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The paper advances the view that Freud's main legacy will be the application of psychoanalysis to community and social problems and issues, rather than in contributions to the treatment of mental illness. The history of applied psychoanalysis is outlined with suggestions for the training and validation of Community Psychoanalysis as a discrete field. How Community Psychoanalysis differs from Clinical Psychoanalysis is reviewed.

The paper finishes with a sketch of typical modern applications to rearing of children and prevention of emotional disorders in children, contributions to understanding large social groups including racial and ethnic strife, school violence, terrorism, prejudice and conflict.

One might term the 21st century, the century of the social brain, an opportunity for rapprochement with the neurosciences. It is unfortunate that the later part of the last century involved a great deal of Freud bashing, spearheaded by E. Fuller Torrey, philosophers such as Crews and Grunbaum, and a vast array of hangers-on guided by personal and job related territorial battles with psychoanalysis, especially in academia. Freud seems to have been a necessary scapegoat for the relative ineffectiveness of psychiatric care in the United States, which for several decades had been dominated by psychoanalytic thought constrained by physician domination of psychoanalysis. Freud might well have been troubled by the way his ideas were employed toward personal and political ends rather than the quest for knowledge and the improvement of the lot of the human race, as always had been Freud's somewhat idealistic aim. America was known to not be one of his favorite countries in spite of a wider acceptance of his ideas here than anywhere else. He no doubt would have embraced the neurosciences, given his conviction that psychoanalytic theorizing would one day be confirmed by neuro-scientific findings.

He was a scientist and a far-seeing visionary. Although it seems he disliked philosophy, he created modes of thought with rules and laws that suggested a philosophy of mind; he coined the term "metapsychology," modeled on the term "metaphysics," his look at philosophy. Clearly, he created his own language and paradigms to approach knowledge (note that the idea of overdetermination is an original contribution to the philosophy of logic), to create a general psychology.

Examining his legacy 150 years after his birth, one tends to look at evidence of his contributions to the treatment of the mentally ill. Rather, we are going to look at some implications of Freud's work for the future of psychoanalysis, and for what we know to be exciting new directions.

Freud was born the year Darwin published The Origin of the Species; he grew up in one of the most exciting times in human history, when the basis of modern science was being laid down by early psychophysicists like Helmholtz, Billroth, and Brucke (Sulloway, 1979).

Freud was a generalist in the best sense of the word, taking many years longer than necessary to get through medical school; he seemed always attracted by challenging thinking, for example his interest in the existential philosophy of the Jesuit Priest, Brentano. His deviations into research, neuroanatomy, and neuropathology are legendary; his gold stain of neural tissue is used to this day, and his pioneering explorations of cocaine led to its use as a topical anesthetic. Some assert that his father was the 1st to have cataract surgery under cocaine anesthesia. Freud, intellectually gifted, had perhaps the ideal academic mind, curious about everything, attracted to ideas, which no doubt fostered the support he received from some of his professors, who provided personal monies to pay for his education. Freud was a Fellow of the Royal Society, making him, along with Albert Einstein, the only selections for this honor in the 20th century. The Royal Society, inaugurated by Goethe, includes luminaries like Isaac Newton, Lavoisier, Charles Darwin, and Michael Faraday.

Our position is that the legacy of Freud include, as he suggested more than once (Freud, 1933/1964), the application of his ideas, beyond the couch and outside the consulting room. There is little doubt that psychoanalysis will have a key place in the training of mental health professionals, and that analytic concepts will be implemented in the training of those who manage people and need people skills for that management, and that psychoanalysis as therapy as well as psychoanalytic psychotherapy will continue to be the lynchpin of dynamic psychotherapies. But we, as did Freud himself (Freud, 1933/1964), do not think these contributions will be psychoanalysis' greatest legacy. We hold the position
that until psychoanalysis is recognized as a body of knowledge that can be applied to understanding and solving pressing community and social problems, rather than hold to its limited application to the treatment of patients with specific psychiatric diseases, or in training those who treat them, it will lose its pioneering relevance in the "social brain" initiative in the 21st century.

Two domains of Freud's thoughts are of particular relevance, both applicable toward the betterment of health not only of the individual but also of society: (1) his interest in human development, which revealed to him opportunities for preemptive interventions on behalf of the development and health of the individual, and (2) his understanding of group psychology, which points to loci where intervention on behalf of the well-being of society has been shown to be feasible. The coequal development of these areas with clinical applications was hindered by many historical and political pitfalls, which we will briefly review.

Determined to establish psychoanalysis as the depth-psychology of the individual's inner mental workings, during this past century we analysts have rigorously focused on the nature of that individual inner mental world. Regrettable for psychoanalysis, when analysts themselves have made efforts to look outside the clinical situation using the lens of and strategies derived from psychoanalysis, until recently, they have been marginalized, at times with dismissive disinterest and even approbation. Anna Freud (1972) argued years ago that perhaps psychoanalysts have been determined to dismiss and distance themselves from other endeavors to explain mental functioning or the treatment of its derailments—such as efforts made by psychology and biological psychiatry—because psychoanalysis was born in such adversity, being rejected from nearly all corners of the globe, such that it had to build a fortress around itself and lay claim, perhaps even as sole proprietor, to the inner workings of human mental life. Anna Freud herself (1958), very protective of what she believed to be the limits of the integrity of psychoanalysis, took some time to come around to endorse the merits and feasibility of depth-psychological direct child observation strongly first put forward in 1950 by Kris (1950) and Hartmann (1950). She was no doubt protective of her father's legacy as she functioned as his scribe and interpreter in the last years of his painful death. So too, her 1976 critique of Andre Green's call for the modification of classical analytic technique toward developing the means for the analytic treatment of individuals with psychotic-type disturbances should be compared to her support for Leo Rangell's more cautious approach to the "widening scope of psychoanalysis" (Stone, 1954).

Anna Freud reflected her support for training of candidates in applied analysis in a paper buried in an early edition of the Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic. In "The Ideal Psychoanalytic Institute: A Utopia" she asserts, "What has not yet been learned or taught are the applications of psychoanalysis without which no analytic training is complete" (1971, p. 238). She points out how difficult it is to distinguish between analytic technique used in nonclinical situations and analytic understanding used in the same situations, a problem that remains unsolved today. Most of the time either the technique of doing psychoanalysis is modified to different conditions and settings. For example, the model of psychoanalytic psychotherapy, or psychoanalytic understanding is applied conceptually to communities with interventions that are not psychoanalytic, but instead psychoanalytically informed (Twemlow, 2000).

