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How is it, several of today’s panelists will ask, that something as liberating and ultimately self-authorizing as psychoanalysis could have given rise to training institutes where so many people report feeling wary to reveal much about how they work or to question too much of what is being taught, out of worry it could prevent graduating or advancing in their institutes?

Is this perceived pressure to conform a projection of regressive intrapsychic processes, as Chap Attwell will describe in terms we all recognize from our own training years, or -- although this is of course not an either/or -- or is it based on very real pressure to toe the institute line, such as Carol Levin will recount, in details also familiar.

Would changes in the system of appointing training analysts mitigate against the impression that one has to keep a low profile to get ahead, as Sandra Hershberg will suggest?

Or might the designation of any specially selected training analysts potentially corrupt every so called “training analysis”, if only by flattering those appointed into believing the very thing they must never believe -- that they actually have the knowledge of the analysands’ unconscious that their patients attribute to them. Employing a mix of Lacanian and other concepts in a manner that I find admirably accessible, Mitch Wilson will argue as much.

Finally, Warren Procci will contrast the teaching seen in psychoanalytic institutes with some refreshing innovations recently seen in his former college, and ask whether we are ready to move to a more educationally rich approach to teaching and imparting psychoanalysis.

If I may offer what I hope is a useful distinction, I believe many conflicts over power and authority in our institutes and organizations derive from a fundamental tension between the needs and responsibilities of training versus those of education, and that these have come to be felt more strongly as candidates from doctoral programs have entered into what had formerly been predominantly medical institutions.

Training is geared toward the imparting of an identifiable skill along with a corresponding knowledge base that is, at least for the purposes of training, considered and treated as something "known". (“Watch one, do one, teach one”, I gather, is the phrase in some parts of medical training.) Emphasis here is placed on demonstrating at least minimal competence at doing something, and is much less on, say, challenging the very foundations for that something or on making creative or original contributions.

Education, by contrast, is more concerned with the questioning, expansion and production of knowledge. Institutionally, its disciplines tend to be organized around a shared set of problems or questions more than by any particular solutions, traditions or schools of thought, as has tended to be the case for psychoanalysis.

Invariably, arguments over certification, the training analyst system, frequency requirements and disputes over which deviations from the canon we can accept and which we will not,... these get supported on the one side out of an earnest concern to protect the public, and to protect the discipline, by seeing that people get properly trained. On the other side are those favoring greater flexibility and greater trust in the field to evolve as it will.
Perhaps Jurgen Reeder would refuse my distinction, for good reason. When he urges we place greater emphasis on scholarship and on how our candidates engage the theoretical questions that address the foundations of our field, I think he sees such an engagement as being essential to psychoanalytic practice itself, to training, and not simply as a means of encouraging the furthering of psychoanalytic knowledge by some.

Still, I wonder, had our profession been set up this way from the very beginning -- had it encouraged more foundational self-examination in the manner suggested by Jurgen, or placed a premium on original research, in the manner of academic disciplines, much as Joe Schachter recommended yesterday -- had our profession always done this, from the beginning, would psychoanalysis be recognizable today?

One regret I have about our panel is that we do not have anyone strongly making the case for more traditional structures and standards, but this is how the submissions came in.

I hope in our discussion members of the audience will feel comfortable and welcome to redress this imbalance, and not hold back their reservations should they disagree with our panelists.

After all, our question is what organizational structures are necessary not only to educate but also to train competent psychoanalysts.

Relying on the Powerpoint slide behind us we will dispense with the usual introductions. Our first speaker is Chap Attwell.

==============

Chap Attwell
chapattwell@yahoo.com
"What I Wish I Knew When I Started Training But Took Years to Figure Out"

