Change from within in a traditional psychoanalytic institute: 25 years of debate and transformation at the Israel Psychoanalytic Society

Emanuel Berman

Dedicated to the memory of Helmut Thomä

In: Peter Zagermann (ed.), *The Future of Psychoanalysis: The Debate about the Training Analyst System*. IPA & Karnac, 2016.

The Israel Psychoanalytic Society, and its training body, the Israel Psychoanalytic Institute, were founded by Max Eitingon in 1933-1934, shortly after he had to leave Berlin. The institute is actually named the Eitingon Institute, although this title is rarely mentioned in recent years. The Society became an IPA component society from its first days (Rolnik, 2012). For many years it was a rather traditional organization. In the past quarter century, however, it went through rather radical changes, some of which were reached by consensus, whereas others were the final outcome of fierce debates, and may be controversial to this day.

In this chapter I will summarize some of these changes, starting roughly around 1990 – when I was a junior faculty member at the Institute – and reaching the time of writing in 2015. Let me say at the outset that I make no claim to be objective. I was quite active myself in promoting several of these changes, and I view the process as constructive, on the background of my criticism of what I see as major pitfalls of traditional psychoanalytic training, which I will briefly outline.

I am myself a graduate of the Israel Psychoanalytic Institute (IPI), having been trained in 1977-1984. This was my second analytic training, after graduating in 1976 the Postdoctoral Program in Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis at New York University (Berman, 2010). Returning to Israel from studies and work in the US in 1976, to join the faculty of the University of Haifa, I knew that in order to become part of the local psychoanalytic community I will have to undergo additional training, as the NYU program does not belong to the IPA. I was welcomed by the IPI, my studies at NYU allowed me to be exempted from introductory courses, but by and large I went through a full training program again. I never regretted it. I learned more and benefitted from a second analysis and from three new stimulating supervisions. The comparison between my two training experiences was very instructive.

To give just one example of the contrast: at NYU, while I was a young beginning clinician, I became one of the representatives of the candidates to the program senate, its governing body, and therefore a partner in all decisions about curriculum, procedures and even faculty appointments. At the IPI, while being by that time the head of the clinical psychology program at the University of Haifa, I was clearly expected to be (as a Hebrew idiom says) "a small head", and we the candidates were

never consulted about anything. So whereas I appreciated the Institute and its faculty, some of my positions after joining the faculty myself could be seen as an effort to find a synthesis between the high quality and serious investment of a traditional IPA institute and the innovative and egalitarian spirit of the (non-IPA) NYU program (Aron, 1996), with which I identified.

The major pitfalls of traditional psychoanalytic training

The most widespread model of psychoanalytic training is based on the structure of the Berlin Institute, established by Max Eitingon in 1920. An earlier attempt by Sandor Ferenczi to start a psychoanalytic institute took place in Budapest in 1919 but was short lived owing to political upheavals in Hungary. In view of Ferenczi's strong anti-authoritarian views, it is fascinating to speculate what the style of worldwide training would be today if his institute had retained its seniority. In reality, however, the "Eitingon model" became the dominant one, and Eitingon made active efforts to spread it around the psychoanalytic world (Schröter, 2002). In spite of continuous criticism since the 1940s, changes in this model appear to be slow and hesitant.

Historically, the debate on the damaging aspects of training was opened in London by Balint, Ferenczi's disciple. In Ferenczi's spirit, Balint (1948) clearly outlines the need for a critical view avoiding denial and strives to explain "the curse of strifes which seem to adhere inevitably to our training organizations" (p. 167). Balint's central concern is that candidates are "far too respectful to their training analysts," developing "submissiveness to dogmatic and authoritarian treatment without much protest" (p. 167). The secessions of Adler and Jung, Balint suggests, made Freud believe "that the new generation should learn to renounce part of their self-assertion and independence, to be educated to discipline and self-discipline and to accept an authority with the right and duty of instructing and warning" (p. 170).

Bernfeld (1962) attributes much of the rigidity of the Eitingon model to the "Prussian spirit which rather flourished among the founders of the Berlin Institute," and to the anxiety aroused by Freud's cancer and the imminent threat of his loss, which his colleagues dealt with by "establishing a solid dam against heterodoxy" (p. 467). The result was the introduction of rigid selection and the subjection of newcomers to "a coercive, long drawn-out trial period of authoritarian training" (p. 467). Traditional training, Bernfeld suggests, "distorts some of the most valuable features of psychoanalysis" (p. 458); "institutionalization does not encourage thinking" (p. 468), he adds.

Rustin (1985) studies the tension in psychoanalysis between intimacy and self-exposure, on one hand, and formal regulation and institutionalization, on the other. He concludes: "Orthodox forms of analysis and also supervision require a structured inequality of relationships. The more orthodox the analytic practice, the more hierarchical the organizations through which it takes place" (p. 151). Zusman (1988) coins "the Eitingon syndrome," which he describes as the basis of sectarianism,

religiosity, and abuse of power in psychoanalytic institutes. Lussier (1991; see Wallerstein, 1993) highlights the inherent contrast between the goal of encouraging candidates to search for the truth and the rigid setup of rules and rituals. Lussier calls for safeguarding the privacy of a candidate's personal analysis and advocates avoiding any regulation of that analysis by the institute, except for the requirement that the analyst be reasonably experienced (e.g., practicing at least five years after having graduated).

Kernberg (1986) starts his involvement in the debate by expressing concern about indoctrination, about uncritical discussion of Freud, and about the reluctance of teachers to present their clinical work. While our expected models for psychoanalytic education would seem to be either the art academy or the university college, he suggests that, in reality our institutes are closer to technical trade schools where defined skills are taught without encouraging creativity, or to monasteries and religious retreats founded on faith (p. 810). Kernberg also published a humoristic study of "30 methods to destroy the creativity of psychoanalytic candidates" (1996), and a comprehensive critique of psychoanalytic education (2000).

My own critique of traditional training (Berman, 2000, 2004) focuses on the dangers of the utopian dimension in training and particularly of the utopian New Person fantasy often identifiable in the more ambitious rationales of analytic education. I compare these phenomena in psychoanalytic education to the high aspirations, which may result in a tendency to humiliate individuals seen as insufficiently adapted to the New Person fantasy, in various religious and ideological traditions in human history (the variation I studied most closely is the early kibbutz movement in Israel [Berman, 1988], but there are many more). I relate these aspects to the frequent tendency toward idealization of analysis and analytic training, to potential persecutory aspects, and to the "analytic false self" components that may emerge within a new analyst's identity, when fulfilling expectations, complying and identifying with authority figures substitutes for a genuine process of individuation and self discovery.

