficulties with neurosis to the harshness of the superego and he believed that amelioration through the transference was the route to cure. He also believed in the concept of a basic neurosis and the centrality of vicissitudes of narcissism, a precursor of Kohut.

Bergler's vivid description of 'injustice collectors,' a term later borrowed by the novelist Louis Auchincloss for the title of a collection of short stories, seemed to me to provide a possible solution for some of the dilemmas I experienced concerning what was the proper theory and stance for the conduct of psychoanalysis. It seemed to combine an appreciation of depth in a way that I was not sure Rado did, while retaining an emphasis on pre-Oedipal events, a focus on the patient's actual behavior in a way that I felt much of ego analytic theory had abandoned, and a role for the interaction of analyst and patient that was clearly analytic in intent, relieving me of the guilty feeling that I might be doing psychotherapy. At the same time, I was aware that I was again going against the mainstream, choosing to attach myself to another outsider; I worried over how much was intellectual discovery, and how much was personal neurosis.

Another of my formative experiences was the teaching of a course, shortly after my graduation, on what were then called the dissident schools of psychoanalysis. It was then that I first studied the writings of Klein, Sullivan, Adler, Horney, Jung, and others. My first reaction to many of these workers was that their language and thought were entirely foreign to me, and I was dismissive. But after teaching the course for several years and beginning to read the writings of other followers of Klein, I began to realize that there was another universe of discourse in psychoanalysis coexisting with the one to which I was accustomed, and that might have something to offer. I readily saw great similarities in the stance of Klein and Bergler, realizing how much he had taken from her and Abraham, and I began to think that maybe my analytic thinking was not entirely outside of acceptability – at least in some parts of the globe.

Upon the death of Bergler, I took over the treatment of a number of his patients, and was consulted with some frequency by some of his former patients. Included in the group were several homosexual men and women. Bergler had been the most outspoken psychoanalyst at that time on the topic of the curability of homosexuals. As I began to piece together the history of these patients and the history of their psychoanalyses, it became increasingly clear that in Bergler's view the cure of homosexuality lay in exposing its masochistic roots in the early pre-Oedipal attachment to the mother, the hidden terror and rage at women, the flight from women to men, and the endless pursuit of self-damage. Bergler's treatments consisted of deep exploration of pre-Oedipal rage and disappointment, combined with enormous amounts of subtle exhortation. As I began to see some patients whom he had officially cured, it became apparent that these patients had been retrained, but their deepest yearnings and fantasies had not been altered. While this was on the one hand a bitter disillusionment

to me, it was also the beginning of my reeducation in learning anew to listen closely and carefully and collaboratively to my patients, it was an early lesson in the limits of analytic authority, and the real awakening of an intersubjectivist view of my work with my patients. My positivism died an early and painful death and another phase of my analytic career began, with a continuing appreciation for the importance of pre-Oedipal events but with a renewed openness to the vicissitudes and complexities of early experience and later development, and a new sense of the possible powers, abuses and limitations of analytic theory and knowledge.

Rather early in my career I had what was for me a highly traumatic experience. At the first regional meeting of the psychoanalytic societies of the New York area, I presented my first paper on the narcissistic–masochistic character, one of the first papers I ever gave in public. I was enjoying the friendly and ecumenical atmosphere of the vacation spot where the meeting was being held, and I was flattered that a number of the elder and revered New York analysts were welcoming and warm. In my paper I suggested that the core pathology in the patients I was describing was pre-Oedipal in origin and I was at some pains to indicate that this contradicted what Freud had referred to earlier in his writings as a shibboleth of psychoanalysis: that the Oedipus complex is the nucleus of neurosis. I was horrified and terrified when my discussant from the New York Psychoanalytic Institute, one of those revered elders, angrily and, I thought, viciously attacked me. I was accused of being totally anti-psychoanalytic and charged with accusing Freud of being unscientific since the word 'shibboleth' was not in the vocabulary of science. My discussant seemed unaware that the word 'shibboleth' was a quote from Freud himself. Although I was intellectually on solid ground, the personal effect on me was devastating. It was years before I attempted to write up any of this material or to present it again.

I think such an event can no longer occur in the analytic community. We are much more alert to the need to develop creative young colleagues and we no longer have an investment in the preservation of every thought of Freud's (or indeed of 'sanitizing' his thought). The positive side of the experience, however, was that it did lead me to think very carefully about the sociology of psychoanalysis and the power of group processes. I emerged with a slightly thicker hide – a requirement for anyone who wishes to engage in scientific discourse.

For by now obvious reasons, the issue of analytic identity has long been both puzzling and interesting to me. It seems to me a uniquely psychoanalytic issue, a guild issue rather than a genuinely professional one. I know of no other specialty in which one's professional identity is such a perplexing ongoing question. At the same time, it was many years before I developed real comfort with the idea that I was a psychoanalyst by any serious definition, even if I differed with the mainstream. It was of enormous importance that throughout