Last year I wrote a paper about some of the early experiences that can shape the beginning candidate’s thoughts and feelings while at their most malleable and about the anxiety that can result and may contribute to candidate inhibition – in both the formation and expression of opinions and questions in general, and of writing in particular. I believe that positive interventions at the institute level can alleviate profound anxiety, with the aim of bringing it into a more manageable range – a range necessary for the mental freedom to learn well. During the six years of my training, I often wondered how psychoanalysts become less anxious. In a word, how do candidates become candid? I present today a brief summary of what I most wish I knew at the beginning of my candidacy that took years to learn. These ideas gelled at early staff meetings of The Candidate, where we brainstormed about issues central to candidates’ experience. The ideas of fear, anxiety, paranoia, inhibition in general, and writing inhibition in particular, consistently emerged. We assumed that, as candidates, we bring to analytic training fantasies that are expressions of our internal worlds; from this perspective, candidate anxiety is less an institutional issue than a process with which each candidate must wrestle in his or her own analysis and own life. However, I believe that learning more about our history might facilitate the search for these corresponding intra-psychic issues and help minimize the generation of candidate anxiety. For example, while I felt that I could begin to ask these questions towards the end of my candidacy, I was too intimidated to do so earlier on. In contrast, I found the senior analysts I interviewed for this project quite candid and willing to talk, with seemingly little fear of consequences. This evolution from fear to comfort – in correlation with one’s experience and level of training – is striking. It makes me wonder what, in particular, allowed that transformation to occur.

At its best, I believe that analytic training encourages curiosity, open-mindedness, and the belief that
difficult, complex, conflictual themes may be spoken on the record without redress. When fostered from
the beginning, this wish to learn more develops into a way of being and thinking that can occur more
naturally and spontaneously. Despite the fact that I regard my process of training as a largely positive one,
I nevertheless have genuinely worried about the impact on my career of presenting and publishing this
work. I view this concern as a vivid example of candidate anxiety.

Summary Points:

• I wish I knew that psychoanalysis today operated in a contemporary, pluralistic world where no one
school could legitimately claim to own the truth; in fact, the state of knowledge with which we work could
not carry that type of authority. A lecture given years ago at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute by Judy
Kantrowitz did wonders to assist my own analytic open-mindedness. As I struggled with the anxiety and
frustration of not knowing with which theory to ally myself, she spoke on “What Theory Choosest Thou?”
She revealed that she resorted to different theories at different times with different patients, based on what
the particular individual situation at hand brought to her mind. So an established TA, lecturing at the
oldest, perhaps most “orthodox” institute in the country, spoke about keeping an open mind. As I started
to wonder how much of our open-mindedness stems from more sophisticated theories of mind – ones that
allow for de-idealization and tolerance of uncertainty – I witnessed Dr. Kantrowitz’s celebration of the
excitement of not knowing. She felt that her ability to employ multiple lines of inquiry was of great benefit
to her and her patients.

• I wish I knew that real debates have emerged about the very nature of training and the validity of its
particular components. Reading about these debates would have left me feeling more comfortable with the
tensions inherent in a situation that combines professional training with such intense personal
development. Learning this history would have reassured me that genuine thought had been given,
regularly, to the way we do things and that a kind of institutional self-analysis was at work

• I wish I knew that I could expect to feel anxious as a function of psychoanalytic training, which presents
formidable emotional and intellectual challenges to the beginning candidate. Not only do candidates have
to figure out some version of clinical truth, but we also have to discern the relative contributions of its
multiple sources. How much does it derive from our own emotionally constructed inner world, from
identification with our own analyst (and his or her technique), and/or from supervision and/or coursework?
Add to this the challenge of passing through the curriculum and persistently struggling with core notions of
what being psychoanalytically competent might mean as we begin to work with our own cases and learn to
write about the psychoanalytic process. Regardless of a particular institute’s stance, candidates must
navigate a pluralistic theoretical world, perhaps yearning the whole time for an expert to orient us to some
“analytic truth” to counter the anxiety of not knowing. These already difficult hurdles become even more
complicated when we learn – often through the grapevine – of a colleague’s rejection from an institute’s
training program, or hear an esteemed teacher berate a dissenting theoretical school-of-thought after just
having watched him show the highest degree of respect for a patient’s clinical struggle.

• I wish I knew that fixed stances on who is eligible to train, and with what theoretical perspective or with
which TA, influence candidates’ feelings of safety and autonomy, or lack thereof. I wish I knew that
identification with the aggressor is one style of analytic teaching, and that when encountered, it could be
understood and handled as such. Fortunately, I have not personally had to confront that style as a
candidate. Paternalism, orthodoxy, and intolerance of diversity have characterized the history of our field
but no longer need carry the academic day.

• I wish I knew that I would struggle intensely over the years to discover some version of the truth about
myself, my patients, and my fellow human beings, but that analytic training would, paradoxically, lead me
to form only tentative conclusions, ones that I would continue to evaluate and revise as I learned and read
more.

