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Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose

Below is an excerpt from the letter written by Karen Horney, Harmon S. Ephron, Sarah R. Kelman, Bernard S. Robbins, and Clara Thompson, explaining the reason for their resignation, in 1941, from the New York Psychoanalytic Society. I think this is interesting for a few reasons. One is that of course, The American Institute for Psychoanalysis, which was founded by their departure, became an APsaA approved institute this past January. The departing analysts disagreed with the need for particular, what could today be called “standards,” in psychoanalytic education, and favored the idea of the student, what we would today call a candidate, being allowed to choose their own analyst. Additionally there was a dispute about the nature of the curriculum: should candidates begin their education with the “classical” theory and technique, and progress to “deviating” or “non-classical” concepts? Clearly fighting about how best to prepare candidates is not new within organized psychoanalysis. Presently psychoanalysis is losing the power that was consolidated by earlier generations; this alone can lead to conflict. The tension between “classicists” and the groups that today no one would term “deviant,” at least not out-loud, persists, and the professional stakes may be even higher because there are fewer candidates. But today we see conflicts between American Ego Psychology, and the Self-Psychologists, the Relationalists, and Interpersonalists, to name just a few of the new developments in theory and technique, and very often the core of the conflict is about who will determine the curriculum for candidates, particularly those early in their formation. And of course, the issue of who becomes a training analyst looms large because one’s analyst has a very significant effect on one’s formation.

The tension between “classicists” and the groups that today no one would term “deviant,” at least not out-loud, persists, and the professional stakes may be even higher because there are fewer candidates.

“There are two antithetical attitudes towards psychoanalysis today. One of these is based upon the awareness that psychoanalysis is still in an experimental stage of its development. The other attitude regards psychoanalysis as having in many respects passed beyond this stage and holds that training in psychoanalysis should begin with the learning of certain concepts and techniques which are, as they sometimes term it, “classical,” and which represent psychoanalysis as they conceive it to have been handed down by Freud. No two of these “classicists” have precisely the same notions of what “classical” psychoanalysis is. But they seem to be agreed that something which passes under the name of “classical” psychoanalysis should be first inculcated in the student; and that after this certain “deviating” notions of psychoanalysis may be taught to the student, if he so elects.

The educational program which is based upon the conviction that psychoanalytic therapy—and therefore theory—is still in an experimental stage, and which, for want of a better term, might be called “non-classical” is considerably less crystallized than the “classical” one. Its advocates hold that the student at the beginning of his training in psychoanalysis may choose whether he will first be exposed to “classical” or to “deviating” or “non-classical” concepts. They likewise hold that the student who elects to be personally analyzed by a “non-classicist” should be taught “classical” concepts in the course of his training and that the student who chooses a “classical” type of personal analysis should learn “deviating” notions as a part of his later training.
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Thus while the “classicists” are very positive about what the beginning of psychoanalytic training should be and are willing to enforce this view where they have the power to do so—as in the case of the disqualification of Dr. Karen Horney as a training analyst of the New York Psychoanalytic Institute—the “non-classicists,” realizing that any crystallization of this nature is in the present circumstances premature, are of the opinion that the decision should in each case be left to the individual student.” *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis* (1941) 1:9-10.a

This issue of the Candidate Connection looks at diversity. Psychoanalysts have overwhelmingly been white. There are now many more women, there are also many more openly gay and lesbian analysts, and there is widespread acceptance that one can be gay, lesbian, or female and be a good analyst. But we have not been as successful in recruiting non-white candidates, or serving populations that are not affluent. Our newsletter editors Danielle Dronet and Valentino Luca Zullo have done a fine job of bringing the issue of diversity of race and socio-economic status to the forefront in this issue.

It is important that we hold in mind that conflicts about what is psychoanalytic, and what is classical or divergent, have deep roots within psychoanalysis. And the question of what is psychoanalysis, which is the core of the classic vs. contemporary debate, is influenced by who writes the theory. Only by expanding who is included under the umbrella of psychoanalysis do we really allow psychoanalysis to respond to the changes in contemporary culture. Things keep changing; by increasing the diversity of our profession we may be able to ensure we do not keep repeating the same debates from the past. Maybe we can focus outwardly onto the needs of our communities for psychoanalytic thinking. ❖

Phoebe A. Cirio, M.S.W.
President, APsaA Candidates’ Council

---

**JOIN US FOR THE CANDIDATES’ COUNCIL’S**

**Spring Soiree**

*Hosted by Chicago’s Candidates’ Association*

**Friday, June 17, 2016**

8:00 PM to 10:00 PM
(following the Ticho Reception)

Enjoy an evening of Dinner, Wine & Soft Drinks.
All candidates and psychotherapy trainees are invited.

$55 per person
Eat | Drink | Network

Please RSVP to Gina Shropshire • ginshrop@gmail.com
Checks should be made out and mailed to:
‘Candidates Association’
Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis
Attn: Vijay Khilinani
122 S. Michigan Ave., 13th Fl., Chicago, IL 60602

NOTE: Space is limited so it is important to RSVP.
Without a reservation, payments of cash or check will be accepted on the day of the party
ONLY if space is still available (we cannot accept credit card payments).
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Psychoanalysis and the New Generation

Welcome to the Summer 2016 issue of the Candidate Connection of the American Psychoanalytic Association. We began this issue asking the question, “where does psychoanalysis need to go in the twenty-first century?” However, we soon learned the more important question was not about “where,” but “what will psychoanalysis look like in the twenty-first century?” It seems an almost impossible question to ask, as so much of what happens in the field is behind closed doors with analysts and supervisors, but we have learned while speaking to candidates, analysts and members of the community, that psychoanalysis needs to be seen. Our work will not be known and our field will not grow if we do not have a presence in the community, and more significantly a diverse presence.

