

PSYCHOANALYTIC POWER
Its Unique Character and Self-Destructive Effect
Howard Shevrin

THE PROBLEM

Psychoanalysis as a practice and science must confront two interrelated problems:

1. Despite more than a century of efforts to maintain standards of training and practice, substantial organizational resources are still required to maintain these standards in the face of apparent continuous efforts to subvert and dilute them.
2. Despite more than a century of existence as a science, instead of a growing agreement on a body of knowledge there are an increasing number of different points of view as to what constitutes that body of knowledge, how it is to be further expanded, and what methods are to be used to achieve that goal.

These two problems must be addressed fairly quickly; psychoanalysis cannot afford another decade, let alone another century, in which internecine struggles over standards and what constitutes its science and the nature of its clinical method continue to weaken its standing with the public at large and in the world of science. The managed care revolution has only aggravated a situation that has been developing over the better part of a century, and shortened the time for finding a solution.

In this paper I will address these two problems in the context of the American Psychoanalytic Association. However, the analysis I will offer has much broader application. It is my thesis that the persistence of these two problems derives from the way in which psychoanalysis as a practice and science is organized institutionally. Moreover, the organizational difficulties go back to the very beginnings of psychoanalysis and are deeply rooted in the nature of psychoanalysis itself so that the problem is unique to psychoanalysis. It is also the case that awareness of these difficulties can be traced to the very beginnings of institutional psychoanalysis. Nevertheless, the problem has remained intractable down to our own day, if not worsening because of changing attitudes toward psychoanalysis in the world at large.

In his monumental treatise, The Discovery of the Unconscious, Henri Ellenberger (1970) referred to psychoanalytic institutional organization as Freud's "greatest novelty" (p.550), likening it to the ancient philosophical schools of Greco-Roman antiquity such as the Stoics and Epicureans. In these philosophical schools, the neophyte was inducted into the philosophy as a way of life in addition to didactic instruction. The philosophy had to be acquired through personal experience and modeled and exemplified in a mentor. Perhaps for other reasons, something similar is required in psychoanalysis in the form of a personal analysis for the psychoanalytic neophyte. The consequences of this

mingling of the personal, professional, and didactic will concern us in the balance of this paper

THE UNIQUE NATURE OF PSYCHOANALYTIC POWER IN PSYCHOANALYTIC ORGANIZATIONS

In any organization the distribution and exercise of power is of paramount importance. Things get done by those who have the power to bring them about, usually on the basis of some agreement as to who will exercise power. What is vital is how this exercise is sanctioned and by whom. Usually in a voluntary organization power is derived from the membership on the basis of some agreed upon procedure (voting) and its exercise is limited by some definition of responsibilities and term of office. We also know that in every organization there are unofficial sources of power that can substantially override the official sources. This unofficial power can derive from money (a heavy contributor), or force (threats of injury, law suits), or privileged information (some piece of information that can be damaging or compromising if revealed, as in declassifying government documents). In political parties, for example, all three of these sources of unofficial power are at work so that the nominal chair or candidates are beholden to the so-called power brokers who may not have any official position at all.

What might be the sources of unofficial power in our organization? Certainly it is not money and seldom is it force. Note, however, how the mere mention of a lawsuit evokes great apprehension because its effects, if resorted to as it has on at least one occasion and threatened at other times, can be powerful and costly. That leaves privileged information. Psychoanalysis by its very nature deals with privileged information of the most private and intimate sort. We go to great lengths to insure confidentiality and we are correctly quite troubled by the wide-ranging access insurance companies and governments have to medical records. Yet in the way psychoanalytic education works a handful of members of the American, the training analysts, possess privileged information concerning many other members and members-to-be.

