The Coming Changes in Psychoanalytic Education: Part I

Otto F. Kernberg

The author presents a critical overview of the literature on psychoanalytic education, focusing on criticism regarding structural aspects of our educational institutions. He then presents arguments for the need of radical changes in the organizational structure of institutes, and focuses on the problems of the training analysis system. He proposes concrete solutions for these problems, in the form of changes both in the assignment of responsibilities for the personal analysis of candidates and in the selection and function of supervisors.

Totschweigen [To Kill by Silence]: A Review of Relevant Psychoanalytic Literature

Mary Target (2001), in her comprehensive review of the literature on psychoanalytic education, points to a recent increase in papers on this issue in contrast to earlier times, attributing this change to an inhibition that gradually was overcome. While highly critical analyses of psychoanalytic education emerged from the very beginning (Bálint, 1948; Bernfeld, 1962), a majority of the early papers were descriptive, and usually affirmed the validity of the Eitingon training model prevalent throughout the international community related to the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA), as highlighted by the classical work of Lewin and Ross (1960) and Joan Fleming (Fleming, 1961; Fleming and Benedek, 1966). It was not until the 1970s that critical analyses of the organizational structure implicit in the Eitingon model and of the educational programs of psychoanalytic institutes began to dominate the respective literature: a critique that is now, by far, the dominant trend in the corresponding contributions: Arlow, 1969, 1972; Bruzzzone et al., 1985; Davidson, 1974; Dulchin and Segal, 1982; Greenacre, 1966; Kairys, 1964; Keiser, 1969; Lifschutz, 1976; Szasz, 1958.

From early on, criticism of psychoanalytic education focused on dysfunctional aspects involving the selection of candidates, the criteria for graduation, the nature of psychoanalytic seminars and supervision, and particularly the authoritarian consequences of the training analysis system and the excessive bureaucratization of training. In the 1980s and 1990s this critique turned its focus to the underlying structural and organizational problems in psychoanalytic education and their historical antecedents (Bruzzzone et al., 1985; Cooper, 1990, 1997; Dulchin and Segal, 1982; Giovannetti de Freitas, 1991; Green, 1991; Infante, 1991; Kernberg, 1986, 1996, 2000, 2001a, 2001b; Köpp et al., 1990; Lussier, 1991; Roustang, 1982; Wallerstein, 1993).

Analyses from a historical and organizational, but predominantly from a psychoanalytic perspective proper have pointed to the stultification of candidates leading to inhibition of creativity, professional impoverishment, and scientific standstill. Major changes in psychoanalytic education have been proposed to remedy this situation (Auchincloss and Michels, 2003; Bartlett, 2003; Berman, 2000a, 2000b; Cupa et al., 2003; François-ポンセ和Lussier, 2001; Garza-Guerrero, 2002a, 2002b; Gomberoff, 2001, 2002; Kernberg, 2001a, 2001b; Kirsner, 2003; Levine, 2004; Meyer, 2003; Szecsothy, 2003; Thomà and Kächele, 1999).

There are, of course, contributions that, basically, defend the present psychoanalytic educational structure, while proposing some changes that, they believe, may reduce shortcomings without changing the essential structures of psychoanalytic education (Amati-Mehler, 2000; Butterfield-Meissl and Grossman-Garger, 1996; Calef and Weinshel, 1973; Orgel, 1982; Shapiro, 1974; Weinshel, 1982).

In an effort to draw some general conclusions about the impact of this bibliography, and what it reveals about the self-reflection of the psychoanalytic community regarding its educational structures, I propose several tentative generalizations. To begin, problems in our educational structures were sensed very early. Bernfeld (1962) originally gave his pathbreaking paper on analytic training in 1952, and, although, it was not published until after his death in 1962, its critique is relevant to this day. Together with Bálint's (1948) early critique, and the papers that followed in the 1960s and 1970s, these papers were largely ignored by the psychoanalytic community. In fact, what appears to me most impressive is the extent to which the nature of serious problems in psychoanalytic education, clearly emerging in the psychoanalytic
community of all three regions, (Western Europe, Latin America, North America), was ignored at the organizational level. Even as evidence of grave problems of an institutional, professional and ethical nature rocked the boat and threatened psychoanalytic education in several countries, the official attitude was dismissive. Discussions of these problems at meetings and congresses were noticeably absent or tepid at best.

I believe that powerful resistances emerged against self-reflectiveness in this domain, this tendency to protect or defend the status quo illustrating, in the process, the very problem that was being signaled by those early critiques. This resistance was overcome, finally, in the 1980s, as external reality contributed to put into sharp focus the inflexibility of the psychoanalytic community's failure to respond quickly and effectively to the new challenges. We must also bear in mind that this myopia coincided with a period of ascendance of psychoanalysis from the 1950s through the 1970s in some European countries, as well as Argentina and the USA.

As long as psychoanalysis flourished, and psychoanalytic institutes were being solicited by large numbers of highly trained and qualified applicants, while psychoanalysis was accepted as a prestigious treatment within academia and in the community, the critique of psychoanalytic education could be ignored. Such lack of a self-critical stance proved costly, however, as threats to psychoanalysis emerged from alternative psychotherapeutic approaches, short-term treatments driven by managed care, improvements in psychotropic medications, the self-help movement and other cultural factors. I believe that a recognition of the urgent need to innovate psychoanalytic education, together with needed investments in outreach and research, for the protection and development of the psychoanalytic profession and science, has become too evident for the previous inhibition and denial to succeed.

Following this general overview, I wish to highlight a few contributions that have been particularly relevant to various sections of the analysis and proposals that follow. Bernfeld (1962), criticizing the excessive bureaucratization of psychoanalytic education, providing the historical background for the Eitingon system, and pointing to the institutional infantilization of candidates, alerted the psychoanalytic leadership to problems in the training analysis system. There are four papers by psychoanalytic candidates (Bruzzone et al., 1985, from Santiago, Chile; Köpp et al., 1990, from Berlin; and François-Poncet and Lussier, 2001, and Cupa et al., 2003, from Paris) that are of particular interest because they describe, respectively, the paranoia that characterizes the psychoanalytic education provided by the total educational structure. It is interesting to observe that Bruzzone et al., and Köpp et al., were training within an Eitingon system institute in Chile, and Germany, while the Paris candidates' papers, obviously, reflect the French educational system. We can see that problems of authoritarianism affect very different educational models, from diverse geographical and cultural settings.

