Dear Affiliates,

I hope this finds you with a bit more time now that classes are finished for the summer. I also hope to see you in Atlanta at APsaA’s 97th Annual Meeting.

The Atlanta meetings will be a turning point for psychoanalytic training. I believe that we have reached a crisis point in how psychoanalytic training will be handled forever after. Please give some thought to these issues for yourself and for your institute. I will need your feedback now more than ever.

The training analyst system is under siege. There are two factions within the Association on this matter. One faction wants to retain the training analyst system and one faction wants to do away with it. As you know, training analysts must do “extra” training over and above graduating from an accredited institute and gaining some experience. They must pass the national certification exam; they must have 5 years post graduation experience with an “immersion” experience carrying a number of analytic cases. They must be vetted by their institutes and then they must be approved by the national Board on Professional Standards. When they become TAs, they typically meet regularly with their local TA group to discuss issues pertaining to analyzing candidates. They are also leaders of their institutes. And they usually have a great deal of say in psychoanalytic training curricula at their institutes, teach candidates, and supervise control cases.

These “extra” steps are taken in order to give candidates the best analysis and training experience available. The system is not perfect. TAs are not perfect. However, TAs from the American Psychoanalytic Association endorse a set of national training standards and participate in site visits by the Board on Professional Standards in

On Psychoanalysis

Reflections on the Difficulties in Conducting an Analysis that are Created by our Clinical Theories
—Melvin Bornstein, M.D.

Anyone who is trying to learn how to conduct an analysis frequently feels frustrated with experiences of failure, guilt and self depreciation. The vitality, creativity and aliveness that should be basic to the conduct of an analysis disappear and are replaced with pain. The problems frequently have little to do with the student and more to do with the deficiency of our clinical theories; by clinical theory I am referring to a conceptual guide that helps us understand what occurs as patient and analyst are interacting with each other in the present moment. The problem is compounded if the student has not learned about the deficiencies and the necessity to be creative in the clinical situation to fill the gaps.
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order to do the best job that they can do for candidates.

Now this system is being taken apart piece by piece. There are two bylaw amendments being discussed at the Atlanta meetings, one of which will abolish certification as a prerequisite for TA applicants and allow institutes to choose to ignore the national standards for TA appointment, and hence for national vetting for TAs. It will make it possible for institutes to endorse a local option to decide whom to appoint as a TA. If only one institute chooses to do this, it will demolish a unified system of national standards for how candidates are trained and analyzed. Each institute will be able to do what they wish. Candidates at such institutes may not have any recourse in the event of problems in training (such as a national venue). Institutes could choose not to have site visits for the evaluation of training programs.

The Task Force on Externalization is a group of representative members of our association who have been looking at options for those institutes that do not want to endorse national standards in a way that would allow some institutes to choose to remain within a version of the present system. The report will not be final until shortly before the Atlanta meetings. The proposed bylaw changes will supersede this thoughtful plan.

Please consider carefully what you want for your institute, for your personal education, for your analysis and for your future. Educate yourself. Sign up to review the documents written by the Task Force on Externalization.

The documents are available for viewing by all Association members by sending an e-mail to TFE-APsaA-subscribe@yahoogroups.com and then replying to the test e-mail. Carefully evaluate any bylaw amendments that come forward at the Atlanta meetings. And then take a stand. Fight for your views. I am going to fight for the TA system because I believe that this system is the best one for training candidates. I can be reached at 303-777-4627 or by e-mail at ljensen701@aol.com for questions. Thank you.

Sincere regards,

Laura L. Jensen, Ph.D.
President, Affiliate Council
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The limitations in clinical theory is revealed by the sparse reference in discussions and the literature of the whole patient and analyst living in the analytic situation with degrees of closeness, spontaneity, feelings of vitality and being alive. Essentially our theories lead us to describe dynamics in terms of conflicts, compromise formations, the status of the Self, interpersonal and object relationships that contribute to pathology and expressed in transferences, countertransferences, resistances etc.

Yet we frequently miss the richness of the human dimension that addresses the wholeness of the patient and analyst in the present moment. The present moment rests on the analyst and the patient as whole people interacting with the other, principally by using language. Patient and analyst share one common goal to help the patient bring disparate parts of the patient into the whole of her Self that will transform suffering into freedom, vitality and feeling alive. This transformation is promoted by talking. To follow this communicating-talking experience, we need to focus on the whole of the patient and analyst who are agencies that run themselves and try to influence the other. Patient and analyst must struggle with the resistances against the transformative experience that result in feeling vital, alive with far greater capacities to reach out, be close and love. The resistances rests on the danger of humiliation in revealing the transformative experience to the analyst because of fear that the analyst does not appreciate nor is interested in what the patient is trying to reveal in actuality or in the transference.