The curious thing about privileged information is that it is powerful especially when unrevealed. Knowing that someone has private and intimate information about you changes your relationship to that person for good (during and after analysis), and knowing further that your colleagues (fellow candidates) very likely have communicated such information about you to *their* training analysts creates something of the same relationship with other training analysts. Moreover, the awareness that there is a group of people who, as a defining characteristic, possess such private and intimate information about others in the organization sets that group apart and bestows upon it a form of power that can only be called psychoanalytic power because it is unique to psychoanalysis. How each training analyst handles that power and how each current and past analysand responds to that power will of course be an individual matter related to particular transference and counter-transference issues. But over and above the particular form it might take in any individual instance, there is the *reality* of this unofficial psychoanalytic power that plays itself out on all levels of our organization.

The existence of a group possessing privileged information poses difficulties in and of itself, but the situation is aggravated substantially when members of this group also possess official power by virtue of election or appointment in the organization. Mosher (email/open line, 2/24/03) has documented the extent of this combination of unofficial and official power: 1) only two APsaA presidents have not been training analysts, only two have been treasurers, and none have been secretaries, 2) Most committees have a preponderance of training analysts (e.g., Bylaws Committee: 8 out of 11; TFEM 17 out of 20) and the Executive Council itself is 45% training analysts. When it is borne in mind that training analysts are 22% of the membership at large, they are more than doubly represented in the power structure of the organization, and this without taking into consideration that the Board of Professional Standards is largely made up of training analysts, as is the case for most institute Education Committees. The point I wish to make with these statistics is not that this disproportionate representation could be criticized as undemocratic. My point would hold if the representation were proportionate and the procedures involved in their election and appointment entirely democratic. The point I will be developing throughout this paper is that when unofficial power based on privileged information is joined with official power a combustible organizational environment is created that has contributed to the two serious problems stated in the introduction to this paper: 1) the continued struggle to maintain standards of training and practice, 2) the proliferation of points of view, theories, and practices that result in the failure to evolve a cumulative body of evidence..

When unofficial power based on privileged information is augmented by official power a daunting combination is forged that psychoanalytic history has shown is responded to by those without such power with compliant identification, alienation, or revolution. One need only examine the early history of the psychoanalytic movement to find evidence for this hypothesis. When Freud performed was analyzing all the major figures in the early movement, while exercising considerable official power by virtue of his uncontestable leadership of the psychoanalytic movement, powerful emotional forces were let loose as a result. There were the well known early splits of Adler, Jung, and Rank. There were those who held firm to the master's teachings like Abraham and Jones, and those who teetered on the edge between alienation and revolution like Ferenczi and Groddeck.

This early combustible mixture of privileged information and official power based on Freud's charismatic leadership resulted in much damage to the early systematic development of psychoanalysis. Splits resulted that dog us to this day. The organizational inheritance of this combination of privileged psychoanalytic information and official power has resulted in the constant need to re-affirm standards under attack, and to the failure to sustain the scientific evolution of knowledge (see Shevrin, 2003). In this kind of system there are three alternatives confronting those who lack psychoanalytic power: compliant identification, alienation, and revolution. This latter alternative is of special interest because only through revolution are those who possess this unofficial power "destroyed", that is, disenfranchised entirely and a new organization formed in which they can no longer exercise this unofficial power. Alienation serves the same purpose, but on an individual basis. After the revolution the same drama is eventually re-

enacted in the new organization because again some group gains possession of that special form of psychoanalytic power- privileged information. I will leave for later a consideration of the possible roots of the desire for and fear of psychoanalytic power.

The forces working for fragmentation that I have tried to identify also help us to account not only for organizational fragmentation but also for the lack of continuity in psychoanalytic theory and practice. We are constantly it seems beset by “paradigm shifts”, something that occurs maybe once in a century or two in other sciences. Ellenberger pointed out decades ago that whereas continuous progress had been made in other sciences developing at the same time as psychoanalysis, controversy and polarization of views persist in psychoanalysis. Differences are not experienced within a common frame of reference subject to modification, but the frame of reference itself is challenged and disowned. I submit that this unhappy state of affairs is one serious consequence of the conflation of official and unofficial power.