Cooper's (1997) sharp critique of the destructive discouragement of psychoanalytic research which prevails points to one of the problems of the present educational system. In many locales, not only does there not appear to be any interest in fostering the development of psychoanalytic scientists and researchers, but, to make matters worse, some institutes adopt a frankly negative attitude toward research in general.

Körner (2002) has given us, I believe, a most important overview of the road to objectifying the criteria for psychoanalytic competence on the basis of knowledge, technique, and psychoanalytic attitude. Cabaniss et al. (2003) at the Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research, on the basis of empirical research, provide evidence of specific problems in psychoanalytic education with regard to the striking uncertainty and confusion about the requirements for graduation characteristic of the member institutes of the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsaA).

Proceeding from the question 'How can we objectify and do justice to our global subjective judgments of a candidate's competence?', Tuckett (2005) has proposed three parameters that jointly may permit such an objectifiable assessment of competence. They are:

1) the participant observational frame, the candidate's capacity to sense relevant data, affects and unconscious meanings;

2) the conceptual frame, the candidate's capacity to link the observed data meaningfully with relevant unconscious dynamics; and

3) the interventional frame, the formulation of an interpretive intervention communicating effectively the candidate's understanding, and the related sensitivity to sensing the patient's reaction to this interpretation.

This approach may be an important beginning towards the task of transforming subjective clinical judgments into objective standards.

A symposium on 'Problems of Power in Psychoanalytic Institutions', with contributions by six authors has been published in Psychoanalytic Inquiry (Kernberg 2004), and provides important relevant information. A contribution by Target (2002), on 'Psychoanalytic models of supervision: Issues and ideas' presents an aspect of her work as Chair of the
European Psychoanalytic Federation's Working Party on Psychoanalytic Education, and provides interesting perspectives on supervision, particularly the learning expectations of the supervisee and how the interaction with the supervisor might influence it. It does not however, focus on the requirements for the supervisor as such (!). In this connection, Bartlett (2003)—a candidate at the now combined Philadelphia Institute—wrote a critique of the dispirited nature of seminars in psychoanalytic institutes.

Meyer's (2003) analysis of the distortion that the very status of 'training analyst' inevitably introduces into the analysis of candidates, interfering as it often does, with the possibility of full transference analysis and resolution is a thought-producing contribution to the literature. He designated this situation as 'subservient analysis.' The final report from Rocha Barros (2001) from the Pre-Congress on Training at the IPA Nice Congress reveals how this issue—the nature of the training analysis—clearly split the participants, and in parallel to the endless discussion of whether psychoanalysis should be required on a four to five time basis or on a three to four time basis, that has characterized so many self-limiting discussions on methodology of psychoanalytic education. Garza-Guerrero's (2002a, 2002b, 2005) contributions provide a highly critical perspective regarding what should be aspired to, in the long run, for psychoanalytic education. Berman (2004) has described the Israel Psychoanalytic Society's struggle to overcome its own institutional rigidities over an extended period of time. In addition, the analysis of the historical roots of authoritarianism in psychoanalytic education by Cremerius (1986, 1987), and the narrative of the book by Reeder (2004), have contributed significantly to the contemporary discourse on the training analysis system.

Finally, with regard to the subject of selection of psychoanalytic candidates, the comprehensive overview of this issue by Kappelle (1996) supports the conclusion of the Commission on the Evaluation of Applicants for psychoanalytic training (CEA) of the IPA. This commission summarized its findings, stating,

At present we question whether it is possible with any certainty to say more than the following: that a person who seems analyzable, says he wants to be an analyst, and has accomplished in life enough so far to give promise that he can carry out what he intends to do or wants to be, should be acceptable.

My own contributions to the analysis of problems in psychoanalytic education started with explorations of the relationship between the goals of psychoanalytic education and the administrative structure of psychoanalytic institutes (Kernberg, 1986).
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I concluded that severe discrepancies between educational goals and administrative structures were influential in determining authoritarian features in psychoanalytic education, and outlined the corresponding symptoms. I later described the influence of different psychoanalytic cultures and the personality of leadership in the distortion of administrative structures (Kernberg, 1992), then illustrating the consequences of excessive rigidity and fear of change in an ironic description of the experiences of psychoanalytic candidates (Kernberg, 1996). I began to suggest possible changes in various aspects of psychoanalytic education in several contributions (Kernberg, 2000, 2001a, 2001b), that constitute the background for the present integration of such proposals into a comprehensive administrative structure, reasonably free of the consequences of the traditional training analysis system. What follows is that integrated set of proposals, and the theoretical and practical discussion of their implications.

**Paranoiacigenic Aspects of Psychoanalytic Education**

As president of the IPA, I was also privy to individual concerns, complaints, and revelations of a broad variety of difficulties faced by members and candidates. What came as a shocking surprise was the discovery that seemingly isolated cases of mismanagement, mistreatment, unethical behavior, or gross unfairness as causes of individual and group complaints in various societies and institutes throughout the three regions proved to reflect more general, chronic ways of institutional malfunctioning that seemed detrimental to the tasks of psychoanalytic education, to the morale of the corresponding institution, and to the professional and scientific creativity of both faculty and candidates. Anne-Marie Sandler's (2004) dramatic, tactful and concerned analysis of a long-lasting tolerance within the British Psychoanalytic Society and Institute of a notorious case of corruption of psychoanalytic principles and ethics, unfortunately, is not about an isolated incident: I have been involved in similar situations in all three regions. While in all human institutions it is unavoidable, I believe, that such situations emerge, the question is, to what extent is a dysfunctional institutional structure contributing to trigger them and to prevent their correction.

I have suggested in earlier work (1986) that an organizational analysis of psychoanalytic education leads to the conclusion that the administrative structure of psychoanalytic institutes is discrepant with its professed primary tasks. While the explicit objective of psychoanalytic education is the development of scientific knowledge, and an artistic, personal skill to apply this knowledge to psychoanalytic treatment—the objective of a university college and an art school—the administrative structure corresponds in practice to the combination of a technical school and a religious seminary. I also have proposed that the origin of this discrepancy is the very nature of the 'product' handled by psychoanalytic institutes, namely, the dynamic unconscious as revealed in transferences and countertransferences of all
Naturally, when a strong ideological current dominates a particular institute, the aggression is projected outside, to competing psychoanalytic ideas and institutions, such as we saw in the historical, mutual suspiciousness and devaluation between Kleinians and ego psychologists from the 1940s to the 1970s. As a graduate from a South-American Kleinian-oriented institute and a visiting fellow to an ego-psychological institute and a Sullivanian leaning Institute in the USA in the early 1960s, and training analyst at ego-psychological institutes in the USA from the late 1960s on, I was able to personally experience these different institutional cultures. The contemporary stress on plurality of approaches to psychoanalytic theory and technique would seem to ameliorate this situation, leading to a more open and questioning atmosphere. However, that very position of plurality may also assume the characteristic of a dominant ideology, passively accepted as such without raising challenges to the incompatibility of alternative models, or, in the absence of any empirical research, the apparent theoretical openness may lead to self-congratulations regarding the ‘scientific attitude’ that simply replaces one theoretical edifice with an eclectic one.

