

ATHE AFFILIATE COUNCIL



NEWSLETTER

PRESIDENT'S LETTER

— By Julio G. Calderon, MD

Dear Candidates and Affiliate Members:

This year marks Freud's 150th anniversary. As we commemorate his contributions to the development of psychoanalytic thought, practice, and our understanding of human behavior and motivation, we stand on the threshold of significant changes and threats to our way of thinking and to our ability to provide the necessary help that many of our patients need. The infringement from managed-care and the emphasis on "evidence-based" treatment approaches and measurable outcomes have gradually eroded the foundation of psychoanalytic understanding and treatment approaches. We have much work to do in our efforts to reassert the scientific basis of our discipline and to regain the preeminence we once had among many theoretical approaches.

The Affiliate Council is working diligently to ensure that you remain informed about the pressing issues faced by our Association which is entrusted to preserve and advocate for the future of our profession. As we look forward to our next upcoming annual meeting in Washington, D.C., several important issues are in front of us. I want to extend a personal invitation to all candidates and affiliate members to join us for what promises to be an exciting meeting. Here are some of the highlights:

EDITORS' NOTE

The theme of this Newsletter is clinical writing, and how it is taught throughout the institutes of the American. We have invited Barbara Almond, MD, of the San Francisco

Reorganization

Our Association has been besieged by years of internal tensions that have drained its energies and have drawn our attention away from the real threats posed to the future of our profession. In an effort to address these tensions and in keeping with a mandate to comply with current laws regarding not-for-profit corporation law, the Association embarked on a strategic planning initiative that included the Task Force on Reorganization, whose members were voted on by the entire membership, to address these important governance issues. Several candidates were selected to sit on the Task Force representing our particular interests in the reorganization plan. The history of these conflicts is a long one and stems from the relationship between the Board on Professional Standards (The Board) and the Executive Council (The Council). These tensions have frequently arisen because we are a combined membership and educational organization. The Board primarily develops standards for education, appointments of training analysts, accreditation of institutes and certification of individuals. The officers and Executive Council also have a duty toward educational and practice standards, but their charge is broader. The Council must consider the interests of its members, emphasizing such things

Continued on page 2

Psychoanalytic Institute, to share her thoughts on the subject and inform us of how clinical writing is fostered in the program. Also of great interest is John Skulstad's IPSO column, which discusses various approaches taken internationally.

June 2006
Volume 8, Issue 2

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

President's Letter	1
On Psychoanalysis	3
IPSO	4
Affiliate Business	5
Institute News	9
Committee News	10
Statements from Nominees for Office	11

JULIO CALDERON
President

LAURA JENSEN
President-elect

EILEEN PIASECKI
Secretary

JACQUELINE MCGREGOR
Treasurer

CAROL ARLAND
Co-Editor

LESLIE CUMMINS
Co-Editor

Continued from page 1

as enhancing our public image and ensuring inclusiveness, while maintaining a solid financial future for the Association. As you can see, the tensions between membership and education are inherent in the way our association is organized and governed.

In January, the Task Force on Reorganization presented its report in keeping with its mandate. The recommendations provide for a new Board of Directors that is thought to be potentially more effective and streamlined than our current Executive Council that serves as the current Board of Directors for the Association. For the sake of brevity, I will not enter into a full explanation about these distinctions but urge you to take the time and read the Task Force's report that is on our web page. There are significant proposed changes that would impact on the Affiliate Council and would potentially give candidates a much stronger voice in the newly reorganized structure. Included in the recommendations is a successor to our current Board on Professional Standards, the Council of Institutes, which will have its own Board of Directors and be constituted as a subsidiary corporation. The proposal would include representation from four elected members representing the Affiliate Council. Our current Executive Council would be constituted as the Council of Societies. The new Board of Directors would include two representatives of the Affiliate Council. You can see from the recommendations that candidate members would have a strong representation and voice in this reorganization plan.

As you can imagine, the proposed

plan has been met with much discussion but also dissension. The reorganization process was derailed in the Executive Council and the proposed plan was tabled for further discussion this June. The implications of this are significant for our association, which is very much in need of a new governance structure that will address these long-standing tensions and allow for much smoother functioning without all our energies being drained by futile disagreements.

We will keep you posted of further developments and continue to ensure that candidates are well represented as we work towards reorganizing our Association, the preeminent home of psychoanalysis.

95th Annual Meeting and Leadership Academy

I would like to extend a personal invitation to have you join us at the 95th Annual Meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association in Washington, DC. The Affiliate Council under the leadership of its candidate members has organized a wonderful lineup of programs of interest to candidates. The Affiliate Council meeting and breakfast on Thursday, June 15, 2006 at 7:45 am will be a wonderful opportunity to meet other candidates from across the country and learn more about what other institutes are doing to address candidate concerns. This meeting will feature a special workshop on media training led by Dottie Jeffries, Director of Public Information for the Association along with Patrick Cody, a well-known and respected consultant who works with institutes of the American.

