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Editorial
Going Forward

After several years of negotiation, two votes and multiple bylaws amendments, PANY is now for practical purposes merged with its sister institution, the Institute for Psychoanalytic Education Affiliated with NYU School of Medicine. We are now both an institute, an educational organization, and a society, a membership organization that represents and furthers the interest of its members and of psychoanalysis.

PANY maintains its name and its corporate identity, but it has one corporate member, IPE. According to our revised bylaws, voted into effect in January, the practical functions of the society will be managed by a committee, the “PANY Committee,” which operates under the authority of the IPE Board of Trustees and has representation in the Board of Trustees.

The revised bylaws define the functions of the PANY Committee: “The PANY Committee shall promote professional development, research, training and practice in the field of psychoanalysis, including practice development and post-graduate education.”

The new PANY Committee was structured so as to replace the PANY Board of Directors under the new structure. That Board served for a span of over six decades. This gives us a good starting point. We can look at what PANY has been doing both in the past and recently.

I have attended nearly all the PANY Board meetings over the three years that I have been serving as Director of IPE, actually going back to three years ago when I was Director Elect. During this time, the PANY Board met approximately monthly. However, a good portion of the time spent in those meetings concerned the merger, itself, with questions of whether and how to merge. Now that that is over, the new Committee will have the luxury of focusing more on other issues, even if the frequency of meetings is reduced. Nevertheless, we can look at what PANY has been doing in recent years as a starting point going forward.

My impression, both recently and in my many years as a member of PANY is that the most prominent function of the Society has been the maintenance of a high level of scientific meetings. Although there has been discussion at times of decreasing attendance, the quality of the program has been very steady. I’ll take this moment to thank Dr. Marina Mirkin for her excellent programming and attention to detail. I would add that she is part of a long tradition of excellent program chairs. In fact, the maintenance of our scientific meetings would appear to be the easiest task before us. Obviously, if we find that attendance by members is declining, we should think about reaching out to members in some form to determine causes and suggest solutions. This may well be part of a general focus on “Inreach” at IPE.

Practice Development has been a more recent focus. Under the supervision of Dave Newman, Bob Chalfin and Chap Attwell, PANY has run a “Practice Gym” as a means of offering members advice and an exchange of ideas about developing and maintaining a successful analytic practice. That will clearly be a continued focus of the new committee. In addition, the PANY Committee should be open to and encouraging of other ideas that may be of help for practice development. There is reason to hope that when IPE develops a new website that it can be used to further practice development of members.

Another recent approach to professional development has been the Journal Club that met monthly under the supervision of Barry Rand. Like many such efforts in which groups of members gather regularly for scholarly or clinical discussions, it had a natural life span. Nevertheless, this and other similar projects should be a consideration going forward. I recall similar past attempts at seminars and discussion groups conducted by the society and the institute that lasted for some time and were quite successful, most notably to my mind the joint meetings on applied analysis that
Editorial
Going Forward

included members of the Psychoanalytic Institute and Society and members of the English department at NYU over 20 years ago and the series of seminars with visiting speakers some years later that were organized by the late Len Barkin. Sometimes the past can be a guide to the future.

One mission that is not spelled out in the bylaws amendments is the preservation and enhancement of the PANY/IPE analytic community. This should be a focus going forward. Certainly the various meetings and projects already mentioned are a big part of that. The Scientific Meetings are a major gathering point for our members. In addition, PANY has a tradition of fostering parties and other social gatherings, often mixed with a professional focus. I would include the annual PANY Fall Welcome Back party that now is also the gathering at which we honor those who have completed psychoanalytic training at IPE during the previous year as well as the recently instituted Holiday party in December. The PANY Committee should be thinking about such events as well as other potential vehicles for community enhancement. It is likely that the question of a list serve, message boards or something similar will be coming up in its discussions.

I think the *PANY Bulletin* could also be included in the potential means of fostering community. It is a vehicle for members to express themselves, tell others about what they have been doing, and, of course, announce their professional accomplishments.

We should also keep in mind that PANY is our official link with the community of the American Psychoanalytic Association. For better or worse, institutes have no representation in APsaA, only societies. Our councilor to the American Psychoanalytic Association will be a standing member of the PANY Committee and will report to us about what is happening at the APsaA council.

