I didn’t attend a wonderful conference a couple of weeks ago. That’s right, I missed it! The day-long conference was entitled Enlightening Relationships in New York and included a number of speakers from both the Buddhist and Relational Psychoanalysis traditions. By all accounts, it was a great conference. But although my interest in attending was high, I found myself very over-scheduled and tired by the time the weekend came. My ambivalence was working in over-drive. I used the wrong setting on my alarm clock and so was late in getting to New York. I hadn’t bothered to verify the address at NYU. By the time I arrived in Washington Square, I meandered around, allowing myself to be distracted by my need for oral gratification (Look! A Starbucks!). It was a beautiful day. I finally realized that the last thing I wanted to do that morning was to go inside of a building and listen to people talk. So I indulged my desire to play hooky and sat down on a bench in the square and sim-

Continued on page 2

Linda Hopkins has written a wonderful book that I highly recommend: False Self: The Life of Masud Khan. Khan, who was D.W. Winnicott’s student, analysand, and collaborator, was brilliant, flamboyant, and committed so many boundary violations that he was finally expelled from the British Psycho-Analytical Society. False Self is a scholarly and thoughtful work that is based on meticulous research conducted by Linda over a period of thirteen years. It is also an entertaining and engrossing book that reached me on a very personal level.

As the child of an analyst growing up in the 50s, I lived in the world that Linda writes about: analysts were revered and many boundary violations occurred. I have known Linda for 40 years. We roomed across the hall from each other at Brown University. As children of psychiatrists (her father and

Continued on page 6
As I sat on the bench indulging in my voyeuristic reverie, I recalled how when I first began reading Freud in college, I had the sense that psychoanalysis was somewhat like turning over rocks to find the bugs and other critters beneath—an exploration of the human psyche meant to expose all of the nasty bits within. As such, it seemed reductionistic rather than expansive and satisfying. Many years down the road, I’ve come to appreciate Freud and all who followed much more multi-dimensionally. My meditation brought me to a sense of how both studying and practicing psychoanalysis is indeed an exercise of seeing what is beneath the surface, but even more so is a practice of being present to oneself and to others. I felt grateful for those moments when I could really feel present to the world in its complexity and challenge in a way which inspired hope and commitment. In my career, I have been most inspired by teachers who both possessed and encouraged a stance of openness to experience and a capacity to be awake and attentive to the world. In addition to my brief foray into New York, I experienced another moment of inspiration in early October during our annual fall meeting. Set in the wonderful atmosphere of the Rosenbach Gallery, Janet Sayers’ presentation related her own way of seeing many forms of modern art through a psychoanalytic lens again brought to mind the importance of being able to see our experience with greater depth and curiosity. It was also good to be able to gather with many of our members and be reminded of the importance of the many relationships which support us in our work.

During the coming year, in addition to our regular programs, the Board of PSPP has embarked on a process of giving more attention to the mission and future of our organization as we seek to be present for our membership and for the larger community. As I’ve stated before, I find this to be a particularly vital and exciting time for our field, in spite of all the challenges posed by the marketplace. My hope that PSPP will continue to be an organization which allows all of us to be awake and aware in the work we do.

**Transportation to PSPP Events**

Have you had difficulty finding transportation to PSPP events in the suburbs? We can help! When signing up for PSPP events, please let the contact person know if you are either able to provide a ride or need a ride to that event. With this information, the contact person can help to make the necessary arrangements.
Committee Reports

Treasurer’s Report

Ellen Balzé, Ph.D., PSPP Treasurer

The PSPP treasury balances are as follows, with 2006 balances shown for comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checking</td>
<td>$4,472</td>
<td>$8,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market</td>
<td>$2,341</td>
<td>$2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Bank Accounts</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,813</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,002</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Yr. Rising Rate Certificate of Deposit</td>
<td>$5,316</td>
<td>$5,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,129</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,092</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our balances continue to be lower than at the same time last year, reflecting the increased expenses for the Spring Meeting (see Currents, Spring 2007); as well as some additional expenses incurred for the Fall Meeting, which involved a different venue (the Rosenbach Museum) and format (wine and appetizers) from the typical dinner meeting of past years. Both major 2007 events reflect efforts of the Board to offer members something new. PSPP continues to have sufficient funds to meet usual expenses, but the relatively lower balances may necessitate a more conservative approach to expenditures for the next 6-9 months.

---

Membership Report

Jeanne Settler, Psy.D., Membership Chair

With the opening of our fall season, 2007, we welcome the following new members:

Shannon Chanofsky, M.A.
Amanda Swartz, M.A.
Peter Goldenthal, Ph.D.
Kimberly Johnson, Psy.D.
Dan Livney, M.S.
Pamela Lehman, Ph.D.

