Theme: #MeToo on the Couch

Valerie Golden, J.D., Ph.D.

It is my pleasure to welcome you to this edition of The Candidate Connection, the theme of which is #MeToo on the Couch, in reference to the movement that began in October 2017 amidst allegations of sexual misconduct against Harvey Weinstein. The hashtag #MeToo went viral via social media, encouraging millions of people worldwide to demonstrate how pervasive sexual assault and harassment have become in our society, especially in the workplace. Coined as early as 2006 by social activist Tarana Burke, the term “MeToo” began as an expression of empathy aimed at empowering women of color who had experienced sexual abuse, particularly within underprivileged communities.

In October 2017, amid the Harvey Weinstein allegations, Alyssa Milano encouraged the use of the hashtag to show just how widespread the experience of sexual assault and harassment is. The movement elicited a groundswell of reporting, with more than 100 high-profile men facing allegations of inappropriate behavior in the workplace, and spread almost immediately to dozens of other countries and languages. It came to mean different things to different people; to comprise all genders, all colors, and all ages who have been in some way marginalized, dominated, harassed, or abused, with a focus on determining the best ways to hold perpetrators responsible and to stop the cycle. In the U.S. alone, a recent study found that nearly all women and almost half of men in the U.S. have faced sexual harassment or assault.¹

Co-editors Himanshu Agrawal and Tamarind Knutson suggested turning our lens on the movement as it relates to psychoanalysis, and I embraced the idea. As we moved #MeToo to the couch, we asked how intimidation, secrecy, domination, sexual power dynamics, and silent complicity look in our institutes and our profession. Who may be silenced, how does it manifest, what is the fallout? How do we maintain professional boundaries, hold perpetrators accountable, and stop the cycle, while engaging in the unique kind of psychological intimacy that analysis requires. We hope you will enjoy exploring these issues; we anticipate that the mere act of engaging in the conversations will give rise to potentially far-reaching and profound consequences for both our profession and the world in which we live.

Turning now to the various branches of the Candidates’ Council, I am pleased to inform you that we continue to expand our efforts to engage and connect our colleagues across the United States and abroad. We have focused on strengthening candidates’ identities as analysts and building relationships among our active members and our less involved colleagues as well. Our officers and committee chairs have been working hard to initiate several exciting new projects, to administer existing programs, and to create new opportunities for candidate participation in APsaA. Several new committees are on board within the Candidates’ Council, including a Diversity Committee (David German, D.O., Chair), Committee on Psychoanalysis in the Community (Jane E. Keat, Psy.D., Chair), Nominations Committee (Angela Vuotto, Ph.D., Chair). A Membership Committee is in the works. We welcome Sumru Tufekcioglu, Ph.D. as our incoming Chair of the Candidates’ Council Psychoanalytic Paper Prize Committee and thank Holly Crisp, M.D., outgoing Chair, for her many years of extraordinary service as Chair of that Committee. We thank them both for a smooth transition. We are excited about the new programming planned for the 107th Annual Meeting in June, and invite all to attend. I also want to thank all of our new, as well as our existing, Committee Chairs for their hard work and their service as representatives from the Candidates’ Council to the corresponding committees within APsaA.

Last, but not least, the Candidates’ Council is now in an election year. I would like to encourage you to run for office and become part of the Candidates’ Council Executive Committee. Positions include President-Elect, Treasurer, and Secretary. Serving in the leadership of the Candidates’ Council not only provides candidates an opportunity to sample the organizational life of APsaA, but also to develop their analytic identities, leadership, networks, and interests. The Candidates’ Council empowers candidates, gives us a voice in APsaA, and in the process, fosters lifelong collegial friendships. I hope you will get involved during training in our Candidates’ Council and on the many APsaA Committees open to candidate representatives. Please contact me with any questions and interests you may have.

Thank you.

