Ch. 4. Detoxifying the toxic effects of psychoanalytic training: A case study

In my opinion a superabundance of regulations and prohibitions injures the authority of the law… Moreover, it does not mean one is quite an anarchist if one is prepared to realize that laws and regulations cannot from their origin claim to possess the attribute of being sacred and untransgressable… (Freud, 1926, p. 235)

The question I pose in this chapter – and study through the test case of Israeli psychoanalysis – is: can training based on the ‘Eitingon model’ be transformed from within? can its toxic effects, such as paranoia and infantilization, be detoxified?

Today, with the serious attempt to re-examine all aspects of psychoanalytic theory and technique, a candid and critical re-appraisal of traditional training, and the possibility of considering alternative models, become urgent tasks. In a rapidly changing world in which democratic values play a crucial role, the quality of psychoanalysis, its status, and its continued professional appeal may depend on far-reaching innovation in training, and may be damaged by an authoritarian and overly hierarchical training method that encourages elitism and isolation.

THE ISRAELI CONTROVERSIAL DISCUSSIONS, 1992-1996

How can a traditional psychoanalytic institute be transformed from within? What are the implications of such a change process? I will describe attempts to overcome some of the drawbacks of the traditional training structure, disagreements about the gains and risks involved in these attempts, and the complex processes they triggered. These efforts at the Israel Psychoanalytic Society (IPS) started with a stormy period of intense internal debates between 1992 and 1996, and I’ll open my discussion by reviewing that crucial period.

In some ways, these debates in Israel parallel the Controversial Discussions that transpired in the British Psychoanalytic Society between 1941 and 1945 (King &
Steiner, 1991). However, while the British discussions covered all areas of psychoanalysis (metapsychology, development, technique, training, and so on), the debates in Israel focused specifically upon the structure and atmosphere of training. Still, more general issues were present in the background, insofar as opinions about training are necessarily influenced by views on other matters.

Some of these background issues – a few of which I already alluded to – are: Is psychoanalytic technique basically a clear method with solid rules which needs to be transmitted and taught by knowledgeable 'expert' teachers, or is it to a considerable extent reinvented in each analysis and therefore strongly dependent on the candidate's inner freedom and creativity? Can analytic skills be judged objectively, which allows an authoritative evaluation of candidates (who is fit to become an analyst) and analysts (who is suitable to be a training analyst), or are such judgments frequently based on subjective feelings and intersubjective processes (transference/countertransference), as well as on personal values (diverging visions of what is good psychoanalysis), and therefore inherently open to controversy? How similar or dissimilar are psychoanalysis and psychoanalytically-oriented psychotherapy, and, therefore, may an experienced dynamic therapist be deemed an advanced trainee when coming to train as an analyst, or else is his or her past experience irrelevant or even a hindrance?

I believe the history of the Israeli debates gives an instructive picture of the difficulties that will face any attempt to achieve substantial changes in traditional psychoanalytic training, and is therefore of broader interest. The short time that has elapsed since the debates took place, and the fact that I myself was an active participant in them, do not allow me any kind of detached perspective. I have chosen therefore to mostly present a factual account which will rely as much as possible on existing documents (e.g., official protocols of the business meetings of the Society), and to strive to avoid interpretation or evaluation of the different positions involved, beyond their manifest content. Still, my own views unavoidably influence my way of describing the course of events, and I remain open to the possibility that different perspectives may be presented regarding the same period.
Before going into the specific content and sequence of the debates, I will give a condensed background picture of the history and structure of psychoanalytic training in Israel, drawing on and updating an official account submitted by the Society to the International Psychoanalytic Association (Litman, 1994)*.

The Israel Psychoanalytic Institute was established by Max Eitingon in the autumn of 1934, shortly after his immigration from Germany, and was naturally modelled after the Berlin Institute (Gumbel, 1965; Winnick, 1977; Moses, 1992). Its original members were all *émigré* analysts from Europe, and it is officially called the Eitingon Institute, though this title is rarely mentioned nowadays. The Institute has been operating continuously since that time as the training vehicle of the parent Israel Psychoanalytic Society (itself formed on August 3, 1933, initially as the Palestine Psychoanalytic Society), which has been part of the International Psychoanalytic Association since then. The Institute is governed by a training committee elected by the Society. The separate position of Director of the Institute was abolished in 1991, and since then the involvement of all members in policy-making has increased. The Institute is located in Jerusalem, although around half the seminars and other educational activities are conducted in Tel Aviv, in the area where most members and candidates now reside (the percentage of Jerusalem people has steadily declined). Candidates commute to seminars which are out of their area, while supervision and training analyses take place all around the country.

As of 2003, there are around 130 members in the IPS and around 80 candidates in its Institute. Throughout the years, the Institute has been a highly demanding training center. Originally classical in orientation, its theoretical and clinical perspectives have broadened with time, and the ideas of Klein, Winnicott, Bion, Kohut, and relational psychoanalysis have influenced faculty members.

Candidates are admitted following a thorough evaluation from a pool of highly qualified mental health professionals. During the 1980s and early 1990s, 25-35% of the applicants were admitted biannually (i.e., a class of 10-15 candidates from among 40-50 applicants). They have been mostly clinical psychologists, a few being psychiatrists and social workers. They start training in their late thirties and forties, with 10-25 years of prior experience in dynamic psychotherapy. The first two years of study used to consist of introductory theoretical courses. If evaluated

*An account in the preparation of which I participated.
positively, candidates used to begin conducting supervised analyses in their third year. They have always been required to conduct three such analyses, four sessions per week each, under the supervision of three training analysts, once a week each. Only analyses that continue for at least two years' duration are counted, but most are much longer. Upon the recommendation of all three supervisors, the candidate submits a written report of one of these analyses, accompanied by a theoretical discussion. When the report is approved by the training committee, often after editing and modification, the candidate is invited to discuss the case in an open meeting, and respond to questions and criticisms, as the final step towards graduation.

During their training, candidates are also required to undergo a personal analysis of four sessions a week. While the formal requirement is for at least 500 hours, most candidates stay in analysis five years and longer, at times undergoing two analyses. The average candidate graduates the Institute and becomes an associate member after about eight or nine years of training, though some take longer. In order to become full members, associate members were for many years required to subsequently present a theoretical paper to the Society. A discussion took place regarding both the paper and the member's credentials as a psychoanalyst and as a contributor to the Society, and a two thirds majority in favor of acceptance had be reached in a secret ballot.