From within psychoanalysis, object relations theory, "the broadening scope" of psychoanalysis (Stone, 1954), self psychology, relational and intersubjective and con-structionist approaches pushed against this resistance to make themselves part of, as Rangell suggested, the enlarging domain that is psychoanalysis (see A. Freud, 1976). This resistance evolved in response to the vast and deep rigidity of the various schools of thought, especially prominent in the British Psychoanalytic society, that feel threatened by "deviant" ideas, not derived from the "correct" authority and also from political and economic territorial battles. The worn out comparison with religious infighting and early schools of philosophy is, however, still intriguing, although this is not the place to develop these ideas, see Kirsner (2000) for well argued observations on these matters. Two other study subdiscipline off-springs of psychoanalysis initially abandoned the domain of psychoanalysis in order to exist unimpeded by psychoanalysis' self-protective constraints and to be open to contributions from other disciplines, namely, Attachment Theory (John Bowlby, founder in the 1960s—see Bowlby, 1958, 1960, 1969—with the help of Mary Ainsworth [Ainsworth & Wittig, 1969]) with a recent rapprochement suggested by Peter Fonagy (2001), and Cognitive (now Cognitive-Behavioral) Therapy, introduced in the 1970s by psychoanalyst Aaron Beck. To be sure some might explain our history differently. But it is essential, in order for psychoanalysis to continue to be the fertile field of mental life that it is, that we look at our own history with openness and unafraid self-scrutiny.
Another complication is the rocky path of psychoanalysis as a natural science. Although a number of analysts have done much admirable qualitative research, problems abound when psychoanalysis tries to adopt quantitative methods. The contemporary emphasis on evidence based standards, particularly standards requiring randomization, consensual validation, blinding, and so forth has always been a thorn in the side of psychoanalysis. By contrast, most social and community applications of analytic technique can be measured by standardized outcome measures that are acceptable in almost all other branches of medicine and science. This is in contrast with the difficulties involved in researching what goes on during a session of psychoanalysis, or psychoanalytic psychotherapy since the experimental technique impacts the treatment itself. We think that if we took some of the pressure off “the analytic session” and shifted it onto “analytic applications,” we could justify our theorizing and our procedures without the criticism we seem to try so hard to avoid.

What Is This New Vision of a Psychoanalyst?

Obviously we are redefining what a psychoanalyst actually does, a redefinition a number of us have already begun. The analyst as therapist who treats patients in clinical psychoanalysis is covered in detail by training and certification standards, controversial as they are. The psychoanalyst who applies his knowledge in the service of a community requires additional training, which then should also be considered for certification or validation in some sense. A training process for such analysts should be made available in analytic institutes or in other settings but as part of their institute training. It is not impossible to imagine that for certification of the community psychoanalyst a community problem could substitute for a patient. We have already proposed such a model to the committee on psychoanalytic education (COPE) of the American Psychoanalytic Association in a model that involved a partially successful intervention with the mayor and city council in Topeka, Kansas, called the “The Healthy Community Initiative” (Twemlow & Wilkinson, 2004). This field study was presented to the COPE committee by Twemlow as a case study, not a success story. Transferences, countertransferences, resistances, and enactments were all displayed in gory detail, and without any more than the usual defensiveness. It could have been a meeting of BOPS (Board on Professional Standards). The committee was very open and intrigued with the possibility that communities could also function in this way, and be seen and helped by analysts, and reported the ideas enthusiastically in communications with the American Psychoanalytic association membership.

The next question might well be, what will this 21st century psychoanalyst be like? Aspects of this identity formation are outlined in the introduction to *Analysts in the Trenches: Schools, Streets and War Zones* (Sklarew, Twemlow, Wilkinson, 2004). We present here some thoughts, paraphrasing and quoting directly, from that introduction (pp. xiii-xviii).

The Challenge of Being a Community Psychoanalyst

How an analyst defines his or her identity in a community intervention comes to conflict when a psychoanalyst engaging in such community action begins to make choices between a clinical stance and an active interventionist group-focused stance. The conventional clinical approach would hold the analyst to the role of passive interpreter of group functioning, as in a group therapy. Interpretive insights uncover problems and can prepare the way for the group to collaborate on solutions. Here the analyst remains separate from the group, and the method is expressive. The active interventionist group-focused approach equally values understanding the transference-based expectations of group participants in order to ascertain etiology. However, as the reader will see from the many examples we give below, as well as those given in *Analysis in the Trenches*, the primary intervention is actively to change how the group functions rather than interpret its underlying dynamics. This method is supportive of but no less informed by the analyst’s understanding of the extant conflicts and compromises, as in this example from the book, of “Angolan war-bred youth who had evolved into highway bandits [who] began to repair their damaged sense of themselves when enlisted to secure the roads for the delivery of supplies and medicine…” (Sklarew, Twemlow, Wilkinson, 2004, p. xii). The simultaneous opportunity to fantasize about violence while protecting themselves and others from it, undercut the accrual of unconscious guilt, allowing for self and social reparations.

The mode of action employed by an analyst to initiate problem-solving dialogues between community stakeholders, and to draw out of the participants’ helpful approaches toward the
reframing of questions and solutions, offers a unique [strategy to] approach [dealing with] violence and trauma. The following principles elaborate the active interventionist group focused approach (Volkan, 2001; Twemlow, 2000a):

1. To establish a point of similarity between participants that allows for toleration of differences in others and negative emotions without reacting impulsively or angrily.
2. To develop the habit of collaboration by initially addressing nonconflictual issues to help establish common ground and agreement.
3. To develop personal relationships and perceptions of each other, so that the people and the process become humanized.
4. To establish mutual respect for differences which have the potential to trigger racial, religious, gender, or ethnic stereotypes.
5. To develop an agreed-upon common language to communicate ideas.
6. To understand that the process is not a magic bullet and requires continued maintenance.
7. To understand that only a collaborative nonblaming, rather than competitive, partnership will result in change.
8. To achieve an understanding by all participants that the facilitator(s) must remain neutral in the psychoanalytic sense, that is, not adopt sides or advocate a particular position but instead encourage mutual problem solving. (Sklarew, Twemlow, Wilkinson, 2004, pp. xii-xiii)

These points help to illustrate the idea that the community psychoanalytic method is more actively supportive than interpretive, but the psychoanalytic knowledge-base for action is essential.