We will also be continuing our discussion with the Project for Innovation

in Psychoanalytic Education chaired by Drs. Michael Singer and Don Rosenblitt. We will be discussing our current Training and Supervising Analyst system. Your thoughts, opinions and experience would be greatly valued as we continue this in-depth discussion from a candidate's perspective. Don't miss it!

Affiliate Membership Drive

The Membership Drive ran from October 15 to November 15, 2005. It was hugely successful with several institutes achieving 100% membership in the Association among its new first-year candidates. Overall, we had a 76% acceptance rate, which was a 14% increase over previous years and the highest acceptance rate we have seen since 2000. We also have 119 new candidates, which is also the highest number of new first year candidates since 2000. On behalf of the Affiliate Council, we want to thank all the local faculty representatives who served as drive leaders, along with Debbie Steinke (Manager, Education and Membership Services), Prudy Gourguechon (current President-elect of the Association) and Mary Scharold (Chair of COPAP).

We are a powerful voice within the Association. Let your voices be heard. Educate yourselves on the important issues that affect our training and the future of our profession.

I look forward to seeing you all in Washington.

Warmest regards,

Julio G. Calderon, MD

CANDIDATES AND CLINICAL WRITING

— By Barbara Almond, M.D.

Writing about patients and our work with them is a requirement of psychoanalytic training from beginning to end. From yearly case write-ups, clinical presentations, final case summaries and graduation papers, to certification write-ups, training analyst applications and scientific papers undertaken at one's own initiative at any time during professional life, the need to describe and convey clinical process clearly and vividly is crucial to demonstrating understanding and mastery of the work and to enabling successful communications between clinicians.

Writing is a complex skill but one that causes undue anxiety in candidates. Sometimes this anxiety delays advances in training if, for instance, papers and case write-ups are not written and submitted. A more serious consequence of this anxiety is that it may keep talented people who have things to say from saying them to the larger audience that can be reached in print. Such marked anxiety is somewhat puzzling since most candidates have already written theses, and some have written scientific papers. Many candidates have also done creative writing. Stories, poems, memoirs and journals are often part of their past writing experiences as they have traversed the many years of education that lead to psychoanalytic training. Perhaps some of this anxiety stems from the connection between clinical writing and progression, in analytic training. To quote Alice Jones, who teaches in the writing program at the San Francisco Psychoanalytic Institute: "While the particular anxiety may shift depending on context—whether writing for progression or certification or publication—the writer is aware of the pressure to appear polished. Often, beginning writers take this as a signal to become more formal and rigid..." (p.842). Spontaneity, originality, colorful imagery and humor are all casualties of this pressure to demonstrate rigor and professional mastery.

There is another, perhaps more important, reason that some candidates (and graduates) dread writing.

Writing is to verbal expression as a real letter is to an email. The latter can be forgotten or erased. Writing something down is an irrevocable declaration of knowledge and opinion. Revealed in clinical writing are intimate exchanges of thought and feeling, as analyst and patient strive to understand what is going on between them. As consciousness of inner process deepens, the clinical dialogue becomes more powerful and the writer more vulnerable to criticism. Candidates feel very exposed when conveying this kind of development in their work and, empathic to the sensitivities of their classmates, they are often unwilling to comment frankly about the writing of others.

Many institutes are taking pedagogical measures to address the problems candidates face in writing about their work. The San Francisco Psychoanalytic Institute has recently developed a Psychoanalytic Studies track, to enrich and augment long established tracks in theory, development and clinical technique. At the present time the Psychoanalytic Studies track consists of four courses. Case writing is taught toward the end of the first year, a few months before the first write-up is due. In the third year a more comprehensive course in psychoanalytic writing is taught, much in the fashion of a creative writing workshop. In the fourth year a course is offered that allows candidates to present their working ideas for the preceptorship paper that is a requirement for graduation from the San Francisco Institute. This is a scientific paper, usually with a clinical emphasis, which is presented and discussed in a seminar taught in the fifth year of candidacy. In *all* of these courses the emphasis is on creating an atmosphere of safety for candidates to write, read, and critique the writing of others, creatively.

When I teach the course on case write-ups, I ask my candidates to choose a patient with whom they feel particularly emotionally involved, or one who confuses them, preferably a patient that their class-mates have not heard presented before, so that there will not be any preconceptions about what is to come. I then assign a piece of writing which will be the scaffolding

of a later, more complete case write-up. First, I ask my students to write an introductory *sentence* to inform the reader who the patient is and why they entered treatment. This is to be followed by a *paragraph* which includes the most salient aspects of the patient's history, those aspects that will have bearing on the description of clinical process which comes next.