Since September 2006, we have gained 15 new members thanks to the nominations from our membership. Special thanks to Barbara Goldsmith and Karen Berberian for developing extensive nomination lists. Our membership stands at 200.

Forty-six members returned the Needs Assessment Form with their suggestions and feedback. Twenty-eight different speakers were suggested, with Nancy McWilliams, Salman Aktar, Bertram Karon, Drew Weston, and Grace Jackson receiving multiple nominations. Suggested topics for our meetings were varied and rich. General topic examples were more on child and adolescence, psychodynamic approaches to neuroscience, education, illness, psychosis, forensics, eating disorders, families, groups, and geriatrics. More specific topics included multiple code theory and psychosomatics, contemporary Kleinians, Gilligan on her new book, *Pleasure*, and how to challenge the “quick-fix” managed care paradigm and contemporary mindset. Other suggestions concerned eagerness to have more PSPP events in Center City and more collaboration with PCOP. A request to provide information on therapy groups running in the Philly area was discussed by the Board and will be considered in the near future. We are working to include your ideas and preferences in our future PSPP programming.

Thanks to all members who enriched our joint experiences by attending our programs this year. The collegiality at our programs never ceases to hearten and enrich our community, and the topics and content deepen our work. Our invited speakers inevitably remark about what a warm, creative, collaborative, gracious and intelligent group PSPP is and how much they enjoyed their experience with us. We should all be proud that our membership is so well regarded and enjoyed.

I hope everyone had a lovely, rejuvenating summer and is enjoying the beautiful fall.
**Why Mentor?**

Many graduate students are eager for more exposure to psychodynamic ideas, especially if they are in graduate programs that focus on CBT and offer little exposure to psychoanalytic theories or therapy. Students often have limited opportunities to get psychodynamic supervision or consultation at their practicum or internship sites.

Mentoring satisfies an important developmental need in preparing graduate students for successful entry into the profession and offers practicing professionals the opportunity to share their knowledge and experience by providing monthly meetings with students. These meetings can take the form of consultation regarding dissertation research, case conceptualization, and provide information about career planning, conferences and programs, analytic training opportunities, and networking into the psychodynamic community.

**The program**

Since beginning in 2005, the PSPP Mentoring program has included nearly 40 graduate students from local colleges and universities such as Widener, Immaculata, Chestnut Hill, Temple, and Bryn Mawr social work and psychology programs, as well as psychology interns from universities across the U.S. and abroad. So far this academic year, we have already matched 14 graduate students with PSPP mentors. This is a good start, but we would like to increase the number of student-mentor pairs. We have had a terrific response from our members who have generously volunteered their time to mentor. Many of you who volunteered were not matched due to location and we hope that we will have additional requests from more students as the semester continues and through further outreach to the local graduate programs.

---

**What’s new?**

At last May’s graduate student brunch, several new ideas were generated by the students that could expand the mentorship program even further. One idea was a monthly case consultation group, which is open to students and led by a PSPP member. The other suggestion was for a summer reading group run by PSPP members, similar to the relational reading group formed in the summer of 2005. We will be thinking about how to incorporate these suggestions into the mentoring program this year so that we can begin offering these groups in May 2008 through the summer months.

**How to get involved**

For those of you who are new to the mentoring program, mentors and mentees are matched based on common interests and geographic locations and meet for one hour each month during the academic year at the mentor’s office. Summer meetings may also be an option depending on mutual interest and availability. Please note: mentoring is not the same as supervision and all students involved in the program should have supervisors responsible for their clinical work. Mentors function as consultants, not supervisors.

**If you are a graduate student who is interested in finding a mentor:**

Just fill out a questionnaire that can be downloaded from the PSPP website, [www.pspp.org](http://www.pspp.org). Complete the questionnaire (rank order your interests) and email the questionnaire to Dr. Barbara Goldsmith at barbgsmith@aol.com.
If you are interested in becoming a mentor:

Contact Dr. Barbara Goldsmith at barbgsmith@aol.com. Please include your contact information, locations where you would like to meet, areas of interest/expertise (both scholarly and clinical), as well as any other information that might help us ensure a good match.

I would like to thank several of our members who are currently mentoring students for the 2007-2008 academic year:

Susan Adelman, Ph.D.
Peter Badgio, Ph.D.
Cynthia Baum-Baicker, Ph.D.
Thomas Bartlett, MA.

