Dear Candidates, Colleagues, and Friends,

This is my final column as President of APsaA’s Candidates’ Council. As of February 2019, new elections will be held, I will step down (having served two years as President-Elect and another two years as President), and my very able President-Elect and treasured friend, Holly Crisp, will assume the Presidency with a new vision and agenda of her own, and a capable team of officers and committee chairs, as well as new and returning candidate members. It has been my pleasure to work with Holly as my President-Elect, and I could not have asked for a better partner in this endeavor. I also want to thank my slate of officers for their immeasurable help, diligent hard work, and unwavering support over the last two years.

This issue of the Candidate Connection, “The Neurosis of Candidacy,” is the brainchild of our newsletter editor, Himanshu Agrawal. To my mind, it is as relevant, interesting, diverse, and rich a topic as each of us is as an individual. Moreover, each of us is neurotic in our candidacy (and in life) in our own unique, idiosyncratic way. My initial reaction to Himanshu’s idea for this newsletter was, “Candidacy is not for the faint-hearted,” followed closely by, “what am I going to say about that?”

The contributors to this edition of the newsletter have done a superb job of speaking to the relevant issues, addressing the essentials of the neurosis of candidacy in its myriad forms. As the outgoing President, I want to speak to that as well, and to my personal experience both at my institute and at APsaA.

Looking back at my experience as a candidate at my institute, I am struck by the intensity of the roller coaster. There was ambivalence, self-doubt, paranoia, and compensatory defensiveness among us, in addition to the excitement of new friendships, new emerging identities as psychoanalysts, and new clinical skills that greatly expanded our repertoire. There was also gratitude for our psychoanalytic teachers, who gave of their time, energy, and expertise. As diverse as my class was, candidacy was for all of us a meaningful and transformational experience in our own, unique way. Simultaneously both participant and observer of our own repetitions, we manifest gratitude, excitement, fear, competition, old “sibling” rivalries, parental transfers, political alliances, triangulations and solidarity. We had idiosyncratic ways of coping with stressors, competing commitments, ambivalence, and doubt. All adults with professional degrees coming in to the process, we predictably regressed, which I believe we all experienced as both expectable and unnerving at the same time. Nonetheless, we all grew from it. It was anything but smooth and easy for most of us, but all of us grew.

At the same time, APsaA served for me and many of my Candidate Council colleagues as a welcome oasis of sorts, a place to escape the pressures of the home institute and hometown communities. At APsaA meetings, we compared notes, normalized our shared experiences, compared our institutes’ ways of doing things with institutes that differed from ours for better or for worse, and found a kind of stable, expansive, collegial professional experience of great value. The friendships I formed at APsaA were the best antidote to the stresses and pressures of candidacy that I could have ever imagined. I met senior analysts for whom I developed great respect, I made friends from around the world, I had fun, I learned a tremendous amount, and I was often inspired by the meetings. I would not have enjoyed my candidacy or grown nearly as much from it without my APsaA involvement. As such, I encourage all candidates to get involved and participate in APsaA during candidacy; it offers a multitude of rich opportunities.

Last, before I sign off, I want to thank my team (the officers, committee chairs, committee members, and other candidates) whose hard work, enthusiasm, dedication, loyalty, commitment, and creativity made my APsaA experience all that it was. None of that could have happened without you. I sincerely thank you all, and our APsaA candidates, for allowing me to serve as the President for the past two years. I will always be grateful for the experience.

Wishing you all the very best,

Valerie Golden, JD, PhD
President, APsaA Candidates’ Council

Valerie Golden, JD, PhD

PRESIDENT’S NOTE

Theme: The Neurosis of Candidacy
EDITOR’S NOTE

My dear companions,

Tamarind had to bow out, so you’re stuck with me as the sole editor. Expect a shift in the tone of the newsletter, and to the superegos of folks who are sticklers for pristine and proper, I submit in advance an insincere apology. The good news for me, as you will discover in this edition, is that I have recruited some iconic analysts whose writing styles help validate my audacious liberties!

And now, on to the theme of this newsletter:

The need to explore the neurosis of candidacy emerged from my own experiences as a candidate thus far. I feel my analyst provided ample guidance and warning about the storm of psychoanalysis (especially the middle phase—although it is still rather wild when it hits!) However, over the last 2 years I have come to realize that I was not entirely prepared for the whirlpool that has been psychoanalytic training. It dawned upon me that the pressures of psychoanalytic training can provide the setting for the perfect tempest of neurosis—sibling rivalry, idealization/devaluation, regression and acting out to name a few. And all this even before I begin a control case! I wanted to know if other candidates felt the same way, and after receiving Val’s blessings I sent out a survey to all the APsaA candidates—the results were astonishing to me (perhaps you will not be as surprised). The highlights have been shared in this edition.