**Psychoanalytic Identity Derived From a Mode of Action:**

We found at a conference where analysts from 20 different countries discussed efforts to inform the public about psychoanalytic ideas that the discourse returned repeatedly to the topic of the psychoanalyst's "identity" as a professional highly trained in procedures designed to alleviate mental suffering, and how that "identity" as expert could be successfully represented to the public. We have at times gotten the impression that some analysts believe that the psychoanalyst's expertise is reason enough for the community to heed his or her wisdom, even to beat a path to the consultation room.

Those among us who do psychoanalytic community work, for example, the authors who contributed to the volume *Analysts in the Trenches* (op. cit.), have learned the wisdom of enlarging our analytic identity. Rather than presenting ourselves as able to help by virtue of our rigorous analytic training and clinical expertise, as if credentials and expertise in treating individuals in depth were sufficient recommendations in and of themselves, the progenitors of the projects we are talking about here have foremost advocated learning from the community in vivo what the existing problems are and asking to be part of the team that is problem solving, asking just how we can be helpful. We have found that being helpful may be the best way psychoanalysts can make their mission known to the lay public. When people feel they are being helped, they become appreciative, even respectful, of us, of our training and clinical background—by then being a psychoanalyst no longer makes us some "ivory tower egghead."

The community analyst is required to exercise flexibility in technical engagement with community members and demonstrate personal humility, forging an analytic identity derived from the mode of action undertaken. We know this to be especially true with applications addressing community violence, observing directly children's aggressive behaviors, as well as making efforts to optimize child rearing practices, especially in ethnic communities other than one's own. Interpretation is generally not the most desirable intervention; transference may be more important to leverage, to use on behalf of the community, than to understanding and putting our interpretations of it before the community. Analytic abstinence may be undesirable, and neutrality may need to be defined along entirely different dimensions; for instance, explaining why a rearing strategy may or may not work well is facilitated by examples of one's own experiences as a parent—and then the proof lies in the pudding. In certain types of community interventions, the analyst may not be involved with delivering the intervention, but rather may be a member of a team, not the leader. Other team members may approach community problems in a manner that is counteranalytic, if not antianalytic. Such stakeholders are just as important to the team functioning as the analyst, and it is incumbent on the analyst to accept a more limited role in attempts to solve complex social problems.
Clearly, we psychoanalysts have much to contribute by virtue of our understanding of unconscious determinants of irrational actions within groups and our appreciation of process over time, invariably having to constructively modulate expectations of immediate change and improvement. As “community psychoanalysts” we are applying our knowledge of the influences of unconscious processes, including transference, projective identification, projection, and other defenses, to population groups. We articulate and integrate theory with observable phenomena in considering how internal and external factors interact to influence development and adaptation.

The next issue is how one molds that community psychoanalyst identity from a largely clinical training. How are the approaches similar and different? Sallye Wilkinson has developed a set of ideas listed here in outline form (2004, work in progress):

**Psychoanalytic Resources to Promote Understanding Relative to Analytic Identity: A Non-Exhaustive List of Considerations**

**Clinical Perspective**
- Analyst's expertise attributed to benefits of psychoanalytic training. Analyst has expertise that the patient does not have
- Focuses on pathology
- Analyst serves individual patients
- Analyst works confidentially with individual
- Neutrality is protected through "equidistance" (variously defined)
- Trauma is to be recognized and integrated
- Relationship is laboratory for change
- Transference is used to bring to the individual patient's attention to problematic behaviors
- Regression is necessary to elucidate "clinical facts"
- Countertransference analysis is valuable data and helps address apparent impasse
- Technique addresses resistance
- Technique hinges on interpretation
- Relative thrust toward autonomy and differentiation of the individual
- Enhance reflective self-functioning

**Community Perspective**
- Analyst's expertise conferred by degree to which she is helpful; fosters leadership and collaboration in community experts (parents, teachers, police, etc.)
- Focuses on prevention, adaptation and restoration
- Groups are recipients of interventions
- Analyst works publicly to change how a group functions
- Neutrality is protected by an altruistic focus on goals which may be passionately held
- Trauma defines group membership
- Relationships are mutative; partnerships between stakeholders across multiple sectors of community enhance outcome
- Transference is used to propel adaptive solutions without necessarily interpreting
- “Facts” developed from shared experiences and examined in context (contrasts with administrative or nonpsychoanalytic fact-finding)
- Partners from different disciplines can help each other take off blinders inevitably created by distinct points of view
- Resistance creates opportunity for subversive pressure that may be more experiential than interpretive. Allows for identification of conditions necessary for a shift to collaboration.
- The act of designing an interaction between antagonistic groups brings to light obstacles to change.
o Relative thrust toward community-generated solutions
o Enhance community response-ability across different groups/identities

Elements in Common
o Developmental perspective imperative; in fact, developmental perspective may be missing from more traditional community problem solving strategies
o Holding and containing are an important frame of reference
o All sides of the conflict are respected and privileged in the process of working through
o Appreciation of the other's subjectivity
o Sufficiently motivating anxiety is necessary
o Compartmentalized solutions for specific symptoms are likely to fail
o Urgent requests to fix/short-term solutions are best examined further" Freud saw and specified the remarkable potential of applications of psychoanalytic knowledge to social problems. In 1933, he specified one of the applications he believed of far-reaching potential.

The Application of What We Have Learned to the Rearing of Children—Pathways to the Prevention of Experience-Derived Emotional Disorders

Psychoanalytic understanding of human development has opened pathways for the prevention of experience-derived emotional disorders in children and thereby so too in later adults. Having observed its feasibility over time, in 1933, in his New Introductory Lecture XXXIV “Explanations, Applications and Orientations,” Freud looks over some “applications of psycho-analysis to the mental sciences.” There are too many, he says, to speak of in detail, but he tells us, “there is one topic which I cannot pass over so easily—not, however, because I understand particularly much about it or have contributed very much to it. Quite the contrary: I have scarcely concerned myself with it at all.2 I must mention it because it is so exceedingly important, so rich in hopes for the future, perhaps the most important of all the activities of analysis. What I am thinking of is the application of psycho-analysis to education, to the rearing of the next generation” (p. 146; italics added).