Several characteristics of the "utopian state of mind" may contribute to its risks. Its emphasis on desiderata, and constant comparisons with a valuable end-state, may interfere with the full appreciation of the complexities and inner contradictions of existing reality. Splitting between the flawed present and the yearned for improved future may imply blindness to the inherently paradoxical and conflictual nature of human existence. The seriousness, strictness, and moralism of utopianism may push aside humor and irony, often necessary preconditions for a "live and let live" flexibility. Attributing emotional needs to condemned sources (evil, sinfulness, greed, materialism, narcissism, etc.) may prevent tolerance of the unavoidable imperfection of individuals and rationalize a judgmental and persecutory attitude toward them. Believing that goals sanctify means, one may forget how means mold outcomes. In structural terms, a utopian state of mind is dominated by a perfectionistic ego ideal and a rigid superego, at the expense of ego and id alike.

Our training system, Balint (1948) says, contrary to its conscious aim of developing a strong critical ego, necessarily leads to "a weakening of these ego functions and to the formation and strengthening of a special kind of super-ego" (p. 167). "Idealization processes and an ambience of persecution are practically universal in psychoanalytic institutes," Kernberg (1986, p. 815) suggests. Among the topics idealized in our literature (Berman, 2004) I would list the notion of analyzability as an absolute attribute of the patient; the idea of a standard "correct technique"; the belief in "being fully analyzed" or its later version of "structural change"; the related sharp differentiation between psychoanalysis and psychotherapy; the belief that applicants for psychoanalytic training can be objectively screened; and the pressure for a continuous thorough evaluation of trainees, when "candidates are subject to a process of judgment which is necessarily experienced as a judgment of themselves as persons" (Rustin, 1985, p. 152). This is a major source of "the paranoid atmosphere that often pervades psychoanalytic institutes… [with a] devastating effect on the 'quality of life' in psychoanalytic education" (Kernberg, 1986, p. 803).

The training analyst as a superior analyst

A central idealization concerns the training analyst. Although many authors agree nowadays with Ferenczi and Rank (1924) that "the correct didactic analysis is one that does not in the least differ from the curative treatment" (p. 60), the image of the training analyst as a superior analyst is still prominent in the literature, and much has been written about the outstanding qualities expected of training analysts. Such descriptions are very appealing, but I have some doubts whether they fit the way any of us are described in informal conversations among colleagues or trainees.

Moreover, while the goal is to make sure that candidates benefit from high-quality analysis and supervision, it appears that the appointment of training analysts is very often influenced by transferences, political alliances, charisma, visibility, personal popularity, rumors, and other factors not necessarily related to quality per se. "Discretion, secrecy and uncertainty about what is required to become a training analyst, how these decisions are made, where and by whom" are listed by Kernberg (1996, p. 1039) as widespread phenomena that sabotage the creativity of faculty members, and subsequently of candidates.

The belief that training analysts can be chosen as the best according to objective standards appears to disregard intersubjective emotional reality and social processes. Experience shows that views about most analysts vary, and even senior colleagues may be admired by some and criticized by others. Variations in theoretical approach and in preferences for different analytic styles appear to influence such gaps, in addition to purely personal likes and dislikes, which are easily rationalized and intellectualized. Awad (2009) describes situations in which the supposedly objective criteria for choosing training analysts rationalize favoring certain theoretical orientations while blacklisting colleagues holding other views.

In this respect, "objectively choosing the best analysts as training analysts" may be equivalent to "objectively choosing the best applicants to be admitted as candidates"; both beliefs convey disregard for the subjective and intersubjective nature of all interpersonal perceptions and attitudes. Moreover, as every one of us is likely to have in mind a “private list” of analysts we genuinely respect (those to whom we would refer a family member or a close friend), and these lists cannot be all identical with the “official list” of training analysts, the forced idealization of an official list may inadvertently lead to an actual devaluation.

The category of training analyst is itself being criticized by several authors. Bernfeld (1962) writes. "We possess no way by which we can rationally rank our membership into Good, Very Good, and The Best Analysts. . . . By singling out a few members . . . implying that they are the best analysts, we confuse fantasy and magic with reality factors . . . [and] disturb perceptibly the transference in the personal analysis" (p. 481). Lussier (1991; see Wallerstein, 1993) also feels that having a separate class of training analysts is destructive:

> Can the science of psychoanalysis, by definition, admit, without inner inconsistencies, of two classes of analysts: The High Priests and the ordinary ones? For the unconscious phantasy formation of any candidate, the fact of being analysed by a member of the select group cannot but feed the unconscious belief in a special magic power, the phallic power, with which his “special” analyst has been invested. . . .What a fertile ground for idealization, unconscious magical participation to a special power through identification, a pathogenic transferential relation that can hardly be analysed (Lussier, 1991, p. 16).

Meyer created quite a stir in the 2001 IPA conference of training analysts when he described becoming a training analyst as a pursuit of status and power, and discussed training analysis as stimulating narcissistic gratification, fostering an atmosphere with paranoiac qualities, and creating a tyranny veiled in academic clothing. In his subsequent paper (Meyer, 2003) he further elaborates his devastating deconstruction of the "official" training analysis as a fetish and as an ideological structure, and suggests that "every discriminated category of analyses should be abolished" (p. 1257).

Outlining the history of training analysts and institutes, Zusman (1988) speaks of "The Eitingon syndrome.” Eitingon treated Freud's work as sacrosanct and organized the Berlin Institute accordingly. “The Committee” running the psychoanalytic movement acquired the characteristics of a sect or a secret society, and these were transmitted to all institutes, training committees, and local societies. "The Eitingon syndrome is a transference phenomenon defined by the transposition of a petrified bipersonal relationship (Eitingon/Freud) to the institutional level, where it then multiplies by 'regenerating' the original pair in each training analyst and his or her candidate" (Zusman, 1988, p. 361). This observation parallels Benjamin's (1997)

comment, "The seduction by knowledge as power remained the unanalyzed transference in the geneology of analytic training, the unconscious basis of authority that leads us back to our ideal father" (pp. 792–793).

The intrusion of institute dynamics into a candidate's personal analysis, most prominent in those institutes which practice some form of reporting, in spite of the serious arguments raised against it (e.g., Kairys, 1964, McLaughlin, 1967), has provoked Kernberg's (1986) critique of the "hypocrisy and dishonest manipulation" involved in "the dramatic contradiction between hiding one's personality in order not to influence the candidate's analysis while actually influencing the candidate's progression behind his back" (p. 817). McLaughlin (1967) suggests making "every effort to remove the analysis of our candidates, as far as possible, from any institutional connection" (p. 230). Thomä (1993) emphasizes the need to achieve "a climate of freedom, where the analyst is not obliged to supply any information or give an assessment (p. 26), so that "the analysis proceeds as a private affair" (p. 17).

But the issue is not limited to reporting. Another intense intrusion may occur when a candidate is admitted while already in analysis with an analyst who is not a training analyst. Some institutes require termination of the ongoing analysis and initiation of a new one with a training analyst, irrespective of the feelings of either trainee or original analyst. To me this procedure suggests that the idealization of training analysts has led us to lose our respect for the integrity, continuity, and natural course of the analytic process. Consequently we present a negative role model to our trainees. A second analysis is often a blessing (even when the first one was conducted by a senior training analyst), but our analytic experience indicates it should be chosen and timed by the analysand rather than forced by administrators.

