PRESIDENT’S LETTER

Dear Affiliates,

I hope this finds you all back in classes after your holiday break. The subject of my column is the Task Force on Externalization, which is of utmost importance to candidates.

While I am the only candidate on the Task Force, the issue under consideration is the externalization of the Board on Professional Standards (BOPS) in order to preserve educational standards for APsaA candidates. So in essence, a major reason for the discussions is the educational future for candidates in training at APsaA institutes.

The charge of the Task Force is to address the feasibility and desirability of separating the standard-setting and/or certifying and/or credentialing functions from the membership organization. This question has come about because one goal of a membership organization is to welcome new members. This goal potentially clashes with the goal of the educational arm of our organization, which is to educate psychoanalysts who automatically become members of the membership organization. Up until a short while ago, only those educated at APsaA institutes were automatically accepted for membership in our Association (with a few exceptions).

The educational arm of our organization has the charge of educating candidates in our APsaA sponsored institutes only and has the responsibility for certifying them after graduation. Our organization has decided already to accept IPA psychoanalysts as members automatically, making the BOPS an entity that does not apply to all Association members. Why would analysts educated at IPA institutes want to allocate funds to APsaA institutes?

Therefore, this issue is of considerable importance for all APsaA candidates. All of our e-mail discussions for the task force are available to all members, so you are welcome to “listen in.” You will not be able to post to the list, but you can read what we say. This ability to monitor the discussion on line is in the spirit of complete and total disclosure of our deliberations.

Continued on page 2

ON PSYCHOANALYSIS

HELPING PATIENTS ENTER ANALYSIS: THE ROLE OF A FUNDAMENTAL INTERPRETATION IN BEGINNING PSYCHOANALYTIC TREATMENT

—By Charles P. Fisher, M.D.
    Faculty and Training Analyst
    San Francisco Psychoanalytic Institute

In 1913, Freud offered a Fundamental Rule for patients in psychoanalysis. He advised the analyst to tell the patient:

“So say whatever goes through your mind. Act as though, for instance, you were a traveller sitting next to the window of a railway carriage and describing to someone inside the carriage the changing views which you see outside. Finally, never forget that you have promised to be absolutely honest, and never leave anything out because, for some reason or other, it is unpleasant to tell it. (S.E. 12, p. 135)”

While Freud’s description of free association is vivid, the process which he recommends is problematic. His
Continued from page 1

And this is one good argument for e-mail discussions. However, I happen to feel that discussions of such import need to be done face-to-face or at least over the telephone so that some long-standing disagreements can be healed. I have doubts that when people sit alone in a room with just a computer, much is lost. After all, we are in the business of discussing difficult issues with people. But let me know what you think. Your opinion matters, especially on an issue such as APsaA education as well as how we communicate within our Association. So call me if you have questions, my number is 303-777-4627. I look forward to speaking with you on this issue.

Sincerely yours,
Laura L. Jensen, Ph.D.
President, Affiliate Council

On Psychoanalysis cont.
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tone is steeped in the language of authority, fitting for the early 20th century physician/psychoanalyst, but not so fitting for the psychoanalyst of today. Our patients generally expect to be treated as equals and as informed consumers of professional care. Those who are unable to feel or express such expectations may present the psychopathology of the masochistic or overly compliant patient—difficulties which must be addressed in order to create a fruitful analytic process. So how can the contemporary psychoanalyst create a psychoanalytic process with a prospective patient?

There is evidence that practice has changed significantly since Freud’s time. Some 20 years ago, in an article entitled, “The Fundamental Rule: A Study of Current Usage” (JAPA 35: 47-76), Joseph Lichtenberg and Floyd Galler reconsidered Freud’s rule. Lichtenberg and Galler reported a survey of what was then the current practice of 102 senior psychoanalysts. They concluded, “Our findings confirm an impression of diversity of approaches to the fundamental rule and indicate that what is said and the reasons for it should be given greater attention in analytic education.” Discussing reasons for the change in emphasis since Freud’s time, they cite “Epstein (1976) who suggests that Freud’s authoritative stance and the theme of the active, morally superior analyst and the passive patient may have reflected his need to establish standards among young practitioners in a new science where his authority was required as a supportive measure to beginning analysts.” [EPSTEIN, G. 1976 A note on a semantic confusion in the fundamental rule of psychoanalysis J. Phila. Assn. Psychoanal. 3:54-57] Despite their finding that analysts had moved away from Freud’s authoritative stance, the diversity that Lichtenberg and Galler encountered centered on various ways of providing “initial instructions” for the patient.