There will likely be other functions and missions evolving over time, but I want to focus on one which is as important as it is ill defined, the ongoing governance of IPE.

It was envisioned during the discussions concerning merger of PANY and IPE that the Education Committee (EC) and the PANY Committee (PC) would function side by side under the aegis of the IPE Board of Trustees, one focusing on education, the other on societal functions. The merger agreement attempted to set up that structure with the creation of the PANY Committee and of its representation on the Board of Trustees and on a Finance Committee that has been established by the Board.

What is ill-defined is exactly how this bicameral government will work. For the entire life of IPE, the EC has been the primary governing body of what was an educational institution. Even after incorporation, when it was placed under the authority of the Board of Trustees, it still functioned in this way for most practical matters.

Now, we are combining societal functions and educational functions within the same institution. In theory, societal functions are to be administered by the PANY Committee and educational functions by the Education Committee. The problem is that these functions are not always easily separated. The faculty of the educational branch of IPE is also, with a few exceptions, the membership of the societal branch.

What happens when one branch of governance wants to take action that may affect the function of the other branch? Does the Board decide? Ultimately, yes, but there are probably better practical solutions before it gets to the Board. It seems likely that there will be inter-committee discussions at times.

Ultimately, this should be a good thing. For the most part, we are the same people sitting in different meetings. The details of governance will evolve through experience.
Dear Members

As always, the Program Committee looks forward to your suggestions for topics and speakers. Even more importantly, we are looking to you to participate and share your work with the PANY/IPE community. Whether you have an idea for a lecture or a panel or clinical material to present, we would like to hear about it. Our membership has a lot of talent and expertise to offer to each other and to the general public, and scientific meetings are an excellent forum to showcase them. Two out of five meetings in the 2016-2017 academic year were organized by or with the participation of PANY members. We hope this number will increase.

With warm regards,

Marina Mirkin  
Chair, PANY Program Committee

### Scientific Meetings

**September 18, 2017**
C. Philip Wilson, M.D. Memorial Lecture  
Harold Blum, M.D.  
The Wilson Lecture will be on the subject of Hate, the exact title to be determined.

**October 16th 2017**
Harvey Schwartz, MD  
Illness in the Analyst — 30 years later

**November 6, 2017**
Gil Katz, Ph.D.  
Contemporary Views on Enactment and Therapeutic Action: The Enacted Dimension of Analytic Process

**December 11, 2017**
Jeffrey Rubin, Ph.D.  
Meditative Psychoanalysis

**January 9, 2018 (will take place at NYPSI)**
Joint NYPSI-IPE Scientific Meeting.  
Moderator - Ted Jacobs, M.D.  
Panelists: Harold Blum, M.D., IPE  
Claudia Lament, Ph.D., IPE  
Lissa Weinstein, Ph.D., NYPSI  
Phil Herschenfeld, MD., NYPSI

**March 19th, 2018**
James Herzog, MD  
The Child as Teacher; The Child as Text: Learning from Each Analysand how to be a Trustworthy Co-Explorer of the Inscape.

**April 21, 2018**
Symposium in Honor of the Work of Samuel Abrams, M.D.  
Moderator: Claudia Lament, Ph.D.  
Contributors:  
Alexandra Harrison, M.D.  
Rona Knight, Ph.D.  
Robert Michels, M.D.  
Arden Rothstein, Ph.D.  
Murray Schwartz, Ph.D.  
Noah Shaw, M.D.  
Lissa Weinstein, Ph.D.

Freud Lecture: To be announced.
My Experience Treating Vocalists

by Doonam Kim, M.D.

I hope that Dr. Kim’s fascinating description of his work with vocalists will encourage others to send us accounts of their own specialized work. HHS

“Voice is more than a mechanical or acoustic phenomenon. It is a mirror of personality, a carrier of moods and emotions, a key to neurotic and psychotic tendencies.”

Friedrich S. Brodnitz, M.D.

