FROM THE DESK OF THE PRESIDENT

Dear Candidates,

The various branches of the Candidates’ Council have continued to expand in efforts to connect colleagues from across the country and to strengthen the internal sense of analytic identity and cohesion among our active members. Since the Candidates’ Council is now in an election year, I would like to encourage you to run for office of the Candidates’ Council’s Executive Committee. Positions include President-Elect, Treasurer, and Secretary. These positions not only provide candidates with an opportunity to sample the organizational life of the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsaA), but also to bond closely with the likeminded community of colleagues in training. Please feel free to inquire more about these positions from me or any other member of the Candidates’ Council’s Executive Committee. Positions include President-Elect Navah Kaplan, Treasurer Jamie Cromer, and Secretary Valerie Golden. Election ballots will be sent out this coming fall, and candidates for office will be asked to make their position statements during the Candidates’ Council meeting this June.

Our committees have been actively working over the past several months to help foster candidates’ involvement and empowerment. I am thrilled to announce the launch of the first-ever candidate study group, chaired by Candidates’ Council’s Education Chair Caryn Schorr and sponsored by the Committee On Psychoanalytic Education (COPE). It will assemble during the 101st Annual Meeting in Chicago on Wednesday, June 13th. The study group, comprised twelve candidate and recent graduate members, will address challenges that candidates face in training. More specific goals will be sharpened during the meeting. This group is intended as a forum of study that will hopefully conclude with publications and/or presentations.

After four years as the Candidates’ Council’s Program Committee Chair, Phoebe Cirio will step down from this role after the upcoming June meeting. Phoebe’s contributions to the scholastic branch of the Candidates’ Council have been outstanding and greatly appreciated. Sarah Lusk, who is an adult candidate at the PINE Psychoanalytic Center and a child candidate at the joint Boston Psychoanalytic Society and Institute and the PINE Psychoanalytic Center program, will take her place. Sarah will be a wonderful addition to the Candidates’ Council’s Steering Committee, and I sincerely welcome her to her new role.

For her last meeting, Phoebe has planned the following: 1) Candidates’ Forum: Developing a Psychoanalytic Mind and Identity with presenters Carlos Almeida, Deisy Boscan, Robin Deutsch, Ilene Dyller, Navah Kaplan, and Vanessa Sinclair, and 2) Candidate to Candidate Discussion Group: Handling Displaced Affect in Analytic Treatment with presenter Kelly Bradham and discussant Brenda Solomon who will be focusing on a clinical case.

In the continued spirit of innovation, Navah Kaplan has submitted a proposal to the American Psychoanalytic Foundation for funding for the Candidates’ Scientific Paper Prize that would enlarge the scope of the program. The proposal added the component of a Candidates’ Writing Workshop to further the aim of helping candidates learn to write for professional dissemination. Monetary awards will continue to be given to the winner and runner-up of the Candidates’ Scientific Paper Prize as an additional incentive for candidates to write. The winners will present at the Candidates’ Writing Session during APsaA’s meetings.

I am pleased to announce that the new Candidate Members’ Information Page is now available in the Members Section of APsaA’s website: www.apsa.org/Member_Section/Candidate_Members_Information_Page.aspx

American Psychoanalytic Association (APsaA), but also to bond closely with and to help a likeminded community of colleagues in training. Please feel free to inquire more about these positions from me or any other member of the Candidates’ Council’s Executive Committee, including President-Elect Navah Kaplan, Treasurer Jamie Cromer, and Secretary Valerie Golden. Election ballots will be sent out this coming fall, and candidates for office will be asked to make their position statements during the Candidates’ Council meeting this June.

Our committees have been actively working over the past several months...
The Candidate Connection Newsletter is also seeing a shift in leadership. Editors Michael Garfinkle and Jamieson Webster stepped down at the end of last year. I thank them both for their wonderful contributions. Replacing them is Graciana Lapetina, a candidate from the Institute for Psychoanalytic Education affiliated with the New York University School of Medicine. I am incredibly pleased to have Graciana join our community and look forward to seeing her contributions. As in the past year, the newsletter will continue to be printed electronically.