• I wish I knew that I would experience disappointment along the way in my pursuit of an ideal. It was just
that – an ideal. With enough work and insight, however, that state of intolerance would become tolerable
to me.
I wish I knew that the largest fear I would have to conquer in training would not stem from the outside, in any particular structure of the institute, but would originate within myself. This authoritarian exclusion would be of myself by myself, independent of our field’s institutional history.

I wish I knew that part of my task as a candidate would be to de-link this projection of transference from my mind onto the training structures from any actuality of the training structures.

I wish I knew that candidacy would open my mind like a developmental stage that would offer a new way of feeling and being in the world – with my patients, my family, and myself – and that this new state would feel infinitely better than before.

I wish I knew that one of the indicators of a good referral process is candidates’ becoming analysts where they trained and participating in their analytic communities after training. This community life might entail study groups, teaching, or joining with people who share a similar pursuit of life.

Presenting this material to candidates early in their training constitutes an intervention. First, I am providing information that had been unavailable to me, or that I believed to be unavailable to me. Second, I am implicitly endorsing a spirit of open inquiry in sharing the reflections of senior analysts who endorsed my pursuit of knowledge about how psychoanalytic institutes deal with beginning candidates. Third, I am stating that candidate anxiety is not simply an intra-psychic issue; interview material conveyed that candidate anxiety is real and may, in part, stem from behaviors of institutes that have been injurious to applicants along the way.

* The full text of "The Impact of the Admissions and Training Analysis Referral Processes Upon the Beginning Candidate’s Anxiety: What I Wish I Knew When I Started Training But Took Years to Figure Out" was published in the online journal, The Candidate.

********

Carol B. Levin
levinc@msu.edu

"‘That’s Not Analytic’: Theory Pressure and ‘Chaotic Possibilities’ In Analytic Training“

While in the soup of analytic training and hoping to create my analytic voice, I reliably experienced complex pressure to follow the venerated rules of American ego psychology, the well-known brand of psychoanalysis that holds sway at the institute where I trained. Ego psychology is passed on intergenerationally by a group of aging training analysts, and by their analysands who have become training analysts themselves. As we were becoming the next generation of analysts and, for those with ambition and political skill, training analysts, even our case conferences were taught exclusively by these same training analysts. An overvalued theory, engendering an unexamined authoritarian certainty and press for conformity, becomes a mother tongue. Other analytic languages are foreign and generate anxiety, and “standards” become the signifier for rigid rules that are unsupported by data and haunted by ethics violations. “Standards” could be viewed as the lynch pins of a self-interested guild system and are invoked to devalue overtly or covertly other versions of psychoanalysis that become threats to power and privilege.

Two of the legacies of ego psychology are rules and their correlate, the often-heard certainty about what, exactly, is “analytic”. Rules that function tyrannically—as external and internal theory/technique pressure—create an unanalytic training experience, one that dampens aliveness. They close down, rather than open up, a space for authentic inquiry and growth. Analytic training can become the antithesis of good psychoanalysis. The pressure I experienced to demonstrate conformity to these rules, interacting with my developmental (and realistic) need to progress in my training, risked stagnating at best, derailing
at worst, both my clinical work and my analytic development. Rather than experiencing a climate of safety in learning to analyze that would parallel the one that I hoped to create for my patients, I could find myself looking over my shoulder both with my patients and in reporting my work to my supervisors. Daring to disregard these rules in my supervised analytic work was a challenging experience. At times I felt guilt or shame, at others, defiance and reciprocal certainty. And the fear of not progressing was often around the corner, for progression and graduation rested on supervisory stamps of approval, not just on fulfilling prescribed case and writing requirements.