For over the past 5 years, I have focused part of my practice on treating the mental health concerns of vocalists, usually meaning singers, but also others whose livelihood depends on their voice (i.e. teachers, speakers, etc.). At first, I had a few vocalists in my practice that I did not approach differently than my other patients. What started off as regular, casual coffee with a colleague/friend who taught vocal pedagogy at the NYU Steinhardt School, led to my developing a practice addressing the more specific mental health concerns of vocalists. I had audited his graduate school class and got to know various members of the New York City voice community. Now I get referrals to address issues most often related to poor adjustment to vocal injury, performance anxiety, and suspected psychological cause of vocal dysfunction when no organic pathology has been found. As a result of my collaboration with the voice community and requests for me to present topics specific to voice, I have researched different issues and discussed them with a variety of voice specialists. As such, what I would like to cover in this brief overview of some of my work with singers are general personality characteristics of singers and a list of general points to keep in mind that set singers apart from other musical performers. I will then briefly mention some of my experience treating singers from a dynamic perspective.

So what can we consider as part of the mental makeup of singers? Almost every time I met with a speech-language pathologist, a vocal coach, a voice teacher, or an otolaryngologist and they learned that I was a psychiatrist interested in learning more about voice, I was often met with a smile and the comment, “Great! A psychiatrist! You should know that we (singers) are all crazy.” (Their words, not mine.) I had heard this enough times that I had to follow up, investigate, and verify such a characterization. According to Rosen:

“Typically, successful professional voice users (especially actors, singers, and politicians) may fall into a personality subtype that is ambitious, driven, perfectionistic, and tightly controlled. Externally, they present themselves as confident, competitive, and self-assured. Internally, self-esteem, the product of personality development, is often far more fragile.” (Rosen, Heuer, Levy and Sataloff, 2005)

I also discovered more:

“Punt has described the personalities of professional actors and singers as intense, volatile, excitable, emotional, neurotic, anxious, temperamental, moody, intemperate, vain, and unstable.” (Rosen and Sataloff, 1997)

I was fascinated that within the voice community itself, there was a self-acknowledged distinction of the singer’s personality. From my own clinical experience, I found that singers are often ambitious, resilient, talented, and hard working. However, I also found they can be emotional, sensitive, self-conscious, insecure, and neurotic.

Next, to better understand the mindset of singers, over many meals and cups of coffee I have asked vocalists and voice teachers what might set singing apart from other forms of musical performance. I received interesting feedback. First, singing involves anatomy that require detailed calibrations with muscles that are not necessarily under more direct voluntary control as compared to playing an instrument or dancing. Also, it does not help that, relative to other instruments, the vocalist hears something entirely different from his/her audience. This distortion is due to the effect of receiving sound from conduction through both air and head tissues, rather than receiving the sound of someone else’s voice on the external ear canal only conducted through air. This awkward phenomena is often experienced when hearing one’s own recorded songs.
voice and characterized by the phrase, “Is that really what my voice sounds like?” Also, singers, compared to instrumental performers, can often endure much more highly subjective critical reviews. Vocalists may dedicate a lifetime honing their craft, but an audience member might react negatively simply because the singer’s voice reminded him/her of an annoying relative. Or they might say, “I don’t know what it is, but I just simply don’t like the sound of his/her voice!” A subtler point is that compared to actors, singers might experience a higher level of vulnerability given that they are sharing a more personal vocal tone that lies outside a typical speaking range. This might explain why many people are reluctant to sing anywhere outside the privacy of their own shower. Lastly and most importantly, in singing, you are your instrument. As such, receiving feedback or criticism about your singing is often received much more personally. It is often not so easy to say, “Oh, it is not that they do not like ME, they just do not like my voice.”

Whether I am addressing a patient’s poor response to vocal injury, difficulties with performance anxiety, dealing with the demands of a stressful career, or flushing out the psychological underpinnings of a conversion disorder that is affecting the voice, much of my initial work with voice patients involves a great deal of support. Initial issues I often address are how to handle panic and performance anxiety, clinical depression, increasing one’s sense of control, and refocusing the patient’s attention on not trying to be perfect, but refocusing on what is “good enough.” A later issue that I might often address with singers in long-term dynamic therapy is the pervasive sense of never feeling good enough. Unfortunately, the life of trying to be a working singer in New York City encourages an unhealthy pressure to strive for perfection. This unhealthy pressure is reinforced by the industry’s perpetuated ideas of “you are only as good as your last performance”, if one cannot keep up doing 8 Broadway shows a week you will be replaced, and never let anyone know you have a vocal injury because you will be dropped. One actor patient I had treated told me that finding out about her vocal fold paresis was “more devastating to me than my cancer diagnosis.”