In our attempt to foster a discussion on the future of analysis, we offer several different voices on the subject in this issue through three interviews.

We began with Dr. Dorothy Holmes, who we were inspired by after viewing the documentary, Black Psychoanalysts Speak. We spoke with Dr. Mark Blechner of the William Alanson White Institute because the White Institute has long been at the forefront of psychoanalytic thought and practice. Finally, because this is a candidate newsletter, we wanted to be sure to add the point of view of a psychoanalytic candidate that was not our own, and we asked Dr. Candela Bonaccorso about her ideas about the future of psychoanalysis. These three voices offer new visions and experiences of psychoanalysis, which we hope will foster conversations on the future of the discipline and the theory.

It is necessary that we continue to support the inclusion of different voices and bodies in our practices, in our training, and the literature in order that psychoanalysis may continue to serve the largest population possible and envision a more just world.

Interview with Dr. Dorothy Holmes

Danielle and Valentino: Hello Dr. Holmes, thank you for agreeing to the interview this morning. Let’s jump right into the topic we wish to discuss with you. We are thinking about the future of psychoanalysis or as we have titled this issue “Psychoanalysis and the New Generation.” We would like to talk about where psychoanalysis is heading, and what needs to be considered as we move ahead in the 21st century.

Dr. Holmes: To begin, psychoanalysis needs to address the troubles of the world, especially in terms of these xenophobic and other hate-based phenomena. I think analysis has, unfortunately, unduly shied away from lending its voice to those issues. For psychoanalysis to be really vital—to be true to its radical nature—I think it needs to open itself up to examination and opinion, informed opinion on those factors. Conflicts about cultural factors reside in the individuals...
who come to see us for treatment. Their culturally-based conflicts may become accessible to our treatment approaches applied in the consultation room, if we make ourselves open to them.

On my way into the office this morning, I was listening to one of the talk shows, which was focusing on the way radical terrorists recruit—exploit one might say—to radicalize one another: a little brother, big brother dynamic. Well if the terrorists can figure out that there is a psychology to this, which serves evil purposes, it seems psychoanalysts should understand this as well and use whatever vehicles are available to undermine or help support others. Psychoanalysts should be attuned to these issues, research them, and use them to the benefit of treatments we conduct and in addressing these issues in public forums.

Terrorists approach families, try to seduce them and undermine whatever conventional societal principles they may hold so that they will participate in hateful acts of terrorism. They have ways of doing this and certainly it is within the realm of analysis to understand this, i.e., how it is that certain people may be amenable to such indoctrination. If terrorists can propagandize and recruit, then analysis can inform to the contrary. The world needs to understand how deeply vulnerable people are subject to influences that propagate hate. Psychoanalysis would be more relevant if it made that contribution.

Psychoanalysis challenges profound miscarriages of justice such as sexism, racism, homophobia. However, it is paradoxical and ironic that psychoanalysis set itself up in this country as an exclusionary discipline that did not allow anyone without a medical degree to obtain training. It undercut its own power in doing this. Maybe because of the guilt and shame of doing that, it became further silenced about so many important issues. There are historical reasons within psychoanalysis for this. It is not so much theories and concepts that are at fault but imperfect human beings—all of us—have done things to weaken our powers as a clinical science.

I think psychoanalysis is institutionally more aware of this unfortunate history and is positioning itself to understand the world around us. Historically, psychoanalysis held to a positivist point of view that overvalued objectivity as expressed in anonymity, neutrality and abstinence. Psychoanalysis said we should not get involved in the world outside of the consultation room. I haven’t heard anyone say that recently but that was certainly a major focus while I was in training. There was a lot of suspicion if you got too active in social causes. Being too much of an activist would spoil your capacity to be sufficiently objective with your patient.

Freud’s positivist point of view was very protective of young psychoanalysts. He did not want them doing “wacko” things that might hurt the discipline. This point of view led to a deficiency in curricula, in institutes, which have been devoid of courses related to society, history and culture and their psychodynamics.

It’s very complicated but there are psychodynamics to all of this.

Psychoanalysis I think is vibrant and needs to relate to the world that it is in. Psychoanalysis challenges profound miscarriages of justice such as sexism, racism, homophobia. However, it is paradoxical and ironic that psychoanalysis set itself up in this country as an exclusionary discipline that did not allow anyone without a medical degree to obtain training. It undercut its own power in doing this. Maybe because of the guilt and shame of doing that, it became further silenced about so many important issues. There are historical reasons within psychoanalysis for this. It is not so much theories and concepts that are at fault but imperfect human beings—all of us—have done things to weaken our powers as a clinical science.

I think psychoanalysis is institutionally more aware of this unfortunate history and is positioning itself to understand the world around us. Historically, psychoanalysis held to a positivist point of view that overvalued objectivity as expressed in anonymity, neutrality and abstinence. Psychoanalysis said we should not get involved in the world outside of the consultation room. I haven’t heard anyone say that recently but that was certainly a major focus while I was in training. There was a lot of suspicion if you got too active in social causes. Being too much of an activist would spoil your capacity to be sufficiently objective with your patient.

