

Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts
fall 2022

Psychology 495
Special Topics: Psychoanalysis
Carter J. Carter Ph.D., LICSW
Carter.Carter@MCLA.Edu
Office Phone: 413-662-5310

Office Hours: Mondays at 12:00, Wednesdays at 3:00 & Thursdays at 4:00, CSI 326A

Course Map

*A star indicates a week with particularly heavy reading

1. Introductions

McWilliams, N. (2004). *Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy: A Practitioner's Guide*. New York: Guilford Press. **Pp. 27-45 (required), pp. 1-26 (strongly recommended).**

Seligman, S. (2019). The new psychoanalysis. Retrieved from <https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/the-return-of-psychoanalysis>.

Ogden, T. (2005). What I Would Not Part With. *Fort Da 11* (B2), **pp. 8-17.**

2. Freud Part 1: Drive Theory and the Seduction Theory*

Freud, S. (1896). The Aetiology of Hysteria. In Strachey, J. (Ed.). *The Standard Edition* (Vol. 3). London: Hogarth. **Pp. 191-221.**

Freud, A. (1992). *The Harvard Lectures*. New York: Routledge. **Pp. 4-20**

Half the class will read . . .

Bettelheim, B. (1982, March 1). Freud and the Soul. *The New Yorker*.

And the other half will read . . .

Freud, S. (1952). *Sigmund Freud: An Autobiographical Study*. New York: W.W. Norton. **Pp. 11-17.**

3. Freud Part 2: Structural Theory, via “Mourning and Melancholia”

Freud, S. (1917). Mourning and Melancholia. In Strachey, J. (Ed.). *The Standard Edition* (Vol. 14). London: Hogarth. **Pp. 243-258.**

Eng, D. & Han, S. (2000). A Dialogue on Racial Melancholia. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues 10* (4), **pp. 667-700.**

Recommended:

Kristeva, J. (1992). *Black Sun: Depression and Melancholia*. New York: Columbia University Press. **Pp. 3-30.**

4. Freud's Interlocutors and Critics

Ferenczi, S. (1949). Confusion of Tongues Between The Adults and the Child—(The Language of Tenderness and of Passion). *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 30. **Pp. 225-230.**

Jung, C.G. (1981). *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. **Pp. 42-53.**

Jung, C.G. (1906). Letter from C.G. Jung to Sigmund Freud, December 29, 1906. *The Freud/Jung Letters: The Correspondence Between Sigmund Freud and C.G. Jung*.

Heuer, G.M. (2001). Jung's Twin Brother: Otto Gross and Carl Gustav Jung. *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 46 (4), **pp. 655-688, and it's fine to skim.**

5. Anna Freud & Ego Psychology*

Freud, A. (1992). *The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense*. New York: Routledge. **Pp. 42-50, 109-122.**

Hartmann, H. (1958). *Ego Psychology and the Problem of Adaptation*. Madison, CT: International Universities Press. **Pp. 1-35.**

Sheehi, L. & Sheehi, S. (2021). *Psychoanalysis Under Occupation: Practicing Resistance in Palestine*. New York: Routledge. **pp. 45-56**

Case Analysis #1 Best By Due Date is Friday This Week!

6. Klein & (Neo-)Kleinians

Klein, M. (1946). Notes on some Schizoid Mechanisms. In Klein, M. (1993). *The Writings of Melanie Klein Vol. 3: Envy and Gratitude and Other Works, 1946-1963*. New York: Karnac Books. **Pp. 1-22.**

Bion, W.R. (1959). Attacks on Linking. *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 40, **pp. 308-315.**

Rasmussen, B., & Salhani, D. (2010). A contemporary Kleinian contribution to understanding racism. *Social Service Review*, 84(3), **pp. 491-513.**

Strongly recommended, but could be read most any week, needn't be this one:

Ogden, T.H. (1979). On Projective Identification. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 60, pp. 357-373.

Dennis, E. (2022). The Paranoid-Schizoid Position and Envious Attacks on the Black Other. *Psychoanalysis, Self, and Context* 17, pp. 141-153.

7. Middle Group

Winnicott, D.W. (1947). Hate in the Countertransference. In *Through Paediatrics to Psychoanalysis*, pp. 194-203.