Although an oversimplified generalization, from an analytic perspective, I often notice this atmosphere encourages these patients to sustain and maintain an unhealthy transfer-

ence from childhood. I often find that my voice patients come from upbringings that involved difficulties trying to please or appease a parent. This could be based on reasons that include, but are not limited to, the parent being difficult to reach, emotionally unavailable or invalidating, or even suffering from mental illness or an overt personality disorder. As such, these patients often have a strong and reinforced sense that they are never good enough and the solution is then to strive to be perfect. Although this pressure to be perfect might dangle the hope of receiving the nurturance they hunger for, this validation they seek often never really comes in the way fantasized. Even if this perfection is achieved in a performance or getting cast in a relished part, it is often temporary and short-lived. Also, it is often impossible to sustain, especially in NYC’s musical theater arena where “the show must go on” and vocalists have to maintain a high level of performance for months. The combination of the singer’s sensitive and emotional personality and the singer’s strong identification of the self as one’s voice often leads to an emotional crisis when a singer is referred to me after a vocal injury. As such, frequently my therapy work with singers focuses on better distinguishing their own individual sense of self from their voice.

“The voice is seen as the product of the self, rather than an equivalent to the self. For many performers, this is painfully difficult.” (Rosen, Heuer, Levy and Sataloff, 2005)


The Graduate As Seen 50 Years Later

by Herbert H. Stein

“Hello Darkness my old friend ...”

This year marks the 50th anniversary of The Graduate. Benjamin Braddock is 71 years old. He had his 21st birthday one week after coming home from college. He flew home alone to his parents in southern California. It’s not clear if they simply did not attend the graduation or if he took some extra time in the east after the ceremony.

As I recall it, for those of us who were part of Ben’s generation, the film was spellbinding. I remember my classmates in medical school talking about it long after having seen it, and I presume I saw it more than once. One classmate pronounced excitedly that he had figured it out. “He’s schizophrenic!”

I decided to see it again with a hope that I might gain some additional understanding of its impact. I don’t think I succeeded in that, but I did see, or perhaps imagine, something that would never have occurred to me in 1967.

Spectrum Cable (formerly Time Warner) gives The Graduate five stars and provides a concise, if lifeless, description of the plot: “An aimless college man (Dustin Hoffman) lets an older woman (Anne Bancroft) seduce him, then finds himself falling for her daughter (Katherine Ross).”

That is the basic plot. It doesn’t sound like much and the film is listed at 1 hour 47 minutes, not long by today’s blockbuster standards; but even in 2017, watching it on a small screen, I found it riveting, with a sinister tension that I don’t think I felt as a young man. I don’t have a complete and clear memory of my reactions in late 1967 or early 1968, but as I recall it, I was more taken with the second part of the film in which a young man, seemingly lost and shy, ends up having the date of a lifetime with Katherine Ross’s character, Elaine Robinson. The ending—in which Ben breaks into Elaine’s wedding to another man, screaming her name through an enormous glass window looking down on the ceremony and then defending her from the wedding party with a large wooden cross—was electric.

But the follow-up to that scene left some people perplexed. Fresh off their victory, Ben and Elaine run to catch a bus, moving to the back with all the riders staring back at them. Elaine is dressed as a bride. At first they are laughing together, smiling, but slowly, as the music starts up to “The Sounds of Silence,” first Ben and then Elaine look forward with a quiet inward stare, unsmiling, unexpressive.