In the process of developing this edition, what I have discovered is the shot in the arm I had been craving. I hope you will find it helpful too. Overall, the message I have received from our contributors (who are all graduate analysts and stalwarts in their own right) and from my frantic fellow candidates can be distilled into two parts: Firstly, candidacy is difficult, VERY difficult! Secondly, if you stick with it, it can be worth it! I hope you enjoy reading this one.

Warmly,
Himanshu Agrawal, MD, DF-APA

The APsaA Candidates’ Council and IPSO invite you to

Join us
for the Winter Candidates’ Party!

This year we will gather on the Upper West Side at Da Capo for dinner, drinks, and mellow jazz from The Shrinks Trio. Join us for an evening of networking, conversation, music, dinner hors d’oeuvres and an open bar (wine, beer and craft cocktails).

Thursday, February 7th
7:00–10:00 PM
Tickets: $75 advance online, $80 at the door
7–8:30 pm – Networking, dinner and drinks
8:30–10 pm – Relax with music from The Shrinks Jazz Trio
To purchase tickets please visit: apsa.org/product/candidateparty

Location: Da Capo 322 Columbus Ave
(Between W 75th & W 76th Streets)

Questions?
Contact Valerie Golden, J.D., Ph.D.,
President of the Candidates’ Council (goldenvalerie@hotmail.com)
Hosted jointly by APsaA’s Candidates’ Council and the International Psychoanalytical Studies Organization (IPSO)
Eat | Drink | Network | Connect
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Valerie Golden, J.D., PhD, President
Holly Crisp, MD, President-elect
Sandy Landen, PhD, Secretary
Alex Barends, PhD, Treasurer
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(A complete list of CC Committees can be found on the Candidate Members Information Page located in the members section of apsa.org)
The unique dynamics of candidacy

Q1
How do you identify yourself?
Answered: 50  Skipped: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Candidate</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Candidate</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2
In your training analysis, have you ever discussed your feelings about your fellow candidates?
Answered: 50  Skipped: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't remember/Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3
Have you ever felt negative affect about the cost associated with analytic training?
Answered: 51  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't remember/Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4
What percentage of assigned mandatory readings do/did you usually complete for didactics?
Answered: 51  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;50%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 50 and 75%</td>
<td>21.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;75%</td>
<td>45.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't remember/Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51 responses
The unique dynamics of candidacy

Q5
Has your analytic training ever created strain or strife in your personal life?
Answered: 51 Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't remember/Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6
Have you ever felt tempted to change particulars of your write ups?
Answered: 51 Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't remember/Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>17.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7
Have you ever experienced splitting/triangulation amongst faculty?
Answered: 51 Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't remember/Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8
Have you ever experienced splitting/triangulation amongst fellow candidates?
Answered: 51 Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't remember/Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51 responses
The unique dynamics of candidacy

Q9
Have you ever pondered quitting analytic training (check all that apply)

Answered: 51  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes-financial cost</td>
<td>49.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes-time commitment</td>
<td>37.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes-dynamics in institute/faculty/classmates</td>
<td>45.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes-cost to personal life/relationships</td>
<td>31.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t remember/Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 51

51 responses
THE NEUROSIS OF CANDIDACY

Candidacy and Its Discontents
Glen O. Gabbard, MD

It has often been said that everyone starts analysis with ambivalence. In the current zeitgeist one could say that everyone who starts analytic training has an even greater level of ambivalence. It would not be controversial today to characterize psychoanalysis as a beleaguered profession. Respected academics and journalists are sounding its death knell on a regular basis. “Evidence-based” treatments are claiming good results in a short period of time and providing manuals to make these approaches user-friendly. Even computers appear to do a pretty good job with some patients with some conditions. Indeed, computers have another advantage—as far as we know they have escaped the perils of countertransference (at least so far).

lower one’s fee to a dollar per session (payable at the end of the analysis), and a host of other accommodations. When a candidate finds someone who is willing to come four times per week, the candidate may be thinking privately, “What is wrong with this patient? This is too good to be true.”

When one finally starts a training case, one must also start supervision with a supervising analyst. The difference between a regular analysis and a supervised analysis is eminently clear: in a supervised analysis the patient receives the relevant interpretation one week later.