My recommendation is that we use the concept of a fundamental interpretation to replace Freud’s use of a fundamental rule. The purpose of a fundamental interpretation is to show the patient a bit of what a psychoanalytic process can be like. To offer a fundamental interpretation, the analyst must listen carefully to the patient’s presenting problems. These may be conscious concerns of the patient or preconscious, implied issues which can be clarified by the analyst. The analyst simultaneously observes difficulties which the patient encounters in speaking openly and comfortably with the analyst. (I do not mean to suggest that all difficulties in communication are caused by the patient.) Over the course of one or several sessions, the analyst looks for ways that the patient’s difficulties in communicating with the analyst reflect underlying concerns that are also reflected in the patient’s presenting problems. The analyst then offers a fundamental interpretation, linking a presenting problem, a difficulty in communicating with the analyst, and an underlying issue. When it is possible to offer such an interpretation, the patient has an opportunity to see a direct connection between his or her presenting concerns, and work within the treatment. It is often the case that such an insight brings about a shift in the patient’s communication difficulties, leading to a deepening of the treatment relationship.

The interpretation that I’ve described is fundamental in the sense that it forms the basis of initiating an analytic relationship. Needless to say, such an interpretation near the beginning of treatment is not meant to be comprehensive or fundamental in an etiologic sense. It is usually, but not always, possible to find and articulate such an interpretation within several sessions. In my, admittedly unsystematic, experience, the ability to do so correlates well with the level of functioning of an analytic dyad and with the likelihood of developing a rich analytic process.

The following vignette summarizes the beginning of a treatment in which a fundamental interpretation moved the work forward dramatically. Mr. G., a retired man with considerable financial resources, sought treatment because of chronic depression, a painful sense being without male friends, sexual concerns about his relationship with his wife, and an inability to take pleasure in reading or certain other activities. In initial sessions, he was able to speak very articulately about these complaints, but seemed quite hesitant to engage in an intensive treatment process. He expressed admiration about the perceptiveness of my questions and comments, and I experienced his praise as genuine. Nonetheless, Mr. G. questioned the prospects of my providing him substantial help with his difficulties. I sensed that he was hesitant to tell me...
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in detail about his life outside the areas of difficulty which he described. In particular, it was hard for him to tell me about his financial success, his beautiful and loving wife, and his intellectual accomplishments. I commented that it seemed he could not allow himself to become closer to me because he feared that I would be harmed if I were fully aware of his successes. This comment, in combination with my next remark, constituted a fundamental interpretation in this treatment. Mr. G. responded that he was very afraid of competing with me, lest I feel hurt or angry. I said that similar concerns were probably involved in his difficulty in having male friends. Mr. G. recalled having felt very close to his father. But the price he paid was alienating his older brother, who was shorter, less intellectually gifted, and less favored by his father. Recognizing the connection between his difficulty in speaking freely with me and several of his presenting problems, Mr. G. moved into a more intensive analytic treatment with me. His associations deepened, and we met more frequently. This shift was made possible by the patient's diminished fear of his competitive feelings, as well as by the intellectual insight about his difficulties. I was able to point out that his praise for my abilities was intended to protect us both from his aggressive and competitive feelings. This interpretation was part of the process of working through the earlier fundamental interpretation. Mr. G. began to recognize the pervasiveness in his life of concerns about aggression and competition. As a result, he opened up additional areas of exploration. As we worked together, Mr. G., who was indeed very bright, served up areas of his history in such a way that I could easily make astute connections. Thus, he both enhanced my functioning and offered excessive praise. In order for me to recognize that this pattern was problematic in our communication, I had to confront my own desire to be and to feel as wise Mr. G. made me. I described this interactive pattern to Mr. G., again as part of helping him work through the earlier fundamental interpretation. He became less anxious about competing with me, and more able to offer his own thoughts and insights about his associations, rather than simply setting them up for me. At this point, we were working together in a collaborative analytic process.