The final authority of psychoanalytic institutes, in practical terms, resides with the executive committee or education committee, typically constituted either by training analysts only, or, with representation from the faculty and/or the psychoanalytic society, by a group in which training analysts have an overriding decision-making power. The non-training analysts who may become part of such administrative structures are not immune from the hierarchical nature of the relationships in the institution, aware that prospects of eventually joining the training analysts’ group may depend on the extent to which they accommodate to the rulings of that elite. In joint meetings of candidates and faculty members as part of the curriculum committee and other committee structures, the overriding authority of the executive committee becomes apparent, as does the unwillingness of the non-training analyst faculty to challenge such authority.

Orientation to the hierarchical structure of the institute on the part of candidates, as well as junior society members, also derives from an additional fact: the economic dependence of junior members and candidates on referral of desirable patients (inclusively financially viable patients) from senior analysts and, particularly, training analysts. This is a painful fact of life in many countries, especially at the present time with fewer patients seeking psychoanalysis. Institutionally favored candidates may develop a significantly different practice from those who have fallen in disfavor.

In short, an inordinate atmosphere of submission to the established authority acts as a disincentive to innovative endeavors in psychoanalytic institutes, and reinforces a climate of unanalyzed idealizations of the training analyst. As Roustang (1982) suggested many years ago, the idealization that affects candidates, who, in their personal analysis, are supposed to resolve their transference, while, at the same time, they are expected to identify themselves with their analyst, creates a double bind for candidates. Thus, a basic contradiction in the individual training analysis and the distorted administrative structure of psychoanalytic institutes powerfully reinforce each other. One of the consequences of this state of affairs is the unconsciously motivated isolation of psychoanalytic institutes from their social and cultural environment, our next point.

The Motivated Isolation of Psychoanalytic Institutes

The history of the psychoanalytic movement is marked by the emergence of early disidents, who, based upon their charismatic personalities or a disappointment within the psychoanalytic community, decided that major or minor differences in theory or technique warranted their setting up an independent psychoanalytic group. As Bergmann (2004) has pointed out, during Freud's life, his personal relationships played an important role regarding whether different viewpoints could be incorporated into the evolving psychoanalytic theory or would lead to dissidence. At times, dissidence opened up an area of psychoanalytic theory that was later explored by Freud himself. The organizational threat that dissidence signified related to the very subjective and intimate nature of the new knowledge acquired through psychoanalytic exploration, not verifiable by external, ‘objective’ means, so that new discoveries could easily be challenged. The decision regarding what was acceptable derived from an organizational consensus that, therefore, could be challenged and throw the delicate nature of the new science into disarray (Kerr, 2004). The effort to control this threat led to the institutionalization of psychoanalytic education, which provided the boundaries of what was psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic technique proper. These boundaries were historically fixed and changed historically, so that

what at one point appeared as an impossible dissidence might appear at another time as a modification in theoretical perspectives.

It is painful to say so, but, in many institutes throughout the three international regions, an exclusive concern with psychoanalytic theory and technique, totally divested of any contact with other disciplines, evolved as the ideological counterpart to the authority of training analysts, while suspiciousness of sources of knowledge from university settings led to critique and organizational rejection of psychoanalysts who were dedicating a significant part of their lives to such
To illustrate this point practically, in the immense majority of psychoanalytic institutes, before the end of the 20th century, there was no study or in-depth reference to the new developments in instinct theory in biology, in affect theory in the neuropsychological and neurobiological field, and in the biology of depressive disorders. Candidates who, in their professional commitments outside their training activities, would get in touch with those specific developments were at times treated as if they questioned basic principles of psychoanalysis. The training analysis system derived apparent strength from its exclusive focus on a restricted psychoanalytic theory and technique, and mistrust of external scientific challenges. To this day, many psychoanalytic institutes do not inform their candidates about—let alone use for educational and research purposes—the Open door review of outcome studies in psychoanalysis (Fonagy, 2002), an updated report on empirical research on process and outcome, published by the IPA.

The self-destructive isolationism of psychoanalytic institutions in the USA, leading to the separation of psychoanalysis from most psychiatric university settings in the 1970s and 1980s (similar developments took place later in Germany and Scandinavian countries), was largely a consequence of the monolithic assertion of psychoanalysis by psychoanalytic institutes, and their rejection of the scientific, educational, and research requirements of university settings to explore critically all developing areas in the broad field of the mental sciences. In all fairness, restrictive policies in university settings, such as in Germany, limiting professorial activities not directly related to their official tasks, made the integration of academic and psychoanalytic activities more difficult. But the psychoanalytic institutes, in turn, exploited this situation by marginalizing further academicians who could only maintain a limited psychoanalytic practice. This isolation, retreat or expulsion from university settings reinforced the narrowing of intellectual pursuits in psychoanalytic institutions, and was a setback to the impressive developments of psychoanalytic knowledge that had taken place in the 1940s and 1950s, particularly in Great Britain. During this period, radically divergent theories and techniques within the British Psychoanalytic Society generated a period of intense scientific and creative inquiry. Then the cultural impact of French psychoanalysis—in significant part motivated by Lacan's dissidence and its impact on French culture—led, in turn, to a cultural interchange with their environment on the part of French psychoanalytic institutions that had maintained their identity within the IPA. This development provided French psychoanalysis with an opening to cultural and political currents that compensated for the relative isolation of psychoanalysis from university settings in a strict sense. The British case illustrates the positive effects of a break-up of ideological monopolies, and the French case the positive effects of an open interchange with the surrounding culture.