The film begins with that same stare, with Benjamin sitting in an airplane. His face is expressionless. We hear an announcement saying that they are about to land in Los Angeles. I was surprised that the experience of being on an airplane has not changed dramatically in 50 years. As we see him going down an escalator to pick up his one small suitcase, we hear Simon and Garfunkel singing “Sounds of Silence.” Ben’s face remains expressionless and when he does move to pick up the suitcase and to walk with it, there is an extreme economy of movement. He is dressed impeccably in a dark suit and tie. There is nothing in his body language or his demeanor that conveys any sense of affect. The film moves seamlessly to Ben sitting in front of a large fish tank, not moving, still expressionless. There is an eerie quality to his lack of emotion. My medical school classmate attributed it to schizophrenia. I have another thought.

With Ben so impassive, the action must come from others. His father enters the room and asks what’s wrong. In a quiet voice, Ben tells him he is thinking about his future. The sense we get, however, is that it is empty thought. His father urges him to come downstairs where “All our friends are here.” He clearly means Ben’s parents’ friends. We never see or hear mention of Ben’s friends. Perhaps they are back east where he went to college. In the realm of the fantasy, they do not exist.

The following scene is much talked about. Ben enters a crowded room, filled with middle aged and elderly people who are eager to congratulate him and, in one famous case, give him advice, “Plastics.” He is simply trying to get away from them, but just seems to bounce from one to the other. He finally escapes to his room, but Mrs. Robinson barges in, played by a still very attractive Anne Bancroft. We will learn that she is the wife of Ben’s father’s business partner. We see a little more emotion
in Ben in the form of a muted anger at her intrusion.
And yet, in a tense exchange she verbally coerces him to drive her home. It is clear that she does not cajole or even seduce him. She coerces him, using her assumed authority and sealing it with a coda in which she throws his car keys past him into the fish bowl, so that he must retrieve them in what appears to be the first in a series of humiliations.
We don’t question her authority, in part because she plays her part so coolly and efficiently, ignoring his muted protest as she enters his room, lights a cigarette and, not finding an ashtray, says in a subtly demeaning manner, “Oh, I forgot. The track star doesn’t smoke” as she places her match beside her on his bed. He meekly picks it up and throws it in the wastebasket.
We accept her authority in part because of her superb acting, but it must have a context for us. On the surface, we see an older woman, a close family friend, with a shy young man, struggling to get past adolescence. But watching it with older eyes, it occurred to me that we also accept it as an adult talking to a child.
There are other cues that help to create that atmosphere. We can start with the direct visuals and camera work. Benjamin Braddock, Dustin Hoffman, is slim and relatively short. In the early scenes, he somehow appears to be smaller than the adults who surround him with kind advice in that opening party scene. He is shorter than both his parents, shorter than Mrs. Robinson and Mr. Robinson. We know that a filmmaker can arrange the camera work to even out such discrepancies. I don’t know how tall Katherine Ross is, but when he is in scenes with her later in the film, the difference in height is less pronounced. In the opening scene at the party, Benjamin appears to be surrounded by older, bigger people.
He is also treated as a child by his parents, particularly his father, who parades him in front of family friends, gives him toys, adult toys, but toys nonetheless. In one of the opening scenes, he forces him to march out to the pool area to a group of onlookers in his new deep sea diving outfit, replete with wetsuit, flippers, mask, snorkel and oxygen tank. He reluctantly accepts this role.
There is no doubt that this film was designed to capture a sense of the innocence of youth confronting the corruption of their elders. This film was released in the midst of what might be called a youth rebellion. Hippies dominated San Francisco and elsewhere and the baby boomers were being told not to trust anyone over 30. JFK had been killed in Dallas four years before and older politicians had led us into Vietnam.
But in creating that atmosphere, the film makers have left us the possibility of experiencing an even darker image, the image of an adult knowingly sexually abusing a child.
Throughout the seduction, Mrs. Robinson manipulates Ben, using her authority as an adult who has known him all his life. In all their dialogue, he calls her Mrs. Robinson (we never learn her first name) and she calls him Benjamin.
She plays with his mind, causing him to feel that he is the guilty party. Having gotten him into his house under the pretext of being nervous entering it alone in the dark, but also using her authority, she puts on music, has him pour her a drink and tells him to pour one for himself. She tells him he has to stay with her there because her husband won’t be home for hours and she’s afraid to be alone.
In a moment of anxious insight, he protests, “For God’s sake, Mrs. Robinson, here we are, you’ve got me into your house. You give me a drink. You put on music, now you start opening up your personal life to me and tell me your husband won’t be home for hours.”
“So?”
“Mrs. Robinson, you are trying to seduce me.”
But he quickly reverts to his child-like position. There is a pause as she stares at him. In a weaker voice, he asks, “Aren’t you?”
“Why, no, I hadn’t thought of it. I’m rather flattered that you ...”
“Mrs. Robinson, will you forgive me for what I just said?”
He continues to plead for forgiveness, castigating himself for having such a thought.
Only minutes later, the seduction begins in
earnest in her daughter Elaine's room with
Elaine's portrait watching them. She has
taken him there to show him the portrait. As he
stands watching it, we see her by the bed
behind him, taking off her jewelry. Listening
to the dialogue, it's not difficult to imagine an
interaction between an adult and a child.