I would like to offer several additional comments on my technical recommendation. My point of view is not to downgrade the importance of free association, and certainly not to replace it. By replacing a fundamental rule with a fundamental interpretation, I aim to:

1. Show, rather than simply tell the patient, something of what an analytic process is like.
2. Work collaboratively with the patient to clarify the patient's presenting problems and to develop an analytic process.
3. Privately observe communication difficulties that arise in the treatment dyad.
4. Selectively describe these difficulties to the patient.
5. Infer areas of conflict within the patient that contribute to these communication difficulties and also to the patient's presenting problems.

6. Move flexibly back and forth between focus on the mind of the patient and private mental work on the part of the analyst. This private mental work needs to include self-analysis in order to make sense of one's reactions to the patient and one's own contributions to the process, in order to grasp the nature of communication difficulties which occur.

7. Move back and forth between attention to interpersonal relations in the analytic dyad and inference about the patient's internal object relations.
8. Promote the patient's freedom of association within an interpersonal frame, and in the context of the patient's internal object relations.
9. Promote the analyst's freedom to work analytically by way of items 1–8 above.
10. Assess the prospects for fruitful analytic work within a particular analyst/analysand dyad.

To situate my technical recommendation within the realm of theory, I see it as reflecting an integrated view of analysis. It enfolds a topographic view (freedom of association) within an object relations and structural view (conflict about communicating with an other). It acknowledges that internal object relations are played out and reflected within an interpersonal frame constructed by both participants. And it considers general difficulties in communication within a framework of mental conflict.

NYUPI

—By Ed Dewey, PsyD.

At NYU Medical School Psychoanalytic Institute (NYUPI), our candidate organization, currently lead by Jason Greenberg, Ph.D., has a moderately sized membership. Our organization began several years ago due to growing concern on the part of some candidates that they had no adequate forum to bring up issues regarding training and practice building. Candidates wanted a place to focus their collective concerns and develop an effective voice in the institute at large. Though our candidate organization represents and works for all candidates in the institute the number of candidates that attend meetings fluctuates. We hold monthly meetings to
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discuss ongoing agenda items, which I will describe below, as well as any concerns that may come up amongst the membership from meeting to meeting.

Our organization’s focus has broadened somewhat since its inception and has the goal of facilitating relations in three general areas as Dr. Greenberg, our president, has conceived it: inter-candidate relationships, intra-institutional relationships and inter-institutional relationships. With regard to the first, we organize biannual casual social events to bring the classes together the first of which is a welcoming gathering for new candidates. We also offer a mentor from one of the upper classes for incoming candidates who request one.

To facilitate communication between candidates, faculty and administration, we also hold an annual meeting with a representative from the curriculum committee. This meeting gives candidates an opportunity to ask questions and to have the reasoning behind the evolving curriculum explained in an effort to clarify the teaching goals of the institute. It also provides candidates an opportunity to voice concerns about the curriculum and to make suggestions for change that the faculty representative will then report back to the curriculum committee where it can be discussed further. Additionally, if particular training, practice building or other important issues emerge in candidate organization meetings, the organization may arrange for a faculty member to meet with interested candidates to discuss such topics and provide guidance.

The candidate organization is also interested in building inter-institutional relationships though this area is more of a work in progress. We are involved in the International Psychoanalytic Studies Organization (IPSO) and are expecting our first foreign exchange candidate form Greece this year through the IPSO foreign exchange program. Additionally, this winter, we hope to be hosting a German national who is in psychoanalytic training in Germany but is seeking graduate training in Clinical Psychology in the United States. At the local level, we are discussing ways to bring candidates together from the local institutes both inside and outside of the APA to share ideas and experiences. Several collaborative efforts to create panel discussions and symposia on training and early practice issues have already been begun through other organizations such as The Candidate journal which is separate from the candidate organization. The clear interest candidates form different institutes have shown in the beginning of these events has stimulated the candidate organization to see in what ways it may facilitate these efforts and build on the general interest candidates have shown for coming together.