Another serious consequence is the paradoxical problem that no matter how persistently efforts are made to maintain standards of training and practice, they seem always under attack. Although BOPS has the authority to require acceptable standards of training from its affiliated institutes, it has had instead to create a system of certification focussed on the individual graduate in order to monitor standards. Presumably BOPS has felt that it cannot maintain standards on an institute level. It is well known, for example, that within a given institute the experienced failure of a training analysis can lead to alienation and revolt against the views represented by the training analyst that in the hands of a charismatic and powerful intellect can lead to a new approach to psychoanalysis that some then perceive as undermining accepted standards of training and practice and others, some in training analyses with the charismatic new leader, accept as a new standard of training and practice. These views are maintained with all the force of unresolved transferences and counter-transferences. This quite apart from whatever validity the new departure might have that becomes difficult to discern because of this volatile admixture of powerful emotional forces. New institutes are established, or older ones changed in the image of these new approaches, and thus standards are challenged, subverted, changed for good or ill, depending on who is doing the judging. The problem of maintaining standards is inevitably “kicked upstairs” to the national level where BOPS has the unenviable task of maintaining standards across all institutes and thus facing a Hobson’s choice: Rein in the perceived excesses of some institutes each of which has its own group of training analysts whose desires and needs must be respected by other training analysts (i.e., BOPS), or require individual graduates of these institutes to meet standards at variance with their didactic and training analysis experiences. Alienation and revolt are inevitable. And thus the lamentable history of repeated needs to defend standards and repeated revolts against those attempting to maintain standards as new departures in theory and practice are advanced by a dissident group.

These are two of the most serious consequences of the conflation of official and unofficial psychoanalytic power: 1) a loss of cumulative, evolutionary continuity and change in psychoanalytic theory, 2) a repeated assault on the standards of training and practice prevailing at the time by those disaffected.

We learn from Bernfeld (1962) that the problem was already identified with the appointment of the first training analyst in the Berlin Institute. According to Bernfeld, Hans Sachs was asked to analyze the Berlin Institute candidates. Wisely he agreed to do so on the condition that he not participate in any activities of the institute- teaching, supervision, serving on committees, or holding office. Only years later was his wisdom confirmed by Lewin and Ross (1960) They pointed out in their 1960 survey of the condition of psychoanalytic education that institutes suffer from a built in syncretism because they are pursuing two incompatible goals simultaneously: To both treat and educate the candidate. While the training analysis treated, the course work and supervision educated. Lewin and Ross took great pains to emphasize that the two goals pursued within the same organizational structure and by the same people were incompatible and resulted in what they defined as an egregious compromise essentially illogical in nature and counter-productive in practice. They describe how in older as well as in contemporary institutes, this syncretism “complicate the ‘reality’ in which the training analysis takes place (p.232)”. Quoting a graduate analyst who described his training in these words: “...students, teachers, and analysts met each other constantly...It was difficult for them and us to keep reality and fantasy apart. The negative transference remained in many instances unanalyzed and ‘reality’ gave excellent rationalizations” (p. 232).

Lewin and Ross summarized their trenchant observations in these prescient words:

“...education and the psychoanalytic procedure exist in two worlds and that psychoanalytic education, as a concept, is a syncretism... the two models “psychoanalytic patient” and “student” complement, alternate with, and oppose each other. A psychoanalytic treatment is *sui generis*. The education introduces a parameter for the therapeutic procedure, and the analytic procedure an even larger one for the education. The institutes are unavoidably trying to exert two effects on the student: to “educate” him and to “cure” or “change” him. Hence, the student as a phenomenon fits into two conceptual frameworks: he is the pedagogic unit or object of teaching and the therapeutic unit or object of psychoanalytic procedure (p.47).