In such cases, the candidate may feel that unless she agrees with the supervisor, she will be viewed as misguided and receive a lukewarm evaluation from the supervising analyst.

When I was in psychoanalytic training, and rather close to graduating, I started a control case with a classically-trained supervising analyst. He was deeply devoted to a strict ego-psychological model that emphasized neurotic organization and interpretation of intrapsychic conflict. My supervisor was actually a charming and intelligent individual, but he wasn’t well-suited to my patient, whose internal organization was for more disturbed than a garden variety neurotic. Early in the analysis it became clear that the patient required a considerable amount of ego support, empathy, and extensive validation to be able to tolerate four sessions per week on the couch. My supervisor felt differently, and I found myself skewing my account of the analytic work to emphasize interpretation of transference and resistance above all else. However, I often shared that I thought the patient needed holding and support because the material she presented reflected issues that were primarily pre-oedipal.

My supervisor was less convinced and would periodically say, “Have you noticed, Glen, that the more you stay in the classical model of defense and transference interpretation, the better she gets?” I actually hadn’t noticed that at all. My observation was quite to the contrary. I felt that I was in a no-win situation. If I responded to my supervisor’s query with an affirmative reply, I would be dishonest. If I responded in a negative way, I might be seen as devaluing his help. I chose not to engage in an argument with him because I was close to graduation and thought it was better to simply nod and take notes while continuing to do what seemed to help the patient.

The candidate must be prepared for several categories of problematic supervisors:

(1) The Chatty Supervisor. This individual, having been starved all day for conversation while restraining himself with his patients, seizes the opportunity to chit-chat and gossip with his supervisees.

(2) The Sleepy Supervisor. Many analysts who are in the role of supervisor work excessively long hours to accommodate the schedules of their patients and may see supervision as a time when they are entitled to drift off to sleep. Trainees may feel it is their responsibility to be entertaining and clever to keep their supervisor awake.

(3) The Boundaryless Supervisor. While often male (but not exclusively so), this variant of supervisor may comment on the clothing that the supervisee is wearing or suggest that the patient sit next to him on the couch rather than using a chair.

Continued on page 7
Reflections on a “Perfect Storm”

Fred Busch, PhD

Looking back over almost a half-century of involvement with psychoanalytic institutes in a variety of capacities, I see two separate eras in how candidates are viewed, leading to distinct perfect storms. The first era was during my own candidacy and seemed to be characteristic of the time. As one colleague depicted it, “I never said anything right, and then I graduated”. There was a decidedly chilly atmosphere in seminars, where it seemed like some of our instructors perceived us as adversaries when raising questions. At the time I wondered if we were being taught according to a medical model, where students were supposed to accept received wisdom, rather than a graduate school model where free-wheeling questioning was encouraged. As an aside I want to mention that the institute where I trained were pioneers in accepting psychologists for training in the early 1970’s. In my initial class of seven, we were three psychologists, one philosopher, and three psychiatrists. The general feeling amongst candidates was that we never knew where we stood. This is true across the eras in that candidates rarely receive constructive criticism of their work. At an earlier time, there was almost no feedback, and at the current time it’s my impression that we’re afraid of traumatizing candidates with constructive criticism, as if candidates weren’t mature professionals who want to learn how to work like a psychoanalyst. The lack of meaningful feedback played into certain insecurities about my capacities as a developing analyst, which played out in the context of the inevitable regression one experiences in analysis.

In the few studies that have been done (e.g., Cabaniss et al, 2004) candidates rate seminars very low on the hierarchy of what was important in their psychoanalytic training. What effect does this have on candidates? My own experience as a candidate was often reading a complicated text (e.g., Freud’s “Project”) with no context for why we were reading it, and the seminar revolved around being asked, “So what did you think about this reading?” I was hoping the instructors would help me understand this reading, as I often had little clue as to what I thought about it. However, the candidates were left to barely articulate our inadequate understanding, only to be corrected by the instructors. Clinical seminars were centered on what the instructor might say, or we were asked what we might say, but there was no context. As everything we say in psychoanalytic thinking is based upon a theory (articulated or not), it was the reasons for saying one thing or another that was missing. Becoming a psychoanalyst has often been associated with an identification, with one’s personal analyst or supervisors. I think this is an inadequate model, often leading to idolatry. Becoming a psychoanalyst should be based on an understanding of theoretical-clinical models in the context of the evolution of Psychoanalysis, along with a passion and respect for the privilege of attempting to understand and help another.