INTRODUCING THE BERKSHIRE PSYCHOANALYTIC INSTITUTE CANDIDATES ORGANIZATION

—By Jesse A. Goodman, M.D.

We are pleased to introduce the newly formed Berkshire Psychoanalytic Institute Candidates Organization formed by candidates of the Berkshire Psychoanalytic Institute in Stockbridge, Massachusetts. We discovered our need to form a candidate organization after Ellen Rowntree, M.D. invited the candidates to her home for a lunch with Carmela Perez, Ph.D., who spoke of her own experiences in a candidate organization at NYU Psychoanalytic Institute. As a result, we saw how a candidate organization would provide a formal structure through which we could communicate with the Berkshire Psychoanalytic Institute, with other candidates within our institute and with other candidates in the American Psychoanalytic Association. We also aim to create structures for recruiting and orienting new candidates, develop a referral system, and organize social events.

We elected Lyn Yonack, MSW, President and Liaison to the Institute, Anne Rocheleau, Ph.D. Representative to the Board of Directors of the BPI, myself the Delegate to the Affiliate Council, and Michael Groat, Ph.D., Alternate Delegate to the Affiliate Council. We are currently working to create bylaws, and to negotiate how we communicate with the Berkshire Psychoanalytic Institute. We are working to join various institute committees and trying to spread the work among us, since with such a small institute, a few of us can serve numerous roles.

The Berkshire Psychoanalytic Institute was formed in 2001. It is a New Training Facility, sponsored by a team from the Committee of New Training Facilities. At the present time, the Berkshire Psychoanalytic Institute is relatively small, with eight candidates, one psychoanalytic scholar and about 20 faculty, including 11 training analysts. We have two classes, which commenced in 2004 and 2006. The candidates live and work in the Berkshires, Albany, and Connecticut. The faculty is diverse, having trained at many different institutes. Some live in the Berkshires and Connecticut, and others live in Boston or New York and summer and weekend in this area.

MICHIGAN PSYCHOANALYTIC INSTITUTE

—By Susan L. Flinders, Ph.D.

Today in Michigan we saw our first seasonal snowflakes gently glide lazily to the brown earth, leaving me with jubilant anticipation for the wondrous white blankets that will soon surround us. This is the type of feeling I have for the candidate year that has just begun. I am especially joyous as I begin my fourth and final year of classes. The Candidate Organization kick-started social gatherings with a potluck lunch-eon for candidates and families at a local recreational area with water sports, biking and other outdoor activities aplenty. An excellent time was had by all. This was planned by outgoing Co-Presidents Lynn Kuttnauer, Ph.D. and Bernadette Kovach, Ph.D. and incoming Co-Presidents Suzanne Thomas, M.S.W. and Bob Zoltowski, D.O.
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The year has opened with two scientific meetings that left minds churning over the wealth of ideas and feelings stimulated by the presentations and discussions. The first presentation was by Dale Boesky, M. D. and dealt with the concept of “contextualization” related to the analytic hour and was discussed by Michael Shulman, Ph. D. This talk was intellectually invigorating. The second presentation centered on the topic on how seasoned analysts’ techniques and theories have been influenced by their work with patients. The presenters were, Marvin Margolis, M. D., Ph. D., Melvin Bornstein, M. D. and Evangeline Spindler, M. D. with discussant Michael Singer, Ph. D. This scientific meeting was especially emotionally moving. Supervision policy, as a potential Candidate concern, has been a recent topic of discussion as related to possibly having mandatory supervision prior to first cases and how there might be some guidance in this area. No decision has been reached at this point.