My main point is the stress on the defensive nature of intellectual isolation of psychoanalytic institutes, related, I am suggesting, to the effort to maintain their hierarchical structure in the light of a changing social, scientific, and educational environment. In recent years, the growing concern expressed within traditional institutes about the threat to the 'identity' of the psychoanalyst involved with professional and scientific activities outside the narrow boundaries traced for themselves by traditional psychoanalytic institutes is a symptom, I believe, of this defensive retrenchment (Beland, 1983; Thomâ, 2004). I propose that the concern with the 'identity' of the psychoanalyst is an expression of fear to use psychoanalytic knowledge and technique for exploring new challenges presented by the nature of the broad spectrum of patients that we are seeing nowadays, and by dramatic developments in the neurosciences and the social sciences. Practically, the concern expressed in many—if not the majority of—psychoanalytic institutes over the threat to their psychoanalytic identity when candidates and graduates appear seriously interested in developing the theory and technique of psychoanalytic psychotherapy, or psychodynamic group processes, or couple's therapy illustrates this issue. A professional identity depends on the professional work one is committed to, what one does, the conviction about what one does, and the correspondent knowledge, technical skills and specific attitude. To assume that this identity is at risk when the work expands into new areas, when new interests and knowledge enrich it, reflects a biased, timid conservatism. Even the esoteric debates within psychoanalysis about 'what is science' and 'what is research' seem to be more geared to protect the status quo than addressing the philosophical and methodological contributions that these questions may stimulate.

One consequence of this general state of affairs has been the heavy-handed conservatism and the slowness with which institutes have reacted to the dramatic changes in the field. The membership of the psychoanalytic societies who do not have 'training analyst' status have experienced a reduction in the number of patients in analysis in their private practice for a significant period of time. Training analysts, by virtue of a steady stream of candidates seeking analysis, have been relatively protected from the full impact of changes in the social environment. Psychoanalytic institutes only began to react to these changes when they were threatened with fewer psychoanalytic candidates from departments of psychiatry and from medicine in general, and in response to the shift of the candidates body to clinical psychology and other professions, including social work and the humanities. Finally, the tendency to withdraw behind institutional walls may be seen in the curious rejection of the easy transfer of candidates and training analysts from one psychoanalytic institute to another, especially in the component institutes of the IPA where the high uniformity of educational procedures would seem to support easy transfer of educational status and functions among these psychoanalytic institutes of different cities.
The Bureaucratization of Criteria for Training vs the Development of True Professional Standards

I have pointed out in earlier work (1998) that two fundamental mechanisms employed by organizations to reduce group regression and a paraonoiogenic ambience under conditions of dysfunctional organizational structures are ideology formation and bureaucratization (Jacques, 1976). Ideologies are shared systems of thinking and beliefs that unite a certain social group in terms of its functions, purpose, and past history. Psychoanalysis, as a belief system, has qualities of an ideology regardless of the fact that it constitutes, at the same time, a bona fide scientific theory and method of treatment. The monopoly of thinking characterizing traditional psychoanalytic institutes, including the presently fashionable ‘pluralism’ (also based on the deciding influence of leading psychoanalysts rather than on objective confrontation by empirical evaluation of alternative psychoanalytic theories), has a protective function in maintaining the cohesion within the institution, and in protecting institutes by such commonality of thinking from the risk of internal fragmentation or the loss of boundary control.

Bureaucratization refers to an excessive stress on rules, procedures, and regulations; practically, in the case of psychoanalytic institutions, the procedures that determine the acceptance, progression, and graduation of candidates, as well as the acceptance of members of psychoanalytic societies, their advances in membership, and the appointment of training analysts. No organization can function without administrative procedures, so that bureaucratic arrangements are an indispensable part of the functional process of the relationship of task groups and task systems within an institution. However, when a dysfunctional organization experiences a threat to its basic fabric, bureaucratic arrangements may proliferate in an attempt to protect the institution from insecurity and excessive mutual suspiciousness. Here bureaucratization provides a certain security and predictability in the face of the feared arbitrariness related to distorted power relationships (in contrast to functional authority).

The lack of scientific research in psychoanalysis also affects psychoanalytic education. The lack of clear criteria of competence in psychoanalytic work, the fact that these criteria are used to determine the quality of the training analyst rather than being objectively verifiable, has resulted in the bureaucratic nature of the discussions regarding the required frequency of sessions, the number of supervision hours of control cases, the presentation of papers for graduation and advancement, in short, in the trend to transform educational concerns into a system that permits easy ‘counting’. As a result, the controversy over the number of weekly sessions (four in the USA, five in the UK, three in France) illustrates how an arbitrary number has become a battle cry for the assumed maintenance of ‘standards’.

What can be done to reduce the development of high paraonoiogenic tendencies in psychoanalytic institutes, with the corresponding idealization processes split off from devaluation and hostility, passive submission, and provocative rebelliousness? What can be done to reduce the subtle, well-concealed sadistic and masochistic forms of acting out that punctuate psychoanalytic education, that are a source of much unhappiness, complaints and even lawsuits? What follows are some concrete recommendations for changes in the administrative structure and related educational approaches in psychoanalytic institutes, geared to transform the organizational structure into a more functional one, and to reduce the high level of paraonoiogenesis. Having made several suggestions regarding many issues that I refer to in earlier work, here I shall integrate them systematically, and propose additional solutions to provide an integrated frame for a new educational structure. Thus, for example, changes in the functions of the training analyst proposed before (Kernberg, 1986, 2000) will now be subsumed in the recommendation for transforming the current training analysis system altogether; criteria for the function of supervision, methods of selection, progression and graduation are spelled out within a coherent overall educational frame; and functional faculty organizations and relationships between institute and psychoanalytic society are explored.

Some Concrete Suggestions

Changing the training analysis system

The wish to assure that the personal psychoanalysis of candidates be carried out at a high level of expertise is reasonable, and one might even say that it is a responsibility of psychoanalytic institutes to assure the quality of the personal analytic experience of their candidates (Sachs, 1947). In fact, it is the professional responsibility of psychoanalytic institutions to assure that all graduates are competent in carrying out psychoanalytic work. One might raise the question whether it is ethically justified that a special ‘high-quality’ group be selected for analyzing candidates in contrast to a ‘lesser quality’ accepted for the analysis of patients in general. The recognition of this disparity was addressed within the French psychoanalytic system, where any full member of the psychoanalytic society may carry out
the personal psychoanalysis of candidates, and, after vigorous protest by the associate members of the Paris Psychoanalytic Society, they too are eligible to carry out the personal analysis of psychoanalytic candidates.