Fairbairn, W.R.D. (1943). The Repression and the Return of Bad Objects (with Special Reference to the "War Neurosis"). *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 19, pp. 327-341.

White, K.P. (2002). Surviving Hate and Being Hated: Some Personal Thoughts about Racism from a Psychoanalytic Perspective. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis* 38 (2), pp. 401-422.

Recommended, because it will tie together readings from this week with future ones:

Frederickson, M.S. (1992). Hate in the Countertransference as Empathic Position. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis* 26, pp. 479-495.

8. Attachment Theory

Wallin, D.J. (2007). *Attachment in Psychotherapy*. New York: The Guilford Press. Pp. 1-24.

Sheehi, L. & Sheehi, S. (2021). *Psychoanalysis Under Occupation: Practicing Resistance in Palestine*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 56-65

Vaughans, K. & Harris, L. (2016). The Police, Black and Hispanic Boys: A Dangerous Inability to Mentalize. *Journal of Infant, Child, and Adolescent Psychotherapy* 15 (3), pp. 171-178.

Recommended, if you want a super readable and comprehensive review of the attachment theory literature, I really like this book a lot:

Allen, J.G. (2013). *Restoring Mentalizing in Attachment Relationships: Treating Trauma with Plain Old Therapy*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Publishing. Pp. 3-46.

And recommended if you want the really hardcore deep dive into the attachment theory literature:

Fonagy, P. (2014). *Attachment Theory and Psychoanalysis*. New York: Other Press Professional. Pp. 19-46, 135-156.

Case Analysis #2 Best By Due Date Is Friday This Week!

9. Fanon*

Fanon, F. (2008). *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press. **Pp. 120-184.**

Fanon, F. (2021). *The Wretched of the Earth (60th Anniversary Edition)*. New York: Grove Press. **Pp. 181-218.**

10. Interpersonalists

Sullivan, H.S. (1953). *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry*. New York: W.W. Norton. **pp. 367-384.**

Kuriloff, E. (2002). When the Fiercest Attention Becomes Routine: A Discussion of Harry Stack Sullivan and Feminist Psychoanalysis. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis* 38 (2), **pp. 301-314.** °

St. Jean, S. (2016). Lessons from the Late Erich Fromm: Novel Ideas for Social Work Theory and Practice That Were Ahead of Their Time. *Canadian Social Work Review* 33 (2), **pp. 255-271.**

°Fun fact! Notice how this Kuriloff article is from the same journal edition as the Pogue White paper from a couple of weeks back?

11. Self Psychology

Lessem, P. (2005). *Self Psychology: An Introduction*. Northvale, NJ: Aronson. **Pp. 1-10.**

Kohut, H. & Wolf, E.S. (1978). The Disorders of the Self and Their Treatment: An Outline. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 59, **pp. 413-425.**

Recommended:

Miller, A.E. & Josephs, L. (2009). Whiteness as pathological narcissism. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis* 45, **pp. 93-119.**

12. Contemporary 1: The Social Turn*

Stolorow, R. & Atwood, G. (1996). The Intersubjective Perspective. *The Psychoanalytic Review* 83 (2), **pp. 181-194.**

Hoffman, I.Z. (1992). Some Practical Implications of a Social-Constructivist View of the Psychoanalytic Situation. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 2 (1), **pp. 287-304.**

Mitchell, S. (1998). The Relational Matrix. In *Relational Concepts in Psychoanalysis: An Integration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. **Pp. 17-40.**

13. Contemporary 2: Feminist and Queer Theoretical Psychoanalysis*

Corbett, K. (2009). *Boyhoods: Rethinking Masculinities*. **Pp. 87-119.**

Dimen, M. (1997). The Engagement Between Psychoanalysis and Feminism. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis* 33, **pp. 527-548.**

Saketopoulou, A. (2011). Minding the Gap: Intersections Between Gender, Race, and Class in Work with Gender Variant Children. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 21, **pp. 192-209.**

14. Contemporary 3: Psychoanalyzing Racism and Colonialism

Layton, L. (2020). Racial Identities, Racial Enactments, and Normative Unconscious Processes. In Layton, L. & Leavy-Sperounis, M. (2020). *Towards a Social Psychoanalysis: Culture, Character, and Normative Unconscious Processes*. New York: Routledge.