Valerie Golden, J.D., Ph.D.
President, APsaA Candidates’ Council

¹http://www.newsweek.com/after-metoo-study-finds-nearly-all-women-and-almost-half-men-us-have-815660
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Tamarind and I were texting (because we’re cool like that!) when I suggested we address the #MeToo movement in this edition of the letter. I’ve been wondering why I texted Tamarind that day, and an anecdote comes to mind. During a recent trip with my family, a TSA officer started interrogating me while I was in the airport security line with my wife and toddler. I was the only person being questioned in the entire queue, and it felt humiliating. For all my so-called confidence and self-esteem, I found myself voiceless and frozen when I felt oppressed and demeaned. It took my (Caucasian) wife to stand up for my cause when she witnessed racial profiling and discrimination. They backed down because they saw her as someone in a position of empowerment (and they also knew she was correct!). A few weeks later, I found myself preparing a Psychiatry Grand Rounds titled “Me(d) Too—Gender discrimination and harassment in the world of medicine,” and the president of the Council for Women’s Advocacy at Medical College of Wisconsin wrote the Council for Women’s Advocacy at and the president of Gender discrimination and harassment in the try Grand Rounds titled and they go about the challenging task of their professional development. I think that’s why I texted Tamarind that day.

Himanshu and I were texting when he suggested we address the #MeToo movement in this edition of the newsletter. I responded enthusiastically, but my face betrayed conflicted feelings he could not see. Although I agreed it is timely and important, I also felt overwhelmed at the idea of doing the topic justice. It is straightforward, yet complex. It is both in the public eye and shrouded in secrecy. It is unifying and polarizing. The statistics are staggering! RAINN.ORG reports that “every 98 seconds, another person experiences sexual assault.” Additionally, although “the number of assaults has fallen by more than half since 1993—even today only 6 out of every 1,000 rapists will end up in prison.” These are statistics for particularly egregious acts of sexual violence. They don’t even begin to address other forms of assault, abuse, and harassment which are the norm in our society and more common in our institutions than we would like to acknowledge.

The great thing about being editors is that we get to ask people with more experience and wisdom to weigh in on important topics. We asked Harriet Wolfe, M.D., Vivian B. Pender, M.D., and Adrienne Harris, Ph.D., to share their thoughts on this topic:

**The #MeToo movement on the couch.**

Although we strive to work through difficult issues, the analytic community struggles with the same issues that society at large does. From boundary violations to cultures of secrecy, we struggle to change the tide. How do silence and secrecy impact analytic training? How do we give a voice to the voiceless? How do we speak out when we are unsure of the political ramifications? How do we do this while also maintaining healthy boundaries? These are some of the ways in which we would like to explore the very important issue of the culture of harassment and the silence that has allowed it to become epidemic.

Harriet Wolfe is the current President of APsaA. Vivian Pender is the editor of *The Status of Women: Violence, Identity, and Activism*, and Adrienne Harris contributed the chapter, “Women and Activism: a long history, a complex problem.” We think you will agree that they have given us much to contemplate as we support our patients and colleagues and strive to effect meaningful change in our institutions and our world. We are grateful for the time and energy they have given us. We are also thankful for the work of the leaders of the Candidates’ Council and believe you will be inspired by their reports and commitment to psychoanalysis.

Warmly,

Himanshu Agrawal
and Tamarind Knutson

**SAVE THE DATE**

**2019 National Meeting**

**February 6-10, 2019**

**New York Hilton, New York City**

[www.apsameeting.org](http://www.apsameeting.org)
The #MeToo movement has brought a silent epidemic of sexual harassment and abuses of power into public consciousness. Are we able to see it “on the couch”? We might want to think psychoanalytic training and practice are free of perversions of trust. But when candidates or graduate analysts are afraid to speak out about intimidation in their professional relationships, or when speaking about uncomfortable experiences is considered politically unwise, our profession is in the thick of the cultural epidemic that has surprised some but resonated with many.

In various administrative roles in psychoanalytic organizations, local and national, I have been exposed to a range of boundary violations on the part of colleagues that have puzzled or shocked me. “Puzzled” reflects the occurrence of a minor violation, like the mention of a patient’s name seemingly by mistake, or the vague insinuation of malfeasance about an unnamed colleague who is nevertheless identifiable. Such actions can seem silly or forgivable when in fact they may be part of a problematic web of power plays that violate someone’s privacy, whether it involves a patient or a colleague, and are boundary violations in the making.