The dilemma crystallized for me in my fourth year of training during a session with a patient that I would present to my supervisor and a site visitor. I wanted to make a “teaching” intervention and found myself thinking: “What I want to say is going to get me in trouble.” In the observed supervision my supervisor showed his disapproval with a scowl. When I later made my case to the site visitor, giving evidence in the material for why I thought my intervention had helped my patient to explore her transferences in a new way, he said: “But something can be therapeutic and help a patient and not be analytic.” He spoke in an authoritative, even patronizing tone that signified certain knowledge, and the exchange reverberated in my mind, organizing a network of experiences in my training in which supervisors and teachers communicated their views of acceptable analysis by actual criticism, a scornful glance, a blank stare, or a dismissive tone, all attempts to coerce conformity to overvalued ideas. A supervisor, for example, criticized my patient for going into “action mode”: “I told you so, she doesn’t want to be analyzed.” He was communicating the classical idea that analysis is what we do to passive patients. But actions are associations that can be analyzed and perhaps, or perhaps not yet, brought into reflective discourse. Another supervisor’s positive comments in my evaluation conveyed not-so-subtle pressure to use ego psychology in my clinical work: “Dr. Levin continues to work primarily in the conflict mode in a skillful manner. The patient frequently presents life events in a way that invites advice, but Dr. Levin rarely takes the bait.” The implication, of course, is that I am conforming to what Hoffman (1998) so felicitously calls the “book,” and that advice interventions would be “unanalytic.” But giving advice, like any supportive intervention, can actively communicate engagement, but it can also deprive a patient of an opportunity for productive struggle. Sometimes patients can find their own solutions to life problems, but sometimes they can’t. Or they can, but in too long a time frame, with life opportunities passing them by. Galatzer-Levy (2005) thinks that it is the “entire setup that makes change possible, [that] the hours of struggle, jostling, chatting and speculating are just as central to analytic change as mutative interpretations and dramatic, transformational moments.” And this has also become the view of the Boston Change Process Study Group (2002).

So as you probably by now can tell, I have emerged from a training program that was saturated with the rules and ethos of ego psychology with my own analytic voice. How did it happen when I was pressured to see only through the lens of a particular theory? I had the good fortune to find one supervisor with whom I felt safe to discuss whatever was in my mind, sometimes a patient, but sometimes my own training experiences as they were unfolding in real time. This supervisor listened for the striving to grow and love that my patients expressed underneath the defenses and resistances that armored them from feeling the pain of their early lives, and for my own striving to grow as an analyst. Together we hashed out an alive understanding of what my patient, or I, was struggling to work out in analytic, or training, time. My development and learning were grounded in the playful freedom of an intersubjective field that was creatively analytic, mirroring the analytic experience that I hoped to offer my patients. This supervisor’s engaged and open supervisory attitude modeled a true analytic attitude, alive in the moment and communicating hope rather than anxious judgment about whether I, or a particular intervention I made with a patient, was "analytic".

Returning then to my initial question of how it happened that I emerged from my training with my own analytic voice, I propose that analytic training is a dynamic, non-linear complex developmental process that is grounded in a space of “chaotic possibilities” (Galatzer-Levy 2004), a rich system for learning, one that is organized but in which so much is going on that it is on the edge of chaos, oscillating between order and disorder, with one thing inevitably leading to another. Complex dynamic systems reach tipping points and reorganize, and each reorganization leads to greater complexity and maturity. I found enough of what I needed in the sloppy, moving along process (Stern 2004) of training, and could keep myself open enough, for my own analytic voice to emerge unpredictably, but reliably, through exploring, taking risks,
feeling anxiety, and from making my own inevitable mistakes and learning from them. And all the while, I was engaging with a multiplicity of theories, and talking, reflecting and writing about the complex processes that were in play. I explored what moved my work with my patients along, and what derailed it. Getting in sync with one supervisor created a process in which my analytic resources could grow. It strengthened my resilience and helped me to deal with my more rigid supervisors in reasonable ways, and I even found myself more appreciative of ego psychology, not as dogma but as a resource in my work. In the end the power to promote development that resides in a particular quality of interaction trumped the linear pressure for conformity that is condensed in the arrogant, and all too frequently heard pronouncement: “That’s not analytic.”

*The full version of this paper was published in Psychoanalytic Inquiry (2006): 26:5.

==========

Sandra G. Hershberg
hershbs@erols.com
"The Road to Becoming a Training Analyst: Traversing the Terrain between Creativity and Accommodation"

Why is it, I have often wondered, that the trajectory of the psychoanalytic process itself, where the analyst promotes openness, self discovery, and affirmation for the analysand along the way, can be (and if the open line of the American is any indication, has been for many) such a different road from the process of becoming a training analyst? The latter route, unfortunately, is one more likely to call for caution about how much to reveal, to promote chronic wonder if what you know is good enough, and to feel all too isolated along the way.