So, if I thought my training was mediocre, how did I end up contributing to the psychoanalytic literature? I was fortunate that, after drifting away from my institute for many years, I was invited to teach Freud’s papers on his move to the Structural Theory. This, in conjunction with finding a writer who actually used the Structural Theory in defining clinical technique, led me to re-engage in psychoanalytic thinking with renewed enthusiasm and energy.

The Second Era

The second era in psychoanalytic training seems to have been, in part, a reaction to the first era. It seems to me that the current tendency to think of candidates as primarily narcissistically vulnerable to being hurt, may be a projection of an older generation’s response to their own training scars. Regression may ensue when there continues to be difficulties in helping candidates understand where they are in their development as analysts in a way that is constructive. The tendency amongst some to think that our primary job is to enhance the candidate’s sense of competency, when they are there to learn how to become competent, or to help them find their
“own style” before they know what it means to be a psychoanalyst, can contribute to narcissistic defenses against learning.

There have been remarkable changes in University education over the last half-century, mostly revolving around the student as consumer. As Edmundson (2013) notes, the University has become a buyer’s market, and “That usually means creating more comfortable, less challenging environments, places where almost no one failed, everything was enjoyable, and everyone was nice” (p. 14). He goes on to describe how classrooms remain a place for the free exchange of ideas, the student’s ideas.

My own epiphany came in teaching a clinical seminar to candidates. I’ve taught this seminar in a particular way for many years at different institutes. I ask the candidates to grapple with my particular view of the psychoanalytic method (Busch, 2013), not presenting it as the only method, but as a method worth thinking about and incorporating. The seminars are usually lively and helpful to all of us. I am frequently challenged (in the best sense), which I find helpful to modify or clarify my thinking. Still, I consider myself an authority on thinking about aspects of clinical technique from my perspective. A few years ago, I was teaching an advanced group of candidates, when amid a discussion a candidate interrupted to say she liked the previous way a clinical seminar was taught, where everyone sat around and just said what he or she thought about the case. It was at that point I realized what had only been in the background of my mind, that a new era in psychoanalytic institutes had arrived… our Kumbayya moment, the era of false democratization. That is, we were now all the same, no one knew anything more than anyone else, and everything was supposed to be nice. No one needed to be taught, if indeed there was anything to be taught, rather our job had become to help candidates find his or her “own analytic voice” (Levin, 2006). Skorczewski (2008) reports of how a candidate felt demoralized in a seminar, “It made me feel like a novice who could never really understand psychoanalysis, not to mention practice it like my supervisor said to me, “I don’t know why you people want training.”

As an aside I would say we are all regressed when we enter psychoanalysis. That is, we have erected certain defenses that have been both adaptive and interfered with a certain freedom in thinking. It is the need to have these defenses analyzed as part of the working through process that can lead to the kind of regression that contributes to the “perfect storm.”

Footnotes

1 Psychoanalytic training as described by Dr. Agrawal in his invitation to contribute to this issue.

2 While we were welcomed by most members of the Institute, it was clear that some experienced our entering the Institute as an attempt to intrude into the privileged medical hold on psychoanalytic training. This was not an uncommon view of many APsaA members at the time (despite Freud’s paper on Lay Analysis). As one supervisor said to me, “I don’t know why you people want training.”
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The Art of “Not Knowing”
Dan Jacobs, MD

An analytic candidate’s education is an exercise in not knowing—and learning to tolerate that lack of certainty. Not knowing what your analysts think of you. Not knowing how you will pay off your educational loans. Not knowing whether you will have an analytic practice after so much effort, an effort that leaves you wondering if you should be at home with your family instead of at seminars. Uncertainty is the rule of candidacy. Competing psychoanalytic theories often confuse as much as they clarify. And how about the lack of clarity in doing analysis as a beginner? Trying to make sense of a patient’s free associations or lack of them. Being uncertain if the patient will stay in analysis long enough to provide the needed credits toward graduation. And what if one does graduate? What then? And I haven’t even mentioned the inevitable feelings of envy and competition in relation to other candidates and faculty. At any institute, gossip and rumor abound. What is one to believe?

That anyone survives candidacy is a miracle. Some don’t. I had a classmate who ultimately chose a sports car over continuing his training analysis. Some believed his analyst gave him an ultimatum: choose one or the other. Was his analyst being “rigid, a kill-joy”? Or maybe my colleague was being irresponsible, taking on an additional expense while being behind on payments to his analyst. We were unsure what to believe.