I describe this major part of the assignment as follows: Try in a *page or two (double spaced)* to convey how the patient relates to you, that is, how and what they speak about in sessions, how they make you feel, how they react to what you say and do, what the emotional atmosphere is like. You will be describing the transference, either in a particular element (e.g. being unconsciously conflated with an important other) or in the sense of the "total transference"—that is, the ways each patient manages their interpersonal world. Use jargon minimally! Clinical descriptions should be understandable across theoretical divides. In elaborating the process use a clinical vignette or an excerpt from your process notes to illustrate what you think is going on. For example, "the patient talked about X and I said Y and the patient became angry, quiet, anxious, etc. and this is what I think was going on. In the next session, the patient said Z, or had a dream, or was late, and I thought it was because of...or, I didn't understand it at that time." I point out that a longer case write-up is a series of such pieces of clinical process, and the analyst's understanding of this process, over time. A clinical formulation is optional at this early point, but everything included in the write-up should contribute to such a formulation later on.

Most candidates wait until the absolute last minute to turn in this assignment. I ask them to get copies to their classmates and to be prepared to discuss these write-ups in class. Despite the anxiety that leads to such foot-dragging, the results are remarkably lively and informative. People gradually loosen up and discuss what they understand, what confuses them and what could be different. It often

Continued on page 4

Continued from page 3

turns out that this practice exercise, with some filling in of the blanks, becomes the basis of a full yearly write-up.

In the third year psychoanalytic writing course, the field is much broader. This course has been taught by instructors who are themselves experienced writers of psychoanalytic papers, and/or creative writers. Our last two instructors have both been poets! Examples of creative writing are discussed in terms of imagery, associations, and evocation of mood. These pieces are followed by examples of writing from the psychoanalytic literature that are particularly compelling, the kind of writing that captures the imagination and makes the reader want to read more. For each of the eight weeks of class, all the students do a writing assignment which is read and discussed in class. The assignments move more and more in the direction of clinical description and

process, and as in the first course, the emphasis is on clear, non-jargon laden language. Individual style is discussed and encouraged, and the level of comfort increases noticeably as the weeks go on. (For a more exhaustive, and beautifully written, description of this course, I refer you to the reference at the end of this column.)

The preceptorship portion of the program demands an original psychoanalytic paper. This is the hardest part of the writing curriculum for some candidates. However, much help is available. In the preceptorship preparatory class they discuss their ideas with the instructor and their classmates; this often clarifies and enriches their thinking. Candidates are used to this kind of discussion from their previous experiences in the writing track. Everyone has to take the preceptorship course, although not until the fifth year, by which time many candidates have done a fair amount of writing. Candidates also have the option of working with an individual mentor. The

elements of a scientific paper—the development of an original thought, situation or concept, clinical illustration of the former and literature review—are all expected to be included. Even for candidates who will never write another paper, it is a very rigorous and useful experience; for others the preceptorship paper may eventually be published in a psychoanalytic journal and may mark the beginning of a writing career!

The Psychoanalytic Studies track at SFPI is going well. Suggestions for further writing electives and opportunities to write in other classes are being encouraged. Our hope is to create more of a “university” atmosphere, one which encourages originality and individuality in thinking. Writing requires clear thinking, but, in turn, enhances it. We feel that candidates have much to gain from this expansion of the curriculum.

Jones, A. (2005) Generating words: one approach to teaching clinical writing. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 74: 835–853.

IPSO

IPSO REPORT

— *By John Skulstad, MD*

In researching the question of clinical writing at institutes in other parts of the world, I received information from candidates in Portugal, Brazil, and the Netherlands. In none of those institutes was there a required format for clinical writing. In all three locations, the decision of whether and how to record sessions for supervision was a matter left up to the candidate and his or her supervisor. Some supervisors required a particular format, others told candidates to write what they wished. Sometimes the way the writing was done led to awareness of countertransference issues.

In all three locations, a formal written presentation of a case was part of the graduation requirements. In Sao Paulo, Brazil there is a seminar focusing on writing clinical cases. In Lisbon, Portugal candidates can have a tutor who helps them with the writing up of their case for graduation. This however was felt to be intrusive and unnecessary by some candidates. The content of the written case in all three locations usually includes a report of the patient's history and initial presentation, a few whole sessions or extracts of sessions that demonstrate the patient and analyst's evolution in the course of the analysis, the technical approach of

the candidate and its relation to the patient's improvement, and a theoretical discussion related to the case. The reports range from 20 to 50 pages in length.