The most shocking events are those of sexual boundary violations on the part of respected colleagues who have brought much of value to the profession. I have struggled with the administrative duty to pursue such violations through strongly resisted ethical hearings when the facts of unethical conduct seem clear cut and, in any case, merit due process just as any complaint does. The “struggle” is rooted in my own experience of disillusionment as well as the resistance of psychoanalytic communities to hold an honored colleague accountable. I’ve been faced with: “there must be some mistake”, or “it couldn’t be that bad”, or “she/he surely didn’t mean it,” or “do you have it out for that person?” In these ways analysts deny human frailty, the wish for dominance, and the potential for unethical behavior.

We want psychoanalytic minds to be free of unwitting, never mind intentional, abuse and disavowal. Insofar as our psychoanalytic culture idealizes its training, its functions and its leaders, it is especially vulnerable to what the #MeToo movement has exposed.

My interest at this point is less in the vulnerability of individual analysts, reprehensible and unnecessary as acting on one’s impulses may seem, than in the vulnerability of our institutions to complicity in intimidation and unethical behavior. That is to say, I am concerned about the ways in which our profession may foster oppression, denial and therefore abuse. The only way around this is an absence of silence and of secrecy. But there are built-in tectonic plates.

I will single out the basic principle of confidentiality. This ethical rule can weaken in the face of a clinician’s need to discuss the complexity of an encounter with the psychotic states and character of a person who suffers, seeks treatment and then pursues it with the intensity that is reinforced by frequent meetings.
and possible use of the couch. Especially a person in analytic training, but also a graduate analyst who seeks consultation, requires a setting in which she/he can communicate as freely as possible the difficulties being faced. The need for help can lead to the unnecessary sharing of demographic details when a conversation about the nature of the analyst’s difficulty describing a clinical dilemma would lead to a more useful consultation.

Revealing one’s vulnerability in the context of a consultation takes unfortunate turns when there is a power dynamic that fosters intimidation, humiliation or idealization. Also, the confidentiality in the treatment dyad may get transferred in a compromised way to the triad of consultation. It can leave the consulting room and become the responsibility of the consultant. How does that person then manage the multiple layers of painful experience and the responsibility of keeping things anonymous? The consultant may take his/her consternation to a trusted study group in which the facts of the case are more or less successfully disguised, and so it goes. The need for help in providing the best possible care is where we start. The inherent risk is like the childhood game of telephone. The message gets distorted and, in our professional universe, the principle of confidentiality may get compromised.

As the #MeToo movement matures, it may teach us analysts more about the occurrence and problems of patriarchal power than we have yet taught ourselves.

My major concern has become the potential for small and large group complicity in individual ethical violations. The weakening of a clinician’s professional boundaries is unacceptable but it happens. The individual may require the support and intervention of colleagues to recognize and accept ethical slippage in professional behavior. Hard as it may feel, we need to speak to our supervisors, colleagues and analysts about experiences that raise flags in our minds about the integrity of our mutual pursuit. The denial of vulnerability is potentially endemic since we are all human. The presence of secrecy and silence may be the best indicators of trouble. Secrecy about a suspected boundary violation often masks fear and may be rationalized as protection. Silence about a boundary violation also reflects fear and can signal a parallel process in which a patient or a supervisee is experiencing intimidation. Our profession has been troubled over many decades by power dynamics that were enhanced by hierarchical organizational structures. APSA is making progress in creating flexible, respectful, rigorous, inclusive approaches to education and other aspects of its mission. But we need one another to guard against idealizing our own or our profession’s ability to inhibit desire—and all the variations of power over another that acting on desire may entail. It is my hope that APSA’s review and revision of customary educational practices will contribute to a reduction of power-induced ethical problems. As the #MeToo movement matures, it may teach us analysts more about the occurrence and problems of patriarchal power than we have yet taught ourselves.

Neutrality, Morality and #MeToo

Vivian B. Pender, M.D., DLFAPA

At a recent psychoanalytic conference on childhood sexual abuse, there was discussion amongst the six psychoanalysts of what was ‘psychoanalytic’ and what was not, with particular focus on the subjects of neutrality and morality. It was noted that males perpetrate most sexual abuse and most victims are female. In the conference I presented on the topic of sex trafficking. In this article I will present my thoughts on the culture of psychoanalysis in the past, present and future in light of the current #MeToo, #WhatAboutUs and #NeverAgain movements.