Long term impact of inhibiting elements in training

Undoubtedly, we all strive to achieve the best therapeutic results in our analyses and to reach the highest possible standards in training future psychoanalysts and psychotherapists. My criticism is not meant to undermine this goal. To the contrary: I am suggesting that perfectionism, unrealistic idealizations, and a rigid and persecutory atmosphere may lower quality in spite of the honest wish to raise it.

Our fantasy wish may be to find the really suitable professionals, to assign to them analyzable patients with whom they can practice correct technique until structural change is achieved, to let only carefully chosen training analysts analyze them, and to evaluate our trainees continuously to guarantee good results. But this wish involves risky utopian elements and therefore may backfire.

This fantasy wish may stray too far from our clinical experience and from our life experience (Berman, 2000, 2004). In reality we know that all of us, analysts in all stages of professional growth, have our personal and professional strengths and weaknesses; that we all do well with some patients and poorly with others, and we rarely can predict this in advance; that in all levels of the professional hierarchy there

are colleagues we respect and colleagues we have doubts about, and we rarely all agree on such judgments; that good analytic work is creative, individualistic, and never standard; and that all analytic successes are partial and never preclude the need for more treatment in the future.

The inhibiting influences of traditional training do not easily evaporate after graduation. Klauber (1983) writes, "For many years the younger psychoanalyst functions—or at any rate I functioned—in part with an analytical false self… It took me a good ten years of full-time psychoanalytic practice to feel myself a psychoanalyst" (p. 46). Orgel (2002) describes, "In committee meetings, one frequently 'hears' his or her own analyst's voice in the opinions expressed by present and former analysands" (p. 428). Rustin (1985) suggests that the public life of the analytic community is inevitably "influenced by the pressures of the more primitive loyalties and claims on loyalty which arise from the particular relationships in which analysts are trained" (p. 145). Ross (1999) adds: "At almost every stage of their progression, candidates and younger analysts found themselves subject to pathologizing interpretations and to severe rites of passage in the manifest form of successive certifications of competence" (p. 66)

Dulchin and Segal (1982), in a thorough sociological study of the life of a psychoanalytic institute, demonstrate how the informal "leakage" of information, originating in personal analyses of candidates and members, as well as of their relatives and friends, influences all participants in the system, and often inhibits them out of fear of a damaging exposure. One senior faculty member became much more open in a research interview after finding out that the interviewer was not in analysis (p. 32). "The analytic process involved all the junior Institute members in a form of reporting on one another to their senior members" (p. 36).

In other words, the impingements of the training period leave their lasting mark and are also later reactivated in the relationships within the psychoanalytic community. "During training, obviously, candidates are closely scrutinized and evaluated; after becoming fully-fledged analysts, this scrutiny becomes more subtle, but no less important, as selections are made to key teaching, supervisory and administrative roles" (Eisold, 1994, p. 790). Such scrutiny may snowball in some institutes and psychoanalytic societies, until they become haunted by the demons of ruthless perfectionistic judgment, turning at times into character assassination. In such settings, narcissism and other diagnostic terms may play the same function that "sin" and "vice" play in fundamentalist milieus and "bourgeois individualism" in utopian socialist groups.

The important point raised by Rustin (1985) is relevant at all stages of the professional ladder, from applicant to training analyst: "Where 'interpretations' become utilized in everyday life to control individuals or groups, they are often experienced as invasions of privacy, and inhibit instead of supporting the development of individual autonomy" (p. 147).

Individual autonomy is crucial in psychoanalysis, a profession in which the analyst's personality is the major tool, a discipline that teaches us constantly about the illusory nature of all generalized conventional truths, not reached through genuine personal experience. Our clinical effectiveness and our theoretical potency alike are dependent on flexibility; on creativity; on a capacity to use ourselves fully to observe emotional reality freshly, in ourselves and in the other, and to become attentive to our own blind spots and the rigidities that stand in our way. Increasing such capacities is a primary goal of psychoanalytic training, and the factors that hinder them must be of great concern to us.

Bernfeld (1962) suggests that writing regulations and enforcing them "takes the life out of psychoanalysis" (p. 479). Our choice, however, is not between rigid structure and anarchy (Wallerstein, 1993). A stable, containing structure need not be formalistic and impersonal. Unique individual needs of trainees can potentially be legitimized as a crucial element to be taken into account and accommodated by the structure, rather than being stigmatized as a rebellious defiance subverting it and needing to be suppressed.

I am aware, of course, that my thinking also runs the risk of arousing a utopian perfectionistic idealization of its own, of painless psychoanalytic training, of a completely relaxed free institute. Such perfection can never be achieved. Paranoid anxieties are ubiquitous. Learning new skills unavoidably arouses feelings of impotence and helplessness. Criticism may always be experienced as hurtful, but without criticism no growth can be accomplished. Psychoanalytic training can never be all fun and pleasure.

And yet, differences of degree and proportion are at times very important. Having graduated two different institutes, and having taught in more than one, I can attest to significant variations. The atmosphere of an institute may shape the balance between anxiety and excitement, between gradually increased confidence and a sense of being castrated, between a desperate, defensive reliance on a false analytic self (the fantasized Real Analyst as a variation of the utopian New Person) and a better potential for developing an intrinsic analytic identity, which is unique to each of us.

In this respect, an exclusive focus on individual dynamics (conveyed in referring all difficulties "back to the couch" [Kernberg, 1996, p. 1038]) can be defensively abused to deny institutional dynamics and group processes. A personal analysis is naturally geared toward an individual-biographical emphasis; at worst, it may be abused to deny group dynamics, while at best, it can acknowledge them without being able to influence them directly. Open forums for group discussion of candidates and faculty, at times jointly, may be more helpful in resolving training issues than are individual couches.

Psychoanalysis can be seen as a theory about the possibilities of psychic change and also about the limits of psychic change. It has also been applied to the study of

potential change in institutions and organizations, and of the stumbling blocks on the way of such change. It can be self-critically applied to our training structures, allowing a new understanding of inherent difficulties. This understanding can be useful in contemplating reasonable and realistic reforms in our own institutions and in working through the anxieties and resistances any such reforms are likely to generate.

In many national, religious, and social movements, a gap tends to evolve between ideals and the structures created to implement them. This may have happened to us as well. A better understanding of individual and group regressive processes at our institutes may be an impetus for changes in the structure and climate of psychoanalytic training, allowing a better fit between institutional forms of training and its substantial goals of individual growth.

The Israeli experience

I can now return to the specific case I wish to explore, that of the Israel Psychoanalytic Society and its training institute. In past publications, I reported in detail the sequence of what I named "the Israeli controversial discussions" of 1992-1996 (Berman, 1998, 2004), and summarized the subsequent developments of 1996-2003 (Berman, 2004). For the present chapter I chose another structure, focusing on several key issues and making a comparison between 1990 and 2015, a quarter century later.