The information I received from our candidate colleagues in these other countries indicates some of the benefits of involvement in IPSO, the international organization of candidates in IPA institutes, i.e. exposure to the experience of candidates in other parts of the world with the concomitant opportunity for camaraderie and comparison. One of these opportunities will occur at the APsaA Annual Meeting in Washington, June 14–18, 2006. IPSO will have a discussion group (Number 25) at this meeting. At this discussion group, which occurs on Wednesday, June 14, Margot Brandi, IPSO Vice-President for South America will present a paper entitled, “Magic Mirror on the Wall, Who is the Baldest One of All?”. This paper will be formally discussed by candidates and recently graduated analysts from South America, Europe, and North America. I encourage all candidates to attend. If you do come, please introduce yourself to me and the other members of the IPSO executive committee, all of whom will be at the meeting.

There are several new opportunities for candidates as a result of recent IPA initiatives. These include research grants,

Continued on page 5

Continued from page 4

programs for visiting faculty from other parts of the world, and educational loans. Some further details were included in the Affiliate list emails from Robin Deutsch, IPSO President-Elect on March 29 and April 22 of this year. They can also be researched on the IPA website, HYPERLINK "<http://www.ipa.org.uk>" www.ipa.org.uk.

The next congress of the International Psychoanalytical Association will take place in Berlin, Germany from July 25–28, 2007. IPSO will have meetings in conjunction with that congress. The IPSO program usually starts a day earlier, in this case, July 24. The IPSO program includes paper

presentations, senior analyst presentations, and public supervision of candidate cases by senior analysts. Candidates wishing to present papers or submit cases for supervision should watch for announcements about the deadlines for submission of papers and supervision requests on the affiliate email list and the IPSO website, HYPERLINK "<http://www.ipsocandidates.org>" www.ipsocandidates.org. The earliest of these deadlines will be in the end of September of this year, so get your papers ready! Every two years new officers are elected for many of the IPSO executive committee positions. Interested candidates can submit their names in the nominating process as outlined on the IPSO website in the bylaws section.

AFFILIATE BUSINESS**AFFILIATE COUNCIL SCIENTIFIC PAPER PRIZE**

Susan Scheffel, a child only candidate at Columbia, will present her 2005 semi-finalist paper "The World of William Steig: A Representation of Early Separation and Resiliency" at the Annual Meeting in Washington (11 AM on Friday, June 16). Ethan Grumbach, who is graduating from Los Angeles, will be the "Interviewer," inaugurating a new discussion format (created by Barbara Pizer for the 2006 meeting of the International Association for Relational Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy) that we hope will create a rich interaction between Susan, Ethan, and the group. Susan's paper was called "a gem" and "a delight" by its Paper Prize readers, and she will present it with illustrations from Steig's work that illuminate the text. The paper, Susan says, was inspired by her pleasure in reading Steig's books to her children. We hope you will join us for the presentation!

At the winter meeting in January, Adele Tutter, a candidate at New York, presented her 2005 winning paper "Medication as Object" to a standing room only audience. Adele's compelling paper is an important contribution to the psychoanalytic literature on the use of medication in analytic treatment, exploring how medication comes alive as a person in the consulting

room. It was written up in the April 2006 issue of *Clinical Psychiatry News*, and a longer version will appear in *JAPA* in the fall of 2006. Howard Weiner from Michigan was the discussant, and presented an excellent summary of the history of our thinking about the use of medication in analysis and his thoughts about own experience in prescribing medication for his own and his colleagues' analytic patients.

I hope many of you are thinking about sending your papers to this year's competition. The announcement is in this Newsletter, and the deadline is August 1, 2006. For those of you not sending papers, we welcome your requests to be judges, for we want to add new judges to our judging panel. We supply you with an evaluation form to guide your reading of the 2 or 3 papers we send you. Our judges have the opportunity to become editorial readers for *JAPA*, a valuable professional opportunity for candidates that creates new skills and relationships (that can lead to referrals) that can bridge the transition from candidate to practicing analyst. We hope as many of you as possible will participate in the Scientific Paper Prize activities.

Carol B. Levin

Chair, Affiliate Council Scientific Paper Prize Competition

PROGRAMS FOR CANDIDATES IN WASHINGTON, DC

— By Michael Slevin, MA

The candidate program committee has arranged for two exceptional discussions for the June meetings in Washington, D.C.

The Affiliates Forum will host Glen Gabbard, author of the seminal book, *Boundaries and Boundary Violations*. The Forum will begin with Gabbard giving a presentation on the topic. He will then discuss patient material presented by third-year candidate Beverly Betz. Betz's material involves being hugged spontaneously by a patient and her own response to that act. The Affiliates Forum takes place on Thursday, June 15 from 2:00–4:30.

The Candidate-to-Candidate discussion group will further explore the anxieties of training, a topic about which there was considerable enthusiasm at the New York meetings last January. Angelica Kaner, PhD, and Joanna Lhulier, PsyD, both candidates, will present papers as a stimulus to discussion. This discussion group takes place immediately after the Forum on June 15 from 4:45–7:15.

FIRST AFFILIATE COUNCIL LEADERSHIP ACADEMY WORKSHOP

“How to Develop a Scientific Paper (And Get it Published!)”