In order to increase the presence of candidates on the APSaA webpage and to provide easy access to information about the Candidates’ Council, the Chair of Digital Media and Communications Committee, Vanessa Sinclair, has been working tirelessly with the National Office over the course of this academic year. I am pleased to announce that the new Candidate Members’ Information Page is now available in the Members Section of APSaA’s website:

www.apsa.org/Member_Section/Candidate_Members_Information_Page.aspx

In addition, Vanessa is working to expand communications of candidates through the use of Ning, a social networking platform designed to inform candidates of one another’s practices. As the use of technology expands, these services become increasingly crucial to maintain contact, foster communication, and learn about one another’s work.

The Candidates’ Council’s Executive Committee has also been working hard at furthering the candidate cause. In addition to her work on the Candidate Paper Prize, President-Elect Navah Kaplan has been helping to coordinate the candidate party for the 101st Annual Meeting in Chicago along with local hosts Kelly Bradham, Christine Jacobek, Laurie Kenville, Gabriel Ruiz (chair), Jeffrey Seiden, and Wendy Selene. Treasurer Jamie Cromer has been working on the Travel Grant, which will be awarded to several candidates during the spring meetings. At the time of this writing, the travel grant awardees include Kathryn McCormick, (Seattle Psychoanalytic Society & Institute), Meiram Bendat (New Center for Psychoanalysis), Rodrigo Barahona, (PINE Psychoanalytic Center), and a candidate from the Greater Kansas City Psychoanalytic Institute who has yet to be determined. Secretary Valerie Golden has continued her efforts with the Master Teacher Award Program, particularly discussing with her committee how to operationalize the selection of master teachers and how to create a committee of judges. I have continued in my efforts to launch the Pilot Mentorship Program. At the time of this writing, I have corresponded with several institutes about participating in the trial program. I hope to have more information about how to implement the program by June.

As I have illustrated, the Candidates’ Council’s officers and committees are working passionately and diligently to further candidates’ presence in the organization and to enhance their training experiences. I hope you will consider joining us in our work. There is no better time to get to know APSaA’s organizational life, network and develop a sense of analytic identity than during one’s training, when so many opportunities are available to candidates. Please feel free to contact me or any other members of the Candidates’ Council’s Executive Committee for any further information. I hope to see you in Chicago at the 101st Annual Meeting (June 12-17).

Respectfully submitted,

Hilli Dagony-Clark
President, Candidates’ Council

The decision to focus this newsletter on the listserv of the American Psychoanalytic Association (APSaA) was made after the meeting of the Candidates’ Council in January in New York City. During the meeting, many candidates spoke about their experiences with the listserv, both positive and negative. A lively discussion ensued; however, time did not permit for a longer exploration of the issues raised. Dedicating this newsletter to the listserv was intended to provide candidates with an opportunity to write in more depth about their experiences.

To be accurate, there are multiple listserves to which members of APSaA may subscribe, each serving a different function. The names of the listserves are Members, Openline and Election-Discussion. There are also several special-purpose mailing lists, such as the candidates list and the candidate council list to name a couple.

As of the middle of April, there were over 900 members who subscribed to the Members list and over 500 to the Openline list.

According to the APSaA website, the Members listserv is “intended as a general discussion,” and members are restricted to two postings of limited size per week. The Openline list was created to “encourage free and open discussion” with no limitations on the topic, the size or the frequency of postings. Of note, there are “digest” forms of both the Members and Openline listserves, with weekly and daily compilations respectively. The Election-Discussion list is active during campaign season. Please know that there is a separate Candidates’ listserv for candidate members of APSaA.
As of the middle of April, there were over 900 members who subscribed to the Members list and over 500 to the Openline list.

Dr. Paul Mosher was instrumental in developing the listserve. He graciously spoke with me over the phone and told me about history of the listserve. In the mid-1990s, the National Office asked Dr. Mosher, who has a background in computers, to establish an email database and a website for the Association. Dr. Mosher chaired a task force that considered various issues pertaining to the creation of an email list for members, including whether to allow candidates to subscribe and whether to have a moderator. There was concern that candidates’ participation in the listserve may inhibit analysts from posting. As for having a moderator, there were questions about who would moderate, how to establish criteria for accepting or rejecting a post, and who would have the time to review the high volume of posts. After lengthy discussions, inclusion of candidates was approved, and a moderated list was deemed impractical.