“Perhaps the most important of all the activities of analysis.” As we shall note in a moment, Freud's far-reaching vision evolved gradually. Here in 1933, 77-year-old Freud recorded this remarkable predictive assessment after more than 30 years of clinical experience with the treatment he conceptualized.

In his 1933 Lecture XXXIV, Freud talked about the reach of psychoanalysis. We read what he said then (quoted above) to mean that what we have learned from our clinical and empirical psychoanalytic work can with ingenuity be beneficially applied to the rearing of the next generation. The 2nd footnote on page 146 tells us that “though this [in 1933] is perhaps the longest of Freud's discussions on the relations between analysis and education,” he spoke of it en passant in numerous places including as far back as in the “Little Hans” case history (1909), in 2 prefaces of books, 1 by Pfister (1913), the other by Aichhorn (1925/1944). The editors tell us that he also commented on sex education in The Sexual Enlightenment of Children (1907) and 30 years later in Analysis Terminable and Interminable (1937/1968a). And with more assurance than when he wrote Moses and Monotheism (1939/1968b), Freud ventured to put forward an hypothesis on the nature of religion and spoke of religious education in The Future of an Illusion (1927/1961b). It is important to note that as the editors of the Standard Edition (1964) tell us on page 147, footnote 1, “the German word Erziehung” here translated education, “has a much wider meaning than the English word and includes ‘upbringing’ in a general sense.” Although certainly matters psychoanalytic, such as the existence of an unconscious part of the mind, defense mechanisms, that dreams do have meaning, and so forth, are being taught even to elementary school-age children today, and later are taught in psychology courses, we here emphasize the application of what we have learned from psychoanalysis, clinical and research, to the rearing of the next generation. Indeed Freud observed that "We realized that the difficulty of childhood lies in that fact that in a short span of time a child has to appropriate the results of a cultural evolution which stretches over thousands of years, including the acquisition of control over his instincts and adaptation to society—or at least the beginnings of these two. He can only achieve a part of this modification through his own development; much must be imposed on
him by education” (p. 147). We should note that Anna Freud (1956), formerly a schoolteacher, fully endorsed Freud's view.

One of us, Parens and his research team, began studying correlates of the mother-child relationship with the development of ego functions in the child, adventitiously found that helping mothers observe their children’s behaviors and discussing with them the possible psychological meanings of these behaviors, that educating them about their child's development, helping them find solutions to deal with their children in “growth-promoting” ways found visible confirmation that one can “teach” parents a great deal that is essential to the constructive rearing of their children. Parens found that “growth promoting parenting” can be taught in different contexts (Parens, 1988, 1993). From this start, Parens and collaborators developed voluminous educational materials for optimizing the parenting children receive (see below). When in the early years of this protracted project during which we developed parenting education materials—applying what we have learned in psychoanalysis about optimizing the child's development, in effect applying it to the rearing of the next generation—Parens sought the views of Anna Freud and of Margaret Mahler on this application effort. Sample materials were sent to Anna Freud and to Mahler for their comments. Within 2 weeks, in a letter to Parens, Anna Freud wrote, “I agree with you absolutely that psychoanalytic knowledge can be invaluable if brought to the public in this and other ways, and that at present, not enough is done about this” (A. Freud, 1978, personal communication). Margaret Mahler's response was equally supportive of these efforts (1978, personal communication).

Thrust by what Parens et al. found during their now more than 30 years’ efforts in the application of development-optimizing psychoanalytic knowledge toward the “prevention of experience-derived emotional disorders in children via parenting education,” the positive outcomes in terms of the then-children's object relations, social and school adaptation, their aggression profiles, and their mothers' optimizing parenting (Parens, 1993), states of being that have held up for 3 decades as recently confirmed in a 32-year-follow-up study (Fallon and Parens, work in progress), they affirm Freud’s vision and document its feasibility. In Vivo confirmation of Freud's vision, a multiformatted program of educational materials was developed: Parenting for Emotional Growth (PEG), consisting of PEG: Textbook, and PEG: A Curriculum for Students in Grades K thru 12, Sets of Lesson Plans for Grades K thru 10 (Parens, Rose-Itkoff, & Reid, 1997, work still in progress). Also deriving from PEG: Textbook, a PEG: Workshops Series for Child Caregivers—Parents, Daycare Workers, and so forth (Parens & Rose-Itkoff, 1997a). In addition, Trauma—Workshops: On Helping Children and Parents Cope With It (Parens & Rose-Itkoff, 1997b). The PEG materials have also been formatted for class settings for adults, that is, PEG: An Adult Curriculum (work in progress) by Parens, H., Rose-Itkoff, C., and Reid, K. (2002).


**Applications of What We Have Learned to Problems of Groups and Society**

Freud's introductory thoughts on group psychology can be put to service in understanding, and where feasible, in modifying group behaviors, as for instance in interethnic conflict. Interethic conflict is frighteningly widespread in our world. A number of analysts are bringing their psychoanalytically derived knowledge to bear on understanding and even to intervening in the resolution of interethnic conflict. Volkan is by far the most engaged among us in intervening directly amid government-sponsored, interethnic conflict resolution.

In another application of psychoanalytic knowledge to complex social systems, Twemlow and his colleagues, motivated by disasters such as the Columbine school shooting, have brought their understanding of adolescent human dynamics into strategies for the reduction of bullying in schools—a problem that has reached crisis proportions. This team of workers, based in the Child and Family Program of the Menninger Department of Psychiatry, Baylor College Medicine, also includes Peter Fonagy, Eric Vernberg, Frank Sacco, Todd Little, Bridget Gamm, Jennifer Mize, Anne Jacobs, and Ed Dill. Their work has encompassed a randomized controlled trial of an intervention to reduce bullying in elementary schools, labor dispute mediation, intervention in cities in 3rd world countries with burgeoning crime, work with city governments, and collaborative work with the FBI and law enforcement agencies to help assess the “school shooters.” Papers can be obtained by writing to Twemlow at stuart.twemlow@gmail.com and consulting the websites, http://www.backoffbully.com/, where some
papers are available to download, and http://www.iaaps.org/. Below, we have adapted comments made by Twemlow and Jon Cohen, PhD, in an editorial for a special issue of the Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies, on Stopping School Violence (2003).