Towards the end of the 1980s, a process of democratic reform has started in the IPS and in its Institute. An effort was made to allow a much larger proportion of the membership to become actively involved in decision making and in administrative roles. Many members came to feel that too many functions had become concentrated in the training committee. Henceforth, the responsibility for admissions was shifted to an admissions committee, with no overlap in membership with the training committee. (Both committees include older and younger members, and both have rotating membership, so a large number of members is involved over time). The responsibility for recommending new training analysts was moved to another new committee. The latter committee was requested to reach its recommendations after examining the potential training analysts' professional credentials (the minimum being full membership, five years of membership, and the maintenance of a continuous analytic practice of at least three analyses) as well as their competence; and, if satisfied, to submit their names for vote by secret ballot of all members (requiring again a two thirds majority). This
reform was effective, leading to the selection of several new training analysts, after
many years during which there had been no more than a dozen training analysts
throughout Israel.

Nevertheless, in the atmosphere of more open discussions that evolved in Society
meetings, members of the new committee for screening training analysts reported
great difficulty in conducting objective evaluation of the quality of potential
nominees. It was becoming gradually clearer that such evaluation is conducted in
the absence of actual knowledge regarding a member's analytic skills, and is often
influenced (as I pointed out in chapter 3) by transference feelings, charisma,
visibility, personal popularity, political alliances, and so on. This realization
eventually led to a radical change, to be described shortly.

Another major bone of contention was influenced by the changing characteristics
of candidates. Since the late 1980s, fewer psychiatrists apply to the Institute, due in
part to a strong biological trend in Israeli psychiatry. While psychiatrists were the
majority in the earlier decades (though psychologists were also admitted, initially
as child analysts), and while in the early 1990s the Society was still composed
almost equally of psychiatrists and psychologists, the proportion of medically-
trained members is rapidly decreasing (a few quit, after being inactive for some
years), and around 80% of the candidates are now clinical psychologists (the others
include social workers and psychiatrists - only these three professions can be
admitted).

These psychologists are typically admitted after having established themselves
firmly as psychoanalytically-oriented psychotherapists and at times as teachers and
supervisors in this area. Candidates are often graduates of advanced psychotherapy
programs, quite knowledgeable in psychoanalytic theory, and well acquainted with
the psychoanalytic community. Being mature professionals, they tend to be quite
critical, often in realistic and sharp-sighted ways. Many of them have persuasively
argued that their discomfort with feeling infantilized, and their protest against what
they see as at times rigid rules, ought not to be interpreted away as mere
transferential distortion or oedipal acting out.

Moreover, many of the recent candidates come to the Institute while already
undergoing a personal analysis. This has been very helpful in terms of their
maturity as trainees, but has also intensified one particular problem: while in most
cases their analysts have been experienced colleagues with good reputation, many
did not have training analyst status. The traditional demand at this juncture, that the
prospective trainee interrupt his or her ongoing analysis and start a new one with an official training analyst, has aroused much pain and anger among candidates and members alike (especially those whose analysands were ‘taken away’). Many have complained that this practice conveys lack of respect for the integrity and natural course of the analytic process, and poses a negative model for trainees. This complaint has been reinforced by the awareness that such a policy is not universal: "If the candidate is in analysis with a non-training analyst, he will, in some institutes, be required to transfer to a training analyst. In others every effort will be made to allow the candidate to remain with his analyst" (A.M. Sandler, 1982, p. 394).

The criticism within the Society regarding the anti-analytic implications of interrupting analyses led to a two-thirds majority vote (as required for changes in the bylaws), in May 1992, in favor of a resolution I introduced, allowing the training committee to ‘grant waivers’, i.e., the option to recognize any ongoing analysis with a member of the Society, on an ad hoc basis, as fulfilling the training requirement. However, in the following business meeting, in June 1992, many belated objections to the change came up, especially the concern that the possible exemption would erode the status of training analysts. In addition, the training committee expressed unwillingness to evaluate these individual cases. The debate was heated, and two camps clearly crystallized: those seeing firm structure as the first priority (‘traditionalists’) and those who put greater emphasis on flexibility and individual consideration (‘reformists’). Eventually, a slim majority voted to suspend implementation of the May resolution, pending further discussion. This discussion took three and a half years, and continued to be quite stormy.

The tensions that this issue had unearthed could be explored more fully when yet another phase of the democratization process was initiated, this time focusing on the functioning of the IPS itself. Only now did the feelings of members towards the Society, and the subjective experience of being a member of it, come to the surface. Among the experiences related by members were the difficulties in speaking openly at meetings, anxiety regarding harsh criticism, the sense among office holders of being unappreciated, alienation among younger members, a feeling that the Society functioned too much by routine, and that it had great difficulty with new initiatives. An attempt was made to alleviate these difficulties by holding a ‘town meeting’ of all members, in which informal discussions took place in small groups.
During these discussions, some members pointed to persecutory experiences during their training as a source of later difficulties in their attitude towards the Society. This, as well as wishes of candidates to also be involved in the process, led to the organization of a second ‘town meeting,’ attended jointly by members and candidates. Small group discussions revealed a deep sense of alienation and distance among many candidates, an experience shared by some of the younger members. On the other hand, the invitation to speak openly, and the discovery of shared experiences among members and candidates, aroused cautious optimism regarding the possibility of a new beginning. Maybe, many wondered, the atmosphere in the Institute would become less authoritarian and less paranoid. Perhaps candidates could be treated as younger colleagues rather than as schoolchildren, even as training continued to strive for the most sophisticated scholarship and for the sharpest analytic skills.

The issue of interrupting ongoing analyses of incoming candidates reached the agenda again early in 1994. The IPS decided to devote three consecutive meetings to the topic, one consisting of small group discussions, and to vote in the third meeting. By coincidence, the business meeting dedicated to voting was preceded by a scientific meeting in which I presented a paper entitled "Psychoanalytic training: Dynamics, social processes, pathology" (Berman, 1994b).

In that paper I explored the history of the critical discussion about psychoanalytic training, as outlined and further developed in the present book. I discussed some of the pathogenic influences of the hierarchical traditional institute, the idealization of the training analyst, the infantilization of the candidate, the encouragement of regressive and paranoid fantasies, and the potential contradiction between the creative individualistic nature of psychoanalysis and the typical training process. I suggested that these contradictions can be resolved only by changing the structure and climate of training. Specifically, I called for the admission of a higher percentage of applicants to our Institute, as in preceding years numerous highly talented professionals had been turned down. Further, I plead for devoting less time and energy to demoralizing discussions about the adequacy of candidates, and more to the improvement of teaching; for allowing candidates greater freedom in choosing their analysts, limiting them only by objective criteria of experience; for avoiding the interruption of ongoing analyses; and for making candidates more active partners in shaping their training.

In retrospect, that paper may have exerted some influence upon the vote in the April 1994 meeting. I reintroduced my original ‘waiver’ resolution, but another
colleague, Raanan Kulka, proposed a more comprehensive and radical change: removing the personal analysis of candidates from the list of functions exclusive to training analysts. In addition to eliminating the need to interrupt analyses, this would give the candidate full responsibility for choosing her or his analyst. Experience indicates, he suggested, that candidates are very careful in choosing their analysts, being the individuals most effected by the choice. They are eager to have the most profound analytic experience, and look for experienced and serious analysts irrespective of formal requirements.