Initially, there was only one listserve. However, due to discontent among members regarding the volume of election posts, a separate list was established solely for matters pertaining to election seasons. Members were then disgruntled about the overall volume of posts, some of which were jokes and other unrelated matters. It was for that reason that the weekly limit of two posts for the Members listserve was instituted, and, at the same time, the Openline was created to accommodate unlimited postings without any restrictions on content.

There is a wide spectrum of posts on the listerves. Many members use the listserve to request a referral in another part of the country. Other members write to advertise an upcoming lecture or event at their institute. Members often post to alert the community that an article pertaining to psychoanalysis has been printed in a newspaper or magazine. Many use the listserve to call attention to important policy issues, such as those pertaining to insurance issues or patient privacy. Some members post their current thinking on psychoanalysis, while others debate the merits of certification. During the election season, candidates post about their platforms, while others announce their support of one candidate or another. The list goes on and on.

To subscribe to a listserve, send an email to the <listserve>-request@apsa.org and type “subscribe” in the body of the message. For example, to subscribe to the Members listserve, email members-request@apsa.org. If you have any problems in subscribing or unsubscribing, you may contact Brian Canty at the National Office (bcanty@apsa.org). You can always request the digest version of the listserve or unsubscribe if the volume of emails becomes too great.

Sources
Paul Mosher, M.D., personal communication, April, 2012.
The American Psychoanalytic Association website. www.apsa.org/Member_Section/Association_Documents/Electronic_Communication_Resources.aspx

LISTSERVES

Candidates and the Listserves
By Gennifer Briggs, L.C.S.W.
Candidate, Florida Psychoanalytic Institute, Society and Foundation

Much has been said in the past several months about the listerves—the good, the bad, and the ugly. During the Candidates’ Council meeting in January, many candidate members expressed reticence about expressing their opinions for fear of being criticized or even personally attacked. After returning home, I decided to join all the listserves to find out for myself how people posted, how people reacted, and why candidates seemed reticent to post. Coming from a small institute and class, I hoped that the listserves would help me feel a larger sense of community with my peers.

In this column, I would like to share my personal experiences of posting on the ElectionDiscussion and Members Listserves. Then I would like to explore some of the deeper issues that might be fueling many candidates’ strong feelings about how we express our points of view on the listserve and how we interact with others through this medium.

As you may know, this has been an election season. Following the general election, there was a run-off for the Councilor-at-Large position. After reviewing both candidates’ qualifications for the Councilor-at-Large position, I made a decision to endorse one of them publicly on the ElectionDiscussion listserve. I wrote many posts supporting my candidate’s platform, personal qualities, and potential contributions to the organization as Councilor-at-Large. Towards the end of the campaign, I wrote my last and more pointed response to what I felt was a distortion of my candidate’s words. I realized that, in taking a stronger position, I was opening myself up to possible criticism. I am glad to report that I did not receive any negative responses for my many posts. In fact, the opposite was true. I received many replies thanking me for my words.

More recently, another topic of great personal interest having to do with religion appeared on the Members listserve. The posts debated the defensive versus adaptive nature of religion and spirituality. I again decided to express my opinion. Due to the controversial nature of this particular topic amongst analysts, there was a hearty and sometimes colorful exchange. For the most part, I thought
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the multi-layered dimensions of this complex issue. I asked the listserv community if there could be another medium for discussing some of the issues due to concerns about confidentiality. I again received several emails that supported my participating in the discussion. Based on my reading, I felt that a minority of the responses seemed to have taken my comments out of context. I realized that, as with any discussion, at times our words can be misunderstood or distorted. Nevertheless, I am certain that I will post again when I feel strongly about a topic.

In light of my experience with both listserves, I felt that members were overall respectful of my position and the fact that I was a candidate who was new to expressing her opinions online. Based on posts in the past six months, I better understood candidates’ concerns about posting on the listservs. After sticking my neck out to see how a candidate was treated, I generally felt that the members do look out for candidates.

I would now like to postulate as to the underlying themes that I believe are at play on the listservs and some reasons I believe we feel the way we do about posting.