Steven Levy, M.D., Editor of JAPA

Steve Levy, the editor of JAPA, was invited by Julio Calderon, Affiliate Council President, to inaugurate a new component of the Affiliate Council meeting, The Leadership Academy, at the Winter Meeting in New York. Here is a summary of Dr. Levy's Workshop.

In encouraging candidates to become writers of analytic papers, Dr. Levy noted that there are a myriad of resistances to writing one's first paper and joining the “band of brother and sisters” of analytic writers and creating rich dialogues that can last a lifetime. First time writers fear they have nothing to say, for example, or that “the gods will be angry,” a phrase that captures the oedipal anxieties that often plague new writers. Idealizing one's analytic lineage—one's own analyst or one's analyst's analyst, can prevent a first-time writer from taking the plunge. Or feeling inadequate about one's knowledge of the analytic literature can inhibit a new writer, while an easy, working knowledge of it can boost confidence, or reciprocally, lead to the feeling that one has nothing new to say. New analytic writers need to find their own voices, and working methods. It helps, too, to find a writing mentor, since h/she can provide encouragement when one's motivation flags.

Dr. Levy's first published paper was developed from an idea that occurred to him in supervision, and he thinks that ideas for papers often arise from discussions at meetings that lead to

questions and thoughts that can be the starting point for a paper. Annoyance, after all, can be generative, and disagreement is good because it stimulates one's own thinking. Ideas don't have to be great, just good enough. Once a writer has an idea, two paths are possible, depending on the writer's own sensibility. One can search the literature (the wonderful PEP CD-ROM makes this very simple) to see what earlier writers have said on the subject, which can then stimulate one's own thinking. Alternatively, if this is overwhelming and inhibiting because it evokes the thought that one has nothing original to say, one can just search and eyeball the literature before writing a first draft, and then return to it for the literature review at the end of the writing process. One can think and write about related or analogous ideas, one's own idea, then one's clinical material, and then what it all means. One can conclude one's draft with unanswered questions and other ideas to be investigated in future papers.

It is crucial in this first draft stage not to get swamped, and to focus on presenting one's own ideas and earlier ideas that are pertinent to it. One has no obligation, Dr. Levy reminded us, to read everything that's been written on a subject. In our field, everything is reconstruction, a re-working of others' thoughts. One just hopes that one is saying something useful, and it is one's own take that is important.

After one has produced a first draft, one has multiple choices. If one is confident as a writer, one can revise it oneself; if not, hiring editorial help (e.g., a grad student in English, a writing coach) is a good idea. Submitting a well-written paper to a journal

increases its chance of getting published. Papers can often be improved by suggestions from colleague-readers, or one's writing mentor, before being submitted to a journal for review, which is the next step.

Dr. Levy told us that editorial boards are always looking for new writers, and want to publish their papers, for analytic writers often have short periods of productivity and then rework their own ideas for years (which get published because they are by then well-known). All papers submitted to JAPA are read by three readers who submit detailed reviews whose aim is to challenge writers and push them to clarify and develop their ideas. The reviews are synthesized into a long letter from Dr. Levy with suggestions for how to improve the paper so that it can be published. The intent is to help authors rewrite their papers so that they can eventually be published. There is nothing to lose, Dr. Levy told us, and everything to gain, in submitting a paper for review. It usually takes persistence to get one's first paper published, and the first one is the hardest.

Dr. Levy concluded his workshop by giving a topic to each small group and having them brainstorm a paper; he then visited each group to hear the paper outline and gave suggestions for improving it. It was an excellent simulation of the writing and review process, and participants came away inspired to write.

— *By Carol Levin (who encourages the readers of this piece to write and submit a paper to the 2006 Scientific Paper Prize competition!)*

The Affiliate Council of the American Psychoanalytic Association

Announces

The 2006 \$1000 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.

A \$500 honorarium will be awarded to the semi-finalist.

Funding for the honoraria comes from APsaA and the American Psychoanalytic Foundation Committee

The winning author will present his/her paper at the Winter 2007 Meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association; the semi-finalist will present his/her paper at the 2007 Annual Meeting in June. The winners must also arrange to present their papers at a local society meeting or community venue.

The winner and semi-finalist may submit their papers for review by JAPA and, if accepted, they will be published as the winner or semi-final paper of the Affiliate Council Paper Prize.

Submission Guidelines: Papers must be unpublished (but may have been presented at professional meetings) and must conform to the Preparation of Manuscript 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, 2006. Email one **Word document** containing the manuscript **with all references to the author deleted**, and email **another Word document** containing the author's name, e-mail address, address, phone number, and Institute affiliation to:

Carol B. Levin, MD
Chair, Affiliate Council Paper Prize
517.381.0496
Email: levinc@msu.edu

Supported by grants from the American Psychoanalytic Foundation and APsaA

The Candidate

A new online journal

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Hilary Rubenstein Hatch, PhD

MANAGING EDITOR

Rachel L. Blakeman, JD, LCSW

WEBSITE EDITOR

Stephen Malach, MD

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chap Attwell, MD, MPH

Salomon Bankier, PhD

Leslie Cummins, C.S.W.