While we would all agree that the process of psychoanalytic education requires evaluations to assess the progress of each candidate, Institutes under the aegis of the American Psychoanalytic Association, hierarchically organized, require an extensive process of post–graduation examination to judge an analyst’s competence for becoming a training analyst. The implementation of these evaluations as currently organized can lead to the feeling that one has never arrived. The major difficulties in this system which contribute to the current state of affairs include: 1) an evaluative procedure which is based, in the end, on far less information about the analyst as compared to the analyst’s training evaluations and supervisory reports used to determine graduation; 2) extensive evaluation procedures following graduation, including certification and training analyst, which implicitly can undermine the analyst’s sense of competence; 3) in the context of a pluralism of models in contemporary psychoanalysis the problem that exists when the examiner judges using one model (most often the ego psychological model) and the examinee finds another model more salient.

I will examine these three critiques of the evaluation process in greater detail and then propose an alternative.

Ironically while supervisors spend hours reviewing weekly a candidate’s clinical process, somehow three such experiences are adequate for graduation but are not sufficient for certification. Certification is an example where an additional important evaluation occurs with less information about the analyst than the candidate’s graduation panel had available. If one is fortunate or perseverant enough to mount these two hurdles, first graduation and then certification there is yet a final rite of passage, the judgment of the Committee for Nominating Supervising and Training Analysts which, the desirous training analyst-to-be must convince of his/her worth as a training analyst. Shane and Shane (1995) speak to the importance of privileging the educational process with an emphasis on “flexibility and contextual understanding in the application of standards” as an analyst goes through the evaluation process. They provide numerous examples in which a candidate or by extension a training analyst-to-be is instructed, more of less openly, by well meaning supervisors, themselves caught in a bind, to “distort, edit or leave out data” because they know from their experience that the candidate will be penalized for his candor. This systemic problem can all too easily lead to suppression and compliance, certainly qualities that we would all agree is not what we want to foster.
Continual testing of the analyst maintains the hierarchical structure among analysts that can be subtly undermining of an analyst’s confidence. In an informal survey of four relatively recently appointed Training Analysts who were asked about their experiences going through the final phase of the process, which involved making presentations of cases to the CNSTA Committee, each became visibly uncomfortable and did not want to discuss it. Why not? Is there a dictum, implicit or explicit, not to tell? My speculation is that the silence emerged from shameful or humiliating aspects of this experience, which understandably but regrettably intensifies the desire not to speak of it. On the positive side, those who have experienced poor treatment may feel greater empathy for those going through it and provide a level of understanding and responsivity that will serve as an antidote. Of greater concern, is the potential for re-enactment, consciously or not, depending on the experiences of the particular analyst, and influences within the group, that is the history and culture of the particular Institute and the patriarchal legacy of the American Psychoanalytic Association (see Mosher and Richards, 2005).

Currently, a pluralism of models in contemporary psychoanalysis and an explosion of research in related areas have made the evaluative process far more complex and difficult. For the most part Institutes under the umbrella of the American Psychoanalytic have continued in the tradition of emphasizing in training the Freudian and ego psychological models. The real problem emerges when one is being evaluated by judges using a different model. The judges may not really understand, no less believe, in an alternative model and they may feel with emotional conviction that their model is correct. The result for the analyst of a different persuasion could easily be to feel pressures to comply or to suppress their independent creative thinking. The consequences of this condition leaves the prospective training-analyst-to-be struggling with a confounding, potentially irreconcilable dilemma: If an analyst accepts that the accomplishment of the developmental task in one’s training analysis is as Edith Weigert (1954) wrote, the “daring to relinquish a dependent identification for a mutually respectful differentiation” (p.637) then the analyst may be in trouble if h/she embraces the practical application of Weigert’s dictum. For example, when one adopts a different theoretical position that entails a different technical stance or view of therapeutic action, an analyst may risk being judged, usually from the more traditional position, as unacceptable.

It is the rare analyst who moves through each step without having to repeat some part of the process, leading inevitably to sensitive feelings such as incompetence, deflation, or humiliation about having been judged inadequate in some part of the process. This struggle can lead to compliance with a sense of shame or to rebellion with a sense of alienation. While dissatisfactions with the current system have grown, or, perhaps, been more openly expressed, more substantive systemic changes are necessary to promote an Institute environment that rewards independent creative thinking. In my view, we would benefit from looking at the experience of autonomous psychoanalytic institutes, in which a greater degree of independent thinking and writing is encouraged and has flourished, while standards remain high and candidates are not infantilized. In such Institutes, after graduation, which involves case write-ups and often presentations to other analysts, analysts frequently continue to present and discuss their clinical material in groups and may or may not continue to receive other forms of supervision. A customary practice among these institutes is to accept each graduate analyst, after five years of additional experience, as a Training Analyst.