As candidates new to APsaA, most of us are only familiar with members outside our institutes through their writings and occasional lectures. Articles and lectures are carefully crafted, meticulously edited, and focused on practice or theory. As a result, I think we all have an idea in our minds about how these analysts are personally based on what we have read or heard publicly.

When an analyst we have admired posts a heated comment or even a personal attack on a listserv, we can easily become disillusioned that they are not who we made them out to be—much like seeing your analyst yelling at a store clerk, or worse yet, at their children when you happen upon their having a bad day! It is easy to be disappointed when the analysts we so admire express their opinions in ways we might not, and more importantly, to realize that they are human. I believe this acceptance of all analysts’ humanity is critical as we process what we read on the listserv. All of us, no matter how much analysis we have or how successful it is, will still be imperfect when we are done.

Other factors may play into the dynamics of the listserv as well. It seems that people are less inhibited when posting on a listserv as opposed to when speaking with someone face-to-face, leading people to write things that they may not otherwise say. Emotions tend to get lost in text, and subtleties are more difficult to interpret in writing. Also, people are passionate about their opinions, and sometimes they respond in a knee-jerk manner, hitting the send button before they have looked more objectively at what they have written. Finally, many of the people writing have personal, long-term relationships with each other, and they may feel more comfortable making pointed comments towards one another.

That said, I do believe that analysts have a personal responsibility to refrain from personal attacks when expressing their views. These types of comments have no educative value and steer the discussion away from the issues at hand and towards someone’s character. Our listserv does not have a moderator to ensure that members do not feel censured in any way. However, I believe that just because you can say something does not mean that you necessarily should.

I would encourage candidates, at least, to follow the listservs, as they are a valuable source of information, and they stimulate many interesting discussions. To participate or not participate is, of course, a personal choice, but I hope the sharing of my personal experience with the listserv helps you with your decision.

The Listserv

By Bruce Roth, D.O.
Advanced Candidate, Michigan Psychoanalytic Institute and Society

My experience with the listserv over the election season was rather disappointing. I frequently found the conversations dominated by a core group of passionate reformers opposed by a very small group of more conservative voices with which I tended to identify more closely. I am for reform, but I believe that it needs to be considered in the context of a more complete discussion, including the advantages and disadvantages of change. We all know that change for change’s sake is not a guarantee for improvement. That is why I felt passionately that the reform argument for change on the basis of alleged problems with the Training Analyst system or the alleged increasing numbers of candidates attending non-APsaA institutes was disingenuous. I felt these issues were chosen primarily for political reasons.

I believe that we would be better served with a more vibrant and less adversarial debate on these issues on the Openline. There are many more important issues as psychoanalysts we have to face, such as the following: What are the essentials that make any psychoanalysis effective? Is there a common language between psychoanalytic theories that can allow us to speak with each other rather than past one another? How do we make ourselves more visible and relevant in today’s society? The lack of understanding and negative opinion of psychoanalysis by much of the general public is a problem we should be addressing more openly. Lastly, I was encouraged by a number of positive responses and new contacts resulting from my postings. I believe that the future of psychoanalysis will depend on each one of us strengthening our psychoanalytic voice.
Psychoanalytic Development

Candidate Forum, San Francisco, June 2011
By Phoebe Cirio, M.S.W., L.C.S.W.
Program Chair, Candidate Council

The June 2011 Candidate Forum in San Francisco at APsaA’s 100th Annual Meeting was chaired by Jane Hall, L.C.S.W., FIPA, and included panelists Theodore Jacobs, M.D., Mitchell Wilson, M.D., and Mark Smaller, Ph.D., reading a presentation by William Braun, Psy.D., who was unable to attend the meetings. Each panelist was tasked to speak about their experience of psychoanalytic training and aspects of their development as analysts.

Jacobs gave us a rich description of his personal development and of the atmosphere at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute (NYPI) during his training. His mother was a Communist and had a Communist-leaning radio station where Jacobs was an announcer. They reported sports’ scores, except when the Cincinnati Reds lost. Jacobs had a personal treatment during his late adolescence, with an analyst who, while not well known, was spontaneous and related to Jacobs as a person. Since then, Jacobs has valued “individual talent,” more than titles.