Dennis Debiak, Psy.D.
Ilene Dyller, Ph.D.
Jeffrey Faude, Ph.D.
Frances Martin, Ph.D.
Sanjay Nath, Ph.D.
Naomi Rosenberg, Ph.D.
Ronna Schuller, Ph.D.
Laurel Silber, Psy.D.
Jane Widseth, Ph.D.
Jed Yalof, Psy.D.

A very special thanks to Elizabeth Bogado, PsyD., who is helping me coordinate the project this year. Dr. Bogado can be reached at ecbogado@gmail.com.
my mother), we both considered pre-med, briefly. Linda majored in Russian and then took courses in Arabic, first at Brown and then at the graduate level at Johns Hopkins. Eventually, we both became psychologists and Linda completed psychoanalytic training. When she studied Arabic, she became interested in Islam, and when she studied psychology and psychoanalysis, she became interested in Khan, a Muslim analyst.

Karen: Linda, let’s start with Khan’s strengths. What were his most significant contributions to psychoanalysis?

Linda: Khan’s first book, The Privacy of the Self, deals with serious psychoanalytic work with very disturbed pieces of a person, “the suppressed madness of sane men” (in the words of his colleague and good friend, Marion Milner). Khan made Winnicott’s theory practical. He told how to do it—how to work with regression to dependency, with the false self, how to teach people to play. He is most well known for his theory of cumulative trauma, the idea that many small traumas can add up and have the impact of a larger trauma. He described perversions as pathology of the self, and his papers on dreaming, based on his clinical observations, are well supported by current research conducted more than thirty years after his paper was published.

Karen: The concept of false self is so important for understanding Khan that you used it as the title of your book. He was born with a deformed right ear and experienced many losses—estrangement from his mother and the deaths of his sister, father, his first analyst, Ella Sharpe, and his second analyst, John Rickman. His father, whom he adored, was also cruel. Khan grew up to be articulate, brilliant, charming, and at times evil. Could you say a bit more about his false self pathology?

Linda: I think Khan had at least four separate selves, a Western true self, a Western false self, an Indian true self, and an Indian false self. Symptoms of his false self pathology included insomnia, psychosomatic symptoms, depression, feelings of terror, and feelings of aloneness. He had feelings of being unreal, of having a disconnect between his inner self and his outer self. His true self was both creative and vulnerable. His false self could be charming, articulate, and entertaining. Interestingly, when Khan was functioning as a false self, he maintained the ability to play and to function at a high intellectual and creative level. Winnicott wrote that this was not possible. As to his being evil—I would not call him evil, although some others do. The people who were his closest friends, including American analyst Robert Stoller, never saw him as evil. They viewed him as a wonderful friend who was very disturbed—and, severely alcoholic.

Karen: What about the relationship between Khan and Winnicott? I am thinking of the notion that they both got from the other something that was missing internally.

Linda: People who knew both said that Khan was like a son to Winnicott, who as you know had no children. Additionally, Khan wrote better than Winnicott and wrote or re-wrote most of Winnicott’s papers after 1956. Perhaps Winnicott also got in Khan an alive, daring, sexual person who expressed parts of his personality that he was not free to express. Khan said that Winnicott was the man who was “destiny” for him in the West. Their relationship replicated the father-son relationship Kahn had experienced. He adored his powerful Indian father, and his father had adored him.

Karen: During our training, we learn about how important it is to create and maintain “the frame”, and we also learn about our own rescue fantasies. Yet, from the very beginning, many analysts have tried to rescue patients by going outside of the frame. Could you talk about how this affected Khan?

Linda: When Khan was in analysis, the concept of the frame was not yet part of analytic theory, but even so, analysts knew that they should protect the space for the patient’s transference. All of his analysts went outside of the frame and in so doing deprived him of having the type of deep analysis that would have helped him. He was so charismatic, brilliant, and interesting that all of his analysts went outside of the frame, such as by socializing with him or by asking him for feedback on papers they were writing.

Continued on page 10
Editor’s Note: The following is the speech delivered by Jeanne Seitler, Psy.D. at the presentation of the 2007 PSPP Achievement Award to David Ramirez, Ph.D. at the PSPP 2007 fall meeting on October 7th, 2007:

There is no simple description which can be designed to adequately describe this year’s PSPP Achievement Award recipient. We have seen him sport his cowboy hat and boots, debate with surgical focus, and dance like a kid. Elegant, private, yet always engaged in humanistic and psychoanalytic causes: Promotion of justice, equality, egalitarianism, and inclusion. On the one hand, he is sharp-witted, intense, passionate, and serious minded; on the other hand, he is playful and adventurous. We have watched him making mischief and seen him making sublime visionary sense. Although a man of contradictions and many self-states, David is consistently, predictably, and continuously mindful, sensitive, intuitive, generous, and supportive. For those interested in the furtherance of psychoanalytic discourse, and for his students, colleagues, and friends alike, he has been an inspiration and a guiding light.