Freud’s positivist point of view was very protective of young psychoanalysts. He did not want them doing “wacko” things that might hurt the discipline. This point of view led to a deficiency in curricula, in institutes, which have been devoid of courses related to society, history and culture and their psychodynamics.

It is ironic to me and of course paradoxical that a social science and a clinical science that is in its nature radical keeps itself separate from social issues that need its radical perspectives.

The world needs to understand how deeply vulnerable people are subject to influences that propagate hate. Psychoanalysis would be more relevant if it made that contribution.

Danielle and Valentino: This is a really important discussion and we agree. How do you imagine Psychoanalysis might begin going about this?

Dr. Holmes: In my plenary I addressed the need for more theory; we need to make more use of our existing theory and we need to theorize more about hate and why it is and how it is that people are subject to—fall prey to—hate, how terrorism can take place.
We think these discussions of race, ethnicity, and issues of globalization are not considered in the curriculum. Can you talk about some of the changes you have witnessed in psychoanalysis?

Dr. Holmes: There is much progress being made. I’ve been on APSaA President Mark Smaller’s Task Force on Diversity. It succeeded the longstanding and pretty ineffective committee called the Committee on Racial and Ethnic Diversity. It was ineffective not because the Committee was not motivated, focused, and hardworking, but because APSaA cordoned off the committee and did not bring its perspectives and recommendations into the mainstream of APSaA. After 10 years of that, the Task Force has been promoting systemic changes.

I believe all Institutes approved by the American should address various aspects of diversity in their stated objectives, curricula, and recruitment and retention practices, for candidates and faculty. To do so would bring us in compliance with all other national organizations that govern mental health education and training.

Danielle and Valentino: Speaking of changes. What would you like to see from candidates?

Dr. Holmes: Here is what you can do and it won’t be met with easy reception, but candidates need to be part of the collaboration and participate more. Take these issues to your classrooms, your analysts and your supervisors. Request, demand and ask that they be discussed. There will be some resistance this push for more inclusion. We need institutes to be serious and interested in these issues. Even if they are not so knowledgeable about issues of race, gender, class, sexual orientation, etc., invite them to observe with you these phenomena and our subjectivities in relation to them. Candidates need to say,” by the time I’m 60 or 70 year years old, the world is going to be composed predominantly of people who today are in the minority.” As a field, we need to consider now the psychodynamics of this transition in the making, and how we are all experiencing it—personally, in our theories and practices, in the classroom, supervision and in our analyses.

Danielle: Thank you. This experience has been very inspiring. There are so few candidates of any color. For us in Cleveland, we have started a clinic in a very poor neighborhood in Cleveland. We are opening up a community garden, and a food bank and we will take EBT cards. Right now food banks are often very far away and because of public transportation this is very difficult. There will be psychotherapy and psychoanalysis being done there as well. You can hit more than one bird with a stone because that is how everybody is able to live his or her lives except for poor people.

We live in our cultures and our cultures live in us and we need to remember that.

Dr. Holmes: That’s a great, adaptive, wonderful expression of aggression, if you will. The other way to look at your program is that it stems from a commitment to everyone having access to abundance. Let it all spill over. I see this as totally consistent with analysis in the sense of using psychoanalysis to inform and support one being able to use one’s energies to obtain both external and internal supplies. I applaud your initiative and creativity in developing a one-stop shop to help poor folks enrich themselves psychologically while meeting their needs for day-to-day resources as well.

Dr. Holmes: There is no reason you would know this but I did the internship of my graduate psychology training at Hanna Pavilion. I did my training while the city was rioting—race rioting. My first patient was an African American woman. I owe so much to her. She planted the seed for my whole scholarly trajectory. She was a woman of genteel poverty. She was an extremely talented artisan. Today, with the right opportunities she could become an executive chef in the finest of restaurants. But she had so much rage because of multiple neurotic and real life contributions, including that she was held back from promotion to Chef in part because she was Black and a woman.

The year was 1966. She came to me furious. This was in a department of giants in Psychoanalysis. Douglas Bond, Brian Bird, The Katans, The Femans, Benjamin Spock, people of such immense accomplishment and talent. I went to my supervisor, Dr. Charles DeLeon, a black psychiatrist and psychoanalyst and said, “this woman seems so angry.” My supervisor said “the only thing wrong about your statement is that there is no ‘seems’ about it.” I wasn’t sure she would come back but she did.

Her chief complaint was “I’m here because I’m afraid I’m going to participate in the riots.” Why did they give me you? I said “well what is it about me that makes you so angry?”

She said, “you are a woman and you are a Negro and a psychologist.”

On the basis of my gender, my profession and my race. I was worthless.

That opened up a very productive year of work. She stuck with me. I stuck with her. I remember that treatment and my connection with such an amazingly excellent Department of Psychiatry with deep appreciation. My supervisor—a black analyst—did not shy away from these issues and we addressed them together.

So it warms my heart to hear about this wonderful application of analytic issues in your project and in the city that spawned my commitment to psychoanalysis. It really is a misguided issue to believe that the poor will not come for psychoanalytic treatment. We live in our cultures and our cultures live in us and we need to remember that. Institutes have been so hierarchical, ignoring culture and that needs to change. Your project is a firm and admirable step towards that needed change.

Danielle and Valentino: Thank you. Dr. Holmes. This has been an inspiring interview. We are so grateful for you sharing your thoughts and experiences. This has been wonderful.
Interview with Dr. Mark Blechner

Danielle and Valentino: Hello Dr. Blechner, thank you for allowing us to interview you today. As you know, our mutual colleague at the Cleveland Psychoanalytic Center, Dr. Nanette Auerhahn gave us your contact information and we wanted to thank her for facilitating this connection.