The practical question is whether requiring a certain number of postgraduate years of experience, combined with a specially devised objective examination would be adequate to assure a high quality of competence, and, at the same time, decentralize the distribution of power by broadening the ‘training analyst’ base within the psychoanalytic society. This examination would be available to all graduates, with the implication that it would automatically assign authority to analyze psychoanalytic candidates. It seems reasonable that such an advanced degree of competence in psychoanalytic practice be instituted, but with solid guarantees that this does not serve the purposes of a particular power elite in psychoanalytic institutes, and that the monitoring participation of the psychoanalytic society in such a process or of a university structure, for institutes functioning in such a setting, or of outside entities trusted by all those concerned, be involved. Alternatively, one might argue that optimal standards of training in institutes themselves should assure such a competence of all graduates, but this may be an idealistic stance. A special examination after a certain number of years of postgraduate experience, say five years, may be reasonable as long as it is routinely available to all graduates and members of a psychoanalytic society.

The question of whether the training analysis system should be abolished or modified presents strong arguments on both sides (Amati-Mehler, 2000; Denzler, 1995; Garza-Guerrero, 2002a, 2002b; Gomberoff, 2001, 2002; Greenacre, 1966; Kairys, 1964; Keiser, 1969; Kernberg, 1992, 2000; Kerr, 2004; Kirschner, 2003; Levine, 2004; Lussier, 1991; Meyer, 2003; Michels, 1999; Orgel, 1982; Reeder, 2004; Sandler, 2001; Shapiro, 1974; Thomä, 1993; Thomä and Kächele, 1999; Torras de Béa, 1992; Virsida, 2004; Weinsche, 1982). Garza-Guerrero (2004), in a strongly worded overall synthesis of his critique of the present psychoanalytic educational system in a lead article of the JIP presents the case for radical changes. In a rejoinder to his article, Laufer (2004) presents a conservative critique of it. This debate illustrates again the growing awareness of our educational problems—and the openness with which they are beginning to be discussed by the international psychoanalytic community.

In summary of my assessment, I believe that the toxic effects of the present training analysis system and its stultifying and, in the long run, destructive consequences for psychoanalytic education are beyond doubt. The following arguments support a modification of the system in the direction of providing specific assurances regarding the clinical excellence of psychoanalysts authorized to carry out the analysis of candidates. The development of a candidate’s knowledge of, and personal experience with, the dynamic unconscious, essential for a psychoanalyst, also helps reduce ‘blind spots’ that might interfere with their analytic work and warrants the assurance of excellence of their analysts.

In addition, there is general agreement that psychoanalytic experience continues to grow significantly after completion of the formal psychoanalytic institute training. Thus, for example, a 5 year period between graduation and eligibility of an analyst for the analysis of psychoanalytic candidates, with the provision of evidence of sufficient immersion in psychoanalytic practice throughout that time, would seem evidently reasonable. An objective, general certification process might also be relevant, and here we touch on the problematic issue of psychoanalytic certification in general, which I explore later. For the time being, given the present unavailability of objective standards of competence, the process of appointment to ‘training analyst’ may have to remain in large measure the subjective judgment of examining committees that, in turn, may present the danger of perpetuating a self-selected elite with authoritarian functions and control of a particular institute.

On the other side of the argument—proposing to abolish the present training analysis system altogether—is the question of the subjective and politicized process of the present ways of selecting training analysts (and its related corruption) that has been prevalent in all three regions, and the fact that some candidates and recent graduates may be functioning at a much higher level, revealing much talent for psychoanalytic work, than many graduates with more years of experience and institutional ‘presence.’ Here the argument goes in the direction of candidates being free to find out for themselves who are the desirable and respected psychoanalysts in the community, or psychoanalysts sufficiently distant and independent from the psychoanalytic institute for the candidate to feel ‘safe’ from any mutual interference between personal psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic training. The main argument on this side is the danger that, whatever the process of selection for those authorized to carry out the psychoanalysis of candidates, it will unavoidably perpetuate the pathological power structures presently stultifying psychoanalytic education.

Also, in the view of those who propose to abolish the system, ideally, our educational processes should be such that, when we do graduate a psychoanalyst, we
should be able to trust his capacity for further development of professional competence, and, in this context, abandon the old method of ‘compassionate graduation’: in short, the solution would be a better quality control in psychoanalytic education, so that every graduate should be able to analyze candidates.

I believe that there is an advantage in maintaining a specific quality control for psychoanalysts authorized to analyze candidates, reflected in the requirement of a certain number of years of experience, say five, and the assurance of immersion in psychoanalytic work, with flexible criteria regarding alternative professional functions that equally may represent very well an important commitment to the application of psychoanalytic principles and techniques. An objective assessment by means of a committee constituted of faculty members of the psychoanalytic institute, and also of non-faculty members of the society, should make it possible to keep this an honest process, open to the society's scrutiny of the institute or of any specific 'power group' within it.

The general policy of the institute and of psychoanalytic societies at large should be, I propose, that all graduates be encouraged to obtain a second, high level of confirmation of professional competence, and that institutes should be evaluated critically in terms of the proportion of their graduates who successfully apply for this qualification. Needless to say, that qualification should, by itself, be no guarantee or license for any other educational tasks in the institute, or for any organizational representation, and be totally disconnected from all other educational processes affecting the candidates. The total separation of personal analysis from the rest of psychoanalytic education can only be guaranteed when the analyst carrying out a training analysis, in addition to not having any influence over his candidate's personal career as a student, clearly does not represent the authority of the psychoanalytic institute in a symbolic function as its representative (Garza-Guerrero, 2002a, 2002b; Meyer, 2003; Reeder, 2004; Roustang, 1982).

It may be argued that many analysts who have obtained the second level of certification, and, therefore, are authorized to analyze candidates, would also be interested in obtaining faculty positions as supervisors, seminar leaders, researchers, or accepting administrative functions in the institute or society. It makes an enormous difference, however, if these are roles independently and selectively obtained rather than reflecting the ‘anointment’ of the analyst as the representative of the analytic ideal of the institute and carrier of the power of a defined, professional elite.

In effect, here we reach a fundamental argument presented by Roustang, Garza-Guerrero, Meyer, and Reeder that deals with the contradictory nature of the present training analysis system: the psychoanalytic candidate is expected to resolve the transference in the course of the treatment, while, at the same time, identifying with his psychoanalyst as his institutional ego ideal. Obviously, this issue cannot be eliminated totally, but the separation of the personal analysis from all institute educational structures provides a much better chance to reduce the negative effects of the institutionally fostered idealization of the training analyst on the candidate's attitude regarding technical and theoretical issues and psychoanalysis in general. At the same time, it would seem highly desirable to strictly limit the number of candidates at one time that any psychoanalyst may analyze, in order to avoid, not so

much the ‘convoy’ system (Greenacre, 1966), but the very de-skilling of the psychoanalyst who would see mostly such 'special' cases, and whose narcissism may be significantly affected by the prestige that analyzing candidates now brings with it. I believe no analyst should be authorized to analyze more than three candidates at the same time.