At the time he applied for psychoanalytic training at the NYPI, one could be rejected for being too obsessional. Psychoanalytic training was the pinnacle of psychiatric training, and psychiatric residencies were headed by analysts. Analysts were wealthy and had large Park Avenue apartments where candidates and faculty would meet. After World War II there was an influx of analysts from Europe; they were a tightly knit group who were protective of Sigmund Freud. A hierarchy emerged at the NYPI, with the Europeans at the top. If accepted in the preferred group, one was “convoyed” through the institute. Training focused on reading Freud and a little Abraham, resulting in a deep understanding of instincts and infantile sexuality.

Publicly, analysts emphasized neutrality and anonymity in technique. The work in the hour was highly disciplined, but the attitude towards the patient was warm and embracing. Marianne Kris and Edith Jacobson were caring and enthusiastic and wanted to be helpful to patients, though they never talked about themselves with patients. Jacobs realized that there was a lot of communication taking place outside of the awareness of the analyst. He had strong feelings about his patients and realized that his personal reactions were relevant to the analysis. However, at the NYPI, he was regarded as narcissistic and exhibitionistic for writing about his countertransference.

Both Melanie Klein and Anne Reich wrote papers entitled “On Countertransference.” Klein regarded countertransference as a research tool whereas Reich treated countertransference as evidence of unanalyzed conflicts in the analyst. After that, no one would talk publicly about their countertransference. Jacobs thinks his Communist mother’s history of outspokenness and risk-taking may have allowed him to try writing about his countertransference.

Today, our education is more heterodox, and the challenge is integration; we now use countertransference to understand our patients. Jacob’s final advice was that psychoanalysts need to be in groups, so “cultivate the culture at your institute.”

Early influences on Jane Hall were a mother with mental illness and her father’s advice that someday she would understand her mother’s rages and mood changes. She also had an early experience in therapy with a psychoanalyst, which resulted in her return to college, finishing her BA and earning her MSW. While in social work school, she began psychotherapy training with the Blancks, who taught her how to “develop the ego in less structured patients.” She also learned the analysis of defense in her psychoanalytic training at the New York Freudian Society. She regards her formal psychoanalytic education as scaffolding that relieved her anxiety. Hall was also shaped by the theories of Robert Waelder, Hans Loewald, Joseph Sandler, Otto Fenichel, Donald Winnicott, and more recently by Stephen Mitchell and Jay Greenberg. But she credits her patients and the experience of trying to meet them where they are as the greatest influence. She trusts “benevolent curiosity” more than diagnosis to guide her clinical work with patients and emphasizes deepening the treatment from psychotherapy to psychoanalysis. The biggest challenges in psychoanalysis are tolerating the patient’s transference rage, accepting the transference, and knowing what to do with it.

Hall keeps theory tucked away in her mind, waiting to be accessed when needed. She learned to trust her intuition and to let the patient build their own theory, never pushing theory on the patient. She thinks all theory has some value, and her own clinical theory is that, as treatment progresses, patients are able to put into words their envy-fueled rage, fears of separation, the dread of dependency, and the pain of unrequited love, all of which have been repressed, acted out, and invested in their representational worlds. As a result of therapeutic process, guilt diminishes, and closeness becomes possible. People come to need therapy because early caregivers were abusive, intrusive, neglectful, and narcissistic. As the false sense of self fades, there is no longer the need to please. Self-esteem builds as the ego gets stronger and the superego loses its’ harshness.
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The new experience of the analyst changes the body and brain chemistries, and new cognitive templates form, alongside of the old ones. As one’s perspective widens, one no longer needs to rely on the defenses that have become crippling to the personality. Shame diminishes, pride can be tolerated, and the repetition of the past can cease. Loving aspects of the self emerge, and the other can be recognized as separate. Empathy grows, anger subsides, forgiveness and mourning become possible. Given the difficult nature of this internal work, the value of psychoanalytic training lies in that it prepares one to endure the journey.

Mitchell Wilson put his process of becoming a psychoanalyst into a literary context, which is fitting because he stepped out of medical school to obtain a master’s degree in literature. Putting his remarks in the context of Holden Caulfield and Tristram Shandy, he told the audience that psychoanalysis, like these two characters, asks fundamental questions about human life, including how did I get here, what were my parents doing when I was conceived, and how, really, did it all happen? Psychoanalysis often beckons to those of us made receptive through our own experiences of longing, desire, loss, and trauma. Wilson tells of his desire to make things better for himself and his patients. His childhood was marked by his parents’ depressions and his father’s alcoholism. He had the insight, at age twelve, that a person could feel insecure and depressed without being aware of it. This opened for him the possibility that things outside of awareness could trouble a person and trouble them.