Let's get started with the interview. To provide some background, this issue of the Candidate Connection is about Psychoanalysis and the New Generation. We know that the William Alanson White Institute has been a leading and revolutionary force in psychoanalytic training here in the United States and we wanted to talk to you about your institute and your thoughts on the future of Psychoanalysis. As we begin, could you give us some insight into what training looks like at your institute?

Dr. Blechner: In the White Institute model, training is generally four or five years. Some candidates take time off because of pregnancy or other developments in their lives so in that case it can take longer, but most candidates graduate in four years. I teach at NYU as well, and I sometimes have students who are in their twelfth year of training.

As far as supervision is concerned: in the White Institute model you need to have four analytic cases under supervision. The first training case has to go for 240 hours of treatment, at least three times a week, and that translates into 80 hours of supervision. After that each case has to go for a minimum of 120 hours with 40 hours of supervision. And beyond that we have a psychotherapy requirement, which is unusual in psychoanalytic training. The candidates have to see a person in twice a week psychotherapy or sometimes two people once a week for a total of 80 hours. Supervision for the psychotherapy cases is done with a different supervisor than the analytic cases.

This psychotherapy component is done relatively late in the training, in the third or fourth year, once you have internalized the tenets of psychoanalysis and you can see how they play out in short term psychotherapy.

Sometimes candidates will complete the psychotherapy component first. There are some candidates who need assistance to pay for their training so the White institute also has a fellowship program to help them. Those who need the support can spend the first two years of training seeing patients for 12 hours a week at the institute and these candidates do not need to fulfill an additional psychotherapy requirement.

Danielle and Valentino: So candidates see psychotherapy patients for 12 hours a week and they see the cases for free?

Dr. Blechner: No. For the patients the candidates see in the psychotherapy fellowship, the fees are negotiated by the clinic and a certain amount of the fee is credited to the cost of classes, supervision or analysis. On that note, with the first analytic case, all the fees go to the institute for the first 240 hours of treatment. In a sense, it replenishes the institute. We have a whole building and we provide space for the candidates to practice. For the other three cases, the candidate gets the fees.

Danielle and Valentino: Can you tell us a little bit about the courses you offer at your institute?

Dr. Blechner: The candidates take all of their courses together at least for the first two years. In the third year they can start to take electives and those can be at different times and with different people, but for the first two years there is a cohesive group that is formed.

Danielle and Valentino: Wow! It’s really great that you have electives. We would love to be able to choose some electives at our institute.

Dr. Blechner: We have quite a number of electives. We also have a program where students at Columbia Psychoanalytic and the White Institute can take electives at the other institute. We have had students take courses both ways.

Danielle and Valentino: I think we’re envious! This is exactly what we wish we could do in Cleveland. We want to get different visions of Psychoanalysis from different institutes and practitioners.

Dr. Blechner: I realize as we are speaking that I want to comment on the subject matter of teaching. I think one of the reasons the White Institute has done so well is because it was founded as an Interpersonal Institute. I would say most of the major figures in the relational movement, including Stephen Mitchell, Jay Greenberg and others, emerged from the White Institute. Our courses, though, don’t just cover Interpersonal Psychoanalysis, but we cover the broad range of theories—including Contemporary Freudian, Kleinian, and Self Psychology. If candidates are not diehard interpersonalists, they can feel comfortable having learned many different theories and then decide for themselves how they want to practice.

Danielle and Valentino: That’s really wonderful. We think it is so important to consider different types of

Continued on page 7
June 2016

Interview with Dr. Mark Blechner continued from page 6

psychoanalytic treatment. We need to adapt Freud’s thoughts and view for the contemporary scene. Rather than being a diehard ego psychologist. While Ego psychology, object relations, etc. are all fascinating—we don’t want to deny that!—it is the case that so many of the individuals that we meet in the poor neighborhoods of Cleveland cannot be treated with strict defense analysis. It’s not that psychoanalysis cannot help these people; it just needs to be able to adapt and change.

Dr. Blechner: Among a lot of analysts there is an idea that certain people cannot be analyzed—it’s a cultural narrowness. Part of the trouble is that the people who are trained as analysts don’t always know how to treat individuals from backgrounds that are not their own. Even at the White Institute the number of people who come for psychoanalytic training who are African American, Hispanic, or other minority group is definitely too small. We have tried to increase the number of candidates from diverse backgrounds; while we are not totally successful, we are trying. The future of psychoanalysis requires that we train people from more diverse backgrounds because those are the people who will be most empathic toward people from different backgrounds.

Danielle: That statement is like music to my ears. I’m Hispanic, and I want a Latin analyst. It becomes a question of is this a transference or my resistance? I do believe that there is an empathy between—I’m not saying it always has to be the same culture—but there is a rhythm between a client and an analyst from the same background.

Dr. Blechner: Absolutely! There is a whole history in psychoanalysis of resistance to facing these issues. What you are describing is either defining an issue of cultural difference as resistance or calling it political. In fact, the resistance itself is political. Certainly it happened in the 80s and 90s with gays and lesbians. I have worked with patients who are Hispanic and African-American who referred to me as a “white guy.” I think having worked with people who called me a “white guy” has changed the way I see myself. If Psychoanalysis continues to be mainly a field that takes the presumptions of white American middle class culture and puts them out as psychological truth we are not likely to survive. And furthermore, I don’t believe anybody who says you cannot take insurance. In the 70s Fritz Redlich at Yale did an empirical study on whether the patient has to feel financial pressure for the analysis to work, so if your fee is higher they will do better; it turned out to be untrue.