In the vote the more comprehensive reform won a large majority (31 in favor, opposed by 10, 4 abstained), and was accepted. The resolution stated: "Each candidate must undergo a personal analysis while going through training in the Institute. The analysis will be conducted by a qualified analyst who is a member of the Society". Spontaneous applause, quite unusual in the Society, followed the announcement of the results. In a brief discussion that ensued, some members expressed great satisfaction, while others gave vent to grave concerns about the quality of future training. In most cases, the reactions were in line with past positions of members, giving another indication to the crystallization of camps within the Society.

The months following that resolution were particularly stormy. Members alarmed by the change sought to mobilize help from abroad, suggesting that the new policy is incompatible with the regulations of the International Psychoanalytic Association. Supporters of the change saw no such incompatibility, citing the variability in training structures of various institutes recognized by the IPA. Furthermore, supporters emphasized that the new policy did not abolish the status of training analyst, which remained necessary in order to supervise candidates, or to chair the training committee.

Inquiries made by both camps with leading members of the IPA revealed the following complex picture: (1) The structure of training per se is not part of the binding bylaws of the IPA. (Eitingon's attempt to set a powerful International Training Committee with worldwide jurisdiction met with much opposition in the IPA, and was given up after 1938; Balint, 1948, p. 168). (2) Several leaders of the IPA, notably the president at that time, Horacio Etchegoyen, past president Joseph Sandler and vice-president Charles Hanly, strongly support the traditional training structure, and are particularly unhappy about the possibility of candidates undergoing analysis with inexperienced junior analysts. Other leaders, including past and present vice-presidents, view changes in training structure more favorably. (3) IPA bylaws sanction all training structures of component societies
established up until 1975 (including, for example, the Swiss Society which has no training analysts, and the French Association which legitimizes analysis of candidates with any analyst), but since then require international consultation before making changes in training policy. (4) A change in the IPA bylaws, transforming the rule of consultation into a rule of formal approval, did not apply in Israel's case, as the IPA's mail ballot on changing its bylaws was only completed on May 31, 1994, after the Israeli resolution was passed and reported.

The unresolved issues and tensions came up again in a meeting in June 1994. For the first time, the division within the IPS was formally recognized, as three training analysts representing the main points of view were invited to open the discussion. Yehezkel Cohen, past president of the Society, represented the moderate middle group. He expressed reservations about both the traditional conservatism of the Society, as well as the risk of changes that are defiant and too radical. He disagreed with the April resolution, but maintained it was legal and legitimate, subject to change only by due process. He was also in favor of thorough discussions with the IPA before any further decisions are reached.

Shmuel Erlich, who was then chairperson of the training committee, expressed the traditionalist view. The April vote took place in what he viewed as an overly emotional atmosphere of "rebellion or revolution", was influenced by the lecture preceding it, and was held with insufficient understanding of its international implications. It was therefore invalid. Erlich reiterated the view that training analyses are a key element in training, are a unique kind of analysis due to the different significance of termination, and therefore should be conducted only by analysts chosen on merit by the Society. Candidates who, upon admission, are in analysis with other analysts always have the option to postpone the beginning of their training if they do not wish to interrupt their present analysis. Stratification and hierarchy are unavoidable, and the attempt to undo these elements is not democratic but perverse, leading to the erosion of generational boundaries in the analytic family, and sabotaging individuation and growth.

The reformist position was expressed by Raanan Kulka. He emphasized that the bylaws of the IPA already recognize the possibility of changes in training policy of component societies, and the consultation process is meant to contain such changes and not to prevent them. Maintenance of the status quo ante, or of uniformity between different countries and cultures, does not necessarily serve psychoanalysis. In Kulka's view, the change approved in April was the natural
result of a deep-reaching developmental process taking place within the Society, and the attempt to present this change as impulsive was misleading.

The ensuing debate pointed to continued disagreements as to the preferred policy, and to the deep emotional investment of most members in their positions. A consensus was reached to hold discussions with the IPA, to not yet implement the April resolution, and to reconvene for future discussion.

Consequently to this conclusion, a detailed memorandum was submitted to the IPA in July 1994, by Shalom Litman, president of the Israel Society. After describing the history of the debate, the memorandum ended with a plea (Litman, 1994, pp. 7-8):

"The resolution approved by our Society results... from a process of rejuvenation which is very vital to us. This process has considerably increased the morale and sense of identification of many members, who feel now as active partners in reshaping the Society and Institute to fit changing times and values, rather than as passive (and often alienated) recipients of immovable and binding structures. This sensitive process, crucial for the future of psychoanalysis in our country, should not be disrupted. To guarantee our vitality and integrity, we must find our own path. We may enter blind alleys on our way, but we feel confident that we will correct any errors by seriously monitoring the results of any policy we adopt, without idealizing it.

Our belonging to the international psychoanalytic community, and to the IPA, is enormously important to all of us. The IPA has always been a collaborative democratic organization, attempting to increase unity and communication among analysts around the world, while respecting differences resulting from local traditions, cultural uniqueness and social processes. In such a mutually respectful partnership, we believe, a serious attempt can be made to learn from each other's experience...

Our own internal debates are not over. Members who opposed the April resolution hope to convince the Society to change it. Many of the members who supported it are interested in formulating more moderate versions which would take into account the concerns raised by the critics, both within the Society and in the international community. We will be grateful for ideas and suggestions regarding various solutions and their implications. We hope that our own concerns and needs will also be taken seriously, and our autonomy respected".

The autonomy of the Israel Society has indeed been respected. No official body of the IPA criticized the Israeli resolution. The only direct response came in the form of a personal letter from IPA's president Etchegoyen to the president of the
Israel Society, dated 17 August 1994: "I hope you will be able to resolve, in a way satisfactory to all, the changes in the Society, in accordance with the standards of the IPA. The idea that all analysts in the Society could conduct analyses of candidates is not acceptable, and... should be rejected". Etchegoyen's underlining of the word "all" appeared to leave the door open to a compromise.

During the following year, the Israel Society’s president met with some of the past presidents, and they issued a statement supporting changes in the Institute and Society -- in the direction of democratization, and seeking ways to lessen infantilization of candidates -- while maintaining the status of the training analyst. I myself made many consultations with leading analysts in various countries, and reported my findings to the membership. I learned more about the considerable worldwide variation in training structures. While most English-speaking Institutes maintain the traditional structure, most French-speaking Institutes have revised it, in an attempt to interfere as little as possible in the analysis of candidates. (This has often been the long term outcome of debates started in the 1950s and 1960s by Lacan; Roudinesco, 1990). While the language of international communication for most analysts in Israel is English rather than French, we found ourselves aligned with the French-speaking analytic world in this matter.