That tale raises another question. Are there serious consequences to leaving a training analysis or an institute? That uncertainty may contribute to some remaining candidates for many years, neither moving ahead nor dropping out. When I was a candidate, I had a patient who announced he was going to finish his analysis the following week. He didn’t, but I was stunned by his announcement. Not only because I realized I had paid too little attention to a growing negative transference, but because I was amazed by his degree of apparent freedom. He had no connection to analysis other than seeing me. He was not in the mental health field. He knew no one in our field and he had told no one he was in analysis. He could walk away and only he, my supervisor and I would know. A candidate, however, often feels in a different position. She may have to explain her exit from an institute to classmates, her friends in the field, her supervisors. And changing analysts has its own uncertainties. Like a second marriage, it you fail at it again, there’s definitely something wrong with you.

How to deal with all this uncertainty? I chose a path I would not necessarily recommend, though it worked for me. I narrowed my focus. I kept my nose to the grindstone and didn’t look around much. Whatever political and theoretical disputes, whatever animosities between faculty members and/or candidates, I kept myself ignorant of. At the time I trained, mercifully for me, candidates were not invited to be on Institute committees. I could keep myself out of the politics of the institute, its administration and its rivalries. Committee work can become for everyone, graduates and candidate alike, a way “being an analyst” without analyzing many patients. (I later succumbed to lots of committee work, some of which I enjoyed, much I regret). As a candidate and after, I ensured income came second to opportunity—the opportunity to immerse myself in practice, taking on as many analytic patients as I could. (It is hard, I think, to become a good analyst without doing a lot of analysis.) While I was in candidacy, I found a small group of friends I could trust and formed study groups with them. I learned as much from peers over time as I did from supervisors. And their support and friendship helped with the stresses of candidacy. I attended the meetings of the American Psychoanalytic Association. Feeling an outsider at first, I decided to join small study groups where I met colleagues from other institutes other than my own who provided a broader perspective on psychoanalytic education and practice.

The way I coped had its limitations as well as bonuses. How you will find a way that is meaningful, which authentically represents who you are and who you want to be amidst inevitable uncertainty, is your challenge. With the help of self-reflection and some courage, you can find a path amidst the discomforts of uncertainty, and even learn to welcome aspects of “not knowing.”

“With the help of self-reflection and some courage, you can find a path amidst the discomforts of uncertainty, and even learn to welcome aspects of ‘not knowing.’”
We are delighted to have Dr. Abbasi as our 2019 Master-Teacher Award Recipient. She truly embodies the rare qualities of a master-teacher, namely those extraordinary abilities to inspire a generation of candidates to pursue careers in psychoanalysis. Congratulations, Dr. Abbasi!

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.

Program Committee
Sarah L. Lusk, PhD, Chair
At the February 2019 National Meeting, the Candidate at Work Discussion group is titled “You just disappeared. Were you ever here?” It will examine the relationship between dissociation and repressed aspects of unconscious conflicts. Amber Nemeth, PhD, will be presenting. Lucy LaFarge, MD is the discussant.

Current Chair Sarah Lusk will be stepping down after this February meeting and turning over the reins to Amber Nemeth (NYPSI candidate) who brings a wealth of experience in candidate programming. Our heartfelt thanks to Sarah for her extraordinary contribution over the past several years; we are sorry to see her go. At the same time, we welcome Amber with great excitement and enthusiasm!

Membership Committee
Holly Crisp, MD & David German, DO, Co-Chairs
Holly and David have recently joined APsaA’s Membership Committee. Their role on the committee thus far has been to bring the perspectives of candidates and consider the candidates’ roles in the organization’s overall efforts to increase membership and better meet the needs of members, including candidate members. As candidates are the future of the organization, they look forward to getting more involved in these efforts as conversations in the committee process unfolds.

Secretary’s Report
Sandra Landen, PhD
At the February 2018 National Meeting there were a total of 82 candidates present, representing 22 APsaA institutes at the Candidates’ Council meeting. There were 44 travel awards granted to 1st time attendees. At the 107th Annual Meeting (June 2018), 8 candidates attended their first Candidates’ Council meeting utilizing the travel award.