The colleague we honor today is a contemporary Renaissance Man in our discipline. He has served as membership chair, treasurer and president of PSPP and Division 39 of the APA while also serving as treasurer of PCPE. He advocated for the expansion of the membership criteria of these organizations to allow non-psychologists as members. His initiatives as president have included promoting increased awareness of cultural and social diversity issues in regard to psychoanalytic psychology.

As the director of Psychological Services at Swarthmore College, David has developed the most sought-after internship program in the tri-state area, and it represents one of the last bastions of psychoanalytic thinking, perspectives, and dialogues. A recipient of this cutting edge training opportunity, I know, as do several others in this audience, how life changing, and clinically and personally rewarding a year of training is under the tutelage of David Ramirez. His lightning fast intellect, clinical courage, creativity, and authenticity keep his students fascinated, inspired and challenged. His clarity of vision that student involvement in psychoanalytic forums is the key to the future and vitality of psychoanalysis is one of the foci of his ongoing legacy.

The Philadelphia Society for Psychoanalytic Psychology would not be the vital organization it is today if it were not for David Ramirez and for his outstanding contribution to this organization and to the education and professional development of local psychoanalytic and psychodynamic clinicians. It is with individuals like David in mind that this award was conceived by the board of PSPP three years ago. So David, I have the enviable honor and pleasure of being the individual selected to voice our sincerest appreciation to you for your years of outstanding and inspired service to PSPP and the larger psychoanalytic community. May you accept this award with our heartfelt thanks and affection.
The PSPP 2007 fall meeting was held on October 7, 2007 at the Rosenbach Museum and Library in Philadelphia. The meeting consisted of reports from members of the PSPP executive board, presentation of an award to longtime PSPP member Dr. David Ramirez recognizing his local and national advocacy for psychoanalytic psychology, and culminated with a stimulating talk by art historian and psychoanalytically oriented scholar Janet Sayers, Ph.D. Following Dr. Sayers’ talk was a cocktail hour, providing time to catch up with friends and colleagues as well as make new connections with other local clinicians interested in a psychoanalytic perspective. In the following I will provide an overview of my experience of Dr. Sayers’ presentation.

The title of Dr. Sayers’ presentation was Freud & Picasso. In it, she referenced thinkers such as Melanie Klein, Julia Kristeva, and Jacques Lacan (among others) to begin an interesting and complex conversation, first about what could be called methodological similarities between Freud’s psychoanalysis and Picasso’s artistic productions, and then reflections on Picasso’s work as an opportunity for broader considerations regarding the aims of psychoanalytic theory and method. The presentation was rich and evocative; as is said, “You had to be there.” Nevertheless, I hope in these few paragraphs to provide at least a taste of some of the essential ingredients.

Dr. Sayers began her presentation with a talk about Picasso’s painting Les Demoiselles d’Avignon (the Young Ladies of Avignon), a work considered a seminal piece in modern art. After providing an associative roadmap of different elements of the painting (including an Iberian head from the 5th to 3rd Century B.C.E., an African fang mask, and Matisse’s Le bonheur de vivre) she suggested that what makes Picasso’s work differ-
ent from paintings of previous periods was that rather than resolving the piece into a unitary perspective he presented his figures as multiplicity. Picasso’s paintings have different and often contradictory agendas (are his figures men or women? is the image beatific or syphilitic?).

When compared with the effect of the unitary perspective of works from earlier periods, the presentation of unresolved tensions in Picasso’s paintings produces a different effect on the viewer. Rather than being the passive recipient of a fully completed image, already resolved, the spectator is drawn into the creative process itself, provided a collection of images from different vantage points, implicitly asked by the various unresolved aspects of the painting, “Here we are; so what are you going to do with us?” Dr. Sayers suggested that the psychoanalyst is asked a similar question by his or her client by way of associations, symptoms, and dreams: “Here we are; it’s up to you (psy-
choanalyst) to make something out of us (it/me).” So how might a psychoanalyst respond?