Danielle and Valentino: That is amazing. In the neighborhood where we work, the people do not have money, but they always come to sessions. Treatment is almost always through insurance, but they are still coming. And we agree, we need more people of diverse backgrounds, who can empathize and also be more aware of the lives of others. We think the lack of public transportation in Cleveland makes it very difficult for the people who are trained as analysts don’t always come to sessions. Treatment is almost always through insurance, but they are still coming. And we agree, we need more people of diverse backgrounds, who can empathize and also be more aware of the lives of others. We think the lack of public transportation in Cleveland makes it very difficult for the

That is the most damaging thing in Psychoanalysis, when people are afraid of speaking up because of how something will be interpreted. It’s a tough process but you have to speak up.

Danielle and Valentino: We agree. When we look around these other bodies seem to be absent in both training and in the higher ranks.

Dr. Blechner: Racial diversity is something that I am currently pressing the White Institute about. It’s a little bit like everything else in the world—you have to speak up. If you have two people speaking up, it is easier than one person. Sometimes people are afraid. That is the most damaging thing in Psychoanalysis, when people are afraid of speaking up because of how something will be interpreted. It’s a tough process but you have to speak up.

Danielle and Valentino: We don’t read any articles on these issues in our training, and we don’t see them in the journals either. It seems that issues of race, ethnicity, and class are absent in the literature.

Dr. Blechner: I was the editor of Contemporary Psychoanalysis and during my time we only got one article on psychoanalysis and social class. I published it immediately. It is really one of the least talked about issues in psychoanalysis.

Valentino: How many years were you the editor?

Dr. Blechner: About four or five.

Valentino: I ask because that is a very long time to only see one article on that topic. I am sure you are flooded with submissions on countless other topics for each issue.

Continued on page 8
Dr. Blechner: Check out the psychoanalytic journals; even now there are so few articles on social class. You should read Neil Altman’s book, The Analyst in the Inner City: Race, Class and Culture Through a Psychoanalytic Lens. That was an important contribution. It takes up many of these questions and establishes a foundation for future discussions.

Danielle and Valentino: Thank you for the recommendation. We will read it!

As we begin to wrap up, what do you think Psychoanalysis as a discipline and a profession needs to consider as we move forward?

Dr. Blechner: I think along with discussion of race and psychoanalysis, neuropsychoanalysis also needs to be considered in the future. I think this is important. We need to keep culture in mind, but we also need to keep the future of science in mind. Psychoanalysis needs to navigate these two worlds and then it can truly succeed.

Danielle and Valentino: Thank you for that. We think that more investment in contemporary science would also be fruitful. We do have a resident specialist on neuropsychoanalysis in our program, Dr. Anna Janicki, who has also really been pushing for this. She has stated again and again we need to keep up with science.

That’s all for now then. Thank you for the interview and for sharing your thoughts on the future of Psychoanalysis.

Interview with Dr. Candela Bonaccorso

Danielle and Valentino: Hello Dr. Bonaccorso, thank you for taking the time to do this interview with us. As you already know, the focus of this issue is “Psychoanalysis and the New Generation.” We have already interviewed two analysts on their ideas about the future of Psychoanalysis, and we hoped to get the voice of a candidate in this issue. So let’s just jump right in to the discussion.

Dr. Bonaccorso: Hi guys! So, I’ll give you a little bit of my background to start. I’m originally from Argentina and I was born in the 70s. In Argentina, while growing up, Psychoanalysis was part of the atmosphere. You would hear people talking about going to their analyst, and their orientation was psychodynamic. There really were not many other voices. It was a part of me growing up also because I went to therapy when I was little and my therapist was a child analyst. I grew up after that thinking I wanted to be in mental health. It was a long road, but it’s also not surprising that I finally pursued analytic training. During my Masters I was not sure of my orientation but I remember one of my professors saying that psychodynamically-oriented clinicians tended to be better at tolerating intense affect. Well, I thought, that sounds like something worth pursuing! When I decided to get a Doctorate I very deliberately applied to the George Washington University Psy.D. program because it was one of the few programs that claimed its orientation was psychodynamic. Other programs I applied to were eclectic and

when I went to interviews I would find that by “eclectic” they meant that one faculty member was psychodynamically-oriented. One…So I was very happy and so grateful when I got into GWU because all of my supervisors and almost all of my professors were analysts. In addition, during that time I also decided to start my own analysis. It was a great program and I feel like I got so much out of it—as well as out of my analysis. Dr. Holmes, whom you interviewed for this edition of The Candidate Connection, was the director of the program when I was a student and continues to be such an inspiration in so many ways.

After three years in DC at GWU, I moved to New York to complete my pre-doctoral internship at Bellevue Hospital. Five years after that and having tried short or year-long training programs at different psychoanalytic institutes, I landed at the White Institute. I did their yearlong intensive psychoanalytic psychotherapy program and then applied for analytic training there. At this point, being close to completing my first year at the White Institute, I can say that it has been an amazing experience so far.

Danielle and Valentino: When you were in school at GWU and at the White Institute, did you feel that these institutions were culturally sensitive? Did you notice it?