The Paris Society, the largest one in France, decided in April 1994 to follow the smaller French Association in allowing candidates analysis with any analyst they choose. There were objections within the Society and in the IPA, and a compromise was reached. The resultant training regulations now state that training includes "a psychoanalysis which is recommended to be undertaken with a Training Member," but later on qualify the recommendation by adding: "The Training Committee evaluates the candidacies of all individuals having undertaken analysis with a Member of the Paris Society, provided that the analysis had begun when the analyst was already a member" (Paris Psychoanalytical Society, 1994, articles 2/1 & 3/1).

Returning to the Israel scene: In June 1995 a discussion and vote took place about appointing some new training analysts. The tension was great, and it became clear that animosities within the IPS, expressed in members' reactions to the screening committee's informal poll in preparation for the vote, have created a persecutory atmosphere, parallel to the paranoid elements in the candidates' experience. "The demon of intrusive and ruthless judgments, which we unleashed at the candidates, now gnaws at our own feet," someone remarked.

By the next meeting, in July 1995, many members expressed open disgust with
the hostile and judgmental atmosphere generated by the determination to discuss people's 'merit', and subsequently voiced the desire to simplify the process of appointing training analysts. The yearning for change was also manifested in a widespread call for the resolution of the internal conflicts by a reasonable compromise, one that "no one will be happy with but all could live with," in order to overcome the perpetual tension and even the danger of an eventual split. While few members changed their opinions, most appeared more willing to accommodate the opposing viewpoints. A decision was made to create a special task force of about a dozen members representing all points of view in order to seek a compromise. The task force, chaired by the Society's president-elect, Abigail Golomb, finally agreed on recommendations which were approved with slight changes at the January 1996 business meeting of the Society, gaining massive support (40-46 in favor of various articles, 3-5 opposed, 2 abstaining).

The compromise consisted of the following points:

1. Candidates are expected to undergo analysis and supervision with training analysts.
2. The procedure to become a training analyst will be made easier. All existing requirements are to be maintained (five years of membership; full membership; continuous practice of at least three analyses, four times a week; interest in psychoanalysis and activity in the Society; ethical conduct), but the plenary personal discussion and secret vote on each new training analyst are abolished. The Society's board will approve all members who meet all criteria, a month after their names are circulated in order to allow members to raise objections.
3. Candidates who start training while already in analysis with a member who is not a training analyst are expected to switch to a training analyst within two years, prior to seeing their first analysand. If they wish to continue further with their present analyst, so as not to interrupt the analytic process, they may apply to the training committee for special permission. The task force recommended a separate 'waiver committee' dealing with such requests, but the business meeting preferred this to be a subcommittee of the Training Committee, which agreed to undertake this responsibility.

The hope was that these changes could be effective in a way reminiscent of the famous 1946 'ladies' agreement' between Anna Freud, Melanie Klein and the British Society's president Sylvia Payne, which enabled the resolution of the near-split in the British Psychoanalytic Society during its Controversial Discussions (King & Steiner, 1991, pp. 906-908).

Reactions to this compromise from among the international community were
positive. To quote one of many responses, former IPA vice-president Hanly wrote: "I congratulate you and your colleagues on the solution that you have found... By drawing on the specific strengths of your Society, you have resolved a very divisive issue [...] finding a creative compromise to resolve a difficult situation" (Hanly, personal communication, 1996).

The sequence described would appear to prove that change can be implemented in traditional psychoanalytic institutes. A patient process of searching for pragmatic compromises acceptable to most members can result in meaningful innovation even when opinions are divided, and it need not have catastrophic impact on the entire superstructure. The international psychoanalytic community is nowadays quite heterogeneous too, and even the IPA can absorb and accept changes in local institutes in the direction of greater respect for the individual autonomy of candidates, if these changes are made at a moderate pace, are introduced without provocations, are well-explained, and when they occur in the context of an overall commitment to maintaining high standards of psychoanalytic training, practice, and scholarship.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS: 1996-2003

The January 1996 resolutions have calmed down the acute crisis in the Israel Psychoanalytic Society, although serious differences of opinion certainly persisted. The following seven years saw a continuation of the change process, at times by consensus and at times accompanied by disagreements, but the degree of tension subsided. To explore these years I will no longer proceed in chronological order, but instead delineate the main areas of change in training, and the issues involved.

Admission policy

The Israel Institute, like many other institutes, has developed for many years a thorough selection process, during which a penetrating examination of the applicant's personality was attempted, based mostly on two or three long interviews. This was initially accomplished by the Training Committee, and since the 1980s by a separate Admissions Committee. While evaluations of past teachers and supervisors were usually solicited (most of the applicants being experienced clinical psychologists or other mental health professionals), these evaluations were often disregarded, the rationale being that they are too coloured by countertransferential identifications. In the 1980s and early 1990s, only about one quarter to one third of the applicants were eventually admitted, and a large group
of ‘Institute rejects’ has formed among senior members of the professional community, a situation that often generated hostility towards psychoanalysis and a view of the Institute (which was for decades the only one in Israel) as elitist and persecutory.

This policy came under growing criticism within the IPS. With all the enormous amount of time and energy invested in the process, some members claimed that many of the rejected applicants were as competent as those admitted, and that the cumulative impact of numerous rejections of experienced and highly-esteemed clinicians and teachers harmed the future of psychoanalysis in Israel. The system, critics argued, favored average applicants who seem acceptable to everybody over more original and creative applicants who may be inherently more controversial. Moreover, the Committee rarely paid much attention to the applicant’s intellectual potential and broader interests (the application form never asked about teaching or publications, only about clinical work), and seemed to accept inadvertently Kernberg’s tongue-in-cheek advice, “to maintain a relatively uniform student body in terms of… professional aspirations” (Kernberg, 1996, p. 1037).

Other critics raised the negative effect the situation has on motivations to apply, by strengthening narcissistic elements in the wish to be one of the ‘chosen few’, at the expense of wanting the training for its own sake. Another painful issue was the experience of accepted candidates, who often - as suggested in chapter 3 - suffered ‘survivor guilt’ towards friends and colleagues (and in some instances, spouses) who were turned down.

Another issue that came up was that an interest in intersubjectivity requires greater attention to the dynamics of the interview process. The wish to evaluate applicants objectively often implied - as discussed in the preceding chapter - downplaying personal sources of countertransference reactions in interviewers. The applicant's behavior during the interview was attributed to intrapsychic processes, disregarding the interviewer's impact, and the dyadic pattern evolving. For some reason, it had been assumed that long-range supervisors are subjective and therefore unreliable, while one-time interviewers are objective and dependable. At times, the same analyst whose opinion as an interviewer was crucial after a one-hour interview, was disregarded when expressing an opinion about a supervisee of several years. The implied disbelief in the possibility that undergoing an analysis could help an applicant overcome personal difficulties also came up.