Master-Teacher Award Committee
Valerie Golden, JD, PhD, Chair
The 2019 Master Teacher Award recipient is Aisha Abbasi, MD, who will present on Thursday, February 7, of the 2019 National Meeting in New York, immediately following the Candidates’ Council meeting. The title of her presentation is “The Often-Neglected Significance of Asking Our Patients Questions During Psychoanalytic Treatment.” Dr. Abbasi will discuss the problems created by an often-popular analytic idea that the analyst should not introduce into the clinical work anything that the patient has not yet mentioned. Linked to this is another idea that the analyst should not ask questions to clarify, confront, or gather more explicit knowledge of, and understanding about, the patient’s life history and conflicts. She will illustrate with clinical examples the limitations created in analytic work by such an approach and will contrast this with what she believes is a much more useful way of working analytically, in which the analyst points out significant omissions in the material, asks questions about it, and works with the patient on the defensive needs that create such omissions. She will also demonstrate the usefulness of many kinds of questions in the day to day work of the analyst. Dr. Abbasi argues that the analyst’s questions are not intrusions; instead, if thoughtfully used, they can be deeply useful interventions in analytic work.

Child and Adolescent Committee Report
Sandra Landen, PhD, Chair
The Child and Adolescent Section of the DPE chaired by Karen Gilmore, MD, currently has 14 subcommittees active as study/working groups. The Child Congress Committee planned the Child and Adolescent Congress for Tuesday, February 5th, 2019 preceding the National Meeting. This year’s inaugural DPE Child Congress will have a morning panel on “Emerging Adulthood” and an afternoon panel on “Technology and Screens in the Treatment of Children and Adolescents”.

Research Committee and Fund for Psychoanalytic Research Committee
Sasru Tufekcioglu, PhD, Chair
The Committee for the Fund for Psychoanalytic Research convened for its June 2018 meeting in Chicago. They discussed finances and reviewed in detail 9 recent grant proposals, which included four submissions from the United States, and one submission each from the United Kingdom, Turkey, South Africa, Finland, and the Netherlands. The topics of study in the proposed research projects comprised:

- Maternal identity formation in the context of miscarriage; the role of therapeutic alliance in psychotherapy for adolescent depression; mentalization in...
psychodynamic child psychotherapy; psychoanalytic treatment of neurological patients; the development of self-analytic function in psychoanalysis; the moderating role of personality functioning in assessment of interpersonal dependency; patient perspectives on goals for recovery in psychoanalytic psychotherapy; the efficacy of psychoanalytically informed psychotherapy in private practice; and a project proposing the digitizing of recorded treatments by analysts for research and teaching purposes.

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 will meet in February of 2019 in New York for the next round of grant submissions.

To learn more, visit: http://www.apsa.org/research-fund

Candidates’ Council Psychoanalytic Paper Prize
Sumru Tufekcioglu, PhD, Chair

The Candidates’ Council Psychoanalytic Paper Prize and Writing Workshop was held on Friday, June 22, at the 107th Annual Meeting in Chicago. The meeting was chaired by Sumru Tufekcioglu, PhD. The 2018 semi-finalist winner Meade Goedert, PhD, LMSW (Michigan Psychoanalytic Institute) presented his paper “Shamed if you do, shamed if you don’t: Clinical encounters with social class,” in which he considers the impact of social class on the analytic process. Seth Aronson, PhD, Training Director, and Training and Supervising Analyst at The William Alanson White Institute in New York served as the discussant and commented on the themes of the paper as well as on the writing process more broadly. Participants had an opportunity for discussion in a collegial and informal atmosphere.

For the 2019 Candidates’ Council Psychoanalytic Paper Prize, the committee has received numerous strong papers and has granted the Finalist and Semi-finalist awards to two of the papers evaluated by the committee judges: The Finalist for this year is Meade Goedert, PhD, LMSW, from the Michigan Psychoanalytic Institute, who was also the semi-finalist in 2018. His paper “Racism in the Countertransference” explores the impact, on the analytic process, of the unconscious racism the analyst might find himself experiencing in his reactions to the analysand. Meade Goedert will present his paper in June 2019 at APsaA’s 108th Annual Meeting in San Diego.

The semi-finalist this year is Kiana Keihani, PhD, from the San Francisco Center for Psychoanalysis, with her paper “The Analyst’s Character and Training: Guidance and Hindrance,” in which she considers the analyst’s own character, an integral part of the analytic process, and the ways it enhances and hinders the analytic work. Kiana Keihani will present her paper on February 8 at APsaA’s 2019 National Meeting in New York. Judy Kantrowitz, PhD (Boston Psychoanalytic Institute) will serve as discussant.

Social Issues Committee
Alex Sawicki, MD, Chair

I continue to work to keep up with the projects, position statements, and other activities of the Social Issues Department in my role as liaison to candidates.