Our work in schools has shown that although individual psychopathology and genetic endowment of a child impacts how he or she interacts with others, the expression of violence and difficult-to-handle behavior in schools is always heavily influenced by its interpersonal roots. With rare exceptions, these individual factors can be modified if a child is attending a school that can manage social aggression. Put another way, there are very few, if any, psychiatric conditions in which a child or adolescent will become violent without the input of environmental influences.

We feel that school administrators and curriculum planners should keep in mind at least 6 specific dimensions of a child's social and emotional life, which if enhanced, can ensure a solid foundation for steady academic progress and skills to manage bullying. These are:

- The capacity for self-reflection and mentalizing; that is, the capacity to think about themselves, how they come across to others and how others see them
- The capacity to solve personal and interpersonal problems including conflict resolving and mediation skills
- The capacity to make, maintain and deepen friendships
- The capacity to control, modulate and sublimate impulses
- The capacity to work in teams cooperatively and collaboratively
- The capacity for altruistic behavior toward others; peers, adults, those in need and the environment including a broader sense of social responsibility and respect for the quality of the social context within which they live

A psychoanalytic perspective would assume that for a child to further develop and stabilize these capacities, the school should provide a background of safety and a feeling of wellbeing derived from an ego with skills appropriate to the task, a holding environment of adults who can respond appropriately to the child's developmental needs, an environment that provides containment, and helps children process negativity in relationships, processes that help children regulate affect, value relationships, and learn to mentalize in a secure attachment experience and finally supports that encourage children to function as responsible members of the open social system of the community (Twemlow, Fonagy & Sacco, 2002). The challenge is enormous and regrettably too many schools do not provide children with these environmental attributes.

Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, & Ruan (2001) found that more than 16% of U.S. schoolchildren said that they had been bullied by other students during the current term, and approximately 30% of 6th through 10th grade students—about 5,736,417 kids—reported being involved with some aspect of moderate to frequent bullying, either as a bully, as the target of bullying or both. The study revealed that these patterns were consistent across urban, suburban, town, and rural areas, and that bullying has short and long term psychological effects on both those who bully and those who are bullied. Victims experienced loneliness and reported having trouble making social and emotional adjustments, difficulty making friends, and poor relationships with classmates. In addition, victims often suffer humiliation, insecurity, and loss of self-esteem, and they may develop a fear of going to school. It is also known that educators bully students and are bullied by students (Twemlow, Fonagy, Sacco and Brethour, 2006). Today educators often feel most bullied by parents. Each year, 160,000 students stay home from school because they do not feel safe there (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 1999). Only 40% of 14 to 18-year-old students reported feeling safe in school (Park, 2002).

The impact of frequent bullying often accompanies these victims into adulthood. They are at greater risk of suffering from depression and other mental health problems. Bullying behavior has been linked to a range of antisocial behaviors (e.g., vandalism, shoplifting, and dropping out of school) as well as use of drug and alcohol. Olweus and Limber (1999) suggested that bullying can lead to criminal behavior later in life: 60% of males who were bullies in grades 6 through 9 were convicted of at least 1 crime as adults, compared with 23% percent of nonbullying males.

Social and emotional violence inevitably overlap. What occurs socially affects emotional experience, and the emotional meanings that the person attributes to experience, in part, shape social life. There is no accepted definition of emotional violence. More typically, educators and parents focus on what 1 person
or group does to another. Many think of emotional violence as the negative emotional consequence of abusive, rejecting, degrading, terrorizing, isolating, and exploitative or even unresponsive social experience. These experiences certainly do tend to have negative emotional consequences.

We suggest that emotional violence is a function of the meanings that the person attributes to experience. In this sense, emotional violence can and often is directly related to the actions of others: “They rejected me. They think I am a geek. This makes me feel stupid.” Emotional violence has subtle effects on self-experience. For example, a child who cannot admit to not always knowing the answer or ridicules another child who admits ignorance is committing a powerful, potentially life-shaping form of emotional violence. If we as adults and educators consciously and/or unconsciously label “not knowing” as “bad,” it will inhibit the child asking questions and necessarily limit learning and healthy social-emotional development. There is mounting evidence that it is the meanings that we attribute to violent moments that is what is most damaging (Garbarino & Delara, 2002).

The events of September 11, 2001 exposed many children to terrifying violence. Poor children are exposed to crisis on a regular basis, be it violence they see on the streets or between caregivers and themselves. We analysts bring to the problem the fact that it is the meanings that children attribute to these experiences as well as the attunement (or lack of it) that adults show that has the most profound impact of what the effects of violence will ultimately be in the lives of our children.

It is also known that research about youth violence demonstrates that it is not an intractable problem. We now have the knowledge and tools to significantly reduce or even prevent much of youth violence (Surgeon General's Report, 2001).

There is a growing consensus that effective violence prevention in schools necessarily involves 3 overlapping processes: (1) identifying and intervening with “at risk” students; (2) teaching students the skills and knowledge that promote the social and emotional competences that provide the foundation for reflective learning and nonviolent problem solving; and, (3) developing systemic interventions that enhance safer, more caring and responsive schools and optimally, communities (see Catalano et al., 2002 for a recent review). However, this work is too rarely implemented in an effective manner.

We feel, bringing our psychoanalytic knowledge and clinical experience to bear, that there are seven overlapping factors that have inadvertently undermined effective violence prevention efforts:

1. Lack of vision and multiyear commitment and funding
2. Lack of comprehensively understanding the child developmentally and as a thinking feeling human being
3. Lack of an integrated approach to systemic factors in the school environment
4. Physically, socially and emotionally unsafe schools
5. Too little training and support on the part of the adults to recognize “at risk” students
6. Tendency to focus only on the physical aspects of safety
7. Lack of attention to adult role models of bullying and nonbullying behavior

Thus, bringing our analytic understanding to effective violence prevention efforts, we bring to awareness the need for the school and the community to develop their vision of a multiyear commitment to create safe, caring, and responsive places where students will learn not only academically but socially, emotionally, and ethically. Effective violence prevention efforts also need to be comprehensive and integrate efforts between educators, parents and members of the community both individually and systemically. Cognitive, social, emotional, physical, and moral developments are integrally interrelated and all potentially affect the child’s ability to learn. Since effective violence prevention efforts, in part, rest on sound emotional understanding of the child, his needs and the relationships those around him have in school, we point to the fact that when people are related in healthy ways, they recognize when others are in distress. They care and naturally “reach out” and ask, “What is going on?” They listen. When they are anxious (“This doesn’t feel right.”), they act.