After numerous debates, the admissions policy started changing. No formal resolutions were passed, but in the last few years a considerably larger proportion of applicants is admitted, including many that were turned down repeatedly in the
past. The willingness to give applicants the benefit of a doubt has increased. The feeling now appears to be that there must be strong reasons to turn down a competent professional who is willing to make the enormous investment implied in analytic training. In addition, the old system of admitting a class every two years was abolished, and new candidates were allowed to start their training at the beginning of every trimester, in line with the new curriculum to be discussed shortly. More recently, after a large number of new candidates was admitted and flooded the insufficient number of existing seminars, it was decided that new candidates will start at the beginning of the academic year following their admission, to allow better planning.

**Personal analysis**

A personal analysis has always been considered central to training in Israel, though the title ‘training analysis’ became gradually less popular, in view of the realization that an effective analysis of candidates should be as therapeutic as any other analysis and not didactic in its atmosphere. Applicants are required to be in analysis (at least three times a week) for at least a year prior to applying, so that their application is based on a first-hand experience and not only on intellectual knowledge. The latter regulation was introduced a few years ago and was supported by all, though unlike many other changes it made the Institute more demanding. Candidates are expected to undergo during training at least 500 hours of analysis with a training analyst (four times a week), though most analyses are much longer; and to be in analysis when they start their supervised cases, which used to be in the 3rd year of training, and now usually happens in the 2nd year.

Intrusions into candidates' analysis are now rare. The practice of reporting had been abolished in Israel decades ago; and the demand to switch analysts if admitted while in treatment with a non-training analyst has also - as I described - been modified. It is interesting to note, however, how difficult the Society found absorbing this change. A year or two after it was decided, it was mentioned in a business meeting, and the member who wrote the protocol inadvertently quoted the old policy (mandatory switch) as being in effect, having repressed the change (option of not switching). The protocol was amended following protests. Another year passed, and the training committee distributed supposedly up-to-date training regulations, in which the change was omitted once more; again, a new version had to be printed.

By now, the option to ask for continuation of an ongoing analysis, rather than switching to a training analyst, did ‘sink in’. These instances become less frequent,
however, because becoming a training analyst is easier. Of the candidates who apply for ad hoc approval of their analysts, the majority is answered positively, but these applications still arouse tension and uncertainty. It appears that the major criterion used by the training committee is experience, and requests involving recent graduates tend to be turned down.

**Choice of training analysts (and admission to full membership)**

As I mentioned, training analyst appointments are now based on actual experience, and do not require a vote. As a result, their number has considerably increased (to close to half of the members), allowing a real free choice of a personal analyst and of supervisors, who can also be switched by the candidate "with no questions asked". (Free choice has been the official policy for decades, but it was practically meaningless when the number of training analysts in each city was very small).

It might be said that with this change, the definition of a training analyst was altered, from being evaluative to being factual; from an analyst of better quality, to an active, experienced older analyst. Issues of merit regarding training analysts were therefore withdrawn from collective Society or committee judgement, and handed over in practice to the serious personal consultations candidates usually initiate with senior analysts they trust. "Did we leave the control in the hands of our candidates? Yes! They, the consumers of our teaching and supervision, will choose according to free-market rules", suggests Bar-Lev Elieli (2001, p. 33). But I would add that candidates make their choices on the basis of their great motivation to have the best analysis possible, and do not wish to just 'go through the motions' and waste time, money and emotional investment on an analysis which is not experienced as helpful.

Similarly to what I said regarding admission interviews, this change also goes hand-in-hand with an intersubjective emphasis, which casts doubt upon absolute 'objective judgement' of quality. As I suggested, even the most senior analysts may be admired by some and disliked by others, and variations in theory and in style play a role in this heterogeneity: what one values as consistency another suspects to be rigidity, what one welcomes as flexibility another derides as impulsivity, and so on. Unlike committee or group votes, personal choice by the candidate gives full weight to the candidate's subjective preferences and intuitions.

My own subjective impression is that the quality of training analysts appointed in Israel remained equally variable in all three stages (secret decision by the Training Committee, open debate and election by the Society, and appointment according to...
factual criteria). If we use the only empirical criterion of success available, that of actual choice by candidates of personal analysts and supervisors (undoubtedly a flawed criterion in some ways), one can also notice considerable variability among training analysts appointed within each of the three periods.

What became an issue in recent years was the emergence of a group of experienced and highly esteemed members, who could not become training analysts, because they remained associate members for many years after graduation, while becoming a training analyst depends upon full IPS membership. These members - many of them successful teachers and clinical supervisors - did not present a theoretical paper, which used to be a requirement for full membership. After long debates in 2001-2002, a large majority voted for a change in the bylaws, creating three parallel pathways for becoming a full member: a theoretical paper (as before); a peer seminar of two years, covering issues of theory, practice and supervision; and cumulative activity as a committee member or as an instructor at the Institute and in its psychotherapy programs (for beginning mental health professionals and for advanced therapists). All three pathways can lead to a vote on full membership (a secret ballot in which a two-thirds majority is required).

Analysts are heterogenous in their talents and capacities, supporters of the change argued; requiring a theoretical paper of all full members was based on an idealized vision in which all experienced analysts are expected to be theoreticians, as a step towards fulfilling the idealized image of the training analyst as a superior author-teacher-clinician-supervisor-leader. In reality, theoretical, clinical, didactic, supervisory and administrative skills may be distributed unevenly among analysts, being only partially related to each other, and different profiles should be acknowledged as legitimate and worthwhile within the psychoanalytic community.

**Choice of the candidates’ analytic cases**

For many years, each of the three analytic patients a candidate is expected to treat (four sessions a week, at least two years each, though most analyses are longer), was screened by the Institute. One or two consultants were appointed in each city to do the screening interviews, and determine if the patient is analyzable and suitable for a candidate. These were usually expected to be new cases, as the conversion from psychotherapy to psychoanalysis was seen as an inferior option; but even if a patient from the candidate’s private practice was to be considered as a potential analysand, an interview with the appointed consultant was deemed necessary.
Unlike some other changes discussed here, this practice was never formally abolished. It simply evaporated away during the 1990s. Candidates (who, as I mentioned, are usually seasoned psychotherapists in their 40s) now tend to find their own analysands, either from their therapeutic practice, or among new referrals they receive. They gradually stopped referring prospective analysands for screening (“there is often no other means of correcting such inexpedient laws than by boldly violating them”; Freud, 1926, p. 235), and instead started discussing the potential analysand with the supervisor who is to supervise the analysis. Nobody appeared to miss the old system, which often contributed to complications and split transference patterns (the interviewer as the real parental figure and the younger candidate/analyst as a substitute, etc.), visibly infantilizing the candidates.