Alan Dezen, LCSW-R, BCD

Francoise Graf, PhD

Jason Greenberg, PhD

Elizabeth Groisser, PsyD

Norma R. Green, MD

Jason Hershberger, MD

Abby Herzog, PsyD

Doonam Kim, MD

Carmela Perez, PhD

Jennifer Schimmel, MD

Tanya Weisman, MD

FACULTY ADVISORS

Donald Moss, MD

Steven Reisner, PhD

Joseph Reppen, PhD

Arden Rothstein, PhD

FACULTY READERS

Samuel Abrams, MD

Jennifer Stuart, PhD

ADVISORY BOARD

Jody M. Davies, PhD

Muriel Dimen, PhD

Steven J. Ellman, PhD

Glen O. Gabbard, MD

Steven T. Levy, MD

Owen Renik, MD

Henry F. Smith, MD

The Candidate ■ Perspectives from an Evolving Psychoanalytic Community

The first volume of *The Candidate*, scheduled for online publication in the Fall of 2006, is dedicated to "Beginnings" — candidates' initiation into the psychoanalytic community with emphasis on the critical rites of passage that characterize a candidate's early experiences.

Beginnings: psychoanalytic training is characterized by rites of passage: the interview process, referral to a training analyst, approval to begin an analytic case, to name a few. How do these initial experiences affect the candidate's development into a psychoanalyst? Which rites of passage have strong educational underpinnings leading to intellectual and emotional growth? And which of the rituals hamper curiosity and stifle creativity?

Candidates' real experiences with, and fantasies about, such rites of passage color their development, not only as analysts, but also as analysts. As early as the interview process, candidates may wonder who is included in the psychoanalytic community and who is excluded? Who progresses through training and who is left behind? What are the values reflected in that process and what is the resulting psychoanalytic community? Which aspects of the status quo do they maintain? Psychoanalytic beginnings can be open and welcoming or frightening and mysterious. Has the psychoanalytic community adequately addressed the benefits and detriments of these rites of passage, or do some longstanding rituals become relics of the past, requiring further examination?

Submissions

The deadline for our inaugural issue has passed, but please send submissions for our future issues via email. Please contact:

Hilary Rubenstein Hatch, PhD
Editor-in-Chief
HilaryRHatch@nyc.rr.com

Mission Statement

The Candidate seeks to engage candidates in the written dialogue amongst psychoanalysts early in their development as analysts. The journal welcomes submissions from candidates in training at any psychoanalytic institute, regardless of affiliation or theoretical orientation. Our goal is to enrich candidates' current training by representing the diversity of theoretical perspectives in the field.

In addition to candidate submissions, *The Candidate* welcomes non-candidate submissions that address issues of particular interest to candidates, such as training issues and education. The journal will accommodate a variety of written formats: research and clinical papers, interviews of clinicians, reviews of articles, books and films. *The Candidate* seeks both to give voice to the newest generation of psychoanalysts and to cultivate an expanded, intelligent dialogue in an evolving psychoanalytic community.

Content of *The Candidate* will be edited and determined by candidates from the NYU Psychoanalytic Institute and rotating guest editors from other psychoanalytic institutes.

Rachel Blakeman, JD, LCSW
Managing Editor
RachelBlakeman@aol.com

BALTIMORE WASHINGTON— *By Michael Slevin, MA*

The Baltimore Washington Psychoanalytic Institute has a modest but strong formal writing component. In Year One, our Technique I course requires each candidate to write up a case emphasizing the question of analyzability. Then in Year Two, we have a course on clinical writing, with the emphasis on making the patient portrayal vivid. Countertransference material is to be included. The key-stone, of course, is the annual write-up of each analytic case in which we focus on the presence of analytic process.

But writing is a more complex part of our training. Our faculty, many of whom are published clinical writers, consistently point to opportunities to make presentations. A splendid example is that Beverly Betz, MSW, will be presenting a case involving an issue of boundaries to Glen Gabbard, the acknowledged national expert on boundary violations, at the June meetings of APsaA. In addition, several faculty members, graduates, and candidates are editorial readers (such as Beverly Betz and Georgia Royalty) and editors of major psychoanalytic journals.

COLUMBIA— *By Aneil M. Shirke, MD, PhD*

Just a brief note from the folks at Columbia.

Our writing program is very helpful. The writing faculty work with each class differently, with different goals. Each year has a four-week long class, before which we are given writing assignments, and after which, in a seminar-like format, we evaluate each others' work.