Dr. Bonaccorso: I think you always notice it. In my training at GWU and subsequently at Bellevue, I felt appreciated for my ability to speak Spanish. It was a skill much needed in many settings. At GWU, one of my externship placements was at a public school in DC. A couple of the kids were Spanish speakers. And some of their parents did not speak English at all. There were very few of us in my cohort that spoke Spanish: three of us and then just two. The class was about 20 people. I felt definitely that there was a need for Spanish-speakers that do psychodynamic therapy with underserved populations. Concerning whether I felt GWU was culturally sensitive, that seems like a difficult question—it was a huge school and a big program. I would say my professors were focused on issues of diversity in varying degrees as per their interests and their own experiences, and I definitely resonated with those who had more broad perspectives on themselves and others—those who had faced and thought about issues of being different, or who had known prejudice firsthand or who were of other backgrounds. At all times I felt like I was treated very well and my background and viewpoint were appreciated.

When I was at Bellevue, I would say that 75% of my patients were Spanish speaking. There, cultural sensitivity was at the forefront of my training. The training I received there from experienced and seasoned psychodynamically-oriented Latino clinicians was excellent. I would say I felt appreciated by the vast majority of my supervisors and they were themselves interested in providing excellent, dynamically-oriented care to...
Bellevue’s Latino population and in conveying this to trainees. Treating the diverse Spanish-speaking population at the hospital was challenging and enriching. Even at that setting where there were many more Spanish-speaking clinicians than any other place I had previously worked, there always seemed to be a need for more. As you know, within the Latino community there is so much diversity. Different races, different cultural identities, immigration stories, economic hardship (or not) and the relationships between the diverse groups. I remember running a group in which a Dominican member and a Puerto Rican member regularly tried to throw jabs at each other based on cultural and political issues between the countries. It was challenging and something I had not faced before in treatment.

Valentino: I think you brought up a really important point there, that diversity and these cultural complexities enter the treatment in ways that you would not even imagine. We don’t know how it’s going to enter the treatment. It’s also important that we have more people of diversity in training because in many ways for someone with a diverse background, I think we are more open to understanding someone else’s diverse background. Perhaps because I hope someone may be able to understand my own background and so I hope that I can understand others.

Danielle: When you are describing the two men, culture comes from within you. Its like air you breathe. To go into an analytic field—a classic model—that uses neutrality that would not seem to work well at all.

Dr. Bonaccorso: I don’t know how much that is practiced, in the blank-faced way that some people think when they think of neutrality. I definitely know that at the White Institute that is not an expectation of our instruction. In fact, I have found one of the reasons I picked this institute is that I see diversity all around. There are 13 people in my cohort and every single one of us could mark the “other” box in the application! I didn’t know this before starting my training there and didn’t expect it, but I have been so happy about this. I’m one of three native Spanish-speakers and it’s nice to not be the only one, in this respect. Everyone’s diversity has brought so much richness to our discussions and training so far. I also feel lucky, particularly because I heard from other candidates at APsaA’s national meeting and it sounded like their experiences were so different.

The White Institute also focuses on culture and the importance of culture in our daily lives. These are issues that are of massive import and cannot be dismissed or addressed as fantasy or as only internal constructions. I think of my own patients, and I treat a diverse group. I wonder how much of who we have in our practice has to do with our own willingness to speak about race, issues of gender, of sexuality, of similarity and difference...It reminds me of several recent educational meetings at the White Institute where these issues were raised and discussed. I know these kinds of issues come up with every patient. At the White Institute, I have observed an interest in candidates, graduates, and faculty on issues of race, sexual identity, sexual orientation, and cultural or ethnic identity. I certainly have felt respected and appreciated with my point of view. I think institutes have a lot of power by the candidates they accept into training regarding what the future of psychoanalysis could look like.

I want to ask, a Latin person, what do you think that it is that allows some people of color to come to training and not others. When I see us at the candidate meeting, there are so few non-white people.

Dr. Bonaccorso: You know, Danielle, I think that the issue begins before analytic training in some ways. I know at GWU I heard patients would request an African American man as a therapist at our clinic, and I think in the three years of my time there, there was perhaps one and then two men who could have provided this service. I know the faculty wanted more applicants of color, and I just don’t know the complexities of factors affecting who applies, who doesn’t. Grad school can be enormously expensive, and honestly, despite a lot of loans, I do not think I could have managed if my parents had not been able to help me. So...maybe it’s an issue of economics, an issue of how mental health treatment is perceived in some groups, the intersection of politics, race, culture, and economics...To say it’s complex is an understatement. In addition, I remember being in meetings at the APA (American Psychological Association) convention, as well as others I’ve attended in the years since grad school, in which analysis was maligned, Freud was dismissed or made fun of, and the psychodynamic orientation was put down. So getting more candidates in
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general also means facing the view of some in the field that look down upon psychoanalysis.

You know something you were saying reminded me of Dr. Anton Hart at the White Institute. He takes issue with “cultural competence” and terminology of that ilk, which implies that you can get there—that you can say “I’m culturally competent.” “Cultural competence” always rubbed me the wrong way, but I never heard it so well articulated. So many others as well I’ve heard speak so eloquently on this. Dr. Holmes’ plenary talk at APsaA was so brave and so moving. Regarding the future of psychoanalysis, it feels like a time of transition and it feels exciting to me.

Valentino: That is a great point. I agree. You cannot just check these things off. Such as “oh, I’m empathetic now that I took a course.” Or “I’m culturally competent now that I read this book.” You cannot just check these boxes and say “now I’m good.” I think it’s become a thought that we can just gain these skills and that they are taken out of lived experience.