In summary, it is my view that the extensive re-evaluations of the analyst, following graduation, combined with possible judgements of unacceptability based on different theoretical models, can easily undermine a sense of competence in the analyst and foster compliance. Continuation of evaluative processes after graduation subtly maintains a hierarchical structure that can be a corrosive influence on the analyst’s feeling of competence. In an effort to remedy this situation I propose a model similar to that used by autonomous psychoanalytic institutes. In such a model, approval of the committee for graduation, based on case write-ups, presentations, and supervisory evaluations, provides the assessment of analytic proficiency. The status of training analyst is open to all analysts five years after graduation, promoting inclusivity and acceptance of analytic competence. In such an ambience the developmental arc of the analyst following graduation and into maturity can be respectfully and proudly encouraged rather than potentially constrained by repeated evaluations that can all too easily create a protracted period of adolescence.

====================
There is an extensive history in the psychoanalytic literature, starting with Bernfeld’s classic broadside, about the stultifying effects of psychoanalytic organizations on the transmission and teaching of psychoanalysis. There are few papers, however, on the fundamental antinomy—the fundamental contradiction—between the nature of psychoanalytic clinical work and the institutional legislation of a class of analysts specially authorized to analyze students of psychoanalysis.

In this paper I argue that the very nature of psychoanalysis as a practice, and what the analyst comes to understand regarding an ethical analytic stance, has nothing to do with outside authorization and is necessarily (often) corrupted by it. More specifically: conferring upon the analyst a special status can only undermine the essential ingredients of a salutary psychoanalytic process. This doesn’t mean these ingredients will necessarily be undermined—only that conferring special status cannot at all help, and in fact goes against the very spirit of the entire enterprise.

So what is a salutary psychoanalytic process? And what gets in the way? What causes it to stall? [Obviously, this is my particular answer to these questions.] Psychoanalysis proceeds or emerges from the analyst’s ongoing analyzing and working through his resistances to being with, talking to, and experiencing fully the patient with whom he is engaged. These resistances are narcissistically based, inevitable, and ever-available for safe harbors of retreat. I wouldn’t even call them pathological. We all of us so easily fall into the trap of believing in the transparency of conscious experience and that this experience covers the entirety of our mental life. Being psychoanalysts exposes us to this trap again and again, and also shows us the other side, the place of unconscious subjective experience. And yet, the narcissistic reinvigoration of the self is a constant source of false belief, an ever-present fact of subjective life that allows us to gloss over in the next moment what had so disturbed us in the previous one. And so, the analyst’s anxiety and narcissistic attachment to his own thoughts, beliefs, and assessments, are the main impediments to optimal analytic functioning.

However, If we accept the fact that the analyst is a de-centered subject beholden and at times agitated by unconscious desire and conflict every bit as much as the patient—then certain conclusions regarding the analyst’s mental functioning and activity ineluctably follow. One conclusion is that the analyst’s position should be biased in the direction of maintaining a certain degree of neutrality in relation to his own thinking. The analyst’s words are always spoken in relation; once they are uttered they are no longer solely the analyst’s possession. Thus the analyst is necessarily in a depressive relation to his own offerings. There is a cut here, a breach in our relation to ourselves and what we say that we can either deny or respect. As Steiner and Britton write in their paper on selected facts versus over-valued ideas: “[F]eelings associated with the depressive position are an inevitable part of the experience [of interpretation]” (p. 1070).

But note that I am not simply talking about feelings here. If the analyst hopes to inhabit depressive position functioning, then his thoughts, and his interventions must necessarily be partial, conflicted, lacking, and open to interpretation by the patient. The very nature of analytic intervention partakes of the lacking aspects of what Lacan called the symbolic function. There is no such thing as a complete interpretation; it is a structural impossibility. But more importantly, in terms of their future prospects, the analyst's interpretations, on this view, have no inherent value (they do have value as a response, as a “bid” on what the patient has previously offered). They only have value after the fact of their utterance, based on how the patient hears and responds to them. I am simply putting into other words what Haydee Faimberg has written about extensively in what she calls “listening to listening” (1994).
I think it is important to note a contradiction in typical conceptualizations of interpretation (whether from ego psychological, neo-Kleinian, or Bionian perspectives). If it is true that the experience of interpretation is akin to depressive position experience for both analyst and patient, then glossing this experience as one of “integrating” disparate elements seems partial at best, misleading at worst. That is, our literature is filled with a picture or image of interpretation-as-synthesis and integration—a reassuring promise of a kind of wholeness. This picture does not square with aspects of loss, tolerance, conflict, and reparation that lie at the heart of depressive position experience. Psychoanalytic interpretation, obviously, must also partake of those elements. This is no easy task, since the analyst is usually most comfortable making sense of the patient, rather than destabilizing understanding. In reality, sometimes the analyst puts things together—performs a linking function, and at other times destabilizes—and takes things apart.