First-year writing class is just about writing an experience-near, one-page account of a transference, countertransference exchange. Second-year writing is to help us learn to write about microprocess, the back and forth of clinical moments. Third-year class is

about refining the patient, his diagnosis, neurosis, and structuring the data on which our formulations and opening treatment are based. Fourth-year class is on writing about the macroprocess, mapping out the way that transference, counter-transference, defenses, and the patient's life change over the course of treatment, and how the analyst played a part in those changes. Senior class writing, for fifth-years and beyond, is about examining writing to look for traces of unexplored counter-transference of the writer/analyst.

DENVER INSTITUTE— *By John Skulstad, MD*

The Association for Child Psychoanalysis held its annual meeting in Denver this year from April 7th to 9th. Analysts, candidates, and interested community professionals attended various portions of the meeting. Attendees praised the quality of the meeting and enjoyed Denver as a place to visit. The Institute continues to put on multiple "courses" for mental health professionals in the area. These are well-attended and constitute a growing portion of the Institute activities.

Clinical writing is only addressed incidentally as it might come up with one's supervisor when doing initial and annual case reports. Except for a one day "case writing workshop" with Stephen Bernstein in 2001, there are no classes in clinical writing and it is not discussed in the didactic portion of our training.

MICHIGAN PSYCHOANALYTIC INSTITUTE— *By Susan Flinders, PhD*

With Spring/Summer awakenings in our midst, the educational year is winding down. Writing, the topic for this newsletter, is encouraged to the candidates in Michigan through a couple of avenues. First of all, each of the four class years has a writing course in

the curriculum. Brief writing exercises are assigned along with readings that focus on writing as a psychoanalytic process. Writing instructors are also quite encouraging about writing and even promote the creation of peer writing groups, if at all possible. Lastly, there is a paper prize for candidates who wish to enter a sample of writing with the ultimate goal of directing the winning paper toward possible paths for publication. Candidates can also submit papers for scientific presentation locally. In fact, this year, a graduate from last year and an advanced candidate presented papers at local scientific meetings. Jon Markey, MD, presented "Anniversary Reactions: Historical Overview and Clinical Relevance," and Michael Shulman, PhD, presented "On the Particular Pleasures of Doing Psychoanalytic Clinical Work and Notes on a History of Their Non-Discussion."

Writing for candidates, along with other areas of growth as future analysts, is enhanced in Michigan by a variety of stimulating scientific programs throughout the year with the opportunity for candidate case presentations to out-of-town guests. Marcy Broder, MSW, an advanced candidate, presented to Alan Sugarman, PhD from LaJolla, California last fall, for example. We also have two upcoming out-of-town visitors. Kehinde Ayeni, MD, an advanced candidate, will present to Dorothy Holmes, PhD (from Washington, DC), our week-long Visiting Professor of Psychoanalysis and another candidate (TBA) will present to Joseph Lichtenberg, MD, when he visits for a scientific program and presents "What We Know About Change Resulting From Explicit Communication and What We Are Learning About the Influence of the Implicit." Therefore, writing seems to be a fairly integrated learning process in various ways for candidates in Michigan.

Continued on page 10

Continued from page 9

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY PSYCHOANALYTIC INSTITUTE

— *By Carmela Perez, PhD*

I am so glad we are taking up this topic! I am very interested to see how clinical writing is taught at other institutes, how it is defined, and what the expectations are. For at least for the four years that I have been a candi-

date at my institute, there has been no course on clinical writing as a part of the formal curriculum. However, our institute offers an annual workshop for candidates, which is usually taught by a guest instructor. For example, several years ago we had Stephen Bernstein, MD, teach his method of conveying an analytic process. Coincidentally, in just a few weeks, Michael Singer, MD, who is part of our faculty, will be teaching a clinical writing workshop. Otherwise, the bulk of the learn-

ing occurs in supervision, specifically in going over one's write-ups with one's individual supervisor. I believe that most candidates at my institute eventually feel competent doing their write-ups. I also know (and it was definitely my experience) that the goal of learning and writing about an analytic process seems daunting at the beginning of candidacy. I wonder if it is less so for those candidates who have a class as part of their coursework?

COMMITTEE NEWS

COMMITTEE ON RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY

— *By Carmela Perez, PhD, Chair*

I have continued to work with Caroline Rosenthal-Gelman, PhD, from the APsA Fellowship Committee, and Andrew Lagomasino, PsyD in organizing the Wednesday discussion group we have during

the APSAA meetings—Cultures in Conflict: Challenges of Integrating Psychoanalytic Ideas Faced by Mental Health Professionals from Culturally Diverse Backgrounds. During the last winter meetings, Michael Caplan, MD, also from the Fellowship Committee, joined our planning efforts. We invited Susan Bodnar, PhD, adjunct professor of clinical psychology at Columbia

University Teachers College, to speak about her 2004 paper entitled, "Remember where you come from: Dissociative processes in multicultural individuals". Dr. Bodnar led a more interactive discussion group, which allowed for significant participation from the attendees, and was written up in early March in *Psychiatric News*.