Danielle and Valentino: Well thank you for this interview. You have added so much to our discussion. We look forward to seeing you soon.

Dr. Bonaccorso: Thank you so much, Danielle and Valentino! It was really nice talking to you.

---

**COMMITTEE UPDATES**

**Report from the Candidates’ Council Social Issues Committee**

*Alexandra H. Sawicki, MD*

The APsaA Social Issues Department, with which our Committee works, has been productive throughout the winter and spring and I write to make all candidates aware of its accomplishments and ongoing work. A position statement on Refugee Resettlement was approved in December 2015 that begins “The American Psychoanalytic Association condemns inflammatory rhetoric directed at refugees seeking safety from conflicts in Iraq and Syria.” The position statement highlights the traumatic experience of refugees and the dangers of vilifying and persecuting vulnerable groups. The position statement strongly advocates for listening to and valuing distinct human narratives as a way to promote individual and group strength and to prevent intergenerational transmission of trauma. Early in 2016 APsaA also approved a position statement urging and supporting immediate action on the mental health consequences of the Zika virus. The full text of these and all of APsaA’s position statements is available on apsa.org under the “About APsaA” tab.

Members of the Social Issues Department have written recent articles on a wide range of topics for the APsaA website blog including “100 Years of Understanding War-Related Trauma” by R. Dennis Shelby, Ph.D., “Institutional Responses During the Flint, MI Water Crisis: A Psychoanalytic Understanding” by Marie Rudden, M.D. and “Reflecting on Traumatic Brain Injury Awareness Month” by Harold Kudler, M.D., Chair of the Service Members and Veterans Initiative. The Department distributed a press release on the mental health implications of the Flint water crisis, calling on Governor Rick Snyder to acknowledge the significant breach in public trust in Flint, and asking him to address the social and emotional damage caused to citizens.

Candidates with an interest in the intersection of psychoanalysis and social issues who are attending APsaA’s 105th Annual Meeting in Chicago, June 17-19, will have many programs of interest from which to choose. The Committee on Gender and Sexuality has a series of programs at the June meeting beginning with the opening Friday morning panel presentation, “So What Is Gender, Anyway? And Who’s Having Sex With Whom?”, reexamining gender and sexuality through the prism of transgender identity. On Friday afternoon, Symposium I: “(Not) Being Seen/ (Not) Being Heard: How Do We Think about the Disregard of the Other in the Case of Flint, Michigan?” will address psychoanalytic perspectives on the water crisis in Flint, MI. The University Forum: “Revitalizing the South Side of Chicago” on Friday is open to the public and will discuss practical and theoretical issues raised by revitalizing a deteriorated urban area on Chicago’s South Side. On Saturday, Symposium II: “Recognizing and Helping to Break the Intergenerational Chain of Transmission of Trauma: Black Men and Boys” will focus on the impact of slavery through generations and the relevance of this for psychoanalytic thinking. The Professional Development Workshop: “Responding To Breaking News: What Do Journalists Want?” on Saturday afternoon aims to prepare analyst attendees to interact with media and respond to breaking news. Finally, the Sunday morning Panel: “Psychoanalysis Informs Creation Of Courage To Know Violence Against Women” will discuss ways that psychoanalysis can create resilience and courage in women who have experienced rape, trafficking, and other traumatic violence.

Candidates who are interested in learning more about the work of the Candidates’ Social Issues Committee and the Social Issues Department should contact me for more information at alexandra.sawicki@gmail.com.

Continued on page 11
Report from the Candidates’ Council Master Teacher Award Committee

Valerie Golden, JD, PhD

The Committee gave its 2nd annual award for Master Teaching in Psychoanalysis to Lyle E. Rosnick, M.D., of the Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research. Dr. Rosnick gave a highly informative, entertaining, and well-attended presentation at the 2016 National Meeting in January, using the power of cinema, namely, the 1980 film “Ordinary People,” to teach psychoanalytic concepts such as failure to mourn and narcissism. His presentation was videotaped and will be archived for future generations to access via a link in the Candidates Section of the APsaA website. Notification will be posted to the candidates’ listserv when the video is available.

Candidates’ Council Program Committee Report

Submitted by Sarah L. Lusk, PhD
Program Committee Chair

The programs for APsaA’s 105th Annual Meeting, June 17-19, 2016 in Chicago: Candidate to Candidate Discussion Group: “One Foot In and One Foot Out: Ambivalence in the Transference and Countertransference” is scheduled for Friday, June 17 from 3:45 to 5:45 PM. Holly Crisp-Hann, MD will present clinical material to Virginia Barry, MD.

The Candidates Forum: “A Psychoanalytic View of Adults with ADHD” is scheduled for Saturday, June 18 from 3:45 to 5:45 PM. I will be the Chair and Kristin Whiteside, PhD will present. Drs. Alan Sugarman and Stephen Bernstein will be discussants.

I am currently working with Larry Brown, MD on putting together The Candidates Forum for January 2017. It will be a tribute to Grotstein, with a focus on working with Primitive Mental States.

I have not yet put together the Candidate to Candidate Discussion Group and would welcome any suggestions for a Candidate to present.

Report from the Candidates’ Council Secretary

Jennifer Lane Briggs, LCSW

As Secretary of the Candidates’ Council, I have continued working with institutes to ensure they have delegate representation at the Candidates’ Council meetings held during our national meetings. At present, we have the highest number of institutes with delegate representation since I took office.