I don’t know how the Candidates’ organization was formed in Michigan, but I will tell what I do know. It is a relatively independent organization in that the frequency of meetings, types of officers, activities and dues etc. are determined by the group itself. For example, the candidates have decided to have Co-Officers in some positions to lessen the burden put on those in some positions. The dues are currently $100.00 per year and candidates generally use this money as they decide except that it is usually expected that the organization contribute to the amount paid toward some events like the Visiting Professor Program. We discuss in the group meetings and by group e-mail candidate concerns and may bring Institute Officers into meetings as needed to join in the discussions and to enhance communication between the Institute Authorities and the Candidates. The Presidents or Co-Presidents of the Candidates’ Organization will often bring the Candidate concerns to the attention of the Institute President for more formal input and discussion. Overall, it appears that the Candidate organization is highly respected and operates as a Candidate interface with the rest of the Institute’s Groups. Over time, from my knowledge and reports by upper classpersons, Michigan’s Candidate’s Organization has brought significant input to particularly the training portion of the Institute. In sum, Michigan’s candidates continue to flourish in an atmosphere of intellectual and emotional rigor with an ever mindful eye to continual growth and evolution by the caring members of the Institute as a whole.

**THE NEW YORK PSYCHOANALYTIC INSTITUTE**

—By Hilli Dagon-Clark, PsyD.

Our Candidates’ Organization was most recently formed by then candidate Susan Jaffe, MD, in the Fall of 2005 as a way to help candidates from different classes get to know one another and address training-related issues. Our Dean of Education, Philip Herschenfeld, MD, was instrumental in encouraging the existence of this organization and suggested that Dr. Jaffe send a poll to establish whether candidates were interested in participating in an organization that represents them. Since then, several meetings a year have taken place and have served as a comfortable place for candidates from different classes to interact, exchange ideas, and discuss about difficulties related to training, such as progression or problems in classes or supervision. These meetings have taken place in the evenings at the Institute and have sometimes been accompanied by pizza and wine.

The Candidates’ Organization has been instrumental in implementing beneficial changes affecting candidates’ training and professional lives. For instance, the Mentorship Program has paired first year with third or fourth year candidates to assist their transition to the Institute and informally address concerns about training. Additionally, difficulty obtaining the readings for classes resulted in Dr. Jaffe’s speaking to the Education Committee and requesting that a better system be established, which has since then taken place. The Candidates’ Organization, along with the Program Committee, has also helped sponsor a candidate-focused presentation addressing diagnostic, research and treatment issues, and independently sponsored a Media-Training Seminar with Gail Saltz, MD. The Candidates’ Organization has furthermore encouraged candidates’ participation in relevant events, such as the Winter and Spring APsaA meetings, Practice-Building seminars with our dean, and our annual pot-luck holiday parties. Finally, although underutilized, a list-serve has been set up so that candidates may exchange ideas, send one another referrals, and recognize accomplishments such as publications or awards.

Analytic training is an exciting albeit daunting task. Many candidates must readjust to a newly assigned student status after years of forming a professional identity where they are leaders and trainers in their fields. The coupling of regression fostered through one’s analysis, along with the new academic and professional requirements that are assessed in classes, supervision, and with one’s analysands, is demanding. This is why the formation of a candidate’s organization, which can help people find support, build alliances, and establish a professional identity, is crucial to the professional development of budding psychoanalysts.

**THE BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON CENTER FOR PSYCHOANALYSIS**

—By Joy Kassett, Ph.D., President, Candidates’ Organization

The Baltimore-Washington Center for Psychoanalysis has a strong Candidates’ Organization. It has been in existence for many years now and it serves as an important liaison between the Faculty/Institute and the Candidates in Training. Candidates are...
involved in almost every aspect of the functioning of the Center, sitting on many of the established Committees. For example, I sit on the Curriculum Committee that meets 4 or 5 times per year. Candidates are very active in fostering relationships with other Institutes in the Baltimore-Washington area. For example, each year the Joint Institutes Candidates’ Committee (JICC) holds a conference whereby a Candidate presents a case and a member from all the Institutes in the surrounding area discuss the case in panel format. It is one of the most well attended seminars the Baltimore-Washington Institute has to offer. The Center also has a newsletter and the Candidates write columns in this publication as well. The Candidates’ Organization meets bi-monthly to discuss various personal concerns as well as concerns at the Institute level.

OREGON PSYCHOANALYTIC INSTITUTE
—By Nancy C. Winters, M.D.