Eng, D. (2016). Colonial Object Relations. *Social Text* 34 (1), **pp. 1-19.**

Kinouani, G. (2020). Silencing, power, and racial trauma in groups. *Group Analysis* 53 (2), **pp. 145-161.**

Case Analysis #3 Best By Due Date is Friday This Week!

15. Review!

All Case Analyses Last Call Due Date!

POLICIES AND STUFF

Anti-Bullshit Policy:

The superordinate policy that governs all other policies in this course is the anti-bullshit policy. I am using the term “bullshit” in a specific, ethical sense. In brief, “bullshit” is anything that is dishonest, wasteful, and/or unjustified. For further reference, see Frankfurt (2005) and Graeber (2019).

In my professional dealings with you—as your teacher, and as a person—I **promise not to bullshit you**. That means that I promise:

1. To be radically honest with you, even and especially when it may be uncomfortable for either or both of us.

2. To not do things, or ask you to do things, that I believe will waste your resources, including and especially your time, energy, and money.
3. To be willing to justify and and take responsibility for the choices I make in teaching our class.

In return, **I ask you not to bullshit me.** That means that, by signing up for this course, you agree:

1. To be radically honest with me. This includes not engaging in plagiarism, cheating, or lying about your reasons for doing things (e.g. missing class).
2. To not do things, or ask me to do things, that would waste either of our resources, including and especially our time, energy, and money.
3. To be willing to justify and take responsibility for the choices you make in participating in our class.

If you are not comfortable with following this policy, I advise you to drop this class!

Finally, I expect each of us to be open to asking and answering questions about whether or not something is bullshit, in a respectful manner. To answer some common questions up front:

1. Radical honesty is not the same as oversharing—I do not need you to share more information with me than feels justified for you. Spilling your guts is not required.
2. Part of what is radical about radical honesty is tact—in fact, being tactful is part of not being wasteful (i.e. of our time and emotional energy) and justified (i.e. because being tactless is rarely justifiable). To focus on radical honesty without being tactful is to be a jerk.
3. For the most part, using devices in class is bullshit—unless, of course, it is justified. If one is using a device for its assistive function, e.g. to take notes, that is clearly justified; if you are using a device for a recreational function, e.g. checking Tiktok, that is unjustified and wasteful and, thus, bullshit. Pretending you are doing the former when you are doing the latter is dishonest, wasteful, and unjustified—that is, it's *total* bullshit.
4. Discrimination is also total bullshit, because it is always dishonest, wasteful, and unjustified. Thus, the Anti-Bullshit Policy is consistent with College anti-discrimination policies.

E-mail and Communication Policy:

I am eager to be available to you to advance your learning—one of the best things about a school like MCLA is the relationships students and faculty get to build.

E-mail is, mainly, a bad medium for communication—it invites bullshit. Therefore, I would like us all to use it as little as possible. To that end, here are the guidelines I will be following, and will ask you to follow:

1. I ask that we communicate in person to the greatest extent possible. That means before, during, and after class, or during my office hours.

2. When communicating in person is impracticable—e.g. because you are a commuter student—I ask that you call me on the phone. My office hours are the ideal time to reach me by phone. My office phone number (try this one first) is XXX, and if you can't reach me there my cell phone number is 617-680-0395. I trust that we will both be professional and bounded in our use of the phone, including by refraining from texting.
3. When using e-mail, please note that it may take me several days to reply; given this, it will almost always be more practical to just communicate in person, given how regularly we see each other during the term.
4. It is my general practice not to reply to e-mailed questions to which the answer can be found in the syllabus, on our Canvas, or by Googling your question.
5. Please adhere to the Anti-Bullshit Policy in any and all e-mail and other exchanges with your colleagues from class.

For further reading on the rationale for this policy, see Newport (2021).

Recommendation and Reference Policy:

I am eager to give you a glowing and detailed reference if you have made a good overall impression in class! Your academic and professional success is very important to me, and I would like to help you advance in any way I can. I will not, of course, bullshit for you—so please feel free to talk with me in advance about what kind of reference I can offer, given our prior experience together.