At the time of writing, in 2015, the Israel Psychoanalytic Society (IPS) has around 250 members, and over 100 candidates undergo training at the Israel Psychoanalytic Institute (IPI). (This proportion guarantees the future of the Society for some decades, in contrast to societies in which the member-candidate proportion is much more skewed, implying an unavoidable gradual decrease in membership). The classical theoretical orientation of the past has been gradually broadened, and today one can sense in the Society strong influences of Klein, Bion, Winnicott, Kohut, French psychoanalysis and relational-intersubjective trends. There is no "mainstream" any longer. This heterogeneous picture, while it is a blessing in my view, also presents certain difficulties for candidates (Berman, 2014). The Society's home is in Jerusalem, but in recent years most activity and much of the training has shifted to the Tel Aviv area (the Institute holds one semester in Jerusalem and one in Tel Aviv), on the background of demographic and cultural changes.[1]

The continued success of the Institute, in spite of growing competition,[2] can be attested by the fact that 24 qualified applicants[3] asked to be admitted in 2015, of

[1] Affluent, secular and educated populations continuously move from Jerusalem to the greater Tel Aviv area in recent years, including many analysts. Jerusalem is becoming poorer and more ultra-orthodox, and the possibilities to practice analysis and psychoanalytic therapy in Jerusalem gradually diminish.

[2] For many decades the IPS was the only psychoanalytic organization in Israel, and the IPI offered the only option of psychoanalytic training. In 2000 a new body was created by experienced psychoanalytic psychotherapists, the Tel Aviv Institute of Contemporary Psychoanalysis (TAICP), which is also quite

whom the Admissions Committee chose to admit a dozen, with the help of two in-depth interviews each one undergoes.

Let me review some of the major changes in the IPS and IPI during the past quarter century. Many of the changes are interrelated, so the division is a bit arbitrary, and the full picture will emerge gradually.

Leadership and climate

For many decades the IPS had a strong permanent leadership, composed of a small group of training analysts. Office holders maintained their roles for many years. The IPI was run by a Director (who had to be a psychiatrist) and by a Training Committee, mostly composed of training analysts, which was quite secretive about its procedures, and was in charge of many aspects – admissions, evaluation of candidates, curriculum, decisions about graduation (or dismissal), appointment of training analysts etc. The number of training analysts was very small and new appointments were rare.

Processes of democratization and decentralization started in the 1980s and reached greater momentum in the 1990s. The position of Institute Director was abolished, and new separate committees were established for admissions and for proposing training analysts, thus reducing the absolute power of the Training Committee. A new Ethics Committee was created as well, and a Program Committee was elected relieving the Society Board from this function. Rotation in all positions – IPS officers, committee chairs and members – became mandatory, and no one could fill a position for more than three years, so a much larger proportion of the membership became involved in decision making. Chairs of the Admissions and Training Committees have to be training analysts, but many members are younger colleagues, some of them recent graduates. Although not stated in the bylaws, members in key positions never return for a second term later on, so the expectation is for "fresh blood" in important roles.

This creates at times instability, when a newly elected committee reverses the policy of its predecessors. For example, one Training Committee changed the curriculum to an elective structure, with seminars composed of candidates at different stages of training; a later Training Committee reversed the curriculum to mostly mandatory

---

successful. In spite of much controversy within the IPS in this matter, many of its training analysts also see in analysis and supervision TAICP candidates, or offer seminars as guest faculty at TAICP (Berman, 2004, pp. 149-152). On a few occasions, joint scientific meetings of the IPS and TAICP were held. In 2015 a third institute was created, the Human Spirit Institute (HSI), with a unique Kohutian-Buddhist orientation. Many of its founders are IPS members, some belong to TAICP. Neither TAICP nor HSI joined the IPA. These developments had a complex impact on the IPS, but I do not view them as a central influence on the changes I explore in this chapter.

[3] Until recently only psychiatrists, clinical psychologists and psychiatric social workers could apply. In recent years the applications by psychiatrists decreased, and the majority of candidates are clinical psychologists. In 2014 the IPS decided to also admit school psychologists, developmental psychologists, medical psychologists, rehabilitation psychologists, creative art therapists and bibliotherapists, if they have considerable supervised experience in practicing psychoanalytic psychotherapy. All applicants must be in analysis for at least one year at the time of application.

courses which an incoming class takes together. Such major decisions are always approved by the full IPS membership, and the instability they may cause is counterbalanced by a genuine experience of a democratic process.

During the past twenty five years a tradition has also evolved at IPS of holding yearly meetings in which issues related to Israeli psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic training are openly and informally discussed by all members attending, part of the time in small groups. Parallel to that, the IPI candidates hold a yearly weekend meeting of their own, independently organized and planned, which includes presenting and debating papers as well as small group discussions. The candidates have their committee, which often meets with the Training Committee.

In 2014, when a raise in the regulated cost of supervision was announced, the candidates protested what they saw as an exaggerated financial burden during training. While some faculty members responded angrily and viewed the candidates as demanding, disrespectful and defiant, the Training Committee chose to open a dialogue with them, consulted the IPS membership through internet discussions, and subsequently made some changes in the training program. These changes – although not radical, and not altering the substance of the Institute's requirements – could shorten to some degree the length of training and reduce its cost. I will mention later on some of these recent changes, but above all I wish to emphasize the thoughtful process and the open dialogue with the candidates, which were not possible 25 years ago.

Evaluation, graduation, votes

A central characteristic of the IPI, for many years, was a very thorough evaluation of candidates by the Training Committee. Frequent reports were submitted by supervisors, and long meetings were dedicated to a discussion of the personal characteristics and dynamics of each candidate. Some candidates were expelled. This reality often aroused anxiety and paranoia. But by the early 1980s attempts to expel certain candidates aroused stormy reactions. When the Training Committee considered terminating the training of candidates due to negative reports of a supervisor, other supervisors protested, disputing the negative evaluation; and the opposing views made a decision impossible. This new development was influenced by a greater heterogeneity of the faculty, signified lesser confidence in impartial objective authority, and became part of a more skeptical climate regarding the impact of strict institutional evaluation and control.

In recent years, the Training Committee of the IPI became much less preoccupied with evaluation of candidates, and more invested in attempting to improve training. Without any formal decision, the written evaluation forms were abandoned at some point, to the relief of candidates and most supervisors. Evaluation and feedback have been actually delegated to the three supervisors of each candidate, who have practically become the main representatives of the Institute vis-a-vis the candidate.

Little formal reporting by supervisors and teachers takes place, in spite of some attempts to resume it. The subcommittee for evaluation changed its name, and now defines itself as a subcommittee accompanying candidates through their training.