After describing this change, Bar-Lev Elieli (2001, p. 31) asks: "Does this mean that we trust our trainees more than before? Does it mean that we are afraid of losing any opportunity for an analysis? Does it mean that nowadays we feel more skilled in handling difficult cases in psychoanalysis, or that we have more trust in psychoanalysis? Are we more flexible, less rigid? ...Or are we operating as part of a wider cultural transition where youngsters can have a louder voice?"

This shift can also be understood in the context of the growing doubts about the notion of analyzability, as an objective attribute of the analysand alone, raised in chapter 3. Balint's argument “that any kind of technique and the criteria for selection are interdependent” (Balint, 1969, p. 101) has become more influential. Serious attention to countertransference and to intersubjectivity makes it clear that a patient unanalyzable by one analyst may prove to be analyzable by another analyst, with a different model, different personality or (especially relevant in training!) a different supervisor. In other words, in our present theoretical climate the goal is no longer objective assessment by an impartial expert (who must meet the analysand directly in order to bypass the candidate's possible distortions), but rather in-depth examination of the pros and cons of a potential analysis by the analyst and the supervisor, the two individuals who will be involved in the analysis for years, and whose actual subjective experiences may play a crucial role in its success or failure.

Personally, when approached by a candidate with such a question, I do not strive to make an objective diagnosis and prediction (I believe, in any case, that individuals with severe pathology can benefit from analysis), but rather to make sure that the candidate is aware of potential risks and complications and of countertransference stumbling blocks, and does not start the difficult journey with
naive expectations, unsublimated rescue fantasies, or major denied emotions. In most cases I expect the candidates to make their own decision, after we have reached more clarity about the initial dynamics in the dyad and their relevance to a potential analytic process.

The change in this area is also related to the growing interest in the conversion of psychotherapy into psychoanalysis (Rothstein, 1996; Skolnikoff, 1990; Stolorow, 1990). The greater acceptance of this possibility is related both to pragmatic reasons (fewer patients who decidedly seek analysis), and to theoretical reasons, namely the lesser emphasis on ‘uncontaminated’ anonymity in contemporary psychoanalysis, and the greater trust in working through analytically the patient’s experience of the analyst’s exposure and subjectivity.

In terms of the candidates, the different way of accepting analysands has increased their autonomy, and their trust in developing their own unique analytic identity (which may include preferences as to whom to analyze), rather than adopting some standard, ‘correct’ way of analyzing (‘analytic false self’). In addition, this change abolishes one source of “long periods of waiting in uncertainty” (Kernberg, 1996, p. 1032). In general, these changes weaken the control of the Training Committee over candidates, while empowering the individual supervisor as the actual representative of the Institute, and empowering the supervisor-candidate dyad.

**Curriculum**

The curriculum of seminars has gone through gradual evolution, and for a number of years could be characterized as varied, non-dogmatic and flexible in its content. Recent graduates can become instructors if they wish, and all instructors are free to develop their interests and points of view. While in the past coursework went on till graduation (which depended on a case presentation, as will be discussed later on), a few years ago it was decided to limit required courses to six years.

While contents were flexible, structure was rigid: each admitted class (once every two years) went through its own sequence of theoretical and clinical seminars, which were all obligatory. Candidates often complained, that while in earlier studies (e.g., psychotherapy programs, which many candidates attend before applying to the Institute) there were elective courses, at this more advanced stage the Institute allowed no choice, and personal interests could not be pursued. Moreover, the lack of any choice allowed weaker seminars to be continued year
after year, while in settings with an elective structure, seminars which are considered ineffective usually disappear from the curriculum due to low demand. (An attempt was made to collect evaluation forms from candidates at the end of each seminar, but in the intimate/incestuous atmosphere of the Institute the filling and processing of such forms proved quite difficult).

The lack of elective courses is relevant also to the issue of training analysts teaching their own analysands. While I agree with Kernberg that a strict rule forbidding such teaching may be part of a strained anonymity encouraging unanalyzable idealization (Kernberg, 1996, p. 1034), attention should also be given to the complications of such teaching. One of these is the inhibition of critical discussion when participants are aware that the instructor is the personal analyst of one of them. My own preference is not to teach my analysands, but I feel this issue should be left to each analytic dyad to resolve. In a structure of obligatory courses only, however, a faculty member who preferred not to become a teacher of one of his or her analysands had to give up teaching a whole class; and a training analyst who had several such analysands in various classes had to give up teaching altogether.

Two additional drawbacks of this structure were the impossibility of having joint seminars of candidates and graduate analysts (Kernberg, 1996, p. 1033), and the great impact of the group dynamics of a particular class. Experience showed that such dynamics differed: in some classes the climate was of solidarity and mutual encouragement, in others – of competitive tension and constant mutual criticism. In the first case, studying together for six years or more was a pleasure, and a firm foundation for a sense of belonging to the analytic community; in the second – a burden, as the persecutory aspect of the institute shifted from the faculty to the peer-group.

In the late 1990s, two elective seminars were offered, in which both candidates and graduate members (including faculty) participated. Their success may have encouraged the Training Committee (chaired by Rivka Eiserman) to initiate a new curriculum. Starting in 2000, a completely different structure was developed, based on the academic model of accumulating credits in elective seminars, which can be chosen freely according to a list of categories, at times with some prerequisites; the goal is to allow tailor-made curricula to different candidates with divergent needs and wishes.

Paradoxically, while most faculty and members (including recent graduates who
were unhappy with the curriculum they went through) saw this change as a welcome move towards liberalized training, many candidates became worried and resistant. The yearly candidates’ weekend meeting* held around the time of transition was particularly stormy. Participants expressed concern that the new structure will break up the existing classes, and make candidates more isolated and weaker vis-a-vis the Institute. Rather than enjoying the greater freedom and individual flexibility promised, they foresaw and experienced loneliness and confusion.

The change was nevertheless implemented. By now the atmosphere is more balanced, and candidates usually see both pros and cons in the new structure, which coincides with the higher admission rates. From being elitist and relatively cohesive (solidarity of the chosen few), the Institute appears to have become more open and more anonymous.

It gradually became clear that the main difficulty with the new structure has been experienced in the clinical seminars, which function as the setting of group supervision. The fact that their composition too changed every trimester made candidates insecure and inhibited. A reform was therefore introduced: while theoretical seminars remain electives chosen anew every trimester (so that the composition of each is unique), candidates were encouraged to form self-chosen groups (usually with colleagues admitted around the same year) which will hopefully stay together for the clinical seminars. It is hoped to balance this way the need for freedom and variation (expressed in the theoretical seminars) with the need for stability and continuity (expressed in the clinical seminars).