At the end of the day, we bring to awareness that all violence prevention programs come down to relationships: our ability to listen to ourselves, to recognize others’ experience and use this information to solve problems, to learn and be creative together. Good teachers have always known this. Most good teachers automatically “reach out” to connect with students. Such teachers appreciate that how students feel about themselves and others and how they manage or mismanage relationships shapes their ability
to learn, but for the most part—except for those educators of preschool and the early grades who have slowly come to recognize the need for it—American education has tended to view emotional life of children as not part of the basic work of teaching.

It is only in recent years—and we see the point of psychoanalytic understanding there—that there has been a burgeoning of research into how healthy relationships foster a student's ability to learn and to solve problems in nonviolent ways (Cohen 1999, 2001; Pianta 1999). Since family, peer group, school, and neighborhood are interconnected systems, all of these sectors of life influence one another and influence children's development. We know, and the literature is extensive, that, for example as Loebner and Stouthmaner-Loebner (1998) report, aggression at home relates to aggression in schools and certain risk factors in home predict aggression in schools. There is mounting research support for the notion that better violence prevention results will be achieved if school-based interventions are coordinated, collaborative endeavors that involve a vital school-home-community partnership (Cohen, 1999, 2001). We know equally that efforts to optimize experiences children have in their families dramatically optimizes their aggression profiles, the aggressive behaviors they bring to school, and ultimately their school experiences (Paren, 1988, 1993).

Learning how to be a part of collaborative problem solving in schools is a complex and difficult task requiring mutual trust and understanding, and yet is so rewarding and so important for effective violence prevention as well as health promotion efforts. Many schools have developed these processes idiosyncratically while others utilize data driven models that delineate a series of steps and ways of evaluating the efficiency of given interventions (e.g., Carr, Dunlap, Horner, Koegel, Turnbull, et al., 2002). Such research-based or individually motivated efforts are all important in the prevention of youth violence (Pasi, 2001).

There are a number of additional processes that tend to impair collaborative problem solving efforts, such as when teachers and school administrators simply do not communicate with one another and thus fragmenting potentially helpful violence prevention efforts. For example, many schools still do not include what we know to be essential for healthy school life and the students' future, that is cooperative learning, conflict resolution teaching, anger management classes, antibullying efforts, health education, parenting-preparation education, sex education, and service learning in their health education curricula; all of which may directly and/or indirectly foster recognition of "at risk" students, as well as the prevention of youth violence (Pasi, 2001).

In recent years, the culture and climate of schools have become dominant concerns for educational administrators as well as teachers. These considerations have been spotlighted not only because of lethal violence but also because educators appreciate that when students feel safe, academic achievement increases (Fonagy, Twemlow, Vernberg, Sacco, & Little, 2005; Cohen, 1999; Zins, Weissberg, Walberg, & Wang, in press). However, administrators do not often take steps to effectively create safer, more caring, and responsive schools. Too often, character and social, emotional and educational efforts are substituted by inadequate and inappropriate "anger management" programs like those used at Columbine High School: Predictably they do not teach students social emotional skills and knowledge. Limited, as our experiences may be to date, we have found that when we analysts get involved in attempts to deal with social problems such as these, some results are impressive.

School personnel can and should be trained to recognize the signs that a student may be in danger of acting violently. Too few school personnel are sensitized to the range of subtle as well as dramatic ways that students (and sometimes teachers) are emotionally and socially abusive and violent to others. We can help school personnel understand the range of signs of physical, social, and emotional violence so as to provide them with the information needed to "stand up" and address the problem and/or seek help from others. All too often this is not done and the personnel overfocus on the issue of physical safety without appreciating the critical importance of social and emotional safety.

Other examples from the field are reported in Analysts in the Trenches, as well as in several chapters of September 11: Trauma and Human Bonds (Coates, Rosenthal, and Schechter, 2003). These collections of essays show the varied ways in which analysts are bringing their psychoanalytic knowledge to serve society—to determine the dynamics of and to deal with disparate societal problems; see especially the model for "bringing psychoanalytic strategies to bear on solving community problems" (Twemlow and Wilkinson, 2004, p. 105). Foremost is the application of what we analysts know to dealing with danger and trauma, individual and group, that occur in forms as various as crime (see Marans,
the National Academy of Sciences, and to deal with the enlarging problem of violence and its aftermath. See also Fonagy and Higgitt's (2004) thoughts on some implications of what we know toward prevention of mental illness in children for government and society.

A further reach by psychoanalysts is evident in the participation of a number of colleagues who are engaged in activities of the United Nations' Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO). Individual colleagues have for years participated in a variety of specific interest groups, one on mental health, another on the women's rights, UNICEF's Committee on Education, while other colleagues participate collectively as the Committee to the United Nations of the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA-CUN), chaired by Afaf Mahfouz. To date efforts of the IPA-CUN have led to a number of high-profile psychoanalytic "sightings": (1) the inclusion in the U.N. Resolution on "A World Fit for Children" of the need to attend to children's emotional, as well as physical health (Parens, 2002); and (2) current efforts include the development of preventive and treatment strategies for members of the U. N. teams subjected to serious stress and trauma in the field (Mahfouz, Harris and Pender, work in progress). In addition, the IPA-CUN has presented a series of programs—a January 2003 panel on ethnic conflict (the Israeli-Palestinian conflict) and a January 2004 panel on racism—which have been enthusiastically received by NGOs. Secretary General of the U.N. Kofi Annan, under mounting pressure after the virulent attack on Israel at the Durban International Congress for Peace, as well as the recent genocidal conflicts in Bosnia, Rwanda, and Darfur, has spoken out against racism of all kind. Kofi Annan's George Burns Award acceptance remarks, which launched a series of speeches on his part against racism, followed the 2 IPA-CUN panels in January 2003 and 2004 that drew much attention at the U.N. Is it an omnipotent fantasy to wonder if these IPA-CUN panels influenced Kofi Annan, and thrust not only his speeches but also to Shashi Tharoor's (Under Secretary of Public Information at the U.N.) launching a series of well-attended day-long conferences entitled "Unlearning Racism," the first 2 of which were one on Antisemitism and Islamophobia.