Dr. Sayers suggested that our field has provided different answers to this question, each implying a different vision of psychoanalysis. On the one hand, she described a psychoanalytic perspective invested in increasing the strength of the superego, thereby producing a better regulated intrapsychic economy capable of smoother functioning. From this perspective, the aim of psychoanalysis is the resolution of conflicts. Messy ambiguities are cleaned up, leaving a coherent story—a completed and uni-perspectival painting. On the other, she described a vision of psychoanalysis where tolerance of contradictory feeling states is considered the goal. What is more, the superego itself, with its investment in establishing a unitary (correct) perspective by way of prohibition and marginalization, is considered a problematic entity as it functions to cover over incongruities—a “manic defense” in Klein’s language or, referencing Lacan, a phallic investment in tumescence or totality.

Dr. Sayers provided an engaging analysis that seemed to really get persons’ creative juices flowing. In my own experience, my wife (an English teacher who also attended the talk) and I spent an enjoyable car ride home conversing about the presentation, with associations varying from literary criticism to hermeneutics (along with what we should make for dinner). The occasion of such a satisfying conversation references in my mind what I enjoyed most about Dr. Sayers’ talk. Like a good psychoanalytic interpretation, or a work of modern art, she did not necessarily provide clear answers or tie matters up into a tidy package. Instead, she made a number of poignant observations, drew several connections, and then left the audience to put things together, though perhaps now with a different question in mind: “Here’s my presentation psychoanalysts; what are you going to do with it?”

An Interview with Linda Hopkins (continued from page 6)

Karen: What else did you learn when you were doing the research for your book?

Linda: I have become much more aware of the problems of alcoholism. When Khan became a severe alcoholic, the analytic community did not do anything to help him. They did not yet recognize alcoholism and how destructive it is. Analytic theory does not easily adapt to people who do not bring it up as a problem. Winnicott knew about Khan’s alcoholism but did not try to use the power of the transference to help Khan. In fact, Winnicott barely discusses alcoholism in his writings. Now things have changed, and alcoholism has been discussed from a psychoanalytic point of view by Leon Wurmser and David Mann. One of our local colleagues, Dave Wilson, is an addictions expert.

Karen: Amy Bloom, in her review of False Self in the New York Times Book Review, seems to feel that you were overly sympathetic to Khan.

Linda: I hear that comment a lot. People would like me to have painted him in an only critical way. They don’t want to allow him to be paradoxical, and this illustrates how very difficult it is to grasp and apply the essence of Winnicott’s concept of paradox; I see Khan as being wonderful-terrible, both in the extreme.

Office for Sublet

A nice two office suite in prime CC location - 16th and Walnut. Comfortable reception area. One office is completely available during the week (days and evenings) and the weekend. The other office is available Mondays (day and evening) and on the weekend. The office that is more available has not been occupied for some time so there is minimal decor except for some furniture. The person who is using it the most can make it his or her own, with name plate on the door, plants, artwork, diplomas, and so on. I am very flexible in terms of fees and other matters. If interested, please contact me at my e-mail address (janhope@enter.net) or at (267) 251-8575 (preferably). Janet Horwitz, Psy.D.
Insight for All: Homeless Project Thriving

Deborah Anna Luepnitz, Ph.D.

Insight for All (I.F.A.) is a project that connects formerly homeless adults and families now living in residence at Project H.O.M.E with psychoanalysts in the community willing to work pro bono.

It began with one clinician and has expanded to ten. I.F.A. held its second meeting in my home on Sunday, August 26th. Seven analysts—all PSPP members—attended. Since the first I.F.A. meeting just a few months ago, a new member—Carol Jacques—has begun running a highly successful group for staff members at St. Columba’s—our residence for mentally ill homeless men in West Philly. Also, Drs. Patricia Gherovici and Julie Nemeth have begun treating individual patients onsite. Feedback from staff and Project H.O.M.E. has been uniformly positive; they are grateful indeed to have top-notch clinicians coming to treat individuals most often neglected by the mental health system.

The meeting began with a summary of a new article by Dr. Diane Ehrensaft titled: “A Child is Being Eaten: Failure, Fear, Fantasy, and Repair in the Lives of Foster Children.” The author remarks that as much as foster children fear going hungry, they have another, less obvious fear: that of being devoured, like the abandoned children in fairy tales. This corresponds to an issue we have noticed working with homeless adults. They fear not only being without a safe habitat; they also fear being contained. Analytically trained clinicians are unique in being sensitive not only to the desire for gratification but also to the accompanying terrors, which keep many walking the streets and camping out in doorways.

The highlight of the meeting was a brilliant presentation by Dr. Gherovici about a transgender homeless patient.