**Evaluation of candidates**

A central characteristic of the Israel Institute, for many years, was a very thorough evaluation of candidates by the Training Committee. Frequent reports were submitted by supervisors, and long meetings were dedicated to a discussion of the personal characteristics and dynamics of each candidate. Some candidates were expelled. At a later point (early 1980s), attempts to expel certain candidates aroused stormy reactions. When the Training Committee considered terminating the training of candidates due to negative reports of a supervisor, other supervisors protested, disputing the negative evaluation; and the opposing views made a

---

* These regular yearly meetings, re-introduced in the late 1990s after a long interval, clearly signify the greater autonomy of present candidates, who plan and conduct them with no outside help.
decision impossible*. This new development was influenced by a greater heterogeneity of the faculty, signified lesser confidence in impartial objective authority, and became part of a more skeptical climate regarding the impact of strict institutional evaluation.

In recent years, the Training Committee of the Israel Institute became much less preoccupied with evaluation of candidates, and more invested in attempting to improve training. Evaluation and feedback have been actually delegated to the (three) supervisors of each candidate, who have practically become the main representatives of the Institute vis-a-vis the candidate. Little formal reporting by supervisors and teachers takes place, in spite of some attempts to resume it. The subcommittee for evaluation changed its name, and now defines itself as a subcommittee accompanying candidates through their training.

Some faculty members have recently expressed concern that evaluation is now insufficient, and look for ways to reintroduce more systematic evaluation, warning that otherwise "every new applicant we admit is assured of becoming a training analyst in due time" (criticism of the new procedure for becoming a training analyst is clearly implied too). Other faculty members (including myself) believe that supervisors should be encouraged to give more critical feedback to their supervisees, but committee evaluation discussions can be reserved to specifically problematic candidates, and are not needed as a routine.

Personally, I do not observe any lowering of standards since evaluation was minimized. Most candidates appear very invested in their training (which is quite burdensome in terms of time, money and emotional energy) and very eager to improve their knowledge and skills. It seems that their private superego functions are usually quite effective, even without formal external reinforcement. In addition, the attentive and thoughtful atmosphere among the candidates (e.g., in group supervision) appears to supplement the input of faculty in encouraging serious scrutiny of one's functioning as a beginning analyst.

**Graduation**

Considerable changes were gradually introduced in the form of graduation, though its centerpiece - a written report about one of the analyses conducted during training, including a brief theoretical discussion - has remained the same. Some faculty members oppose the case report, saying that it is influenced too much

---

* Some colleagues who were almost expelled then, are now successful training analysts.
by the views of the supervisor; but the majority favors maintaining this tradition. On the other hand, the vote on admitting graduates of the Institute into the IPS, following their case presentation, was abolished in the 1990s. "His teachers and supervisors have implicitly already voted for him", suggests Bar-Lev Elieli (2001, p. 32), who became IPS president in 2002. The candidate now presents the case to an ad hoc reading committee which meets with him or her to discuss it (this replaces a secret discussion by the whole training committee, which used to take place without the candidate's presence); and after approval, or after making required corrections, the candidate presents the case publicly as a graduation event. Admission as an associate member of the IPS is now automatic upon graduating its Institute.

Writing the case report is still a source of considerable anxiety, even though it is no longer followed by a vote. It is experienced as one's resume, and candidates are often afraid they will be seen as insufficiently competent. I suspect this fear is an unavoidable aspect of training. Anxiety often inhibits writing, and some candidates end up presenting their case a few years after they were allowed to submit it (which is when they completed coursework, and all three of their supervised analyses reached a duration of two years at least).

In most cases, the actual meeting with the reading committee is benign, and friendlier than the candidate's prior fantasies. Some reading committees are more critical, at times asking for sections of the report to be revised, or for some theoretical aspects to be explored more fully. There were, however, a couple of instances when reading committees refused to approve a report which appeared to them as too disappointing. Although in all these cases the candidate eventually graduated - after more revisions, appointment of a second reading committee, etc. - the rumors about these situations certainly increased candidates' fears and inhibitions, arousing the experience of being dependent upon a capricious and unpredictable authority, possibly torn by its own internal conflicts. Paradoxically, some candidates suggested that a resumed formal evaluation process may safeguard them against unpleasant surprises at the final stage.

Indeed, at least in one of the instances of disapproval by the reading committee, differences of opinion about quality (the case being seen as satisfactory by the supervisor, and as weak by the committee) coincided with theoretical disagreements as to what constitutes a serious psychoanalytic treatment. The present heterogeneity of the Institute may in this respect become a threat to the
candidates, a topic which I address in chapter 7. What one supervisor - for example - sees as a welcome expression of analytic holding and provision, another faculty member frowns upon as a confusing boundary violation; and the candidate may be caught in cross fire.

The nature of the public case presentation, after the reading committee has approved the report, has also gone through changes. With a much larger membership and a larger candidate group, general attendance is no longer expected, and often the audience consists of the candidate's supervisors, friends and classmates, with only a few ‘outsiders’. Moreover, some candidates ask for a case presentation ‘by invitation only’ for reasons of confidentiality, especially when the analysis discussed is of a mental health professional (this consideration may coincide with the candidate's fear of exposure). In the past, the whole report was read, then discussed. Later on, to avoid boredom, the candidate was asked only to make some brief introductory comments, but this gradually evolved into writing a second report (updating the clinical material, adding another theoretical aspect etc.), multiplying the candidate's chores. Recently an attempt is made to abolish the second report, and to devote most of the meeting to a debate, by an invited discussant (who attempts to explore alternative ways of understanding the analysis presented) and by the audience.

AN ADDITIONAL INSTITUTE

Another development which is relevant to our topic is the establishment, around 2000, of the Tel Aviv Institute for Contemporary Psychoanalysis (TAICP), an independent group unaffiliated with the IPA.

While most new institutes in psychoanalytic history are created through splits in existing groups (Roudinesco, 1990; Kirsner, 2000), such a split did not take place in Israel. It was seen as a potential outcome of the ‘controversial discussions’ of the 1990s, but the compromise reached averted it. It seems that in spite of radical disagreements (many of which persist), members of the Israel Psychoanalytic Society are reluctant to split it up. This may be partially out of emotional needs (e.g., fear of disrupting friendships and professional collaboration), and of concern for the well-being of candidates, who could be faced with traumatic conflicts of loyalty, a need to choose between their analyst and a favorite supervisor, etc.

For a while it seemed that this reluctance means that there will always be only one psychoanalytic center in Israel (there are Jungian and Lacanian groups, but these are quite separate). However, to the surprise of many, a second center,
TAICP, was established by a group of senior psychoanalytically-oriented therapists, many of them faculty members of various psychotherapy programs and experienced supervisors in mental health centers. Ten of the founders of TAICP undertook to pursue a self-regulated psychoanalytic training, encouraged by the model of independent psychoanalytic centers started mostly by psychologists in the US, with the intention of training new candidates later on.