The Problem of Prejudice: What Is It and What Can We Do to Mitigate it?

Freud's (1927) interest in the nature of religion, an interest spurred by Romain Rolland's request to him to explain the nature of "the oceanic feeling," an experience that has long been recognized by religious thinkers, was sufficient to yield his The Future of an Illusion (1927/1961b). Whatever of this work is questioned by some of us, Freud's broad social interest in humans in the aggregate was not new in 1927 since he had also studied and ventured to explicate aggregate human behavior in Totem and Taboo (1913/1955a), as well as in "Group Psychology and the analysis of the ego" (1921/1955b) and in his Moses and Monotheism (1939/1968b).

In 1927, Freud mentioned religious education in passing. Some among us want to bring attention to this question as we look at prejudice, what it is and what we can do to mitigate it. Young-Bruehl notes in her enormous volume The Anatomy of Prejudices (1996) that studies of prejudice by analysts fail to take into consideration the theories of prejudice developed outside of psychoanalysis. In a lengthy critique, she cautions the tendency toward "overgeneralization" with regard to prejudice. We share her view that whatever we analysts can contribute to this question ought to be assumed to only be one view or even only one aspect of what is and what causes the various types of prejudice of which Young-Bruehl speaks extensively. We believe, that psychoanalysts should be guided by her concerns, but also that by looking at prejudice as psychoanalysts are prone to do, might shed light not just on what it is and its causes, but might open it up to interventional strategies that might be implemented to mitigate, and perhaps reduce that prejudice that has and continues to plague our world.

On the other side of Young-Bruehl's critique is the fact that we analysts must lend our findings, our understanding of them and our tendencies to explicate, to the collective efforts of all the disciplines that have undertaken prejudice as a topic of critical importance. Some among us are at work in this area of social concern, convinced that psychoanalysts, in our application to social issues of what we have learned in the clinical situation with adults and children and in our studies of human development, can lend a hand in the world's attempts to deal with "malignant prejudice" (Parens, 1999a, 1999b, 2001).

Cosponsored by the International Psychotherapy Institute, spearheaded by David Scharff, the International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies (Stuart Twemlow and Nadia Ramzy, coeditors), and the International Association for Applied Psychoanalytic Studies, spearheaded by Twemlow, an International Conference on Prejudice and Conflict held in Salt Lake City in December 2005 showed the
Does Psychoanalysis Have Anything to Offer Toward an Understanding of Terrorism?

Analysts have attempted to comment on terrorism, with varying degrees of success (Twemlow, 2004). Similarly, with terrorism the topic is so awful and so personal that it is difficult to discuss it with any degree of rationality. In a recent issue of the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* (Twemlow, 2005), an attempt was made to approach the topic as a psychoanalytic controversy. Twemlow took an attitude to terrorists, as requiring understanding before negotiation could occur. Larry Friedman took an impatient but traditional view that terrorists might be beyond negotiation.

The list serve discussion of the papers often seemed to imply that if one took the attitude that terrorists could be negotiated with, it would be an act that would be seen by others as supporting the enemy. Several contributors characterize the terrorist as a nonhuman entity, precluding the possibility of negotiation, in spite of no evidence of any characterizing mental illness in terrorists. Surely, the hallmark of analysis has been its understanding of individual conflict; suggesting the capacity to see issues such as prejudice and terrorism as solvable problems, and not ones that merely require the extermination of the persecuted or the enemy.

The thinking in this article suggests a set of parameters for a curriculum to train community analysts. They were recently proposed to COPE, a committee of the American Psychoanalytic Association who influences training curricula in psychoanalytic institutes. The work of a subcommittee of COPE: Nancy Kulish and Stuart Twemlow (cochairs), Henri Paren, Steve Marans, Jon Cohen, Alan Felix, Sallye Wilkinson, Ray Poggi, Bruce Sklarew, Phyllis Cath, Moisey Shopper, and Bennett Simon devised the curriculum reported below.

**A Model Curriculum for Psychoanalytic Institutes to Teach a Course Entitled “Applications of Psychoanalytic Knowledge to Community Problems and Social Issues”**

**Conceptual Framework**

This curriculum has as its goal the introduction and expansion of applications of psychoanalysis in line with Freud's vision for the future of psychoanalysis, that is, psychoanalysis applied to the treatment of the individual and to the optimal handling of community (social) problems. The complex nature of human motivation and behavior has shown itself plausible through the lens of psychoanalysis, itself a complex system of observation and explanation. The natural science model with emphasis on parsimony and manifest evidence has proved too limiting to provide satisfactory explanations of human functioning, a challenge the psychoanalytic enterprise was made for. The complexity of community and social problems similarly makes parsimony and relying solely on manifest evidence too limiting for satisfactory explanation and for developing optimizing interventional strategies. Recent advances in neuroscience and philosophy illustrate the necessity of multidimensional theorizing. American ego psychology was moving in this direction, taking off from Robert Waelder's theory of multiple functioning and Freud's theory of over determination which laid the philosophical ground work for complex multidimensional, ever changing
dynamic concepts of the human mind, supported in recent years by modern neuroscience discoveries and by theories of mind that are nonreductionistic. Theories of community functioning and complex experiential social problems, like that of the individual human being, cannot be reduced to simple logical linear thinking. The contributions of analytic researchers over the past 30 to 40 years who have demonstrated that psychoanalytic thinking and knowledge can be usefully applied to complicated social systems. This course represents a maturation of this line of thought.

We put forward the view that for the further fruition of psychoanalysis in its 2nd century, for validation that, as Freud envisioned and stated with deliberation in 1933, psychoanalysis can be applied to facilitating resolution of social problems and can be applied to optimize the life and health of the community. American, indeed, International Psychoanalysis will have to recognize the status of “Community Psychoanalysis,” that is, psychoanalysis applied to the community’s social problems, as coequal and complementary to psychoanalysis as an individual clinical treatment model. This course is an initial effort to cover the areas of studies necessary to prepare candidates for the community psychoanalysis model.