PLATFORM STATEMENTS FOR AFFILIATES RUNNING FOR OFFICE ON THE AFFILIATE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHOANALYTIC ASSOCIATION

I. Candidates for the Office of President-Elect

Carmela Perez, Ph.D.

Currently, I am a fourth year candidate at NYU Psychoanalytic Institute, and I have served as the Delegate for my Institute on the Affiliate Council since my first year of candidacy. I have also been the Chair for the Affiliate Council Committee on Racial and Ethnic Diversity since my second year of candidacy.

In my career, I have had the opportunity to be in a variety of leadership positions, some of which include: starting the Clinical Psychology Graduate Student Organization at University of Massachusetts (Boston) and serving as president for four years; developing the Latino Mental Health service at Boston's Beth Israel Hospital; starting a group therapy program at The Massachusetts Mental Health Center's Clinical Research & Evaluation Unit; and creating a Latino Mental Health program before running the entire outpatient adult psychiatry service at St. Vincent's Hospital in Manhattan. In addition, I have helped to revitalize the candidates' organization at my institute.

Being part of the Affiliate Council has been a wonderful experience, where I have enjoyed meeting and learning from many affiliates about what is going on in our institutes around the country, as well as from members of the American as a whole. As you know, a lot is happening in the American, and it is a time of significant transition and potential change. And with that comes the opportunity for growth and development. I feel confident that I have much to offer as a president-elect and future president during this exciting time in our organization and our field.

I am committed to psychoanalysis, to candidates, to our education and training. I also remain deeply committed to issues of diversity and culture, and will bring those sensitivities and strengths to my candidacy. I hope that you give me the opportunity to continue to work with you, and to serve and represent you in the four years to come.

Gloria Lee Shoemaker, Ph.D.

Dear Colleagues;

Although we have diverse backgrounds, one characteristic we have in common is a commitment to psychoanalysis. We know that a metamorphosis from "analyst in training" to graduate psychoanalyst is both challenging and exciting and requires the dedicated help of others. The mission of the Affiliate Council, through its delegates, officers and committees, is to improve the psychoanalytic training experience.

Assuming the responsibility for leadership as President-Elect of the Affiliate Council requires a sensitivity to the needs of candidates and making certain that all affiliate

members have a voice in the American Psychoanalytic Association, not only to be heard but to be understood. Leadership as President-Elect requires courage and conviction as one represents and presents the concerns of the affiliate members to APsaA, enhancing the possibility that our needs will be paramount in decision making.

It is important to continue efforts of the Affiliate Council in providing a forum for the exchange of thoughts, feelings, and ideas. I also want to reach out to those candidates who have not had the means or opportunity to attend our national meetings. We are the future and I believe the strength of APsaA and the voice of every candidate is important.

As our opportunities for greater participation in our Institutes and APsaA evolve, we have increased responsibility for knowing about governance, membership, and education while restructuring is considered and debated. Our Affiliate Council should be able to facilitate that awareness.

I have a sincere interest and sensitivity to the needs of my colleagues and my experience as a psychiatric nurse, clinician, and candidate will serve me well in assuming a leadership position. I have been involved with the Affiliate Council for five years, first as delegate from the Pittsburgh Psychoanalytic Institute and presently as Chair of the By-Laws Committee. I have also been active as sub-chair of the Affiliate Council Task Force on Training regarding recruitment and retention.

I would welcome the opportunity and privilege of being your President-Elect in providing leadership to coordinate our ideas, efforts, and contributions. I hope that you will consider me with your support in the upcoming election for President-Elect of the Affiliate Council. Thank-you.

II. Candidates for the Office of Secretary

Wolfgang Rosenfeldt, M.D.

I am very excited to participate in the Affiliates' Council and to run for the position of secretary. Energetic enthusiasm and interest in all that is psychoanalytic is my strongest asset. If elected, I would also bring a strong work ethic, dependability, and reliability to my work as secretary.

For this position qualities such as attention to detail and organizational skills are clearly of high importance. This aids in the functioning of the Council in general.

However, as it is a position of leadership in the council as well, I believe values such as advocacy and commitment to affiliates and for affiliates are of prime importance also. I would be very dedicated in this endeavor. I envision engagement in the process and, as a representative in the capacity of secretary on the Affiliates' Council, I would strive to ensure our voice would be heard within the larger organizational context of the APsaA.

It would be a great privilege to serve and I very much appreciate your consideration for this position. Thank you!

Continued on page 12

Continued from page 11

Joann Ponder, Ph.D.

Statement not available at this time.

III. Candidate for the Office of Treasurer

Jill McElligott, Ph.D.

Statement not available at this time.