The analytic literature is replete with papers on enactments, stalemates, retreats, collusions, and the like that often arise because of the analyst’s narcissistically based resistance to thinking flexibly and relinquishing over-valued ideas and attributions they are having about the patient. We tend, as Lacan said a thousand and one times, to see ourselves in the other, to measure the other based on our measurement of ourselves.

Needless to say, it does not follow from the preceding that the analyst never says what he thinks or stands by what he says. The analyst has no choice but to say what he thinks when intervening (even if it’s just highlighting what the patient has said). I am pointing to the analyst’s being captured by what he has said as much as he has coerced language into meaning what he thinks he means. The patient has a capital role in this dialectic of capture, a dialectic that marks the analyst’s fundamental position. I am speaking of an overall sensibility, an ethics of how to proceed, that informs, day in and day out, his analytic attitude and stance.

The training analyst system has a complex history within American psychoanalysis. There are reasons both local and national that such a system evolved and continues to be debated to this day. Some of these reasons are quite understandable. For example, in most professions it is incumbent upon that profession to demonstrate that a set of principles and standards govern and guide professional practice so the public can be assured of a certain level of competence. If there are clear standards, self-policing functions follow straightforwardly so those standards can be maintained.

In the case of psychoanalysis—perhaps uniquely amongst the helping professions—outside authorization runs directly counter to, and may undermine, effective, creative, inspired practice. The reason for this is that any outside authority that endorses especially a given analyst, which places that analyst in a category that implies special talent or expertise above and beyond other analysts, reinforces the narcissistic dimension within which all analysts struggle in their work.

This seems especially true—I would say disturbingly true—in relation to a specific patient population—psychoanalytic candidates—a population that is constrained in whom they can see for analysis precisely because of this special status, and, further, when that population is actively studying a subject that is prone to idealization and mystification. All of this would seem to reinforce candidates’ tendency to identify and comply with their analysts, leading in one way or another, to alienation. And as I’ve tried to show, this narcissistic dimension, feed so inexhaustibly by these institutional supplies, is that place where the analyst resists.

As analysts we sit in a very specific and troubling spot. The analyst is the one to whom the patient attributes special knowledge. This is the very engine of treatment (it is called the transference). And yet, the analyst cannot take up that position with any avidity because that will lead to the enactments, stalemates, misattributions, etc., that I mentioned above. This is the “ethical stance” the analyst struggles to maintain, though he will inevitably (and necessarily) fall short at times. The training analyst designation—at least as constituted within the American Psychoanalytic Association—conspires, quite precisely, against the maintenance of this stance and against optimal analytic work. The relatively neutral
stance the analyst works to maintain in relation to his own mental activity, the inhabiting of lack, the ongoing attempt to create mental and emotional space for himself, and for his patient—all of this is central to an alive and hopeful psychoanalytic process. And all of this cannot be helped by any outside authority that supports and reinforces the psychoanalyst’s narcissistic position.

------------------

Warren Procci
wrprocci@sbcglobal.net
"Power and Authority in Institute Life"

Let me begin by telling you about my background in dealing with authority in educational settings. I have been a Director of a psychiatric residency training program (6 years), a Dean and EC Chair of a psychoanalytic institute (5 years), and a Trustee of a college (9 years). I’d like to take a moment to describe my observations and my reaction to the educational milieu when I returned to my college as a Trustee 31 years after I graduated. During my undergraduate years, Wagner College was a very traditional and conservative institution. At one time it had been affiliated with the Lutheran Church. Instruction occurred in typical classroom settings, utilizing formal lectures and standard textbooks and other readings. Upon my return in 1999 I found a world of change. Wagner had adopted a “Learning Community” (LC) model for a good portion of its instruction. LC’s include a cluster of courses linked by a single theme and taken by the same students. The LC’s were joined by a reflexive tutorial (RFT) where emphasis was placed on experiential learning in “real world” internship like settings. Writing skills and teamwork were essential RFT elements.