The aim of this paper is to show how this syncretism is not limited to institute practices, but is writ large in all organized psychoanalytic institutions such as the American Psychoanalytic Association. Moreover, this syncretism batters on the inherent secrecy of analytic communications and contributes to making it hard to “keep reality and fantasy apart”, especially when some people around the table, or at the head of the table instructing, possess secrets that constitute what I am referring to as unofficial psychoanalytic power.

Once it is recognized that the main source of unofficial psychoanalytic power is privileged information then it becomes relatively easy to see why throughout the history of organized analysis there was always some group set apart by possessing privileged information. The prime example is the training analyst and the tenacity with which that

status is defended and protected. Access to becoming a training analyst is only possible if one is first certified. And here we come to an unstated consequence of the certification process: a group (e.g., Certification Committee; BOPS) becomes privy to the way an analyst conducts analysis in great detail including transference and counter-transference issues. Once having gone through the certification process, passing or failing, you know that there is a group of people, all training analysts, who now possess intimate and privileged (it is meant to remain confidential) information about you. Wherever you go in the organization and no matter what venue there will be those who share this privileged information about you and others who do not. I submit that this new level of privileged information, now at a national organizational level, in its emotional significance is a repetition of similar experiences at the institute and society level where the content is indeed more personal and intimate. At the national organizational level all the unresolved transference and counter-transference issues of both analysts and candidates and training analysts find an unhappy home and result in the bitter, divisive struggles we are now seeing again. It is also instructive to witness how the same reactions are in evidence: compliant identification, alienation and revolution. Many comply and claim to benefit, others remove themselves either from the certification process or from the organization, still others stay to fight in order to overturn and finally destroy those who draw upon this unofficial psychoanalytic power of privileged information. Current efforts to resolve the certification issue will not succeed unless there is an explicit recognition of the underlying problem to which I am calling attention.

It is not difficult to identify the underlying transference and counter-transference paradigm for this organizational syncretism, to borrow the Lewin and Ross term. It is the early parent/child relationship in which the child is convinced that the parent can read its thoughts and knows everything. This is both protective and anxiety arousing because not all one's thoughts are pure; there are some thoughts one wishes the parent could not divine. In a recent gathering attended by training analysts, candidates, faculty, family members and friends, a training analyst with tongue in cheek defined a training analyst as someone who "pretends not to know everything". Judging from the knowing laughter elicited, the point of the joke was not lost on those who heard it. The training analyst must pretend not to know everything because this knowledge is significantly based on privileged information. But as noted above it is its secrecy that gives privileged psychoanalytic information its great power.

The predominant counter-transference of those who aspire to be training analysts (and note must be taken that this remains the only officially recognized path to advancement and preferment) is that of the parent whose superior intelligence, experience and maturity, all generally true in the case of most parents with small children, grant entry into the child's inner life. Although training analysts cannot always claim to be of superior intelligence, it would be granted that they are generally more experienced and by virtue of their own training analysis might claim greater maturity. Beyond these possible givens, there are more regressive elements of omniscience and voyeurism, as well as the desire for omnipotence and, most important, the narcissistic need to live through the child. In short, the child becomes the vicarious future of the parent. Thus, as noted by many in the past, some training analysts are surrounded by "convoys" of ex-analysts

who strive to advance their ex-analyst's agenda. The ex-analysand becomes the vehicle for achieving the training analyst's ambitions. Here official and unofficial power combine to form a powerful clique whose relationships with each other are cemented by unresolved (and ultimately unresolvable) transference and counter-transference forces.

At the same time, we know from our clinical experience that the maladaptive, neurotic side of unanalyzed transference and countertransferences, are often accompanied by adaptive and creative possibilities- healthy and enduring friendships, and valuable collaborations. But these do not cause the troubles I am trying to identify.