Psychoanalysis is on its way to becoming a significant, sustained, healing force at Philadelphia’s world famous Project H.O.M.E. Sister Mary Scullion is delighted to have us on board. When the new documentary film about Project H.O.M.E. is made, psychoanalysis and I.F.A. will be included.

Anyone interested in more information should contact me either by phone at 215-387-0233 or email to babette@webtv.net.

Journal of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy

Annette Leavy, L.C.S.W, B.C.D.

I am writing you as a PSPP member and the Executive Editor of the journal Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy. With its Spring 2007 issue, Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy began both its relationship with its new publisher, Heldref Publications, and its new format as an online journal. The journal also moved from twice yearly to quarterly publication. The Associate Editors, Editorial Board, and I are certain that online publication will ensure the journal’s vitality and its ability to contribute to the intellectual future of our field. Indeed, it is clear that online publication is the wave of the future for scholarly publication in all fields.

During its first 20 years, Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy endeavored to apply psychodynamic principles to diverse fields of study. Our aim, going forward, is to preserve the journal’s commitment to a lively and rigorous exploration of topics which impact clinical work. We are pleased to have a new style of publishing and the support of a new publisher so that Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy will remain a forum for ideas, both within and beyond psychoanalysis.

I am writing to ask for your support of the journal’s new initiatives. Specifically, I am attaching a call for papers. I hope that each of you will consider writing for the journal as well as encouraging colleagues to do so. Heldref Publications provides Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy with access to a broader and more diverse audience. We also hope to attract new and diverse writers in the field. Please feel free to contact me with questions or comments. Access to some content of the journal can be obtained without charge at http://heldref.metapress.com.
Summary of Workshop

Developing a Marketing Statement for your Private Practice

Deborah D. Shain, M.S.S., L.C.S.W., B.C.D.

On Saturday, January 27, 2007, Claudia Apfelbaum, Liz Betterly, Deborah Shain, and Cindy Shapiro—members of the subcommittee of the Private Practice Committee of the Pennsylvania Society for Clinical Social Work—presented a workshop designed to help seasoned and emerging clinical social workers to develop strategies for establishing and enriching their private practice. As an outcome of many planning sessions, the subcommittee used Lynn Grodski’s (2003) book, Twelve Months to Your Ideal Private Practice, as their guide for the seminar. The workshop goal was to provide techniques for attendees to define their ideal practice, preference for client population, and to create and develop a comprehensive and concise marketing statement.

After a 9:30 a.m. sign-in and continental breakfast, the workshop began at 10 a.m. An introductory exercise, led by Cindy Shapiro, immediately got the thirty-six attendees involved and active. We joined in a circle around the perimeter of the Lower Lounge of the Bryn Mawr College Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research. Each attendee called out his/her name accompanied by a movement to depict their feeling-state. The entire group repeated each name and movement with a great deal of energy. Some jumped in the air, some simply reached out a hand, some spoke softly, some sang out, but all were in the spirit of celebrating the prospect of being on the PSCSW private practice team devoted to supporting each others’ pursuits.

The enthusiasm of the group set the stage for the next exercise led by Liz Betterly. A lively exchange of ideas ensued as participants brainstormed their individual views about their “ideal” client. A flood of qualities reflected each person’s interest, skill, curiosity, and experience with clients we look forward to working with as opposed to those who might engender “burn out.” We identified our preferences for clients who run the gamut in age, presenting issues, sexual orientation, and those with a multitude of challenging life experiences. Some knew they would like to treat folks representing international diversity, survivors of trauma, oppressed people, and clients who would be open to spiritual concerns. Positive traits such as “motivated, reflective, responsive, insightful, resilient, courageous, voluntary, respectful of boundaries, curious, able to pay a fee, can-tolerate-truth” flowed into the pool of qualities our ideal clients bring to us. The next exercise based in a reading from Grodski’s book, was to construct a vision statement for our ideal private practice. Location, group-practice vs. solo practice, expressing personal values, professional integrity, and applying a variety of methods and theories of treatment were explored. The large group broke up into smaller clusters to define and refine their visions for attracting their ideal clients into their “dream” practice. After vigorous work, the clusters reconvened into the larger circle to share what they envisioned about their newly-defined ideal practice.

Led by Claudia Apfelbaum, the participants were primed and ready to create the final exercise, creating an “elevator speech.” Based on Grodski’s criteria for a “well-crafted basic message,” verbal introductions should be no more than three or four sentences containing no jargon or technical terms. The language should be up beat, (not problem-oriented) such as “The reason I love what I do is . . .” And only one aspect of your work should be targeted, e.g. “I specialize in...” Once more small groups met to construct their marketing speech and to practice delivering the one minute introduction to each other. The buzz in the room was electrifying. Judging from the eagerness to participate, the small groups achieved their goal. Return to the full circle gave each participant renewed interest in the concept of defining their practice as well as designing a carefully constructed professionally-based business.