If a patient announced he was planning on buying a gun, would the analyst remain neutral or would the analyst intervene? Of course, the analyst would investigate the patient’s motivation in both circumstances. Analysts are in the habit of understanding what, where, when, how and why patients plan on enacting behavior. To whom is it associated?

In the psychoanalytic past, as in the past of the general population, commercial sex was considered normal and most likely would not have been analyzed.

Is male involvement with exploited prostituted persons a moral or humanitarian abuse that should be analyzed? This question was raised at the conference. Despite some participant’s opinion that consensually agreed sexual activity was acceptable, the idea that a prostituted person could ever have free will since it begins at an average age of twelve was also considered. In addition, the buyer or consumer of commercial sex doesn’t truly know whether the prostituted person is a child, dressed up to look like an adult, or has any free will at all. Secrecy must be maintained under threat of dangerous harm to all involved parties.

The general culture as well as the psychoanalytic culture has been one of patriarchy and male dominance. That is, a male perspective dominates most institutions and domains. However, the current public exposure of sexual harassment may increase awareness of the prevalence and the corrosive effect of ‘micro-aggressions’ on women and men.

Continued on page 5
If a woman patient reports that she is being harassed, what does the analyst do? Again, it is important to provide a context in the general culture but also in the psychoanalytic culture that is being constructed in the consultation room, a culture that is brought by the analyst. Some women analysts may begin with their own experience on the harassment spectrum.

Even in the psychoanalytic present #MeToo environment, women continue to absorb harassment and do not report it, even to their analysts. In many cases, it is deeply unconscious. The spectrum ranges anywhere from media portrayals of femininity and actively learned (from birth) female objectification to leering to innuendo to touching to force and violence. Thus, should the analyst accept the patient’s report and encourage her to take steps to remedy her relationships? Otherwise these relationships in her life, past and present will be enacted in the therapeutic analytic relationship, whereas if they are acknowledged and understood, then she will make more informed decisions in her non-analytic relationships.

In a recent TAP article written by Robert Galatzer-Levy about his interview with Robert Emde, the high incidence of divorce amongst candidates was noted. It was attributed in part to an unresolved transference with the analyst and not analyzed. Most analysts in the past were male and this undoubtedly affected what was analyzed and what was implicitly condoned.

As more and more psychoanalysts become aware of the intersectional oppression of being female and having any number of other identities such as being poor, non-white, and non-heterosexual there is a chance that in the future, psychoanalysts will contribute to changing the culture.

In the psychoanalytic future, psychoanalysts should consider the female perspective. That is, the cumulative effect of sexual harassment that is unconscious and heretofore has been considered “normal”. For example, a significant percentage of patients diagnosed with borderline personality disorder have a history of childhood sexual abuse and yet some of the therapies don’t address the harm that this has done to the victim’s psyche.

Therefore future psychoanalysis of such a child who is abused should address the disillusionment and mistrust of powerful authority figures; if the abuse was brutal she was fearful, dissociated and confused about her agency. A female oriented analysis of such a patient would acknowledge the good and rational reasons why she is symptomatic. In a safe environment, mourning could take the place of working through. Her aggression is secondary to her abuse.

As Gina McCarthy, the former head of the US Environmental Protection Agency that is concerned with public health in her 2017 Harvard commencement address said: “Scientists have concluded that there is overwhelming evidence that climate change is real, men are causing it, and that’s why women need to run the world.”

What was once accepted as normal morality is currently coming under scrutiny and should be examined more closely in the coming years.

Reference
“Witch-hunt”
Three notes towards taking on and taking up the #MeToo movement
Adrienne Harris, Ph.D.

I wrote this soon after the #MeToo movement blew full force into our awareness; by ‘our’ I mean mostly American or North American or European. I think it is fair to say that everyone was caught off guard, though for very different reasons.