Parenthetically it might be noted, that there is another parental figure who knows everything and for the best of reasons, Santa Claus. As the song has it, he knows when you are good or bad even though you don't know him at all. You are led to believe in his beneficence if not fairness because he distributes gifts to everyone, even those who know they've been bad. One wonders how much unconscious guilt as well as early skepticism about parental omniscience is engendered by Santa Claus. And the same holds true for the training analyst who is in the mold of a benign parental figure disposed to use his privileged information, good and bad, for the good of the analysand. But this runs afoul of the fact that unlike Santa Claus, or even most parents, once the child is grown, this benign parental figure plays a role in your professional life in which he or she pursues an agenda that might be quite different from your own and which might nevertheless have substantial and unwelcome consequences for you, unless you join his or her "convoy". These benign figures are now the Education Committee, constitute BOPS and the COC, pass on your credentials and may decide your professional fate. The syncretism comes home to roost. The unique individual unresolved transference and counter-transference issues (and everyone agrees that there are such unresolved matters) now are displaced onto the one transference and counter-transference issue that has a basis in organizational reality quite apart from any individual's particular history: there is in fact a group with special official power (e.g., BOPS, COC) who also possess uniquely the unofficial power of privileged psychoanalytic information. Nor does it matter, as stated earlier, that your own analyst does not serve on that particular body; the transference as well as counter-transference are institutional in scope although anchored in the individual's psyche where it is greatly strengthened by unresolved transference issues.

Again an everyday example: when grown children enter into the family business owned and directed by a parent the stage is set for a similar syncretistic conflict. Seeming success in this syncretism is often based on compliant identification in which the child loses its individuality or any chance of following another path; failure is often due to alienation- the child flees the business and the parental home often with considerable guilt augmented by rage; the third alternative is open revolt and rejection. Some may in fact succeed without personal cost, but these are few and far between, requiring enormous maturity on the part of both parent and child. No organization can depend on a consistent level of such all around maturity. As analysts we must certainly appreciate that.

Let us consider an example closer to home based on actual practice in psychiatry. There are several national organizations of patients, ex-patients, and psychiatrists dedicated to advancing the treatment of a particular disease (e.g., schizophrenia, depression). Treaters and patients work together, often quite successfully, to advance the

agenda of the organization. It is not unusual for ex-patients successfully treated to be approached for funding. These organizations can thrive largely because the patient-doctor relationship is not based on treatments expressly intended to elicit transference and counter-transference reactions. Wisely, our organization considers it unethical to fraternize with ex-patients, or approaching them for funding, and would look askance at forming and participating in an organization of analysts, patients and ex-patients dedicated to advancing the cause of psychoanalysis. Yet the American is in fact such an organization!

Finally, what I wish very much to stress is that at bottom all legitimate organizational issues sooner or later become infiltrated with this underlying conflict over privileged information, who has it and how it is used. Those who have it want to keep it, those who don't have it wish to acquire it, ignore it, or reject it. But we all suffer from it.

IS THERE A SOLUTION?

Is there anything that can be done about it? Any solution would have to separate official and unofficial sources of power. It is this combination that is syncretistic insofar as official power serves as a screen and rationalization for the exercise of unofficial power. In psychoanalytic terms it becomes the target for displacements from the underlying unsettled transference and counter-transference issues elicited by the unofficial source of power. As a result legitimate organizational issues become strangely difficult to address directly, bylaws somehow are always ambiguous, and most important feelings on both sides of any issue touching on the confluence of official and unofficial power run high, have a tendency to become personal and entrain all kinds of other dissatisfactions. A case in point is the perennial preoccupation with standards of training and practice of which the certification issue is only the most recent manifestation. There is certainly an organizational need to maintain standards of training and practice. The main issue is how this is to be accomplished and by whom. Throughout the history of organized psychoanalysis maintaining standards has been the prerogative of those deemed to be well trained, highly experienced, and gifted as clinicians as judged by their well trained, highly experienced, and clinically gifted institute colleagues and peers - in short those already training analysts who select others to be admitted to their numbers. Again a good argument can be made (and has) that this is the only way to maintain standards. Who else but those who have dedicated themselves to the practice of analysis and its transmission through seminars, supervision, and the training analysis itself should oversee standards? As already noted, remarkably, despite the century long effort to maintain standards they seem always to be under attack and undermined from some quarter. The serious and insurmountable problem with this approach is that it further aggravates the syncretistic problem identified in this communication. As a result it becomes hard for many people to appreciate that not only maintaining standards is involved; rather they experience those who are maintaining standards as imposing standards to suit their own ends and doing so by drawing upon unofficial psychoanalytic power. It becomes extremely difficult to consider the issues involved in maintaining standards of training and practice in an emotionally conflict free climate.