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

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

Considerable changes were gradually introduced in the form of graduation, though its centerpiece – a written report about one of the analyses conducted during training, including a brief theoretical discussion – has remained the same. In the past this report was read and evaluated by the whole Training Committee, and the final conclusions were reported to the candidate by the committee chairperson (so the candidate was not present in the discussion and never knew who said what). In recent years an ad hoc reading committee of three members is appointed for each graduating candidate (another aspect of decentralizing power); an attempt is made to create heterogeneous reading committees, in which at least one member is identified with the particular candidate's own central theoretical emphasis. The case is discussed openly in a joint meeting of the committee and the candidate, enabling the candidate to respond directly to any critical comments and questions. After approval, or after making required corrections, the candidate presents the case publicly as a graduation event.

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

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

At times, differences of opinion about quality (the case being seen as satisfactory by the supervisor, and as weak by the committee) coincide with theoretical disagreements as to what constitues a serious psychoanalytic treatment. The present heterogeneity of the Institute may in this respect become a threat to the candidates (Berman, 2014). What one supervisor – for example – sees as a welcome expression of analytic holding and provision, another faculty member frowns upon as a confusing boundary violation; and the candidate may be caught in cross fire.

On the other hand, in some instances supervisors confided that they were also critical of the candidate's work, and felt happy that their concerns – maybe not taken seriously enough by the supervisee – were reinforced by another group of analysts not involved in ongoing supervision and in its complex transference-countertransference dynamics.

With a much larger membership and a larger candidate group, general attendance in graduation events is no longer expected, and often the audience consists of the candidate's supervisors, friends and classmates, with only a few "outsiders". Moreover, some candidates ask for a case presentation "by invitation only" for reasons of confidentiality, especially when the analysis discussed is of a mental health professional.

The most significant change regarding graduation is that the vote on admitting graduates of the Institute into the IPS, following their case presentation, was abolished in the early 1990s. Admission as a member of the IPS is now automatic upon graduating its Institute. Only graduates of other IPA institutes, if they wish to join the IPS, are accepted through a vote of the membership.

Around 1990, many Israeli analysts went through three secret votes during their analytic career, and had to receive a two thirds majority in each – a major source of persecutory anxiety. The first vote was upon graduating the Institute, and once passing this vote the analyst became an Associate Member of the IPS. At least two years later, and after presenting a paper to the Society (later on it was decided that the paper can be replaced by a record of active contribution to the Society, for members who did not wish to write a paper), a second secret vote was held, to be accepted as a Full Member. Finally, Full Members wishing to become training analysts had for

several years to go through a (third) secret vote for this role. This voting was abolished in 1996, a central topic to which I will return.

So between 1996 and 2014, only one vote remained – the vote on becoming a Full Member. Not surprisingly, this single vote absorbed all the paranoia inherent in being evaluated by one's colleagues, with criteria which cannot be fully spelled out by anybody. The significance of becoming a Full Member rather than an Associate Member was never clear, but as only Full Members could become training analysts, this was the most significant implication of the vote. In the discussion preceding each voting only positive views were typically heard. Colleagues described their long acquaintance with the person discussed, and gave him or her warm compliments. In most cases, however, some unexplained "no" or "abstain" votes appeared in the ballot. Guessing who cast them became an anxious preoccupation of the person voted upon. Whereas in most cases their number posed no problem, there were several instances throughout the years when the "yes" votes turned out to be insufficient for the two thirds majority required in the IPS bylaws. For example, if a particular colleague received 60% "yes" votes, 10% "no" votes, and 30% "abstain" votes, they were not approved as Full Members – a painful narcissistic injury.

In recent years, this voting procedure became harshly criticized in IPS business meetings. Many members commented that the differentiation between being an Associate Member and a Full Member is meaningless, and the criteria for supporting or not supporting a particular person are extremely vague. With the growth of the Society, many members may not know directly the person voted upon, and they may abstain because they do not have a firm opinion, not as an expression of reservation. Not everyone attends the papers presented, and some of the papers may be rather impersonal, not saying a lot about the presenter. The feeling was that the voting mostly measures personal ties and popularity, and on the other hand – indicates whether a particular member "stepped on the toes" of some colleagues in professional or personal matters.

Moreover, it was repeatedly pointed out, the vote became mostly a symbolic rite of passage. Most of the colleagues who failed to receive a two thirds majority presented themselves for a second vote a year or so later. In the second vote, all of them received enough support to become Full Members (in one case the same person was elected president of IPS a few years later). A possible interpretation is that those members who cast a "no" or "abstain" vote because of a personal grudge or theoretical opposition on the first occasion felt guilty about contributing to a public shaming of a colleague, and changed their vote to "yes" on the second occasion, or else avoided participating in the second voting altogether.

Still, some of the more conservative members expressed concern about abolishing the last remaining vote. They feared this will signify that quality of analytic work becomes irrelevant, and everyone could eventually become a training analyst. A few years ago a special task force proposed abolishing the voting but instead creating a

system of evaluating members' work before they could become training analysts. Many IPS members (including myself) felt, however, that the proposed system is likely to become burdensome, inhibiting and persecutory, and the change will actually be "from the frying pan into the fire". Opposition was so strong that the proposal was not even voted upon.

After many such debates, the IPS Board proposed in 2014 to abolish the "last remaining vote", and to make presenting a paper a requirement for the next step – becoming a training analyst – without any evaluation process. They also proposed creating special seminars for beginning training analysts, to discuss issues of supervision and the unique aspects of analyzing trainees; such (voluntary) seminars were indeed started in Jerusalem, Tel Aviv and Haifa. The Board hesitated between two options: either maintaining the differentiation between Associate Members and Full Members but basing it on factual criteria alone (mostly years since graduation), or giving it up altogether, as happened in numerous IPA societies. In an open vote the second option won a majority, and the IPS now has only one category of membership. In my feeling, these decisions signify the successful culmination of an important long process of making the IPS and the IPI into more egalitarian organizations with much fewer elitist, hierarchical and persecutory elements.

Interventions in the personal analysis of trainees

The IPI has adopted a "non-reporting" policy from an early stage of its existence. Nevertheless, the issue of the Institute's intervention in the personal analysis of its candidates came up in two forms.

First, the question of interrupting ongoing analyses of trainees was the main trigger of the stormy "controversial discussions" of 1992-1996, which almost led to a split in the Society. I described their sequence in full detail elsewhere (Berman, 1998, 2004) and will only summarize them here.

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

others every effort will be made to allow the candidate to remain with his analyst" (A.M. Sandler, 1982, p. 394).

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

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

In the vote the more comprehensive reform won a large majority, and was accepted. The resolution stated: "Each candidate must undergo a personal analysis while going through training in the Institute. The analysis will be conducted by a qualified analyst who is a member of the Society". Spontaneous applause, quite unusual in the Society, followed the announcement of the results. In a brief discussion that ensued, some members expressed great satisfaction, while others gave vent to grave concerns about the quality of future training.