"Benjamin?"
"Yes?"
"Will you unzip my dress?"
After a pause, she adds, "I think I'll go to
bed."
"Oh, well, goodnight!"
"Won't you unzip my dress?"
"I'd rather not Mrs. Robinson."
"If you still think I'm trying to seduce you..."
"No, I don't. But I just feel a little funny."
"Benjamin, you've known me all your life."
"I know that, but I'm..."
"Come on." She turns her back to him,
telling him, "It's hard for me to reach."
He reaches out to pull the zipper down.
"Thank you."
"Right."
He starts toward the door. She asks him,
"What are you so scared of?"
"I'm not scared." (He clearly is.)
"Then why do you keep running away?"
"Because you're going to bed. I don't think I
should be up here."
She lets her dress fall, revealing her leopard
spot bra and slip.
"Haven't you ever seen anybody in a slip
before?"
"Yes, I have, but I just... Look, what if Mr.
Robinson walked in here right now?"
"What if he did?"
"Well, it would look pretty funny, wouldn't
it?"
"Don't you think he trusts us together?"
"Of course he does. But he might get the
wrong idea. Anyone might."
"I don't know why. I'm twice as old as you.
How could anyone think..."
"But they would! Don't you see?"
There is something childlike in his attempt
to convince her, as if she just doesn't under-
stand.
"Benjamin, I'm not trying to seduce you. I
wish you'd..."
associated, repressed memories. Of course, that comes before the seduction, but if we see the film as a whole, as a fantasy, in fact, we might see the opening scenes and the later seduction as part of an interior story. It is as if we are seeing a patient who presents with a strange, muted affect and difficulty speaking, only later revealing the early sexual experience behind it.

This may be why the Simon and Garfunkel song, written and popularized before the film was made, seemed so fitting for this film. Here are the opening words of the song:

“Hello darkness, my old friend
I’ve come to talk with you again
Because a vision softly creeping
Left its seeds while I was sleeping”

I’ve italicized the last two lines to emphasize the suggestion of an image implanted in dreams, a nightmare that comes as a vision softly creeping. I’ll give the rest of the verse:

“And the vision that was planted in my brain
Still remains
Within the sound of silence.”

In the context of childhood sexual abuse, the term “sound of silence” takes on an added meaning, the silence, heard perhaps in dreams, that must be observed by the child, the perpetrator and the adults who care for the child.

But the film offers a potential, if partial, cure. After the initial seduction, in which Mrs. Robinson tells Ben that she is available to him, he eventually calls her to meet for drinks. Following Mrs. Robinson’s instructions, a very nervous Ben begins to rent rooms at a hotel for his affair with Mrs. Robinson. We see a montage in which Ben moves from his parents’ pool to the hotel room where he lies on his back while Mrs. Robinson unbuttons his shirt. It appears that that is his life until Elaine Robinson returns from college.

Until Ben meets Elaine, he is like a child living totally in the world of adults. She is the first person around his own age that he interacts with in the film. We don’t know if he had friends in college, but this is a fantasy and in a fantasy, what is relevant is what is there. Ben is isolated and abused in a world of adults.