While working on his master’s degree in English literature, Wilson first read Jacques Lacan, and it “blew his mind.” Lacan’s idea that the ego could be the problem was “edgy, daring and opaque.” The idea that the ego was based on imaginary and alienating identifications was a radical departure from his previous reading of Freud and Klein. He had thought that the ego was to be strengthened and that it was the site of reason and observation. Having been so introduced to Lacan, Wilson had spent the subsequent years endeavoring to understand the implications of Lacan’s insight.

Like Jacobs and Hall, Wilson sought his own treatment in psychoanalysis. He credits this analyst with impressing on him that psychoanalysis is hard work. This analysis was also instrumental in his developing the awareness that he was in analysis for himself, but also for his father. He came to realize that he had unconsciously felt responsible for his father’s “sadness, madness, and rage.” Analysis helped him to move past this misplaced feeling of obligation.

Wilson maintains that analysts must deal with both idealization and devaluation. He calls idealization an “occupational hazard for psychoanalysts.” He found his way to his own authority as an analyst by forging his own analytic style, which he describes as an amalgam of conflict theory, Lacanian skepticism of the analyst’s authority, and British Middle School ideas of transitional space, creativity, and receptivity. He emphasizes the importance of ongoing rededication to the work of psychoanalysis. Because this work is difficult, there is a convergence of perils and responsibilities for those who would be analysts. Invoking Lacan, Wilson refers to the self-authorizing dimension of psychoanalysis. No one else can make one an analyst. One’s own institute confers this designation, as does the American Psychoanalytic Association and the International Psychoanalytical Association, but Wilson argues that it means little. We each must come to our own conclusions about what kind of analyst we will be. But herein lies the peril of narcissism and the demand for rededication to analysis. The work is hard, and I think Wilson emphasizes the seductions inherent in the tendency to idealize. Candidates and patients idealize analysts. Being idealized can be seductive. Analysts, despite their own analyses, and rigorous training can be seduced, not just sexually, but by delusions of omnipotence, fueled by unmitigated narcissism. Compromised analysts can also seduce. Wilson told us about how both of his analysts were corrupted and committed ethical lapses.

Analysts are vulnerable to “coasting in the countertransference.” By this, he means that it is easy not to challenge ourselves or our patients, by heightening anxiety and risking losing the patient and our income. He does not endorse confrontation for its own sake, rather he sees analysis as intrinsically destabilizing. Psychoanalysts play with fire. Engaging the transference means one should have great respect for the feelings engaged in the transference-countertransference relationship.

In concluding his remarks, Wilson returns to literature. Psychoanalysis for him evokes Laurence Sterne’s Tristram Shandy and can be a genuine pleasure, wherein one speaks freely to see where it takes us. As well, psychoanalysis evokes Holden Caulfield, whose relentless internal narration is an effort to “put his mind back together” and cope with his great loss. Psychoanalysis is a place where we can deal with the great questions of life in a singular and personal way.

The fourth presenter William Braun was not able to present his own paper due to a family emergency. Braun’s paper was presented by Mark Smaller, who added some of his own reflections on Braun’s development from the perspective of his own growth. Braun also shared some of the painful relationships of his childhood. His mother was alcoholic, and he never felt she listened to him. His father always seemed to be gone to Japan on business. He loved music as a child and studied piano with a teacher Mrs. Caramuta, who he credits with not just teaching him to play piano but also to be human through her deep understanding of the emotion in music. Braun devoted himself to music, practicing many, many hours a day, and studied music as an undergraduate. Once graduated, he discovered that while he loved music, he did not enjoy working as a musician.