I want to deconstruct the term witch-hunt, both as a feminist and as a psychoanalyst. It has appeared often in the discourse around #MeToo and the matter of sexual harassment. Most significantly it appears in the essay signed by Catherine Deneuve and in an essay Daphne Merkin wrote for the NY Times Op Ed section.

As it is occurring in these texts and many others, the implications are clear. The objects being hunted are men, the assault for which we see many versions of backlash (small and large) is upon men and often by extension Eros in general and male sexuality in particular. And in this current discourse, the witches are quite clearly the witchy women calling out men regarding sexual overtures.

But notice that something odd has happened to this term. Historically, in witch-hunts women were the witches under pursuit and likely to be drowned or burned at the stake when apprehended. The attack usually undertaken under religious orthodoxy and usually by men.

Curiously, or not so curiously, we have flipped the genders and here the contemporary 2018 witchcraft is nasty women coming after men.

Pursuing that quirky object, the 2018 ‘witch-hunt,’ if men and women have switched places, then men are the prey. Does not the term also unconsciously or pre-consciously turn the men into vulnerable women? Isn’t castration the great fear, whether economic ruin or disgrace and assault? As I think about this, I would say that Deneuve and Merkyn articulate this mad idea—men the witches, men the hunted—but we all carry its traces. This massive sea change in the management of sexual exploitation causes all of us to fear the destruction of men, of sexuality, of the group Eros to say nothing of the individual. We fear the collapse of some libidinal tie even as we struggled to differentiate predation from overture, and pursue the complex matter of consent.

2. March 2018 after an open working session to plan a fall conference at the Sander Ferenczi Center at the New School.

There were troubles from the beginning. Men chairing various aspects of the discussion, warnings about what could be said or not said, an immediate split among women designated to speak about what affect state they were caught up in (sad, angry, fearful). This seemed over the course of the meeting to have a generational component. Older women, like myself grew up in a world—private and public—in which these violations were often pervasive and unremarkable. By which I mean these kinds of events were generally thought to be frequent and unaddressable, and the amnesia and dissociation that covered over these practices were barely on anyone’s radar. A peer of mine tells me that sleeping with her thesis chairman would make her more powerful. Feminism and things like Susan Brownmiller’s book, Against Our Will, opened a little space to think about consent.

Continued on page 7
Recognizing that we put a psychoanalytic lens on the question of consent, we have to wonder how such an existential and legal concept can quite encompass the experience of desire or being desired. Thinking psychoanalytically and thinking about how women certainly when I was young—mid-century—were constrained not to explore or exploit agency. There can arise easily confusion between desiring and being desired.

I continue to think about the potency and confusion in the moment when many women are approached in the class #MeToo moment. Women are often highly anxious about their own ambitions and thus perhaps vulnerable to a moment of undoing just as success comes into view.

The younger generation at the conference-planning meeting was much angrier and they are much clearer about the abuse intended. They experience in these sexual demands from a powerful man a situation where power may be transferring.

This access to anger and protest is such a sign of health and progress. Perhaps inevitably, this meeting was full of contradictions. Women accusing the bystanders and accusing themselves. Just before the end of the session, a woman said that if a woman went to a hotel room after midnight, ‘she intended to have sex.’ People were too tired and stunned to marshal a reaction.

We had been charged with thinking about male socialization and how difficult it is to support tenderness and vulnerability in boys.

This was a powerful meeting on so many levels: a place to think about racism, about the denial and dissociation of white privilege. We began to be able to think together about how haunted we are by the social as well as the familial and the individual unconscious.

Working on a panel with Robert Grossman and Jama Carleton on fathers, I talked about ideas about boys and separation that I had been brewing since the March conference planning meeting and Warren’s comments.

The heart of my argument is that I think fathers—sometimes dangerous, sometimes dangerous because melancholy, are burdened by the psychic labor of holding up and representing the symbolic, of being the practitioners of limit setting and lack while being starved of, bereft of the tenderness, the imaginary, the going on being as Winnicott imagined early relatedness. I say burdened because in the context of most male socialization and development, there is such early pressure on separation, so often such draconian demands for autonomy that neither as father or son is there sufficient pleasure of the imaginary, the power of early immersion in the other.