It may be argued that, regardless of how committees are set up to certify the acceptable experience and quality of work of a graduate analyst who is seeking ‘training analyst’ status, this process would inevitably also be contaminated by political influences, theoretical bias, grudges against any particular graduate on the part of his training institution, etc. Obviously, if there existed serious evidence for incompatibility with such a promotion because of malpractice, ethical problems, incapacitating illness, etc., this would have to be documented, and a mechanism for the redress of grievances put in place for anybody feeling prejudiced against. Still, the question of political considerations and bias may not be eliminated altogether.

The present system of purely subjective evaluation of applicants for training analysis status, before more objective, generally agreed-upon criteria are in place, is obviously imperfect. It is, however, preferable, I believe, to use this imperfect approach to offer the possibility to all interested graduates to be certified at a higher level of expertise and to be authorized to analyze candidates than to maintain the present, restrictive training analysis system. Such a certifying process, generally available as a second level of evaluation to all graduates, would eliminate the tightly controlled power elites from many institutes, and demystify the symbolic function of the training analyst as a representative of the institute's ego ideal and supreme exponent of psychoanalytic practice. The percentage of graduates who would apply and be certified at this second level would also provide an indication of the extent to which the local institute is a truly functional educational institution rather than a politically overshadowed one: the extent to which a low percentage of such certifications takes place, might indicate the acknowledgment of failure of the educational process in that society's institute.

If this proposed system were too complex, ridden with bureaucratic complications, inordinately absorbing resources of the psychoanalytic community, I believe that the alternative process would still be preferable, that is to authorize all graduates from the institute to psychoanalyze candidates as well. This 'worst-case' scenario would be compensated
immediately by the awareness of future candidates that it is in their interest to select from among the locally available analysts, those with a certain number of years of experience and recognized professional expertise.

This ‘worst-case’ scenario, however, has also been considered a ‘best-case’ scenario by those who propose to abolish the training analyst category and function altogether. It may be argued, in support of this proposal, that, if the potential responsibility for analyzing candidates were delegated to all institute graduates, this would reinforce the institute's commitment to their optimal training, and to good-quality control for graduation. It also would increase the pressure for optimal training and quality control of the supervisors. And, last but not least, it would assure the abolition of the training analysis system more clearly than the alternative proposal of several years of post-graduate experience, immersion and certification.

It would demystify radically the personal analysis in terms of the idealization of the analyst as a member of an ‘anointed elite.’

Against these considerations, however, are the facts that analytic expertise continues to increase after graduation with years of immersion in analytic work, and that a specialty examination offered to and expected to be undertaken by the large majority of graduates may become an objective, public process, with explicit expectations and procedures, and protected from bureaucratic sterility by its linkage with explicit educational goals of the institute and the profession. The percentage of graduates who obtain this certification certainly would reflect on the quality of the respective institute. The establishment of control mechanisms in the form of channels for redress of grievances should assure the objectivity of the corresponding examination. And a graduate psychoanalyst should be able to tolerate taking an examination.

One solution that seems to me unacceptable and yet, in the light of past experience, a dangerous temptation would be to assert that all is well with these proposals, except that, before a new method is put into place, research must be carried out regarding the desirable objective criteria for certification that would confer the authorization of all satisfactory graduates who apply after a certain number of years from graduation: ‘No change before we have completed such a research.’ This argument has been applied to other proposed institutional changes in psychoanalysis and usually masks a cynical effort to maintain the status quo, and mocks the terminology of research for this purpose (sometimes by the same persons who have serious reservations about the value of empirical research in the psychoanalytic realm). If the analysis underlying my recommendations is correct, the urgency of our need to innovate psychoanalytic education is such that endless delay in changing the training analysis system may be further aggravating the difficult situation that psychoanalytic education experiences at this time. Research on this process should go on in parallel to change.

The authorization to analyze psychoanalytic candidates should not carry with it any other authority in the psychoanalytic institute, be it of a supervisory, seminar leadership, or administrative nature. As mentioned before, the personal analysis of psychoanalytic candidates should be disconnected completely from the rest of psychoanalytic training, as is already the case in the French system. It would seem reasonable, however, that the analyst who will carry out such an analysis of a candidate should confirm to the psychoanalytic institute that he or she is, indeed, carrying out this analytic treatment, and notify the institute regarding either the completion or the suspension of the analysis.

It is desirable that a significant overlap takes place between the personal analysis and the analysis of control cases on the part of the candidate. This could be assured by an early assignment of as many control cases as possible to the candidate, rather than the ‘one by one drop’ system still prevalent in many institutes. The custom of forcing psychoanalytic candidates to stay in personal analysis until their graduation is an illustration of the arbitrary and authoritarian misuse of psychoanalytic treatment for bureaucratic purposes.

Should a minimum of sessions per week be required for such a psychoanalytic experience? From the point of view of optimal exposure to a psychoanalytic experience, a high frequency is desirable, but may have to be limited by individual considerations as well as different models of psychoanalytic education. I believe it would be reasonable to put an absolute minimum at a three sessions per week basis, recommending the experience of one or several periods of higher frequency of sessions, which would incorporate all the different psychoanalytic traditions, and certainly leave open the possibility for training analysts within different educational systems to recommend a higher number of sessions per week that corresponds to their convictions and experience. And it needs to be kept in mind that analysands with significant narcissistic pathology require a higher frequency of sessions than those where this is not a significant aspect of their character structure. On the other hand, a more radical model, that places the entire responsibility for the psychoanalytic experience in the hands of the analyst and his analysand, would leave it to the analysts and their analysands themselves to decide the pace of their analysis. This would require a conviction about the professional responsibility and trust in our graduates, and confidence in the educational methods of the institute in realistically assessing the level of the candidates' work: in my view, that does not correspond to contemporary reality. Such a delegation of authority requires an
institutional maturity and level of educational efficacy that may appear utopian at this time, but would not seem out of the question in the future—if everything goes well with psychoanalytic education.

By the same token, the relationship between the personal psychoanalysis and all other aspects of training would be reduced to a minimum, with the understanding that the analyst may terminate a psychoanalysis of a candidate that he or she believes is not viable, but without any communication to the institute other than the fact of this interruption or termination. Any other communication about a candidate to the psychoanalytic institute should be considered an ethical violation of the principle of confidentiality, and possibly disqualify the analyst from further assumption of such responsibilities.