The months following that resolution were particularly stormy. Members alarmed by the change sought to mobilize help from abroad, suggesting that the new policy is incompatible with the regulations of the International Psychoanalytic Association. Supporters of the change saw no such incompatibility, citing the variability in training structures of various institutes recognized by the IPA. Moreover, consultations with IPA leaders made it clear that at the time the IPS resolution was approved only a consultation with the IPA about changing training rules was required, even though at

a later date IPA bylaws were changed to require a formal approval.[4] In reality, the autonomy of the IPS was fully respected, and the IPA never intervened in the Israeli debates.

In view of the concern that the radical disagreements will eventually lead to a painful split, it was decided in 1995 to elect a Task Force, chaired by IPS president-elect Abigail Golomb, which will seek a compromise. The task force, in which all opinions in the Society were represented, made the following recommendations, approved by a business meeting of the IPS in January 1996:

1. Candidates are expected to undergo analysis and supervision with training analysts.

2. The procedure to become a training analyst will be made easier. All existing requirements are to be maintained (five years of membership; full membership; continuous practice of at least three analyses, four times a week; interest in psychoanalysis and activity in the Society; ethical conduct), but the plenary personal discussion and secret vote on each new training analyst are abolished. The Society's board will approve all members who meet all criteria, a month after their names are circulated in order to allow members to raise objections.

3. Candidates who start training while already in analysis with a member who is not a training analyst are expected to switch to a training analyst within two years, prior to seeing their first analysand. If they wish to continue further with their present analyst, so as not to interrupt the analytic process, they may apply to the Training Committee for special permission.

These decisions calmed the atmosphere down, and they are indeed applied by and large in the past 19 years. Requests to continue an ongoing analysis with a non-training analyst are approved mostly when that analyst is rather experienced, and usually rejected when the analyst in question is a recent graduate of the Institute. A few years ago a proposal was raised to legitimize the latter situations as well, while requiring such younger analysts to be supervised by a training analyst on the ongoing analyses of candidates; but this proposal was not approved.

In the last few years, the question of intrusions into personal analyses came up again in another version. The training bylaws have required, for many years, a four sessions per week analysis lasting at least 500 sessions during the period in which the candidate conducts analyses under supervision. A few years ago the Training Committee asked that training analysts submit, before the candidate graduates, a written declaration that this requirement was indeed fulfilled. They suggested this procedure because of rumors that some candidates are not acting honestly; they only have a shorter analysis during the period of training, or see their analysts less than four times a week, so the facts have to be confirmed by the analyst.

[4] To the best of my knowledge, this requirement was never actually applied.

This request aroused another stormy argument. Many training analysts (including myself) felt that this will violate the "non-reporting" policy, by drawing the personal analyst into the official training structure; we argued that the issue is an educational issue, and should be dealt with through discussions of ethics, not through new regulations. Indeed, Thomä (2004) suggests – in line with his view that the candidate's analysis should be "an absolutely private matter" – that "training analysts would no longer be allowed to report how many sessions candidates had undergone and after how many sessions they consider the analysis to end" (p. 219).

Other colleagus agreed with the argument of the Training Committee, that "non-reporting" only applies to the content of the analysis, and to the evaluation of the candidate, but not to confirming the formal requirements, which must be defended. It was eventually decided to apply this procedure, but only to candidates admitted in the future, not to present candidates.

Recently, however, two developments changed the situation. First, the Society's Ethics Committee debated the issue extensively, and ruled that asking for the analyst's signed report does indeed violate the "non-reporting" principle. Roughly at the same time, it was decided to abolish the 500 hour regulation, and to write instead "an analysis of substantial duration".

The background of the latter change was the attempt I mentioned before to make training somewhat less burdensome, in response to protests of the candidates. One of the issues that came up was individual differences in the candidates' history as analysands. Some entered analysis the year before applying to the Institute, knowing that an analysis of at least one year was required for admission. These candidates were usually content with being in a four sessions a week analysis during their training, and the 500 hour rule (which implies about two and a half years) made sense to them. On the other hand, some other candidates entered analysis for personal therapeutic reasons, long before starting analytic training. In some cases the candidate already went through seven or eight years of analysis by the time of admission. In many of these instances both candidate and analyst felt that at that this stage, three sessions a week (or maybe even less) are quite enough, and the requirement is too rigid. (As I will discuss shortly, more than a decade ago the Training Committee decided that, while two of the supervised analyses conducted by the candidate must be of four sessions a week, the third one can also be of three sessions a week. In the private practice of IPS members analyses of three sessions a week are quite common).

The Training Committee reached the conclusion that erasing the 500 session requirement from the bylaws will allow it to discuss more freely with each candidate the format of personal analysis suitable for their present individual needs. The wording "substantial duration" indeed appears in the IPA requirements for training, where no specific period or a cumulative number of sessions are listed. In consequence of this change and of the Ethics Committee's conclusion, the requirement that analysts sign a declaration regarding the candidate's personal

analysis is no longer in effect. The candidates report to the Training Committee the length and frequency of their personal analysis, and the committee can discuss with them whether it appears to be satisfactory.

Analyses conducted by trainees: timing, selection, gender, frequency, length, supervision

Numerous changes also occurred regarding the analyses conducted by candidates under supervision. What remains consistent over the years is the requirement for three such analyses with three different supervisors; although on some occasions the idea was raised to reduce the number to two, as some other IPA societies require. This would have indeed made the training easier. Still, the general feeling (among faculty, members and even many candidates) is that three analyses guarantee greater variability in the characteristics of the analysands, and three supervisions guarantee greater variance in analytic approaches to which the candidate is exposed.

In the past these supervised analyses could begin after the candidate completed two years of introductory courses. When I was a candidate, one of the numerous hierarchies at the IPS and IPI was a division of the candidates into two subgroups: "junior candidates" in their first two years, and "senior candidates" in advanced years. Later on, this division was abolished, and subsequently it became possible to start analyses after three semesters. As part of the 2014 reform it was decided to allow starting supervised analyses after one academic year at the Institute. This development makes perfect sense in view of the fact that almost all candidates are experienced clinicians, typically in their forties and at times older, who already studied psychoanalytic theory extensively before starting the Institute – in their clinical psychology internship, in psychoanalytic psychotherapy schools,[5] in private reading groups, etc. The truth is that they do not need introductory courses at all.

In 1990, and a few years later too, the IPI had a system for screening potential patients to evaluate their analyzability. A candidate wishing to start supervised analysis with a patient (whether their own psychotherapy patient – a possibility discouraged in the past as "the transference was already contaminated by the face to face interaction" – a view which no longer exists; or a new patient seeking analysis) was expected to first refer the patient for a diagnostic interview. In each major city a senior analyst was appointed to conduct the interviews, and these analysts had a final say. The criteria

[5] A unique feature of the therapy field in Israel is the existence and popularity of numerous postgraduate psychotherapy schools, mostly offering three year introductory programs to psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, art therapists etc., as well as advanced programs (focusing on Winnicott, Klein, Kohut, relational psychoanalysis and other orientations) to graduates of such introductory programs. Students in these programs conduct psychotherapy of one or two weekly sessions, and most programs have a clear psychoanalytic orientation. The IPS itself sponsors several such programs, and other schools (where many IPS members and advanced IPI candidates also teach) belong to universities and to private organizations.

were mostly Ego Psychology criteria: ego strength, reality testing, tolerance of frustration, capacity for insight, lack of severe pathology.