This development aroused profound disagreements within the IPS. Initially, some IPS members were involved in the plans to establish TAICP, but at present there is almost no overlap between the two groups. However, several central members of IPS (including some of the protagonists of the controversial discussions, such as Y. Cohen, R. Kulka and myself), accepted the invitation of TAICP to help the new group by offering supervision and seminars as guest faculty. Our feeling was that the new group is serious, and that a co-existence of two training centers will be beneficial to the future of psychoanalysis in Israel, and to the IPS itself, which was often resented due to its monopolistic status.

At the other extreme, other central members (notably Shmuel Erlich, IPS president during 1999-2002) saw the new initiative as illegitimate, portrayed the founders of TAICP as charlatans (how can they start an institute before they were trained as analysts?), refused any collaboration with them (and with the new Israel Psychoanalytic Journal initiated by them), and condemned IPS members who help them. They warned that TAICP will lower the standards of psychoanalysis in Israel, and challenged those of us who teach there: how can we accept the co-existence of differing requirements in our own Institute (which insists on three analyses of 4 sessions a week) and in the TAICP program (demanding only two supervised analyses, one of 4 sessions a week and the other of 3 or 4)? While acknowledging that the whole situation is problematic, those of us who were willing to help TAICP (more than a dozen IPS training analysts) felt that these anomalies are unavoidable transitional complications in a development which in the long run will be beneficial.

The peak of this new controversy was in 2001, when a new chairperson was to be elected for the IPS Admissions Committee, and the committee's candidate was a training analyst (Meir Winokur) who also supervises at TAICP. Some members expressed the opinion that he should be disqualified because of his divided loyalty. Nevertheless, Winokur was elected by a considerable majority, and later on Yehezkel Cohen was elected to the IPS Ethics Committee, so it became clear that the membership does not support any blacklisting. In view of the divergent opinions, however, no one in the IPS proposed so far any formal resolution about
its attitude towards TAICP; and it is not likely that any clear-cut position (be it of support or of condemnation) could win a substantial majority.

The questions often comes up, to what extent are recent changes at the Israel Psychoanalytic Institute (notably the higher admission rates and the new elective curriculum) a response to the appearance of TAICP on the scene. Basically, the answer is negative: these changes are the outgrowth of gradual processes within the IPS, many of which matured before TAICP was started. Paradoxically, one might say that TAICP was created too late, as it was more badly needed in the 1970s or 1980s, when admissions were very limited (some of the founders of TAICP were among those rejected then*) and training was more rigid. Still, I believe TAICP plays a constructive role at present, and that some of the opposition to changes within the IPS may be less vocal because of the existence of competition. It is clear, for example, that a return to lower admission rates will mean that applicants will turn to TAICP, and this awareness weakens the elitist position of looking for ‘the few really deserving training’, which was reinforced in the past by the monopolistic situation.

The future, I believe, will lead to collaboration and friendly competition between the IPS and TAICP.

THE PROCESS IN PERSPECTIVE

There seems to be a widespread feeling among members, faculty and candidates alike that the changes in the IPS and in its Institute are mostly for the better; that they contribute to a lessened degree of infantilization and authoritarianism, to a better morale, to a greater identification with the Institute and with psychoanalysis, and to more effective learning.

This experience, I believe, shows that a shift within traditional psychoanalytic organizations to a more open, pragmatic, egalitarian training climate, freer of mystifying idealizations and of persecutory elements, is possible, and could be effective in reducing the toxic influences of analytic training.

The present status quo at the IPS guarantees the continued centrality of training analysts in its analytic education, and maintains a situation where structure and generational stratification are quite important. Stratification, however, is now
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* This is raised at times within the IPS as an argument against them. Personally, I think that starting an independent psychoanalytic program is a constructive response to rejection by an established program, and should be contrasted with the reaction of some professionals rejected by the institute who subsequently became fiercely anti-psychoanalytic.
much less determined by internal political influences. The implication of being a training analyst no longer involves the pretense of guaranteeing an analyst of better quality, an issue that many came to feel cannot be collectively determined, but rather should be left to informal personal judgment and consultation.

In addition, the intellectual and educational message to candidates has gradually become more flexible and complex. On the one hand, the Institute has not adopted a laissez faire policy, and views clear rules as vital. On the other hand, unique individual needs and autonomy are legitimized and better respected. Indeed, as I suggested in chapter 3, such needs are seen more often now as a crucial element that must be taken into account by the educational structure, rather than be judged as a rebellious defiance threatening the structure. The changes also imply growing recognition by the IPS of the potentially infantilizing and persecutory qualities in analytic training, and a serious commitment on its part to combat their possible impact.

The debates in the IPS regarding the optimal balance between structure and flexibility, between institutional authority and individual autonomy, go on. The common wish appears to be to maintain an agreed-upon framework and a more moderate climate capable of containing ideological and personal controversies. This works out at times, and collapses at other times. There is always a risk, of course, that latent persecutory elements may merely ‘change address’. Less severe evaluation of candidates during training may, for example, lead to a wish for harsher admission procedures, or to a more formalistic demand for filling forms and submitting them according to exact procedures; while more liberal admissions are raised by some members as an argument in favor of stricter evaluation. Abolishing discussions of the personal merit of potential training analysts may turn the vote on full member acceptance into the new arena of political manipulation and vengeful reactions.

Moreover, new issues and new tensions unavoidably come up. Candidates are now exposed much more openly to the heterogeneity of psychoanalysis and to the inner conflicts of the Society. This prevents mystification and an awe-inspired idealization of psychoanalysis as some ultimate truth, but can become quite stressful and confusing in itself, arouse the experience of growing up with parents who are at war with each other. I will return to these issues in chapter 7.

A recent event, which aroused much anxiety among candidates, were the discussions by the Ethics Committee and the Training Committee of an ethical complaint submitted by a former analysand against a candidate. Questions were
raised among candidates about the thin line between innovative technique and unethical boundary violations; as to how much backing will the candidate receive from the former supervisor of the case; whether the candidate's theoretical orientation may become a factor in the discussions; and could the candidate be used as a scapegoat in the theoretical controversies within the Society. When considering a less conventional intervention with a difficult patient, some candidates would ask their supervisors anxiously: "will it get me in trouble with the Ethics Committee?"

In a day-long conference on ethics initiated by the Society, some members and candidates protested that the specific case is not openly discussed, while others pointed out that this may be impossible for reasons of confidentiality.

‘The end of history’ is surely a naive illusion, both in the international scene and in the psychoanalytic world.