Report from the Candidates’ Council Mentorship Committee

Jennifer Lane Briggs, LCSW

As the chair of the Mentorship Committee, we have continued to have more of a presence on the Member and Election Listservs. Phoebe Cirio enlisted both candidates for the President-elect position, who provided invaluable information to the candidates about their platforms. We have also worked to provide information about the changes in APsaA. I have addressed the tone of the listserv. In the future, the committee will continue to post on issues of interest to candidates in an effort to engage the members in a positive dialogue with candidates.

Report from the Candidates’ Council Treasurer

Alex Barends PhD

The 2015-2016 budget was reviewed at the association meetings in January and the overall organization was deemed to be in good financial health, even as extra monies are spent on transitioning the governance of our professional body. The well-received candidate Travel Scholarship which provides a travel stipend and conference fee waiver for a candidate member attending their first meeting remained intact.

The concern about the tightness of the budget given the extra money needed for the transition were not realized. Prizes had been reduced to $500 per recipient because of this concern, and it was decided by the Executive Council to restore the awards to $1000.

Therefore the Candidates’ Council Psychoanalytic Paper Prize has been restored to $1000, and our second prize from $250 to $500. Prize money for the candidates has been partially supported through the generosity of a $750 grant from the American Psychoanalytic Foundation.

With the next fiscal year (2016-2017) the Candidates’ Council is hoping to further solidify our position within our larger organization. We are hoping to increase our budget to regularize the support necessary for our popular Master Teacher Award program, while maintaining the financial support necessary for our Candidates’ Council breakfast and coffee with a distinguished analyst.

Candidates’ Council Psychoanalytic Paper Prize Update

Holly Crisp-Hann, MD

The Candidates’ Council Psychoanalytic Paper Prize has had a rich year with 2 winners in 2015 and is gearing up for another great year in 2016. We hope that candidates will plan to attend the upcoming paper presentation and also consider submitting their own writing this year.

The prize is awarded annually based on a competition among candidate members who submit papers to be considered. The award-winning papers are chosen based on a peer review process with candidate colleagues serving as readers.

We were pleased to have Deborah Weisinger, Psy.D., present her winning paper, “Developing a Psychoanalytic Identity in the Presence of Psychotherapeutic Identity” at the 2016 National Meeting in New York this past January. Dr. Glen Gabhard served as the discussant, and he and Dr. Weisinger led the group in a conversation about analytic and therapeutic identity.

We encourage you to attend the presentation of the semifinalist paper at the upcoming 105th Annual Meeting (June) in Chicago. Suzanne Klein, PhD, will present her paper “Healing Psychic Trauma through the Psychoanalytic Relationship.”
Dr. Stanley Coen, a training analyst who also serves on the JAPA editorial board, will discuss Dr. Klein’s paper and engage attendees in a broader conversation about analytic writing and editing. Please plan to attend and bring your own thoughts about psychoanalytic writing!

We are now Accepting Submissions for the 2016 Prize

We invite candidates to consider submitting their papers for the 2016 prize—submissions are due on August 1, 2016. The prize is an exciting opportunity to develop, encourage, and showcase candidates’ creativity. For prize winners, it is an important opportunity to be recognized as a candidate writer and have a chance to present your work nationally with experienced writers/editors as discussants.

Any APsaA candidate member is eligible to apply and submit a paper that has not been previously published or submitted for publication, and is no longer than 30 double-spaced pages. If you have recently graduated, you are eligible to submit a paper for the prize anytime during the year following your graduation. We are glad to be able to offer a prize award in 2016 of $1000 for the first prize and $500 for the semifinalist. Going forward, we plan to continue with the first-prize winner presenting at the National Meeting in January, and the semifinalist presenting at the Annual Meeting in June. If you have any questions about the paper prize or submission requirements, please email me at hollycrispghan@crispghan.com.

We hope you will plan to attend the Candidates’ Council Psychoanalytic Paper Prize presentation at the meeting in Chicago in June and hear Dr. Klein’s paper, and we look forward to reading your submissions of your papers for the prize!
STUDY INVITATION

Psychoanalytic Candidate Dreams and Daydreams About Psychoanalytic Training: The Unconscious Developmental Process of Becoming a Psychoanalyst

Les Fleischer, PhD
Eric Marcus, MD

We would again like to invite candidates to participate in our study, which will use candidate’s countertransference dreams and daydreams to identify the developmental process of becoming a psychoanalyst. Study participants will be asked to share their experienced dreams and daydreams about their patients, supervisors, colleagues or any aspects of their training. The candidates’ countertransference dreams and daydreams might provide rapid access to pre-conscious and unconscious attitudes and themes that could identify the candidates’ emotional adaptation and development. This study could help us learn more about what candidates experience during training. Educators could use this information to improve the candidates’ educational experience.

Participation in this study will take approximately 10-15 minutes and involves writing down the manifest content of your countertransference dreams or daydreams and some brief thoughts about the dream or daydreams. Candidates will be asked to provide their gender, and year of psychoanalytic training.

Candidates will submit this information anonymously on the Internet using SurveyMonkey. Submission of dreams is entirely voluntary, anonymous, and confidential. As a thank you for participating, candidates can receive a $10.00 gift card.

Candidates can learn more about this study by reviewing the study information and consent form on the Candidates’ list serve, and/or can contact Dr. Les Fleischer at lfleisch@lakeheadu.ca for more information.

SAVE THE DATE

2017 NATIONAL MEETING

Waldorf Astoria Hotel
New York

January 18-22, 2017

apsa.org