Braun realized that what he loved about music was not the technique but “the experience, the self-discovery, the ability to plumb the depths of a great composer and end up finding myself.” In high school, he had taken the Strong Interest Inventory that indicated he may have an interest in psychology. He pursued a master’s degree in sports and performance psychology with a cognitive-behavioral orientation. He quickly discovered the limitations of that approach. A young goalie confided in Braun that he would freeze up in the game because he
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was worried about his father’s approval. Braun was advised by his supervisor to ignore that “stuff” and “just get him to focus on the game.” This was not why Braun had pursued psychology and led him to begin to read more deeply. He first encountered psychoanalytic ideas when he read Carl Jung’s The Undiscovered Self. He kept studying until he obtained his doctorate in psychology from a psychoanalytically-oriented program and then completed an internship at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute as well as adult and child psychoanalytic training. At present, Braun joins Smaller in taking psychoanalysis into the wider community. Their motto is “Off the Couch and Into the World.” They embrace the idea that, for psychoanalysis to thrive, it has to be taken to schools and other institutions.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Education Committee Report
By Caryn Schorr, M.D.
Education Chair, Candidates’ Council

A new relationship has been forged between the Candidates’ Council and the Committee on Psychoanalytic Education (COPE). COPE current chair Harriet Wolfe and immediate past chair Robert Michels invited the Candidates’ Council to designate a representative to join the COPE steering committee and encouraged the establishment of a candidates’ COPE study group.

At the June 2011 APSaA Annual Meeting, candidates enthusiastically supported the creation of such a study group with a unanimous vote to proceed. A vigorous discussion took place regarding what topic would be best as an initial focus. The candidates present expressed interest in supervision, in boundary violations and their secondary effects on candidates, and in the certification process. The decision was made to leave the initial focus broad and to call the group “The Challenges of Candidacy.” The plan is to allow more specific foci to emerge from discussions among candidates from around the country and at different levels of training.

A goal of the candidates’ study group, as with all COPE study groups, will be to have an educational impact beyond the study group, such as through publications or sponsorship of panels and workshops.

The study group chair will be Caryn Schorr, the Education Committee Chair for the Candidates’ Council. Eleven Candidate Members and one APSaA Active Member (our past President) expressed interest in June, submitted their CVs, and will comprise the first COPE study group. The group includes candidates at different levels of training and at different training programs. Our first meeting will be on Wednesday, June 13, 2012, during APSaA’s 101st Annual Meeting in Chicago.

In summary, the new candidates’ COPE study group beginning this June will be an opportunity for candidates, who have expressed interest in aspects of training, to explore those interests with the goal of producing a product that enriches the profession.

Candidate Programs for the 101st Annual Meeting (June 12-17) in Chicago
By Phoebe Cirio, M.S.W., L.C.S.W.
Program Chair, Candidates’ Council

We have a panel and a discussion group that will feature candidate presenters and will be on subjects that should be of interest to candidates and those considering training. The “Candidate to Candidate Discussion Group: Handling Displaced Affect in Analytic Treatment,” scheduled for Wednesday, June 13th from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m., will have candidate Kelly Bradham of Chicago presenting to Brenda Solomon, also of Chicago. The clinical material will illustrate how an analytic process can facilitate the emergence of material that is otherwise unreachable and the means of working with such material. In addition, the group will explore the differences between the deficit and conflict models and the reasons for using one or the other.

The Candidate Forum titled “Developing a Psychoanalytic Mind and Identity,” scheduled for Thursday, June 14th from 2 to 4 p.m., will feature a panel comprised entirely of candidates and recent graduates. Our panelists will consider personal and clinical experiences that have shaped their development as psychoanalysts and that have helped form their psychoanalytic identity. The panel is chaired by Phoebe Cirio, and will include the following presenters: Carlos Almeida, Deisy Boscan, Robin Deutsch, Ilene Dyller, Navah Kaplan, and Vanessa Sinclair.

The Candidate Connection has transitioned to an electronic newsletter - available online NOW.

Located under the Publications tab APsaA’s website: www.apsa.org
Report from the PINE Psychoanalytic Center
By M. Carole Drago, LICSW
Candidate, PINE Psychoanalytic Center

The past year at The PINE Psychoanalytic Center has been busy, productive, and, at times, challenging. The separate ingredients of faculty and candidate interests, ideas, and energies continue to mix into a dynamic and stimulating blend.