How can official and unofficial power be separated? There are several solutions, some more radical than others. The most radical solution is to do away with the formal

requirement for a training analysis. A candidate's progress would solely depend on performance in seminars and supervision. The candidate might already have had an analysis privately, or may in fact be in analysis at the time, but this would not enter into the training in any formal way, or even be known by the institute faculty. As a result of supervision the candidate might seek out analysis, again on a purely private basis. The proof of the pudding would be in the candidate's performance, in particular in the supervision of cases. This solution would place more weight on the initial evaluation of the prospective candidate in order to weed out those with apparent serious neurotic problems, and elevate to a more central position the applicant's potential clinical talent. In most such evaluations case material from previous psychotherapies conducted by the applicant is carefully assessed and how the applicant discusses them is given considerable importance. In other words, the best indicator of future performance is past performance, a dictum applied in all assessment procedures- for example, college entrance, hiring a new employee, etc. When it is also considered that there is a literature on the limitations of the training analysis, and how many analysts seek out second, non-training analyses that are often considered more useful, perhaps it is not so outlandish to consider doing away with the training analysis. It should also be noted that perhaps some of the difficulties experienced in the training analysis derive from the syncretism already described.

But there are two arguments in favor of requiring the candidate to go through an analysis: 1) only in this personal way can the candidate experience what his or her patients go through, 2) how else can harmful neurotic conflicts be moderated that could adversely effect the candidates future patients. The first argument harks back to the original purpose of the so-called didactic analysis favored by Freud- the candidate must have a personal experience of the power of the unconscious. The second argument has provided the basis for the training analysis. In this regard it is valuable to recall that the training analysis was introduced in the Berlin Institute and that Ferenczi was its advocate. The main reason for going beyond the didactic analysis was to deal with the growing problem of sexual acting out with patients, one of the early examples was Jung's involvement with Spielrein. However, we have discovered since then that a training analysis is not a panacea for this problem, and it introduces new problems in its own right. Nevertheless an argument can be made for requiring an analysis arranged on an entirely private basis which as I understand it would bring our training closer to the French system. It would also go a long way toward eliminating the educational and organizational syncretism from which we all suffer.

Concretely, it would mean that there would no longer be training analysts, although institutes, societies, and the national organization would continue to benefit from the wisdom of senior experienced analysts. However, there would be no identifiable group that would be characterized as possessing unofficial psychoanalytic power. Harking back to Hans Sacks, there would be one requirement: if as a member of the institute you were analyzing candidates you could not hold an official position in which delegated power was exercised. Standards would be maintained by a BOPS made up of members selected by individual institutes as now. If certification were continued to be required, it would no longer be burdened with the transference and countertransference issues created by the training analysis and might thus be more

conflict-free and educational in nature. It might very well be the case that some of those elected might in fact have analyzed some members, but this would not characterize the group. In fact, one would anticipate and hope that once the unique training analyst route to power and preferment were eliminated that other routes to peer recognition in addition to clinical skill, such as superior teaching and supervision, research contributions, and organizational know-how would become attractive as reasons to select a person to serve on a committee devoted to maintaining standards. Indeed, if this were to happen the very setting of standards might become a more varied and challenging enterprise, incorporating in addition to clinical standards, standards and expectations with respect to teaching and research. I would anticipate that sources of creativity heretofore untapped and even suppressed might be drawn upon by our membership once the syncretism of official power and the unofficial psychoanalytic power of privileged information was dissolved.