In the summary statements, lead by Deborah Shain, participants reiterated their ideas and strategies for setting up a practice that would be in sync with their professional and personal personae. They shared concerns and challenges they would need to address as they
move from the protection of an agency-based practice to becoming independent entrepreneurs. The need for continuing supervision, education, and consultation and networking became clear. In setting up a private office, we emphasized the importance of paying attention to how the space, location (city vs. suburbs), and decor reflect who they are. Each member of the group defined the necessary components for providing the physical and emotional climate they hope to establish for themselves and for their clients: having fresh flowers, tasteful art work, and comfortable furniture to support the therapeutic goals of emotional and behavioral change. We considered advantages and disadvantages of subleasing space. If a practitioner subleases, we emphasized the importance of bringing one’s own possessions into the environment. The environment gives clients important information about your view of yourself as a professional, and your respect for clients as courageous and hopeful folks ready to improve their lives.

In reviewing what they learned from the workshop, each attendee considered how many clients they would want to treat each week and how much money they need to bring in for their practice to meet expenses and monetary needs. We discussed fee-setting and the advantages/disadvantages of participating in insurance panels. Participants reported excitement about addressing ways to balance time treating groups, individuals, couples, and families, how to refer to other practitioners, and the importance of supporting each other rather than competing with each other. Ideas flowed about client-finding: sending letters, establishing a web-site, taking ancillary colleagues to lunch, and keeping your elevator speech lively and current at all professional and social gatherings. We addressed issues of burn-out prevention: balancing work, life, and play, and keeping ourselves healthy and committed to our professional and personal growth. We acknowledged the importance of developing methods for reaching out to develop a client population based on marketing techniques that reflect our interests, talents, and passion for our individual niche in the profession of clinical social work.

Though the workshop ended officially at 1 p.m., many attendees, eager to flesh-out newly formulated ideas, lingered to share thoughts and feelings and to get to know each others’ areas of interest, exchange business cards, and keep the momentum going. All assembled look forward to the next Private Practice Committee workshop, “Marketing Yourself,” designed to address issues of advertising, establishing a web-site, fee-setting, and insurance resources.

**Reference**


---

**Member Publications and Honors**

PSPP member Linda Hopkins, Ph.D. has received two awards for her recent book, *False Self: The Life of Masud Khan*:

First, Dr. Hopkins received the *13th Annual Gradiva Award* presented by the National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis for the best published book advancing psychoanalysis. She was presented the award at a special awards ceremony during the annual scientific conference on October 13, 2007.

Dr. Hopkins will also receive the honor of the *Goethe Award for Psychoanalytic Scholarship* for the best psychoanalytic book written in 2006, awarded by the Section of Psychoanalytic and Psychodynamic Psychology of the Canadian Psychological Association at their annual meeting in June, 2008.

I had been thinking of contributing something for the PSPP newsletter when a colleague suggested that I write about my teaching, supervising and doing therapy in Russia. As I begin the otherwise normal ennui of this flight across the Atlantic Ocean, it seemed like a positive stimulus to initiate this article. I began this trip after arriving in St Petersburg 11 days ago, but am now returning early this morning from Moscow and on my way to Helsinki.

I first went to St. Petersburg, Russia, 16 years ago with my wife, Irina, to visit her parents. While there, Irina, a psychologist, met a former psychiatric colleague while shopping. She mentioned that her husband, a psychoanalyst, was a specialist in the treatment of schizophrenia. The colleague, who was chief of the outpatient department of a famous hospital, subsequently inquired if I would be willing to give a lecture at his hospital. I accepted his kind invitation, not quite sure what to expect. The facility was the Bechterev Institute, one of the most prestigious research hospitals in Eastern Europe. The lecture hall was an amphitheatre where I lectured about the Modern Psychoanalytic approach developed many years ago by my supervisor, Hyman Spotnitz, M.D.*

The people attending had not been exposed to anything like it, and they of course had many interesting and challenging questions. At the end of my talk, one of the staff informed me that he was treating a schizophrenic woman patient with whom he felt completely frustrated because she would not communicate with him. To my surprise, he requested that I interview her and demonstrate my therapeutic technique. I agreed and thus began a process that I was asked to repeat many times during the ensuing visits to Russia over the years.