Beginning with our faculty news, we congratulate Drs. Stephen Keznner and Susan Rosbrow-Reich who were approved as Training Analysts. We also recognize Dr. Maida Greenberg, who was appointed Associate Supervisor to the BPSI/PINE Child and Adolescent Training Program. Dr. Jane Kite presented at the American Psychoanalytic Association’s (APsaA) 100th Annual Meeting in June, 2011. Drs. Fred Bush, Axel Hoffer, Steven Kerzner, and Evelyn Schwaber headed panels at the APsaA 2012 National Meeting in January. Finally, Drs. Fred Bush, Howard Levine, Anna Ornstein, and Evelyn Schwaber each published new work in various professional journals.

As for candidate news, we extend a warm welcome to Margaret Kramer, Ph.D., who joined us in September, 2011, as a first-year candidate. Dr. Kramer brings her twenty-plus years of clinical and supervisory experience to our institute, and we are delighted to have her. We offer congratulations to candidate Robin Gomolin, Psy.D., who passed her APsaA Pre-Certification Exam this winter. Dr. Gomolin also participated in several panels at APsaA’s 2012 National Meeting, where candidate Ayelet Barkai, MD, had a poster displayed. Candidates Rodrigo Barahona, LMHC, and Ayelet Barkai, MD, each published a paper in scholarly journals. Sarah Lusk, Ph.D., continued as the PINE candidate representative to APsaA and also visited the Minnesota Psychoanalytic Institute where she assisted in reviewing its program to facilitate its becoming a full-standing institute.

In the fall of 2011, PINE successfully launched The Clinical Fellowship Program; its enrollment has exceeded expectations. It is a unique, one-year program that combines weekly didactic classes and supervision with PINE faculty. PINE continued its Scientific Meeting Program, held at Cambridge Hospital, Cambridge, MA. The institute hosted analysts Drs. Stanley Coen, Lena Ehrlich, Evelyn Schwaber, and Edward Tronick. Each presented interesting and thought-provoking papers, followed by discussions.

In the winter of 2011-2012, PINE had a joint site visit by the COI-ACPE. The resulting feedback was reaffirming, and the recommendations were helpful. In March, 2012, we met as a community with consultant Dr. Marv Margolis to help us continue to share our thoughts and feelings about a distinguished Senior Training Analyst’s abrupt and unexpected resignation from PINE, resulting in a difficult, yet necessary and useful, discussion.

Chusingara at the Beach
It’s been ten years, no, decades
Since he hoisted his trunks
And crashed waves amongst shores
That only memory knows.
It was a time when teas filled
Blankets that were left to dry
On gravel sand that cut soles ’til shores ran red.

Chusingara knew this as he
Left his rent-controlled apartment
That windy December day
To find a beach that would
Greet him and not spit.

So, he took his day-pass Metro-card
And entered a downtown express
Too filled for cattle.
When he came to Grand Central,
He clutched his beachball and
Walked between two lions with
“Konichiwa” on his lips.

By Jacob Steinberg, M.D., 2006
Candidate, Institute for Psychoanalytic Education affiliated with the New York University School of Medicine

INSTITUTE NEWS

The Candidates’ Council’s Spring Party
Thursday, June 14th, 2012
8 to 11 PM
Eat | Drink | Network
Join us for the Spring Candidates’ Party!
Hosted by Chicago’s Candidates’ Association

An evening of Jazz music with dinner and drinks provided.
All members are invited. $50 per person
Please RSVP by May 14th
Mail checks payable to the “Candidates Association” to:
Jeffrey Solz, Psy.D., Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis,
122 S. Michigan Ave, 13th FL, Chicago, IL 60603
NOTE: Space is limited so it is required to RSVP. Without a reservation, payments of cash or check will be accepted on the day of the party ONLY if space is still available. We cannot accept credit card payments.

Location
1211 S. Prairie Ave, 6th Floor, Chicago
Wonderful view of Chicago’s monument campus!
(Just east of Roosevelt Rd & Michigan Ave - a 20-minute walk from the Palmer House or a quick public transit ride on the ‘C’ or ‘14’ bus, $2.25 each way. Northeast from Michigan, get off at stop for Michigan Ave & Roosevelt Rd)

By Jacob Steinberg, M.D., 2006
Candidate, Institute for Psychoanalytic Education affiliated with the New York University School of Medicine
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