HOW TO ACHIEVE THE SOLUTION

Without question organizational change that renders the powerful less powerful is perhaps more difficult to achieve than individual change. The means, however, may be the same: to cast a bright light, the light of insight, on the underlying problem that to my knowledge has not been clearly and persistently identified. For example, the illuminating Lewin and Ross report that called the training analyst system into question was followed years later by the Goodman (1977) report that re-affirmed the tripartite training system, emphasizing the centrality of the training analysis. And that is where matters have been left.

I would call upon training analysts to examine their own motivations in true analytic fashion in the light of the examination offered in this communication. I would anticipate that some among them would see the peril that their status has placed our organization and choose to either resign their special status or act to bring about organizational change. There is precedent for high-minded acts motivated by the desire for the ultimate benefit of the greatest number. Psychoanalytic training itself is based on self-denial- postponing the fruits of previous professional accomplishment, assuming the burden of great financial expense, and asking those we love to bear some of the burden. We should expect similar acts of self-abnegation in the cause of a higher good from our most experienced and wisest members. Some have made this choice.

Unless change comes about in a peaceful and workable way it is not difficult to foresee that, given the increasingly powerful emotional forces at work in the organization, that change might come about through a resort to force. In these circumstances force would take the form of a law suit. Not so long ago psychologists who had been excluded from training, mounted a successful law suit, claiming that their exclusion amounted to a restraint of trade. They were kept from having access to psychoanalytic patients available to others with the training from which they were excluded and were thus kept from practicing the profession to which they aspired. It is not out of the question that some graduate analysts who had been denied training analyst status might claim that they were excluded from seeing analytically suitable and well

paying patients who happen to be candidates. Their case would be strengthened by the fact that training analysis is only “training” insofar as it is provided by a training analyst. In every respect it is supposed to be no different from a therapeutic analysis. In no other health care profession are certain patients reserved for one particular class of practitioners. Once again we run up against the syncretism between education and treatment. The only argument that can be made in favor of a training analysis is that it is educational, and only those possessing the knowledge to educate can provide a training analysis. But the aim of a training analysis is therapeutic- to resolve as much as possible the neurotic conflicts that might interfere with the candidate’s treatment of others. If the aim is purely therapeutic and if the educational aim is attained through successful analysis, why can’t any graduate analyst provide that treatment? Moreover, the special knowledge claimed by the training analyst in practicing as a training analyst is really no different from any analysis; the training analyst as training analyst imparts no special body of knowledge (a mastery of languages, historical facts, law, medicine, even psychoanalytic theory in any didactic sense). The imparting of such knowledge as knowledge is the provenance of seminars and supervision.

I can well imagine a graduate analyst rejected for training analyst status, or for that matter any graduate analyst whose practice is suffering in these hard times and sees good patients being reserved for one class of analysts, bringing a case in court on these or similar grounds. Given the number of such people one could foresee a class action suit on behalf of all graduate analysts. At the very least the organization, as the experience with psychologists demonstrates, would encounter enormous costs both monetary and organizationally win or lose. And it is always possible that those bringing the suit would win.

Why not forestall even the remote possibility of such a suit and undertake the necessary if painful task of eliminating the one main source of unofficial psychoanalytic power- privileged information that has become closely linked to official organizational power to the detriment of us all?

Bernfeld, S. (1962). On psychoanalytic education, *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 31. 453-482.

Ellenberger, HF (1970). *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*, Basic Books, Inc: New York.

Goodman, S., Ed. (1977). *Psychoanalytic Education and Research: The Current Situation and Future Possibilities*, International Universities Press: New York.

Lewin, BD & Ross, H (1960). *Psychoanalytic Education in the United States*, Norton: New York.

Shevrin, H. (2003). Rapaport’s systematizing attempt, *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 51, 1012-1019.