The melancholic father lives often with a sense of failure to be man enough even as this may be bastioned and overlaid with a kind of performed hyper masculinity. Idealization, of an unattainable gender formation and omnipotence with its surplus of shame and anxiety, actually swamp the persistence of an integrated and affirmed identity and self-regard.

Pause not conclusion:
The problems that surface in #MeToo are both easy and difficult. The phenomena must remain visible and problematic against our entire efforts, social and internal, to go silent, go deaf or blind.

This is the question: Do we (white, class privileged) or they (men) have the will to take up this change.

My comments there:

The pressures around gender performance or construction are acute and transgenerational. We can now see that any individual person—here father—is flooded and grossly or subtly marked with the powerful demands on gender performance.

For me, in this talk melancholy is functioning as a migrant, a nomadic and enigmatic signifier/concept, and an idea from Deleuze. The father is both a melancholy object and a melancholy subject. I am using melancholy not primarily or solely to think about experiences of loss but to see melancholy as a part of the structure of certain subjectivity.
Candidates’ Council Master-Teacher Award Committee Report
Valerie Golden, J.D., Ph.D., Chair

The 2018 Candidates’ Master-Teacher Award recipient is Glen Gabbard, M.D. Dr. Gabbard’s presentation at the 2018 National Meeting in February, entitled “The Difficult Patient,” was highly relevant, interesting, entertaining and informative, as well as extremely well-attended and well-received. Dr. Gabbard is Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at Baylor College of Medicine in Houston, and Training and Supervising Analyst in the Center for Psychoanalytic Studies in Houston, where he also is in private practice. He has authored or edited 28 books, including Psychodynamic Psychiatry in Clinical Practice: 5th edition, an all-time best seller at American Psychiatric Publishing; Long-Term Psychodynamic Psychotherapy: A Basic Text: 3rd edition; Gabbard's Treatments of Psychiatric Disorders: Textbook of Psychoanalysis; Love and Hate in the Analytic Setting; Psychiatry and the Cinema; and The Psychology of The Sopranos. His most recent book is Narcissism and Its Discontents: Diagnostic Dilemmas and Treatment Strategies with Narcissistic Patients, co-authored with Dr. Holly Crisp, our Candidates’ Council President-Elect. He has also published over 350 scientific papers and book chapters, and held numerous prestigious leadership positions, including Brown Foundation Chair of Psychoanalysis and Professor of Psychiatry at Baylor College of Medicine and Director of the Menninger Hospital in Topeka, Kansas. His list of honors and awards are numerous, among them the American Psychiatric Association/NIMH Vestermark Award for Psychiatric Education and the prestigious Mary Sigourney Award for outstanding contributions to psychoanalysis. He has served as Joint Editor-in-Chief of the International Journal of Psychoanalysis and as President of the American College of Psychiatrists. His textbooks have been translated into 11 languages in addition to English. He is a sought-after lecturer worldwide. He truly embodies what is meant by the term “master-teacher” and we are happy to award him the 2018 Candidates’ Council Master-Teacher Award. This reward is the only Candidate-driven award for teaching within APsaA, and recognizes the indelible impact of excellent teaching on all who choose a career in psychoanalysis.

The Master Teacher Award Videos are available in the Members Section of apsa.org. Login and visit the Information for Candidate Members page or click here.

Candidates’ Program Committee Report
Sarah L. Lusk, Ph.D., Chair

At the 107th Annual Meeting (June 22-24) in Chicago the Candidate at Work Discussion Group will be “Feeling Lost and Going in the Right Direction.” David German will present clinical material from the beginning of an analysis and explore the transference and countertransference issues that are present. Alan Sugarman will be the discussant.

Planning is underway for the APsaA's 2019 National Meeting (February 6-10). A possible topic for the Candidate Forum is Analytic Neutrality. We are currently looking for a Candidate to present to the Candidate at Work Discussion Group.

Candidates’ Psychoanalyst in the Community Committee Report
Jane E. Keat, D. Phil., Psy.D., Chair

The Candidates’ Committee of the Psychoanalyst in the Community Section of the Department of Psychoanalytic Education (DPE) has 14 members who are working to provide the candidate perspective to this DPE section and develop creative ways to support candidates in bridging their psychoanalytic work to community issues and settings. The Section has launched a Candidate in the Community Mentoring Program, which pairs awardees with senior analysts who work in the community and offers a small stipend. Awardees will report back on their experience of the mentoring program so that we can learn more about how to effectively support candidates in these endeavors.