Unlike some other changes discussed here, this practice was never formally abolished. It simply evaporated away during the 1990s. Candidates (who, as I mentioned, are usually seasoned psychotherapists in their 40s or older) now tend to find their own analysands, either from their therapeutic practice, or among new referrals they receive. They gradually stopped referring prospective analysands for screening ("there is often no other means of correcting such inexpedient laws than by boldly violating them"; Freud, 1926, p. 235), and instead started discussing the potential analysand with the supervisor who is to supervise the analysis. Nobody appeared to miss the old system, which often contributed to complications and split transference patterns (the interviewer as the real parental figure and the younger candidate/analyst as a substitute, etc.), visibly infantilizing the candidates.

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

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

Personally, when approached by a candidate with such a question, I do not strive to make an objective diagnosis and prediction (I believe, in any case, that individuals with severe pathology can benefit from analysis), but rather to make sure that the candidate is aware of potential risks and complications and of countertransferential stumbling blocks, and does not start the difficult journey with naive expectations, unsublimated rescue fantasies, or denied emotions. In most cases I expect the candidates to make their own decision, after we have reached more clarity about the initial dynamics in the dyad and their relevance to a potential analytic process (Berman, 2014).

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

In terms of the candidates, the different way of accepting analysands has increased their autonomy, and their trust in developing their own unique analytic identity (which may include preferences as to whom to analyze), rather than adopting some standard, "correct" way of analyzing ("analytic false self"). In addition, this change abolishes one source of "long periods of waiting in uncertainty" (Kernberg, 1996, p. 1032). In general, these changes weaken the control of the Training Committee over candidates, while empowering the individual supervisor as the actual representative of the Institute, and empowering the supervisor-candidate dyad (Berman, 2004).

Until recently, every candidate was required to treat analysands of both genders. This became another issue causing delays in graduation; as we know, women seek therapy and analysis more than men, probably due to cultural norms of "masculine self sufficiency". Numerous candidates found three female analysands, but got stuck in looking for a male analysand. As part of the 2014 reform, this requirement was transformed into a recommendation.

In 1990, as before, only analyses of four sessions a week were recognized for training. This created painful situations, when an analysand wished to switch to three sessions a week, either for external reality reasons or for internal dynamic reasons, and the candidate opposed this wish vehemently in order not to lose the analysis as part of one's training requirements. This was a clear example of the way in which a rigid aspect of training pushed candidates to an authoritarian position vis-à-vis their analysands, remote from a more open climate of elasticity in an analysis, in which frequency of sessions can be negotiated by both partners rather than one-sidedly imposed. During the 1990s the IPS Training Committee decided that one of the three required analyses can be of three sessions a week, as are many analyses conducted by IPS members (and most analyses in France and other countries). This helped prevent many of those problematic clashes.

For many years, only analyses lasting at least two years were recognized towards graduation. This created great tension in many analyses, when trainees became very worried that the analysand will drop out before 24 months are completed, and they will have to start another analysis from the beginning and delay their graduation. In some analyses I supervised the quality of work miraculously improved from the 25th month on, when the threat was over. In another analysis I supervised, the patient wanted to terminate in the middle of the second year; but having discovered in the IPS website that only analyses of at least two years are recognized for training, he told his analyst that in order not to sabotage him he will leave the day the two years are over –

which indeed happened. As part of the 2014 reform, the Training Committee allows now greater flexibility. If one supervised analysis ends after more than a year but less than two years, it can be recognized if the other two analyses last over two years, and if in the supervisor's view the candidate's work in that particular analysis contributed to the candidate's professional growth.

One more aspect of the 2014 reform is that after being supervised for three years on a particular analysis, candidate and supervisor can decide whether to switch to meeting once every two weeks rather than every week. Moreover, if the candidate starts a fourth analysis during training (numerous candidates do so), supervision can be by one of the existing supervisors, and the frequency can be chosen freely by candidate and supervisor.

The appointment of training analysts

Probably the most radical changes at the IPI during the last three decades have been in the area of choosing training analysts. Until the mid-1980s, these were decisions reached secretly by the powerful Training Committee. The number of training analysts remained very small, and some experienced colleagues who were in high demand as analysts and supervisors were denied the appointment for mysterious reasons; they were at times approved as ad hoc analysts for particular candidates, but not counted as part of the "chosen".

Towards the end of the 1980s, a process of democratic transformation has started in the IPS and in its Institute. An effort was made to allow a much larger proportion of the membership to become actively involved in decision making and in administrative roles. Many members came to feel that too many functions had become concentrated in the Training Committee. The responsibility for recommending new training analysts was moved to another new committee. The latter committee was requested to reach its recommendations after examining the potential training analysts' professional credentials (the minimum being full membership, five years of membership, and the maintenance of a continuous analytic practice of at least three analyses) as well as their competence; and, if satisfied, to submit their names for a vote by secret ballot of all members (requiring a two thirds majority). This reform was effective, leading to the selection of several new training analysts, after many years during which there had been no more than a dozen training analysts throughout Israel (Berman, 1998, 2004).

The new system created, however, new problems. Members of the new committee for screening training analysts reported great difficulty in conducting an objective evaluation of the quality of potential nominees. It was becoming gradually clearer that such evaluation is conducted in the absence of actual knowledge regarding a member's analytic skills, and is often influenced by transference feelings, charisma, visibility, personal popularity, political alliances, and so on. This realization eventually led to a more radical change.

In discussions held during 1995, many IPS members expressed open disgust with the persecutory and hostile atmosphere generated by the determination to discuss people's "merit", and subsequently voiced the desire to simplify the process of appointing training analysts, and to reduce its judgmental quality. It was also suggested that making it easier to become a training analyst will reduce the number of cases in which incoming candidates have to switch analysts, an issue that – as mentioned before – almost led to a split in the IPS. The task force headed by Abigail Golomb was asked to handle both issues, and as I mentioned before one of its recommendations, adopted by the IPS in 1996, was to change the procedure for appointing training analysts. All existing factual requirements were maintained (five years of membership; full membership; continuous practice of at least three analyses, four times a week; interest in psychoanalysis and activity in the Society; ethical conduct), but the plenary personal discussion and secret vote on each new training analyst were abolished. Ever since 1996, the Society's board approves all members who meet all criteria as training analysts.

As a result, the number of training analysts has considerably increased (to a little more than half of the IPS membership), allowing a real free choice of a personal analyst and of supervisors, who can also be switched by the candidate "with no questions asked". (Free choice has been the official policy for decades, but it was practically meaningless when the number of training analysts in each city was very small).