The patient, an attractive 28-year-old woman that I had passed in the hall on the way to the lecture hall, had with her at that time a small, very nice boy of about seven years. She sat in front of me staring silently at the floor. I asked her whether the child I had seen her with earlier was her child. She nodded. I asked why she had brought him to the hospital and she replied to try to find some food for him. The unfolding of the story that she told very hesitantly at first soon began to open up a stream of pent up frustration and rage. Through my translator I joined her rage and disgust at the terrible authorities that would not give food to a hungry child. At some point she smiled and laughed at a disparaging remark I made about the stupid authorities. She was in a positive mood when we parted. Her therapist was pleased and requested that I gave him some suggestions for her treatment. Later that day I received a phone call from a Dr. Mikhail Reshetnikov, the director of the newly formed East European Institute of Psychoanalysis. He said he had heard about my lecture at the hospital from one of the residents, a Dr. Rinat Galiev, and asked if I would come to the institute the next night to give a similar lecture. Again, I agreed. This institute, which has since become like a second home to me, occupies what was once a palace in a city famous for its numerous palaces formerly owned by Russian royalty.

I spoke in a large lecture hall that had various automobile parts hung on the walls, remnants of its previous occupants, an automobile engineering school. My lecture went smoothly. At the end, this same Dr. Galiev brought a patient for me to interview who was constantly verbally attacking him for not helping her with her depression. I encouraged her to tell me what was wrong with her doctor. She quickly warmed to this request with a lot of rage intermittent with laughter when I agreed with her. The students were obviously pleased with the presentation and afterwards Dr. Reshetnikov asked me to return and teach a few classes during my visit and also give some supervision to the senior students at the institute. Thus began a close relationship that has lasted these many years.

Dr. Reshetnikov’s request that I move to Russia and teach eventually led to our selling our house in 1997 and moving to St Petersburg. My wife and I lived there in an apartment close to the Institute for one year while...
I was a visiting professor. It was a thrilling experience. A special feature that I enjoyed was the external program that Dr. Reshetnikov had developed. Students from all over Eastern Europe would enroll for a special program lasting two or three weeks each year with classes, supervision, and personal analysis. As a result, I came to know people from all over Russia and the countries nearby such as the Ukraine and Estonia.

Since that time, my pattern has been to visit Russia about two or three times each year. For example, I last arrived in St Petersburg on Saturday afternoon, September 10th. The next morning, I met with my first therapy group of about 10 people at 8:00 a.m. for 1 1/2 hours, a second group at 9:30 a.m. for 1 1/2 hours and then a supervision group of about 13 people for 1 1/2 hours. The rest of that day was spent with old friends.

On Monday, the morning pattern was similar except that from 1:00 p.m. until 6:00 p.m. I taught classes each day Monday through Friday before catching a sleeper train to Moscow at 11:30 p.m. The classes consisted of my teaching the theory and practice of Oedipal and Pre-Oedipal resistances and supervision with the entire class.

In Moscow I was met at 7:00 a.m. by a Russian analyst named Katia whom I have known for many years. That day, Saturday, I gave a number of individual supervision sessions plus a three-hour workshop on working with difficult patients to people from Moscow and other cities in Russia. Sunday’s routine was similar. Then next day, Monday, Katia fetched me at 8:00 a.m. for the almost two hour ride to the airport to fly back to Philadelphia via Helsinki.

I have gone into the details of my work in Russia mainly to emphasize how eager the people I work with there are to learn and how rewarding it is for me to teach such intelligent, warm, and thankful people. My classes are very popular and are always oversubscribed with visitors and alumni who come back to see me again and learn from me. The classes tend to both be very serious and at the same time permeated with humor and goodwill. It is not unusual for the students at the end of a class to stand up, cheer, and applaud these lectures. This serves as a powerful motive for me to keep returning to the difficult schedule I follow when I am in Russia.

Sometime soon, I plan to submit another paper to explain some aspects of the theory and practice of Modern Psychoanalysis.

* Dr. Spotnitz trained in Neurology at the Columbia Medical Center in New York, but after practicing as a Neurologist for a few years returned to Columbia to do a residency in Psychiatry. He enrolled as a candidate at the New York Psychoanalytic Center and was in analysis with someone who was analyzed and trained by Sigmund Freud. For many years he was a consulting psychiatrist at the Jewish Board of Guardians and also a training analyst at the institute in New York from which I graduated, the National Psychological Association for Psychoanalysis. For a more comprehensive review of his theory of psychoanalysis go to http://www.wikipedia.com and enter the following: “Hyman_Spotnitz.”