The program’s first two awardees have been selected: Joe Wise, M.D. of St. Louis Psychoanalytic Institute, who is working with veterans in Washington, DC and will be mentored by Kenneth Reich, Ed.D.; and Elizabeth Schmick, D.O., a pre-candidate at Oregon Psychoanalytic Center, who is working with marginalized communities, including in a transitional housing program, and will be mentored by Deborah Choate, M.D. Our Committee also hopes to develop blog posts that address candidates' work in community settings and on community issues to support APsaA’s public outreach efforts.

Candidates’ Child and Adolescent Committee Report
Sandra Landen, Ph.D., Chair

The Child and Adolescent Section of the DPE chaired by Karen Gilmore, M.D. currently has 14 subcommittees working as study/working groups, as well as a Child Congress Committee planning a Child and Adolescent Congress for the Tuesday before APsaA’s 2019 National Meeting in February.

Candidates’ Research Committee
Sumru Tufekcioglu, Ph.D., Chair

The Committee for the Fund for Psychoanalytic Research met in February, 2018. For the fiscal year beginning September 1, 2017 (which ends August 31, 2018), the Fund has $162,609 available for grants. Following a discussion on finances, the Committee reviewed and discussed in detail sixteen grant proposals. One of these proposals was a re-submission from the previous cycle, and fifteen proposals were initial submissions. There were twelve submissions from the United States, two submissions from the United Kingdom, and one each from Turkey and Israel. The topics of study in the proposed research projects were: Trauma-focused psychoanalytic psychotherapy, infant research, mentalization, understanding supervisee perspectives in psychoanalytic supervision, dyadic patterns in couples, patient characteristics that...
determine outcome in psychoanalytic therapy, moderating role of personality functioning in psychotherapy, and a novel machine learning approach to determine a best fit between patients and type of psychotherapy. Committee discussions included assessment of the quality of each research project outlined above, i.e., whether the project is psychoanalytic in nature and promotes public health, whether the costs budgeted are justifiable, and whether the project has strong research design qualities. The Committee made final decisions for the reviewed projects and awarded grants for seven projects in the total amount of $99,000. The Committee will meet again in Chicago in June of 2018.

Candidates’ Study Group on the Challenges of Candidacy
Alex Barends, Ph.D., Chair

The only candidate-led and candidate member study group within the Department of Psychoanalytic Education (DPE) has been moving forward with a qualitative research project on how candidates experience their training—both for its challenges and for its rewards. We are about to have our interview project submitted for IRB approval, and anticipate interviewing candidates throughout the United States in the next year. We have openings for new members and believe our interview project provides an unusually rich opportunity to engage our psychoanalytic community at multiple levels. Please contact Alex Barends if you are interested in participating.

Candidates’ Council Secretary’s Report
Sandra Landen, Ph.D., Secretary

At the February 2018 Candidates’ Council Meeting there were a total of 82 candidates present, representing 22 APsaA Institutes as well as several candidates from IPA Institutes, and candidates who are studying abroad remotely from China with APsaA Institutes. There were 47 travel scholarships granted to 1st time candidate member attendees for the 2018 National Meeting.

Candidates’ Council Treasurer’s Report
Alex Barends, Ph.D., Treasurer

Our organization is in a time of important transition since the regulatory function previously performed by the Board of Professional Standards has now been externalized. APsaA is now a membership organization only and our financial priorities are currently being shifted to enhancing membership experience. The overall financial health of the organization remains strong, thanks to the prudence of our financial administrators and the good investment returns of the last nine years. Candidate membership remains a very strong priority of APsaA, and continues to be generously supported through waivers of conference fees and grants for travel for first time attendees. Please contact me if you are interested in the financial work of the organization. It’s a privilege as a candidate to participate in the financial decision-making process as well as in the administration of foundation grants that support the outreach of psychoanalysis to our communities.
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