Ben is pressured into taking Elaine out on a date by his parents and by Mr. Robinson. He is warned by Mrs. Robinson that he must never take her on a date. At one point, when he brings up the idea when they are together in bed, she grabs him by the hair, pulling his head back, clearly frightening him. Nevertheless, pressured by the threat of both families getting together for a dinner for him to meet Elaine, he decides to ask her out with the intention of scaring her away.

In effect, he takes on the role of the abuser, subjecting her to something akin to the abuse he has suffered. He picks her up in the little red sports car with the top down that was one of the toys his father bought him. He drives at breakneck speed, not talking to her, his eyes hidden under sunglasses. She is frightened and asks if he always drives this way. He says, “yes,” slamming on the breaks to stop behind another car and drags her into a strip club.

They are seated near the stage, her back to the stage. An exotic dancer comes on, spinning something from her breasts. When she gets right behind Elaine and spins her nipple projections above her head, Elaine is clearly feeling hurt and humiliated. Tears come to her eyes.

Seeing her tears, Ben is suddenly brought out of his own dissociative state. It is as if his seeing her pain and her ability to express it allows him to recognize and acknowledge his own. He gets up, shoeing away the stripper and they both leave the club, she running ahead of him. At this point, he takes off the glasses and begins to talk to her. Somehow, they kiss (it is a fantasy) and go to find a drive-in burger place where we see them talking and laughing together. She later asks if he’s been having an affair and he admits to it, not telling her with whom. She asks if it is over and he tells her “yes,” truthfully. Elaine is a vehicle of cure for him. For the first time, he has come to life and is willing to begin to share his demons.

The next day, Mrs. Robinson intervenes, threatening to tell Elaine that the affair was
with her. Ben beats her to it, starting to tell her the truth when Mrs. Robinson appears outside the door, Ben looking at her. Elaine understands and tearfully demands that he leave. As he does, he looks at Mrs. Robinson and we see her, now looking small, seemingly huddled in a corner of the hallway.

In the aftermath, it is Ben who is accused of being the perpetrator by Mr. Robinson, who tells him to stay away from his daughter. Ben has followed Elaine to Berkeley, where she is in school dating another man who is seemingly more mature and corrupted than Ben. When Ben is trying to find out where the marriage is, he goes to the locker room at the groom’s school and hears him described as “the make-out king.” It is in this context, that Ben races around, finds the church and interrupts the service seemingly at or just before its conclusion. As he screams out Elaine’s name and she comes running towards him, we see Mrs. Robinson, Mr. Robinson and the groom all angrily mouthing some kind of hatred towards him.

Which leads to that enigmatic ending, which I described before. Ben and Elaine run to catch a bus, moving to the back with all the riders staring back at them. Elaine is dressed as a bride. At first they are laughing together, smiling, but slowly, as the music starts up again to “The Sound of Silence,” first Ben and then Elaine look forward with that quiet inward stare we saw at the beginning of the film, a sign of the trauma they have now both endured.

“... And the vision that was planted in my brain
Still remains
Within the sound of silence.”

---

**Bulletin Board**

**Affordable Psychoanalysis**

Psychoanalysis is available at reduced fees for adults, adolescents and children through the Institute for Psychoanalytic Education affiliated with NYU School of Medicine (IPE). Consultation is free and confidential. For information call the Institute office at 646 754-4870.

**Training in Psychoanalysis and Psychoanalytically Oriented Psychotherapy**

*IPE* accepts applicants from all clinical disciplines as well as applicants from academic disciplines who are interested in learning about *Psychoanalysis* or *Psychodynamic Psychotherapy*. For brochures and application materials, contact the IPE office at 646 754-4870.

Loans are available from PANY to defray the cost of tuition for candidates of IPE in good standing.
Letters to the Times

To the Editor:
Re “Executions Need Doctors” (Op-Ed, April 22):
Dr. Sandeep Jauhar argues that “physician presence at executions is consistent with our mandate to alleviate suffering.” I disagree. His opinion isn’t just at odds with the American Medical Association; it is also fundamentally at odds with core medical ethics.

As individuals, physicians can have their own positions on the death penalty, but nothing about an execution is a medical procedure. It is a form of punishment that in the United States is overwhelmingly carried out unjustly.