There are different ways of conceptualizing models for teaching. Foremost is defining the knowledgebase and the skills necessary to become a community psychoanalyst; both are needed to effect projects that address community problems. The list of areas applicable for such work is impressive: For example, methods to reduce violence in various community settings (e.g., Twemlow) and methods for optimizing children’s emotional development (e.g., Paren, Scattergood, et al., 1997, Paren, et al., 2005) need to be distinguished from approaches to social issues, for example widely cultural problems like racial and ethnic diversity and the question of “peace and coexistence” (e.g., Halperin, 1997), various forms of discrimination and prejudice (e.g., Mahfouz [2003 and 2004 Panels on Prejudice at the UN]; the Salt Lake City Conference on Prejudice, 2005; Paren, 2005). More abstract but far-reaching are the influences of folklore and cultural mythologies on both individual and community functioning (e.g., Freeman, 1998, 2005) and so forth, which may also be included in such a curriculum. Thus, such a curriculum should address not just community problems but social issues. There is a possible meeting point for such discussions around issues like gender, sexual orientation, age, social class, racial and ethnic origins, cultural origins, political and religious ideologies, and community cohesion and its relationship to personal functioning.

**Specifics of the Curriculum**

**TRACK I (3rd Year).** The curriculum could be divided into 2 tracks. The 1st track would cover the development of an identity as a community psychoanalyst (3rd Year):
1. Identity as a community psychoanalyst
2. Compare the concept to clinical models
3. Study the history of psychoanalysis as a general psychology versus a general treatment method
4. Study the approaches to community and social issues including ones that focus on effecting change through action compared to effecting change through consultation and interpretation
5. A study of small group dynamics
6. A study of large group dynamics
7. How to get involved in the community

This track would focus on several aspects of the identity of the candidate in the community and other social settings, not the least of which has to do with the transition from a very private personal identity to a public identity. Candidates would be exposed to the problems involved with public speaking, speaking to groups in English (or French, or German, etc.) that is not laden with psychoanalytic technical language, working with teams who are not psychoanalysts or are even antipsychoanalytic who would bring to such a setting the unique focus of psychoanalysis on unconscious and preconscious dynamics. In such a setting the identity of the candidate will be molded not into something daunting or anticlinical but instead expanded and focused on groups rather that individuals, on unreality and reality rather as well as intrapsychic processes. It is possible, even desirable, that as part of this track there will be an experience of group dynamics as first used by Bion. It is not necessary to have many hours of such exposures since the regression in groups and their basic assumptions can be produced in a group exercise of not more than 2 hours in length. Models of teaching could include analysts who have been able to discuss their
work without using “psychoanalaeese.” Individuals other than the authors that come to mind in this regard, writing technically for journals but in a clear style when writing/speaking to the nonanalyst, include Selma Fraiberg, Robert Stoller, Erik Erikson, Glen Gabbard, and Stanley Greenspan. Such a track may include reviewing examples of simple clear writing that is not reductionistic but at the same time does not rely excessively on jargon to convey psychoanalytic ideas to nonanalysts.

We suggest that this track take about 10 sessions to cover the required materials with sufficient comprehensiveness. TRACK II (4th Year). Subject matter would include interventions in communities and circumscribed studies of social issues and problems.

This track would take a look at how the issues developed in Track I are applied to specific community and social problems. It is recommended that institutes select from a series of topics, field studies and circumscribed projects accessible to their own specific geographical area. For instance at the Psychoanalytic Center of Philadelphia, a course was given by H. Parens and R. M. S. Fischer in 2002-2003 for child analysis candidates on training DHS Family Centers leaders in parenting education. Another model for teaching that has proven effective is to ask a luminary in a field of interest to be available for candidates to ask questions about his or her methodology and project. If this is conducted by telephone and after hours, it proves inexpensive, and the format would be that candidates prepare questions for the luminary, leaving at least half an hour for discussion about the responses regarding the project. The candidate would then have read several papers by the luminary and support material as needed.

Clearly this particular track would not be large enough to cover most of the extant community applications and the institute should select the series to illustrate a number of basic applications:
1. Addressing community problems that have become relevant to immediate community needs, for example, violence
2. Addressing more primary prevention issues for example (a) improving the social and emotional development of children at home and (b) improving the social and emotional education of children in schools
3. Organizational consultation where agencies who are not working effectively request a more traditional clinical model consultation to help them function
4. The impact of social issues on community integration and cohesion for example the role of immigrants, refugees, exiles, different socioeconomic groups and racial/ethnic groups on community functioning
5. The area of negotiation and mediation particularly of labor disputes and political issues. This is a specific area of application
6. Working with underprivileged populations for example addressing issues that are chronic, for example dealing with the homeless populations
7. Publicizing oneself as community psychoanalyst. How to present oneself to the community, how to write a letter to the editor, how to respond to social problems in a way that demonstrates that psychoanalysis has something to offer. The seminar would address how successful psychoanalytic programs that have managed to garner community support.

These 2 tracks would have as their goal the creation of a new identity for the analyst in addition to her/his work with adults and children and adolescents and would give the analyst skills in large and small group dynamics, public speaking and public communication, clarifying community and social issues, and working with teams of individuals where psychoanalysis is only a part of the solution.

Concluding Comments

In a note entitled “Psychoanalytic Thinking Applied to Social Issues: A Vision of the Future,” Twemlow (2000b) quoted Eric Erikson, who in a talk while in India in 1963, delivered a statement that continues to reverberate (Erikson, 1964): “Man’s sociogenetic evolution is about to reach a crisis in the full sense of the word, a cross roads of offering one path to fatality, and one to recovery and further growth. Artful perverter of joy and keen exploiter of strength, man is the animal that has learned to survive ‘in a fashion,’ to multiply without food for the multitudes, to grow up healthily without reaching personal maturity, to live well but without purpose, to invent ingenuously without aim, and to kill grandiosely without need” (p. 2). Erikson commented at the time that it was his hope that insight and knowledge would help civilize mankind, reflecting the traditional hope of the early analytic enclave beginning with Freud in his
remarkable essay “Civilization and its Discontents” (Freud, 1930/1961a), where he chided religion for having failed dismally in that task, suggesting that science should be given a chance. Our sense is that psychoanalysis has much to contribute to an understanding of and solution for these ever growing problems noted by Erikson. We hope territorial battles and power struggles will not make it impossible to realize this limited and yet quite realistic goal, since a significant collaborative effort will require input and leadership from disciplines not traditionally sympathetic to psychoanalysis.
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