The patient is trying to reveal the rush of feelings, awareness, understanding and desire to communicate which in the transference, from an earlier time was overwhelming. The patient felt she was too much for herself; her ego could not deal with her growth. This is typical of what happens after a trauma, as the person attempts to take ownership of the trauma in the process of growth. Also the danger of humiliation is the result of the patient’s greater individuation, freedom and separateness which is just what the
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patient wants in terms of her desire to develop, but feels that it is too much for her without support and empathy which in the transference was absent. Without the perspective of the dynamics of the whole person, the analyst is handicapped in dealing with the dynamics of the whole person, actually for the most part I do not think this dimension is ignored only it is not talked or written about because our theory does not help us. Psychoanalytic lore used to be that you told your supervisor some things but not everything. Actually the “everything” often was far more analytic than realized.

I will briefly digress. I have been implying that analytic theory is clear about how the parts of the mind work together which helps to understand the workings of the mind. In the clinical situation the whole of the person is not sufficiently addressed which ignores the soul and spirit of the analytic experience. This is because psychoanalytic theory evolved from the cannons of science that arose in the Enlightenment:

To understand the world one must examine the parts that make up the whole and develop hypothesis about the parts then try explore whether there are areas of congruence with parts that have already been validated which increases our understanding of the world.

In the 20th century, the cannons of science began to change. Discoveries in physics and mathematics have revealed that parts of the universe can not be separated from each other i.e., time, space and matter are all part of an evolving whole. By continuing to use the most contemporary view of the universe as metaphors to understand the workings of the mind and the experiences within an analysis, we have a better vernacular to emphasize the whole when we deal with the person.

 Clinically, I am suggesting by looking at the whole of the patient, the analyst is able to share more with the patient as an equal partner in the analytic endeavor. The analyst does not have to be as cautious about the nature of the transference which contains multiple disparate parts of the patient. Patients as whole people understand far more about themselves than they know and they are aware of what is going on more than we describe. To be open, explaining what is going on in the analysis and revealing oneself, to a limited degree, if directed at the whole of the patient helps the analysis, as long as the analyst is also aware of the nature of the transference. Secondly as a result of the progression of an analysis the transformative experiences generate earlier dangers of too much feeling, awareness and separation. To protect oneself from being overwhelmed the patient withdraws from being too close, open, loving and giving because of the anticipated absence of an empathic and understanding other. Frequently progress, because of transformation of parts into a whole, is seen simply as an old resistance when it represents the resistance against the presence of progress. The analyst needs to convey recognition of the patient’s achievement.

In sum, in this very short communication, I am conveying that we are far better than we think. Our problem is frequently not us, it is our clinical theory.

Save the Date!

WINTER 2009 MEETING • January 14-18

APSAAN NEW YORK
Welcome: President Laura Jensen opened the meeting.

**ROLL CALL** (Wolfgang Rosenfeldt)

Roll was called. Fourteen institutes were represented, constituting a quorum. Roster sheets were passed around for updating.

**DR. PAUL HOLINGER, CHAIR OF THE CERTIFICATION EXAMINATION COMMITTEE**

Jensen introduced Dr. Holinger. The pass rate last time for certification was 80%, although traditionally, this has been from 62–75%. With persistence, however, the rate is above 90%.

Dr. Holinger discussed several helpful points to aid in successfully going through certification. He emphasized mentoring, and also approaching past or present committee members for help. Next, he mentioned study groups as being helpful, in particular, going over case write-ups with colleagues. Finally, he noted that bringing process notes to the interviews is helpful, in order to give a sense of the applicant’s voice to the committee. During the scientific meetings, there are Wednesday meetings of the Certification Committee as well with a mock case discussion.

He suggested that Affiliate members can also approach Dr. Rosenblitt, head of their research group, and also Dr. Singer, head of PIPE.

With regard to what the Affiliate Council could do in order to aid the process, Carmela Perez suggested that we could assist with the mentoring process and that perhaps future work could be done at the Affiliate Council meetings regarding this.

A question was posed regarding termination for certification. Applicants are required to have a terminated case in order to apply for certification.

**IPSO DELEGATION**

Kate Schechter introduced the IPSO Executive Committee including Robin Deutsch, President, Corinne Meylan VP-Elect Europe, Adela Escardo, VP-Elect Latin America, Drew Tillotson, VP-Elect North America, Paula Oliviera, Communications Officer, Israel Katz, Editor, Eric Bierens de Haan, Treasurer, Gabriele Pszczol, VP Latin America, Barbara Strack Van Schijnjdel-Garofoli, VP Europe.