While Dr. Jauhar argues that a physician may be able to alleviate suffering during an execution, the presence of a physician lends false credibility and a veneer of humanity to a practice that is anything but credible or humane.

Even physicians who choose to help terminally ill patients end their own lives are keeping faith with the dying. Nothing about assisting in the death penalty could possibly be construed as keeping faith with the condemned.

After the horrors carried out by Nazi doctors during World War II, the World Medical Association affirmed that doctors must “maintain the utmost respect for human life from its beginning even under threat.” Doctors are trusted to act in the best interests of their patients, and participating in an execution fundamentally violates that trust.

KERRY J. SULKOWICZ, NEW YORK
The writer, a psychiatrist, is chairman of the board of directors, Physicians for Human Rights.
April 25, 2017

To the Editor:
Goldwater rule, schmoldwater rule. It doesn’t take a psychoanalyst (although I am one) to see a dangerous behavioral pattern in President Trump: It’s not just truth but national safety that are slain on the altar of his grandiosity and need to shore up his self-esteem. The very fact that the president cannot be counted on to be truthful is perilous, given the need for someone in that office to be reliable in times of crisis.

The firing of James Comey was, arguably, motivated in part by such needs. The leaking of information to Russian officials in the Oval Office - done, according to some accounts, as part of a boast of just how much inside knowledge he has - is the most recent.

Anxiety about his access to the nuclear codes is well taken. How much longer before he attacks somewhere (like North Korea) just to show what a very big guy he is?
DENNIS HASELEY, NEW YORK
May 17, 2017
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News and Notes of Members

Honors

Dr. Anne Erreich was the IPA-CAPSA Visiting Scholar at the International Psychoanalytic University in Berlin, Germany and the Alexander Mitscherlich Institut in Kassel, Germany where she was a case conference discussant in April, 2017.

Dr. Alberto Goldwaser was made the Chair of the ‘Forensic Neuropsychiatry’ Special Interest Group (SIG) of the American Neuropsychiatric Association in March, 2017.

Dr. Doonam Kim, was interviewed in a recent documentary video entitled “You’ll Say Nothing” by Elisa Monti, which won the International Society for the Study of Trauma and Dissociation (ISSTD) 2017 Media Award: Audio-Visual about the effects that trauma can have on the voice. The video can be viewed at vimeo.com/196587758.

Dr. Samantha Leathers was graduated from her psychiatric residency at NYUSOM in June, 2017.

Dr. Kerry Sulikowicz was invited by the graduating class of the NYU Psychiatry Residency to be the keynote speaker at their graduation.

Authors

Papers


Book Reviews


Speakers

Dr. Anne Erreich presented Border crossings: Points of contact between psychoanalysis and linguistics, cognitive/developmental psychology, and philosophy of mind at the International Psychoanalytic University, Berlin, Germany in April, 2017.

Dr. Erreich presented Redefining unconscious fantasy: Its role in a model of the mind and a possible solution to the problem of theoretical pluralism at the Alexander Mitscherlich Institut, Kassel, Germany in April 2017.

Dr. Herbert Stein presented “The Psychodynamics of Oz as seen through Kansas” at the Brooklyn VA Psychiatry Grand Rounds on April 21, 2017.

Dr. Stein presented “Manic Defenses against the Impact of the Holocaust in Grand Budapest Hotel at the Long Island Psychoanalytic Association on February 13, 2017.
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PANY at the Spring Meeting

Carlos Almeida was the Chair and a Presenter at Symposium 1: I Am An(Other)

Brenda Bauer gave the introduction to the Panel: A Psychoanalytic Perspective on the Gun in America.

Jack Novick and Kerry Kelly Novick were Co-Chairs of Discussion Group 18: Parent Work in Psychoanalysis.

Harvey Schwartz was a Chair and Presenter at the Committee Sponsored Workshop 1: Teaching About Analytic Case Writing.

PANY/IPE Members

Please send your information for News and Notes to herberthstein@gmail.com.

or by snail mail to

Herbert H. Stein, M.D.
425 East 79 Street
New York, NY 10075