Supervision

The selection of supervisors would become the main concern of psychoanalytic institutes, and should be carried out on the basis of evidence provided by members of the psychoanalytic society that they are proficient in the skills implied in psychoanalytic supervision. This proficiency may be demonstrated in group supervisions within the institute as well as in the postgraduate activities of the society, in the presentation of clinical work that conveys a sense of knowledge, capacity to transmit such knowledge, and personal qualities commensurate with an empathic, sensitive, and totally incorruptible attitude toward educational responsibilities. The supervisor’s functions should include the capacity to spell out to the candidate a general frame of psychoanalytic technique as the background against which concrete interventions suggested in each case are warranted, and to help the candidate link such a general theory of technique with the practical interventions in clinical work. It may seem trivial to state this: but, in practice, a lack of such an integrative frame of psychoanalytic technique is quite prevalent among supervisors, a reflection of the equally frequent absence, in psychoanalytic education, of a concerted effort to provide such a frame. The supervisor should be able to transcend such a lack, if it existed.
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Undoubtedly, there are different roads toward proficiency in psychoanalytic supervision. Some supervisors proceed from an intuitive attitude (‘a preconscious grasp of cognitive issues’) to cognitive clarity, while others proceed from a cognitively clear intellectual frame, moving gradually into a more intuitive range (Arlow, 1963; Baudry, 1993; Blomfield, 1985; Greenberg, 1997; Levy and Parnell, 2001; Martindale et al., 1997; Target, 2002, 2003; Wallerstein, 1981). An empathic, introspective grasp of clinical material, in any case, should be translated by the supervisor into a formulation that reflects the application of a theoretical frame to that material and of a theory of technique related to it. The supervisor’s denial of the relationship between concrete interpretive interventions and an implicit theory of technique, attributing all analytic interventions to purely ‘intuitive’ understanding, may not only create the danger of an excessive tendency to engage in the supervisee’s countertransference exploration, with a corresponding distortion of the supervisory relationship, but also in disparate interpretations that may make it very difficult for the supervisee to grasp the underlying principles that determine the interventions being suggested by the supervisor.

In short, I believe that it is the supervisor’s responsibility to link concrete interventions with a communication of his underlying theoretical frame. He or she should be able to help the supervisee not only with the concrete interpretation of the material at any particular point, but with developing an internal frame that permits him to creatively apply his theory of technique to different circumstances. The supervisee should be encouraged to integrate his own theoretical frame while acquiring the freedom to integrate his knowledge, his intrapsychic exploration, and his attentively listening to the patient and observing his behavior into one pool of information that needs to be understood and prioritized (‘the selected fact’). It may appear trivial to spell this out, but such a technical skill on the part of the supervisor requires a clarity of thinking on his part, the capacity for clear communication, and a willingness to share his thinking, including his doubts and uncertainties regarding the concrete issues at hand, with a candidate. The demand on the supervisor, therefore, is of a comprehensive understanding of psychoanalytic technique and, at the same time, knowledge of the spectrum and depth of the candidate’s exposure to teachings about technique in seminars and other supervisions, in order to clarify different approaches, reduce discrepancies, provide enrichments, while still respecting the candidate’s autonomy to develop his own theoretical frame, rather than insisting that the candidate think and analyze as the supervisor does.

The supervisor’s willingness to illustrate his explanations with experiences from his own cases may be very helpful, in contrast to a quite prevalent attitude at part of which the supervisor says very little and maintains an atmosphere of ‘anonymity’ that imitates the style of psychoanalytic treatment. This stance may cause regressive and paranoid effects in the supervisee. The supervisor’s awareness of the advantages and disadvantages of reviewing entire sessions, segments of them, or an entire period of analysis; the advantages and disadvantages, in short, of the supervisor’s exploring macro- and microstructures, his sophisticated knowledge of the literature of psychoanalytic technique—all should be assumed as included in the responsibilities and skills of the supervisor.
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It may well be that one of the requirements for becoming a supervisor may be a certification process of professional competence as described before, with the clear understanding that a large majority of all graduates of an institute would be motivated for such a certification and that, therefore, the certification process would not become a political obstacle in the way of appointing supervisors. In addition, supervisors may be authorized by a set of criteria for selecting supervisors, objectified by the demonstration of these skills in group supervision or supervisors' training sessions. I believe it is realistic to establish objective criteria for assessment of the quality of the supervisor, by identifying explicit criteria and instituting a means of monitoring adherence to good supervisory practice.

The lack of concern with the standards of psychoanalytic supervision is a major problem of contemporary psychoanalytic education, resulting in incompetence in some cases, and even in corruption of the educational process, as candidates submit, at times, to incompetent supervisors, and some irresponsible supervisors avoid taking an active stance regarding candidates' difficulties. Supervisors should be clearly aware of their educational and non-therapeutic functions. For example, they should respect fully explore countertransference issues only to the extent to which they affect the psychoanalytic process of the candidate's treatment of his patients, and not engage in a pseudo-therapeutic attitude that imitates psychoanalytic encounters and blurs the boundary between personal analysis and an educational experience.

Supervision should be a collegial experience between colleagues of different levels of knowledge and experience, and promote the autonomous development of the candidate, at the same time as the supervisor carries out a monitoring function that includes the quality control of the candidate's work. In fact, I believe that, clinically, supervision is the very centerpiece of psychoanalytic training, and, both in the form of individual supervision and group supervision, should provide optimal learning opportunities for the candidate as well as an ongoing monitoring of the candidate's development. In some places, it has been suggested that it is impossible to combine the task of helping the candidate in the treatment of his patient 'to be supportive' with the task of an objective evaluation of him. I believe that this is an absurd assumption. Every teacher has the combined task of teaching and evaluating the student. If a supervisor cannot combine these two essential functions of supervision, he should not carry out this task.

One important aspect of the supervisor's work is the utilization of his knowledge of 'parallel process' (Arlow, 1963; Baudry, 1993; Kernberg, 1992) and of its limits. The understanding that unresolved problems in the transference/countertransference constellation of the supervisee's work with a patient may show up as a distortion of the immediate interpersonal relation with the supervisor has been a valuable contribution to the possibility to clarify such introjected yet 'non-metabolized' aspects of the transference/countertransference bond. The supervisee now unconsciously reflects this unresolved issue in the supervisory session, often with an unconscious identification with that aspect of the patient that the supervisee has not understood while yet intuitively sensing it, and projecting on to the supervisor aspects of himself in reacting to that challenge. The tactful interpretation of the distortion in the interpersonal relation

in the supervision derived from the activation of such a parallel process may be a very helpful aspect of supervision. It requires, however, not only intuition and tactfulness on the part of the supervisor, but also the capacity to respectfully explore only those aspects of the countertransference that he assumes have been activated by a specific problem of the patient, to help clarifying the transference of the patient in this context.