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

This change also goes hand-in-hand with an intersubjective emphasis, which casts doubt upon absolute "objective judgment" of quality. Even the most senior analysts, we know, may be admired by some and disliked by others, and variations in theory and in style play a role in this heterogeneity: what one values as consistency another suspects to be rigidity, what one welcomes as flexibility another derides as impulsivity, and so on. Unlike committee or group votes, personal choice by the candidate gives full weight to the candidate's subjective preferences and intuitions. My own subjective impression is that the quality of training analysts appointed in the IPS remained equally variable in all three stages: secret decision by the Training

Committee, open debate and election by the Society, and appointment according to factual criteria.

In general, a vast majority of the IPS membership is happy with the present policy. One change approved a few years ago was to accept training analysts who conducted after graduation two four times a week analyses and one three times a week analysis (as is allowed for candidates), and to also accept training analysts whose three post-graduation analyses were not simultaneous but took place over a longer period of time. Recently, with the decision to abolish the category of Associate Member, the requirement to present a paper to the Society, previously needed for Full Membership, was added to the demands of prospective training analysts. New training analysts are now encouraged to participate in seminars discussing supervision and the unique characteristics of analyzing candidates and other trainees and colleagues.

Conclusion

Although many stages in the quarter century process I describe were tense and painful, when some of us enthusiastically fought for change and other colleagues attempted to stop it and expressed grave concerns about its results, my overall conclusion is optimistic.

Unlike numerous psychoanalytic organizations, the IPS did not split, and we saved our trainees the painful experience of choosing between – for example – a beloved personal analyst and an appreciated supervisor, who suddenly belong to two antagonistic organizations. In spite of forceful opposition by more conservative colleagues, transformations in almost all areas of training and organizational structure made the IPS and IPI less rigid, less hierarchical, less persecutory. The emphasis on continuous evaluation at all stages of one's analytic career is greatly reduced, and contrary to alarmist fears, I do not feel the quality of clinical work and of theoretical thinking has been lowered.

My feeling is that our present way of conducting training gives a better chance for individual development, for finding one's unique personal voice as a psychoanalyst, for creating a genuine analytic identity not predominantly influenced by imitation, identification with the aggressor and aspects of a false analytic self.

It should be noted that the IPA never interfered in the changes described. I hope that this is an indication that the IPA no longer defines itself as a controlling authority, but rather as a voluntary alliance of psychoanalysts and psychoanalytic groups maintaining pluralism and respecting local autonomy and a multiplicity of voices.

REFERENCES

Aron, L. (1996), A Meeting of Minds: Mutuality in Psychoanalysis. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.

Awad, G. (2009), Critical thoughts on choosing training analysts. Int. J. Appl. Psychoanal. Studies, 6:263-265.

Balint, M. (1948), On the psychoanalytic training system. Internat. J. Psychoanal., 29:163-173.

----- (1969), The Basic Fault: Therapeutic Aspects of Regression. London: Tavistock.

Bar-Lev Elieli, R. (2001), Discussion of J. Schubert's paper on training models. Psychoanal. in Europe, 55:27-35.

Benjamin, J. (1997), Psychoanalysis as a vocation. Psychoanal. Dial., 6:781-802.

Berman, E. (1988), Communal upbringing in the kibbutz: The allure and risks of psychoanalytic utopianism. Psychoanal. Study Child, 43:319- 335.

----- (1998), Structure and individuality in psychoanalytic training: The Israeli controversial discussions. Amer. J. Psychoanal., 58:117-133.

----- (2000), The utopian fantasy of a New Person and the danger of a false analytic self. Psychoanal. Psychol., 17:38-60.

----- (2004), Impossible Training: A Relational View of Psychoanalytic Education. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press [Routledge].

----- (2010). My way. Psychoanal. Inquiry, 30:116-132.

----- (2014). Psychoanalytic supervision in a heterogeneous theoretical context: Benefits and complications. Psychoanal. Dialogues, 24:525-531.

Bernfeld, S. (1962), On psychoanalytic training. Psychoanal. Quart., 31:457-482.

Dulchin, J. & Segal, A. J. (1982), The ambiguity of confidentiality in a psychoanalytic institute; Third-party confidences: The uses of information in a psychoanalytic institute. Psychiatry, 45: 13-37.

Eisold, K. (1994), The intolerance of diversity in psychoanalytic institutes. Internat. J. Psychoanal., 75:785-800.

Ferenczi, S. & Rank, O. (1924), The Development of Psycho-Analysis. New York: Dover.

Freud, S. (1926), The question of lay analysis. Standard Edition, 20:183-258. London: Hogarth Press, 1959.

Kairys, D. (1964), The training analysis. Psychoanal. Quart., 33: 485-512.

Kernberg, O. F. (1986), Institutional Problems of psychoanalytic education. J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn., 34:799-834.

----- (1996), Thirty methods to destroy the creativity of psychoanalytic candidates. Internat. J. Psychoanal., 77:1031-1040.

----- (2000), A concerned critique of psychoanalytic education. Internat. J. Psychoanal., 81:97-120.

Klauber, J. (1983), The identity of the psychoanalyst. In The Identity of the Psychoanalyst, ed. E.D. Joseph & D. Widlocher. New York: International Universities Press, pp. 41-50.

Lussier, A. (1991), Our training ideology. Paper presented at Fifth IPA Conference of training analysts, Buenos Aires.

McLaughlin, F. (1967), Addendum to a controversial proposal. Some observations on the training analysis. Psychoanal. Quart., 36:230-247.

Meyer, L. (2003), Subservient analysis. Internat. J. Psychoanal., 84:1241-1262.

Orgel, S. (2002), Some hazards to neutrality in the psychoanalysis of candidates. Psychoanal. Quart., 71:419-443.

Rolnik, E. (2012). Freud in Zion: Psychoanalysis and the making of modern Jewish identity. London, UK: Karnac.

Ross, J.M. (1999), Psychoanalysis, the anxiety of influence and the sadomasochism of everyday life. J. Appl. Psychoanal. Stud., 1:57-78.

Rustin, M. (1985). The social organization of secrets: Towards a sociology of psychoanalysis. Internat. Rev. Psychanal., 12:143-159.

Sandler, A.M. (1982), The selection and function of the training analyst in Europe. Internat. Rev. Psychoanal., 9:386-398.

Schröter, M. (2002), Max Eitingon and the struggle to establish an international standard for psychoanalytic training. Internat. J. Psychoanal., 83:875-893.

Thomä, H. (1993). Training analysis and psychoanalytic education: Proposal for reform. The Annual of Psychoanal., 21:3-75.

Thomä, H. (2004), Psychoanalysis without a specific professional identity: A utopian dream? Internat. Forum Psychoanal., 13:213-236.

Wallerstein, R.S., (1993), Between chaos and petrification: A summary of the Fifth IPA Conference of Training Analysts. Internat. J. Psychoanal., 74:165-178.

Zusman, W. (1988), Our science and our scientific lives. Israel Psychoanal. J., 1:351-377, 2003.