Robin Deutsch described IPSO’s visiting candidate program. The cost consists of airfare, but otherwise candidates are set up with a place to stay, and there is no cost to supervision or attending classes. Visiting candidate projects can be undertaken in the same country, the same region, or between different regions, although candidates must speak the language of the Institute they wish to attend, or English, if classes are conducted in English. She encouraged interested candidate groups to get in touch with her and IPSO.

She also mentioned that the next IPSO Congress, along with the IPA meeting, will be in Chicago in July of 2009. She described the international supervisions at the meeting and also mentioned that there will be a call for papers in March.

Deutsch then asked Affiliate Council members to help complete the election of Luisa Marino, a candidate for President-Elect of IPSO. She explained that all Affiliate members are also IPSO members, and they require ten or more IPSO members for the vote for the President-Elect. Luisa was the only candidate. She gave a speech, stepped out and was unanimously elected.

It was also mentioned that IPSO has a website WWW.IPSOCANDIDATES.ORG where further information may be obtained about all these and more IPSO activities.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS** (Laura Jensen)

Jensen introduced Jesse Goodman from the Berkshire Psychoanalytic Institute who will be heading the Candidate Organization Committee.

She also announced Beverly Betz is leaving as the Chair of the Program Committee as well as the Scientific Paper Prize Committee. A round of applause was given in appreciation of her dedication and work.

Also, Anne Malone is the head of the Nominations Committee, and this year three offices will be open for election, including the positions of Treasurer,
Secretary and President-Elect. Candidates for office will speak at the June meeting, and elections will be held in the fall.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Wolfgang Rosenfeldt):
A motion was made and seconded to approve the 2007 Summer Meeting minutes. They were approved unanimously.

TREASURER’S REPORT (Jill McEligott):
The operating budget of $21,000 was approved for 2008. This is up $2,000 from last year. There are increased expenses mostly because 2008 is an election year. McEligott also mentioned that if there are any budget requests for ideas by Affiliate members to let her or Laura Jensen know.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:
1) Paper Prize Committee (Beverly Betz)
Deadline for paper submission is August 1st. The prize is $1000.

2) Program Committee (Beverly Betz)
Chuck Rothstein will present later this afternoon on developing an analytic practice. Also, after that there will also be a presentation by a candidate on a case with a patient who used insurance to pay for part of the analysis, with discussion on enactments related to managed care.

3) Breakfast with a Distinguished Analyst (Susan Flinders)
Saturday there will be breakfast with Elizabeth Young-Bruehl, a prolific author and analyst. Susan encouraged all to come for a rewarding experience.

4) Nominations Committee (Anne Malone)
Elections will be held in the fall for the positions of Treasurer, Secretary & President-Elect. If interested, contact Anne for more information.

Carmela Perez encouraged all to get involved and noted some of the benefits of taking part in activities on the national level.

5) Committee on Racial and Ethnic Diversity (Carmela Perez)
Carmela mentioned that this committee liaisons with CORED, Committee on Race and Ethnic Diversity, a committee of the American. She is looking for candidate representatives who are interested in issues of race and diversity to help out with this committee.

At this point, Laura related that there will be an experiment done with the meetings. For 2009, we will not have a scientific meeting in the summer, although administrative meetings will still be held. Details are still being worked out.

MEMBER CONNECT ROUNDTABLE:
The member connect roundtable was now introduced. In this forum, members can exchange information regarding training, costs, graduation requirements, demands and other issues of concern particular concern to candidates.

The topic this time was “losing and finding cases,” and also how progression works at each of our different, respective institutes. Various issues were discussed including the effect on the treatment of our patients knowing that we are candidates, the anxieties and issues that come up with the heightened importance of our cases for our progression as candidates, and the widening scope of analyzability.

PRESENTATION ON DEEPENING THE TREATMENT (Guest Speaker, Jane Hall, MSW)
Jane Hall presented her work and thoughts on deepening treatment, including moving from psychoanalytic psychotherapy to psychoanalysis. Her presentation to the Affiliate Council can be found on the following website with a search for “Deepening the Treatment”:
http://internationalpsychoanalysis.net/

NEW BUSINESS AND WRAP-UP (Laura Jensen)
Laura reminded us that there is a Candidate Assistance Fund with which up to $5000 in loans for psychoanalytic training is available and encouraged Affiliate Council members to let candidates at their respective institutes know.

Laura also mentioned that she was going to talk to BOPS and the Executive Council later in the afternoon about providing more financial assistance for candidates wanting to come to the national meetings. She also asked Affiliate Council members to encourage candidates at their institutes to attend.

Finally, she mentioned that in June we will be talking more about the final report of the Task Force for Externalization, a task force she sits on.

ADJOURNMENT:
The meeting then came to a close at 12:30 PM for a no-host lunch at Oscar’s American Brasserie.