This process may require the supervisor's sharing with the supervisee his own emotional reaction to the changes in the relationship between them. It is a delicate process that has to be protected from acquiring a therapeutic function, and must respect the supervisee's private life, avoid inquiry into unconscious origins of the supervisee's countertransference reaction, and maintain the sharp focus on the patient's transference. Utilization of parallel process for teaching purposes, however, should also take into consideration the parallel process of the supervisor, who, at times, may be involved in a conflictual relationship with the institute and express it indirectly in a distortion of his relationship with his supervisee. One aspect of the introspective process on the part of the supervisor should involve his reflection on the extent to which he feels under pressure from the psychoanalytic institute in connection with this supervision, in addition to what we expect from a supervisor's honest exploration of his own general motivation and attitude. A consistent concern about the potentially paranoiac aspects of all supervisory relations should be part of a genuine knowledge base and educational expertise of the supervisor.

An interesting illustration of the risk of authoritarian contamination of the supervisory process, and its paranoiac implications, is reflected in a research project on supervision (Wallerstein, 1981), and particularly Shevlin's (1981) chapter in that book, expressing the conflicts of a candidate in a particular supervision. Shevlin's chapter is a moving contribution to the illustration of authoritarian pressures in psychoanalytic education.

Supervisors must have the willingness and courage to express their critiques or misgivings directly to the supervisee. Supervisory reports should be discussed in such a way that the supervisee feels free to disagree with the supervisor without having to fear any negative consequences evolving from such a disagreement. A similar need for honesty and courage may arise at a different place, namely, in the relationship between the supervisor and the progression committee. The discussion of candidates by the progression committee on the basis of the reports from seminars and supervision
obviously would give primary importance to the supervisors' views, and supervisors should be invited to participate in this process, rather than progression committees making decisions about a candidate without the presence of all the supervisors who are involved with him. In very small institutes it may be possible that a joint meeting of all the supervisors and seminar leaders with the progression committee provide a maximum of openness, shared information, and objectivity regarding a candidate's evaluation. An ombudsman or individually assigned mentor acting as the candidate's 'advocate' should also be able to participate in such meetings, and, as a facilitator specifically concerned with reducing paranoiac effects of the evaluative process, discuss with the candidate his situation in the institution. A perversion of such an ombudsman or adviser's function—not infrequent

- 1668 -

in some institutes—is the crossover role of the adviser to provide feedback on the candidate's progress to the committee, thus engendering a paranoiac climate in which the candidate is inhibited from making full use of the mentor for fear of jeopardizing his progress.

Additionally, supervisors should be thoroughly acquainted with the overall curriculum and where supervisees are within that curriculum, as well as the range of psychopathology they have studied as clinicians. Any potential discrepancies between a particular supervisor's technical approach and that of the general theory of technique the candidate has been learning should be clarified. A non-authoritarian psychoanalytic institute should permit the candidate to freely explore alternative models of technique, to compare the approaches of different supervisors, and to raise these issues at clinical seminars without the fear of reproach.

How can we train good supervisors, given the general lack of knowledge regarding pedagogical principles prevalent in psychoanalytic institutes? Consultation with experts in educational methodology may be helpful. The careful selection of faculty in charge of group supervision of the analysis of control cases may be an important contribution to this issue; training seminars for supervisors based on the criteria referred to in this section may increase the skills of those who are talented in this area.

Part II of this study presents concrete suggestions regarding the curriculum, the selection, progression and graduation of candidates, and the governance of psychoanalytic institutes.

Translators

Die künftigen Veränderungen in der psychoanalytischen Ausbildung: Teil I. Dieser Beitrag beginnt mit einer kritischen Betrachtung der Literatur über die psychoanalytische Ausbildung und konzentriert sich auf die Kritik an den strukturellen Aspekten unserer Ausbildungseinrichtungen. Im Anschluss daran wird die Notwendigkeit radikaler Veränderungen in der Organisationsstruktur der Institute begründet, wobei die Probleme des Systems der Lehrenanalyse im Mittelpunkt stehen. Es werden konkrete Lösungen in Form von Veränderungen vorgeschlagen, die sowohl die Träger der Verantwortung für die persönliche Analyse der Kandidaten betreffen als auch die Auswahl und Funktion der Supervisoren.

Las modificaciones inminentes en la formación psicoanalítica: Parte I. Este trabajo presenta un panorama crítico de la literatura sobre la formación psicoanalítica, y se centra en la crítica a los aspectos estructurales de los institutos psicoanalíticos de formación. El trabajo argumenta la necesidad de establecer modificaciones radicales en la estructura organizativa de los institutos, dedicando una especial atención a los problemas derivados del método del análisis didáctico. Se proponen soluciones concretas a estos problemas, que implican modificaciones tanto en la asignación de responsabilidades para el análisis personal de los candidatos, como para la selección y la función de los supervisores.

Les changements à venir dans la formation psychanalytique: Partie I. Cet article présente une revue critique de la littérature sur la formation psychanalytique, l'accent étant mis sur la critique des aspects structuraux de nos instituts de formation. L'article présente par la suite des arguments en faveur de la nécessité de changements radicaux dans la structure organisationnelle des instituts, et se concentre sur les problèmes soulevés par le système de formation analytique. Des solutions concrètes à ces problèmes, sous la forme de changements à la fois dans l'attribution des responsabilités pour l'analyse personnelle des candidats et dans la sélection et la fonction des superviseurs, sont proposées.

Imminenti modifiche nella formazione psicoanalítica: Prima parte. Questo articolo presenta una rassegna critica della letteratura nel campo della didattica psicoanalitica e si concentra sulla valutazione degli aspetti strutturali dei nostri istituti di formazione. Il lavoro argomenta la necessità di modifiche radicali
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nella struttura organizzativa degli istituti, con particolare riferimento ai problemi presentati dal metodo dell'analisi didattica. Vengono proposte soluzioni concrete a tali problemi, che comprendono modifiche sia nell'assegnamento di responsabilità per l'analisi personale dei candidati sia nella selezione e funzione dei supervisori.
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