Somewhere in the middle of our first year of candidacy (‘06–’07) the OPI candidate group was encouraged to breathe new life into a candidate’s organization that had done its best to get off the ground a few years ago. As a new institute with provisional status, developing a viable candidate’s organization is one of the many activities necessary to create a stable psychoanalytic training environment. Yet, it isn’t really something the faculty can make happen and has to be led by some of us who are still untangling the mysteries of analytic candidacy. In this vein, we started meeting last year with a nod of support from the OPI Director and began to discuss our mission, structure, and challenges. We hoped to learn from other candidates’ organizations how they were structured and set about to acquire copies of bylaws to look at. We spent several meetings discussing how a candidates’ organization might meet our needs. It was immediately apparent that those earlier in their training had the most interest in case finding, and therefore we discussed the possibility of developing an affordable fee referral program. We discussed appropriate venues to place group advertisements. Those later in their training had more interest in having meaningful input to educational decision-making. The summer intervened in our developmental process, and the new candidates’ organization is awaiting a further infusion of agenda and possible meeting times, which will be enhanced by wine and good cheer; most likely this will happen after the holidays. This year we have a sample of bylaws in hand to review and a better idea of what we might want from a candidates’ organization.

save the date
January 18, 2008
The Candidate journal annual fundraising cocktail party celebrating the publication of Volume 2

Park Avenue Bank
350 Park Avenue between 51st and 52nd Streets across the street from the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City

Friday January 18, 2008 6:30-9:45pm
following the plenary session of the AFWA 2008 Winter Meetings in New York City

For more information please contact: Abby Herzig PsyD: ajherzig@juno.com
Sharon Lavon-Klein LCSW: sharonlavon@msn.com
www.thecandidatejournal.org

The Candidate
Perspectives from aspiring Psychoanalytic Candidates
The Winter 2008 Meeting in New York will feature two exciting programs tailored to the interests and experiences of candidate analysts. The Affiliates Forum, titled “Developing an Analytic Practice: A Perspective on Experiencing a Consultation and Beginning Trial of Analysis,” will feature prolific writer and analyst Arnold Rothstein, M.D. who will discuss his approach to cultivating a lively analytic practice. Dr. Rothstein argues that although authoritative analytic pedagogy has propagated the illusion that prospective Analysts can be evaluated in a vis-à-vis consultation and that good cases can be selected, this is in fact a myth. He will discuss an alternative model, the trusting model, for doing a consultation which emphasizes the importance of match as an important factor influencing the outcome of a trial analysis. He will illustrate using clinical material from colleagues’ practices and will then welcome group discussion. The Forum takes place on Thursday, January 17th, from 2:00–4:30.

A second program, the Candidate to Candidate Discussion Group, features Michael Krass, Ph.D., who will read his paper describing a control case in which the issue of insurance money had a variety of meanings. Titled “Fear and Loathing on the Couch: the Intersection of Managed Care and Masochism in Psychoanalysis,” Dr. Krass describes technical, theoretical and dynamic issues around the analyses obtaining authorization and money form the managed care third party. Following the paper, there will be a candid group discussion in which candidates are encouraged to share their own experiences concerning payment, fees, and any other issue related to psychoanalytic training. This discussion group takes place on Thursday, January 17th, from 4:45–7:15.

IPS0 REPORT
—By Kate Schecter, IPSO North America Vice President

As I write this report, IPSO is about to hold its annual Discussion Group on the Wednesday afternoon of APsaA’s Winter 2008 Meeting, with Barbara Strack von Schijndel-Garofoli from Amsterdam presenting her paper “My Screaming Body,” and with discussions by advanced candidates Gabriela Pszczol (Rio de Janeiro), Corinne Meylan (Geneva), and Jason Greenberg (New York). The IPSO DG promises to be a lively cross-cultural exchange, and to stimulate a rich dialogue about our similarities and differences across psychoanalytic cultures. We look forward to seeing everybody there!