Respectfully submitted,

Wolfgang Rosenfeldt, M.D.
Secretary of the Affiliate Council
The New York Psychoanalytic Institute  
—By: Hilli Dagony-Clark, Psy.D.

Hard work and planning among members, candidates, and faculty have resulted in a successful recruitment for our upcoming candidate class. The Recruitment Committee, headed by Richard Weiss, MD, has creatively and rigorously sought out potential applicants for the next academic year. Outreach has included contact with internship and externship programs in the area and advertisement on a psychoanalytic list-serve. Additionally, the formation of the Joint Research Conferences involving both The New York Psychoanalytic Institute and Adelphi University, made possible by the efforts of Drs. Wilma Bucci, John Crow, Leon Hoffman, Wendy Olesker and Richard Weiss has provided potential candidates the opportunity to learn about both psychological and psychoanalytic research and ideals, foreshadowing the intellectual activity involved in psychoanalytic training. Unlike previous years in which our open house was held at the Institute, this year the event took place at a private residence. This made for a lively and warm atmosphere in which applicants appeared comfortable interacting with members and candidates. Follow-up phone calls and e-mails were made to the applicants, who were also encouraged to speak with current candidates about training. Thus far, 16 potential candidates have submitted their applications for admission and the Institute anticipates welcoming a diverse, bright, and motivated class for this coming Fall.

Michigan Psychoanalytic Institute  
—By Susan Flinders Ph. D.

This newsletter is coming at a time when our classes have ended for year 2007-2008. Despite the economic downturn that has hit Michigan, the Institute is alive and vibrant like the green trees having quickly awakened from the lengthy drab of this past winter. Five Candidates are graduating and Congratulations go out to each one of them!

Since there is no specified topic for this newsletter, I thought I would discuss a recent topic that has been brought up by the Institute for consideration by the Candidates. This question revolves around how to more evenly utilize the Training Analysts (TA’s) for Supervision. There are already rules in regard to how many Candidates each TA can have for Analysis and for Supervision paid and free (each Candidate can currently have free Supervision for up to two low-fee cases). Despite this, there are certain TA’s who get utilized as Supervisors more than others. Candidates have met on more than one occasion with the representatives of the Institute to give feedback. So far, one suggestion has been to have Candidates be assigned to TA’s as unpaid mentors prior to starting control cases. These TA’s could then have access to Candidates right away and Candidates could then have the wonderful opportunity for analytic guidance from day one of training. It was also thought by Candidates that new Candidates could also reserve the right to pick another TA to supervise, when they started their first case. These suggestions have been taken into consideration, but as yet, there has been no final decision regarding this issue. What is important, however, is how our Institute has turned to Candidates as partners in our training, looking for our input regarding the implementation of new policies. I think it is this type of open-minded involvement of the Candidates in the running of the Institute in Michigan that has allowed it to remain vibrant and active in promoting Psychoanalysis in our community.
Be sure to login to APsaA’s website so you can maximize your Member Benefits! Logging in allows you to access the many valuable resources in the **Members’ Section** including:

- APsaA’s Membership Roster with Committee Listing
- Association Documents
- Outreach Tools
- Advocacy and Licensing

**How do I login?**

At [http://www.apsa.org](http://www.apsa.org), enter your Member ID and Password in the respective spaces at the bottom of the left hand menu bar. You’ll see your name at the bottom of the menu bar if your login was successful.
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CALL FOR PAPERS

$1,000 AFFILIATE COUNCIL SCIENTIFIC PAPER PRIZE

The Affiliate Council awards this annual prize, on the basis of peer review, to the Affiliate Member who submits the most outstanding scientific paper on a psychoanalytic subject. There also will be a $500 honorarium for the semi-finalist prize. The winning author will present his/her paper at APsaA’s January meeting in New York; the semi-finalist will present his/her paper at the June meeting. The winners are also required to present their papers at a local venue. The winner and semi-finalist may submit their papers for review by JAPA, and if accepted, the paper will be published as the winner or semi-finalist of the Affiliate Council Paper Prize.

Submission Guidelines: In order for a manuscript to qualify, it must be submitted by an Affiliate Member and it must be unpublished although it can be based on a paper that was presented at professional meetings. Each manuscript must conform to the Preparation of Manuscripts guidelines outlined by JAPA, with the exception that the length should not exceed 30 double-spaced, typed pages. Entries must be submitted electronically no later than August 1, 2008. Email one Word document containing the manuscript with all references to the author deleted and email another Word document containing the author’s name, email address, address, phone number, and Institute affiliation to:

Beverly Betz, M.S.W., M.Ed.
(O) 410-464-9756
(E) bbetzmsw@comcast.net
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