In the world of most psychoanalytic institutes, there probably is not such a contrast between learning today and the way it occurred in 1968. Indeed one could probably trace long term stability in the nature of psychoanalytic education back to the 1920’s with the introduction and development of the Eitingon model. While I think much of the tripartite model is extraordinarily valuable, I also think it highly probable that most educators would find our persistent adherence to one educational approach remarkable. While LC’s and RFT’s may or may not be a useful model for psychoanalytic education, I believe our slowness, perhaps even our inability, to innovate is highly problematic and stifling. As I’ve mentioned in other settings, our psychoanalytic educational programs are running the risk of becoming museums and not incubators of new ideas.

I would hardly be alone in seeing the concept of authority as a culprit in this stasis. There are many diverse key values that are part of an educational process, such as respect for learning, capacity for innovation, development of new ideas, acquisition of skills, development of professionalism, understanding the value of influence and being influenced to name just a few. Authority does have a role, and an important one at that, in the educational process but it can also stifle, with deadly efficiency at times. We have not been particularly effective at balancing our use of authority or finding its best uses in psychoanalytic education.

Looking over Webster’s I found 8 different uses for the word “authority”, each with a nuanced difference. The meaning for authority I found most problematic for purposes of this discussion, and unfortunately one which I think we utilize too much in psychoanalytic education, perhaps not always knowingly, but at least at some times quite knowingly, is the idea of “a power to require and receive submissiveness”.

While most of us would no doubt not want to see this aspect of authority as having a major role in institute life there is in fact a legitimate place for this concept of authority, and one which is quite problematic for many of us. I am referring to those instances where we need to deal with issues of candidates or colleagues not conforming to various educational or professional requirements and even some extremely serious cases which would require sanctions, disciplinary action, etc. such as cases involving boundary
violations, ethical lapses, etc. These are important responsibilities in institute life and areas where we need to exercise this form of authority. Yet it is often difficult for us to adequately discharge our responsibilities regarding these uses. In more serious situations, it can be almost impossible to find colleagues willing to serve on appropriate committees. It does strongly suggest, especially when paired with other difficulties we have with the exercise of authority, that there may be something problematic for many of us when put in positions where we need to exercise authority. While I don’t think by any means that these problems are not also endemic to other professional endeavors, I do sense it may be particularly difficult for many of us as analysts. I am sure many of you will also recognize how hard it is to get faculty members to write “honest” evaluations on our candidates, either for the classroom or for the supervisory setting, and how it can be very hard to accept responsibility for managing candidates’ progression. All of us are no doubt aware of the more than occasional “compassionate graduations”. Yet if we are to be taken seriously as a profession, it is necessary that we be capable of exercising this form of authority.

We do not however, need to use this component of authority for issues concerned with transmission of knowledge and development of new ideas. We have gotten ourselves into a lot of difficulty when we have. There are many situations where we have brought the “power to require and receive submissiveness” component of authority into our educational processes as opposed to our regulatory processes. Many of our positions concerning requirements for admission, graduation, membership, and TA advancement, all of which may be considered under the rubric of “standards” are prime examples. So often, especially in APsaA Institutes, these are taken as “givens” and not considered as subject to negotiation or open review, discussion and objective consideration. This also creates a general ambience which can be stifling of innovation and creativity in our teaching. My own belief is that our “new” candidates, who are far more likely to represent women, gays, psychologists, social workers, other mental health professionals and academics, are much less likely to accept the handing down of this form of non-challengeable authority than our traditional candidates have historically been. Missing from this list of new candidates, in my experience, are significant numbers of ethnic and racially diverse groups which should represent a new priority for us. I believe our increasing difficulties, especially in some APsaA Institutes, in recruiting new candidates derives from a sense by potential applicants of the presence of such a stifling environment, i.e. a museum, not an incubator.

A final element of authority, which is constructive, comes from two additional ideas in Webster’s, notably the concept of “justifying grounds” or “convincing force”. For psychoanalysis to be credible as a school of thought and as a healing art, there must be such a justifying, convincing perception or belief about what we do. This cannot be gained by decree, as I believe we have often tried historically, with spectacular lack of success. Rather it can be accomplished only by the transparent, open discussion of our ideas and a willingness to have all of them examined in the crucible of public review.

Perhaps at some future time, a senior psychoanalytic graduate will return to his/her institute of origin and be pleasantly surprised by the flowering of new forms for learning.
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