In other IPS0 news, my colleague Drew Tillotson, IPSO’s North America VP-Elect reports that on October 14th the first North American IPSO Conference, “The Impasse: An International Perspective,” was convened in San Francisco at the San Francisco Center for Psychoanalysis. “The Impasse” gave attendees an intimate look at moment-to-moment analytic interactions in our most difficult clinical situations. The program was partially supported by the IPA’s CAPSA initiative; CAPSA (Committee on Analytic Practice and Scientific Activities) emphasizes the need for inter-regional exchange on clinical issues, and is committed to the development of analytic theory and technique derived directly from the clinical process. IPSO President Robin Deutsch moderated the event, where our international discussants were Drs. Virginia Ungar and Jorge Canestri. Case presenters for the day were Drew Tillotson (Psychoanalytic Institute of Northern California, San Francisco) and Lila Feinberg (Psychoanalytic Institute of New England, BOSTON). The conference was attended by candidates from around the country, including Seattle, Chicago, and San Diego, and Drs. Ungar and Canestri generated a lively discussion. Attendees remarked upon what an enjoyable day it was, and by all accounts this first IPSO North America event was a great success. Of course “The Impasse” will now be a tough act to follow, but we are looking for another U.S. city to step up and host our next North America conference. Please contact me if you are interested; hosting offers a great opportunity to bring international psychoanalysis home, to be involved in our larger professional community, and to meet and dialogue with colleagues from around the U.S. and Canada. As part of this expanding dialogue, IPSO is pleased to welcome four new North America representatives: Deisy Boscan (San Diego), Lilá Feinberg (Boston), Vaia Tsolas (Columbia), and Debbie Zatz (NY Freudian, Washington DC).

Speaking of bringing international psychoanalysis home, the IPSO Visiting Candidate program is up and running, and offers candidates the opportunity to do mini “study-abroad” programs in cities virtually all over the (psychoanalytic) world, with participating institutes in cities like Lisbon, Athens, Rio de Janeiro, and Mexico City. If you’re interested in finding out more, Drew Tillotson is the person to contact. His email is cogster@earthlink.net

Finally, I’m happy to tell you that plans are underway for IPSO’s next Congress, to be held just prior to the 2009 IPA Congress in Chicago. The theme of the IPA Congress is Psychoanalytic Practice: Convergence and Divergence, with a multitude of offerings focusing directly on clinical practice around the world; as the IPSO representative on the Congress Planning Committee, I have been eager to help shape a Congress that would reflect candidates’ concerns and interests in issues of direct clinical relevance, such as the variety of ways
that transference is conceptualized and worked with in various clinical communities around the world. The IPSO Congress, of course, always centers on precisely such comparative questions, offering candidates wonderful opportunities to present cases, theoretical papers, works in the various areas of applied psychoanalysis, and papers on aspects of training that are important to us all. Since the IPA Congress and the IPSO Congress will next be in Chicago, Robin, Drew, and I are very excited that lots more North American candidates will get the chance to be bitten by the IPSO bug. Stay tuned for upcoming announcements for the Congress, and please start thinking about the paper you want to present. IPSO Congresses are hot-houses of theoretical and clinical innovation (well, we aspire to that anyway!), as well as being uniquely warm and fun collegial gatherings. I hope to see you in Chicago in July of 2009, if not before.
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Calling All Candidates!

APsaaA’s Candidate Assistance Fund provides loans up to $5,000 to candidates training to be psychoanalysts.

Who is Eligible?

• APsaaA Affiliate Members, in good standing, who have completed one year of training.
• Financial need must be demonstrated.

When is the Application Deadline?

Applications are due May 1st

Where Can I Get an Application?

The application is available on the APsaaA website. Log in and enter the APsaaA Members Section. Then click on Candidate Assistance Fund. You may also contact the Association office to have a copy mailed to you.

What is the Loan Criteria?

The loans, to be repaid within a maximum of six years, are made from a revolving fund so repayment is critical in order to continue making loans. Currently, between five and seven loans are made annually. Loans are interest-free but carry a one-time 1% service charge that is deducted when the loan is made. Two criteria will be considered in approving a Candidate Assistance Fund loan:

1. Need as evidenced by an applicant’s financial need.
2. The ability to repay the loan as evidenced by the applicant’s overall financial health.

Questions? For further information, please contact Dean Stein, Executive Director, at deankstein@apsa.org or 212-752-0450, Ext. 30.

Editor’s Note

I am ready to retire from my position as Editor of The Affiliate Council Newsletter. Anyone interested in this position, please contact me. My e-mail is carland@qwest.net.

Thank you in advance.

Carol Arland