For letters of reference, I will require three weeks notice. Please feel free to make this request by e-mail, and please include the following in the e-mail:

1. Date (or date range) when the reference is due, and the address to which to send it.
2. Any information you can offer about the opportunity—links are great!
3. An up-to-date copy of your résumé or CV.
 - a. For more information on the difference between résumés and CVs, and how to write each, contact Career Services at career@mcla.edu.

For verbal references, I ask for a reasonable window, but recognize that things can come up on short notice. Feel free to make these requests by e-mail too, and please include the same information as above.

For students applying to graduate school, it is my preference to have an in-person meeting prior to writing you a letter of recommendation. The purpose of this meeting is to clarify and strategize about your applications and my letter's role in them.

Deadline and Late Work Policy:

I promise not to set deadlines that are bullshit. Any deadline set in this course is based on the time I need to give you proper feedback on your work. Typically, I will set what I call a “best by” deadline and a “last call” deadline.

1. “Best by” is the deadline that will allow me to give you detailed feedback on your work. If you want me to engage with your work as fully as possible, including justifying your grade to you (as applicable), I need your work by this deadline.
2. “Last call” is the deadline by which I will be able to review your work just enough to grade it. I cannot guarantee any detailed feedback, and I will not justify your grade in my feedback. While you might still ask me to justify your grade, I expect that you will first consider whether or not this is wasting my time.
 - a. Submitting all your work by “last call” can have an adverse effect on your class participation grade, because it suggests you are not prioritizing receiving detailed feedback that would help you grow. Of course, sometimes life is really hard and we are just squeaking by, and if you truthfully tell me that this is the case for you I will not hold the issue against you in final grading.

Grading Policy:

Grading is almost always bullshit. Thus, a grading policy that does not run afoul of the superordinate Anti-Bullshit Policy is a difficult needle to thread.

Here is the truth: in some cases, it is possible to create a clear point scale that corresponds with different letter grades; in other cases, it is not. Some topics or assignments invite quantitative assessment, while some invite qualitative assessment. I will not bullshit you by pretending that all grading is neutrally objective—it is not.

The letter grades you receive in this class are my best bullshit-free effort to reflect the quality of your work. They are my truthful, justifiable, and ultimately subjective opinion—by being a student in this course, you are signing up to be evaluated by me, and to have your grades reflect my opinion of your work. From an educational perspective, the grades you receive are far less important than the experience you have and the feedback I give you. However, I recognize that there are many contexts (e.g. graduate school applications, financial aid determinations, visa eligibility) in which grades are a central consideration, and I will not bullshit you by pretending they are inconsequential. When the gravity of the consequence for a particular grade far outweighs what I see as its educational importance—for example, if you will lose your visa because you slept through an exam—I reserve the right to assign the grade that I see as having the ethically justified overall effect.

You are absolutely entitled to take issue with your grade in a bullshit-free way; I would be glad to have a good-faith conversation with you about this. Your grade is my truth claim about your work, and you are entitled to make a counter-claim if you disagree. You are also always entitled to avail yourself of the College’s grade appeal policy, which is not governed by this course’s Anti-Bullshit Policy—though I would invite you to consider the ethical implications of doing so.

It would be my preference to have a system wherein you do not receive grades, but rather written evaluations, as is standard in some other schools. In the absence of such a system, this is my best ethical effort to be anti-bullshit in my evaluation of your work.

References:

Frankfurt, H.G. (2005). *On Bullshit*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Graeber, D. (2018). *Bullshit Jobs: A Theory*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Newport, C. (2021). *A World Without Email: Reimagining Work in an Age of Communication Overload*. New York: Portfolio.

ASSIGNMENTS & CLASS PARTICIPATION

At regular intervals throughout the course (see Course Map for due dates), you will be completing assignments in which you analyze the same case through the lens of different theoretical models. You get to choose which theoretical models you write about, and I have spaced the Best By deadlines such that they are relatively evenly distributed throughout the semester.

The idea with these case analysis assignments is for you to explore how different theoretical models cast light and shadows on different aspects of the case. It is not meant to be a paint-by-numbers exercise in which you “apply” the theory to the case; rather, it’s an exercise in thinking about the case with these theorists’ ideas in mind. This is precisely the kind of intellectual work that therapists are trained to do—we call it case formulation—so this will be excellent practice for those of you who plan to pursue graduate work in mental health! More broadly, it is a mode of theoretically-driven case analysis that is a very useful skill in academic, clinical, and industry contexts alike. It is also a skill we will practice in class together, so you will not be learning it on your own.

In addition to these case conceptualization assignments, I will be heavily weighting class participation in your final grade. I do not have a single standard for what constitutes good class participation, because people have different skills, personalities, and needs. Your participation should involve you bringing the best of yourself to the work of the class. Beyond that, there are some good overall rules of thumb to follow.

It will be impossible to participate meaningfully in class without doing the readings; you cannot fake it, and faking it would be bullshit anyway. It’s okay not to understand the reading—helping you understand it is my job, and in fact it’s one of my favorite parts of my job.

Similarly, it will be impossible for you to participate if you are not present. I will not assign a specific point value for every day’s attendance, because that strikes me as disingenuous and infantilizing. Nonetheless, frequent absences will jam you up, because in this class we will often cover information you need to know for your assignments *exclusively in class*—so even if you do all the readings, as you must, you will not know everything you need to know unless you are present.

Finally, class participation is not just about what *you* get out of class; it is about how you facilitate *everyone* getting the most out of the class. This class is a collective effort. If you err on the quieter side, you should know that depriving your colleagues of your thoughts, critiques,

and feedback is not facilitating their learning—please take the leap to speak your mind and share feedback. If you err on the talkative or argumentative side (as I do), you should know that taking up a lot of space, making a show of being a master debater, and/or being tactless is not serving everyone’s learning—please take the leap to listen, pause, and receive (not agree with uncritically, but receive) feedback.

I would much prefer not to assign you discussion questions, it makes work for both of us that is not needed if you are doing the readings and participating. I do reserve the right to institute discussion questions if it becomes clear that people are not doing the reading reliably enough to participate fully in class.

Case Analysis #1: 25%
Case Analysis #2: 25%
Case Analysis #3: 25%
Class Participation: 25%

Class Structure

We will be meeting thrice weekly, for 50 minute sessions (which is very therapy-y, LOL). Let’s call these meetings Day 1, Day 2, and Day 3. This is a slightly tricky setup for a deep dive into high-level theory, but I think there is a good way to make use of this structure. My tentative plan, pending the approval of the group, is to organize things like this:

Day 1: Everyone comes in with the readings done. Meet mainly in small groups to discuss the readings. The main focus of these small-group discussions is to analyze the texts, surfacing questions, confusions, gut reactions, and critical points that you think demand further exploration. Everyone will have lots of questions and strong reactions every week—Day 1 is our venue to hash them all out.

Day 2: A combination of lecture and large-group discussion. My goal is to respond to the questions and issues you surfaced in Day 1, and to clarify and deepen our understanding of the theories and texts. (Basically, we’re using Day 2 in lieu of using a textbook). I want us all to leave Day 2 feeling clear on the premises of the theory.

Day 3: Large-group discussions in which we use the theory to explore bigger-pictures issues. This is our venue to consider how these theories can inform our thinking about psychological, social, and political life. This is also a venue in which we should be critiquing these theoretical models, thinking about how we might build upon or challenge them. Day 3 is when your curiosity and creativity really get room to run.

This format is, of course, flexible—we can change it as we see fit. For example, we may choose to focus on a single reading each class period instead.

Filename: Carter_syllabus_Psychoanalysis_fall2022.docx
Directory: /Users/cavitch/Dropbox
Template: /Users/cavitch/Library/Group
Containers/UBF8T346G9.Office/User
Content.localized/Templates.localized/Normal.dotm

Title:

Subject:

Author: Carter James Carter

Keywords:

Comments:

Creation Date: 10/4/22 1:02:00 PM

Change Number: 6

Last Saved On: 10/4/22 1:20:00 PM

Last Saved By: Cavitch, Max C

Total Editing Time: 7 Minutes

Last Printed On: 10/4/22 1:20:00 PM

As of Last Complete Printing

Number of Pages: 10

Number of Words: 3,673

Number of Characters: 18,980 (approx.)