The Training Analysis System's Manifold Problems:

An Alternative Conception Proposed as a Solution

Joseph Schachter, M.D., Ph.D.

Judith S. Schachter, M.D.

Horst Kächele, M.D., Ph.D.

We would like to express our appreciation and gratitude to Dr.'s Mario Fischetti, Ph.D., Douglas Kirsner, Ph.D. and Arnold Richards, M.D. for their singular critiques and creative suggestions in regard to our paper.

Acknowledgement

We would like to acknowledge, with appreciation, our numerous references to papers in "*The Future of Psychoanalysis. The Debate About the Training Analyst System"* edited by P. Zagermann. Our original paper has been greatly enriched by the new contributions of those eminent authorities.

History of Training Analysis

Freud (1910) assumed that psychoanalytic education would follow the template of his day's apprentice method in medicine. He observed that "this technique cannot yet be learnt from books", but, "like other medical techniques can be learnt [only] from those who are already proficient at it" (p.226). Freud (1912) subsequently, attributing this insight to Jung, described the need for a personal analysis. He wrote that one of the many merits of the Zurich school of analysis was their "demand that everyone who wishes to carry out analysis on other people shall first himself undergo an analysis by someone with expert knowledge" (pp. 116-117). Kerr (2004) emphasizes that "this alternative to self-analysis was Jung's innovation." (p. 25).

Memorably, Jung offered to psychoanalyze Freud, but Freud demurred because of his concern that doing so would undermine his authority. Kerr additionally referred to a statement by Nunberg in which Nunberg (1960) himself reports that "At the Congress of the [IPA] in Budapest in 1918, Freud suddenly announced that I [Nunberg] had an important statement to make. Taken by surprise, I had to improvise, and made the motion that every analyst be analyzed" (p.44).

Pyles (2017) hypothesizes "It seems that the training analyst system did not arise out of any unique educational or analytic necessity to do it in that particular way, but was, in fact, a natural consequence of the German educational system and methods of child-rearing, which were particularly regimented and hierarchical, or, to use Siegfried Bernfeld's term, "Prussian". This view in turn seems to rest on the nineteenth century German philosophical view of man as an animal full of primitive instincts, who must be 'trained' into civilized behavior. … The Berlin system seems to be mindlessly reproduced, preserved, and reified by the training analyst system" (pp. 225-226).

The Literature about Training Analysis

Mallet da Rocha Barros (2017) notes currently that "the model of psychoanalytic education has not been modified, while the world

around us has changed to the point of being unrecognizable for someone who might emigrate directly from 1920 to our day." (p. 187). Although training analysis has been widely regarded as the core of psychoanalytic education, it has been accepted without much scrutiny and received only modest attention in the literature. PEP lists only a total of 94 papers about training analysis, compared to 487 about depression, 594 about anxiety and 1289 about transference. Schachter et al. earlier (2014) had listed 44 papers critical of training analysis, including seven by Kernberg, supplemented by three important critical books (Kirsner, Reeder and Zagermann). This significant subtotal of critical papers and books within the limited number of publications about training analysis, suggests that training analysis as a subject is a disproportionately criticized issue in psychoanalysis.

Thomä (1993) reaches back to quote A. Freud in 1983 about training analysis: "The heart of the matter is that the problem doesn't seem to have changed much in the last forty-five years! But in listening to you here, I also got the impression that my colleagues who first advocated the introduction of training analysis … - if they had known of all the dangers, of the positive and negative transferences, and splits, and hates, etc., would probably never have advocated it! They would

have said, let them be as they are!" (p.257). She added, however, conversely, that the identificatory learning process transmitted via the training analysis, inspires love for psychoanalysis. Thomä (1993) himself concludes "There is every indication that the present-day crisis of psychoanalysis is an indirect consequence of a training system which, over the past 40 years or so, has ever more extended the length of the training analysis and given it the central position in the training" (p. 12). Berman (2017) makes a related, salient observation to these critical comments that "In spite of continuous criticism since the 1940's, changes in this model appear to be slow and hesitant" (p. 3).

Candidates' Evaluation of the Effects of the Training Analyst Experience Upon the Candidate

American candidates personally seem reasonably satisfied with their training analyses. Satisfaction rates vary only moderately among the three questionnaire studies and one interview study: (Shapiro, 1976, 90 %; Goldensohn, 1977, 72%; Craige, 2002, 77%; Tessman, 2003; Katz et al., 2012, > 80%). Supportively, McCarroll (2007) believed that many candidates at William Alanson White were happy with their training analyst and continue their analyses after they meet session requirements. While most candidates remain with their training analyst

until the analysis is completed (Schachter et al. 2014), the degree that this reflects satisfaction with treatment, rather than professional motivation to achieve a successful graduation has never been assessed. A substantial proportion of graduates, perhaps 30-40%, do engage in later personal psychoanalytic treatment often with another analyst, leading to the familiar refrain; – "one for the institute and one for me". No one has attempted to assess the degree that the candidate's own satisfaction with their own training analysis may subsequently interfere with recognition of scotomata when analyzing their own patients. Supervisory consultation is supposed to expose these blind spots but the literature on supervision is scant.

Meyer (2017) refreshes earlier criticism when he observes that "One of the obstacles present in training analysis previously described is the 'realistic' character of transference, which forces identification of the candidate with the analyst, who is, most of the time, idealized" (p.202). This almost inevitable identification with one's training analyst consequently ends up with analysands conducting their subsequent analytic treatment of patients the way they had been treated despite the differences in demographics of the usual practice. He (2017) observed that "Identification on the candidate's part happens with the person and

the ideology of the training analyst, as well as the infrastructure supporting him." (Meyer, 2017, p. 203). Klauber (1983), in a more personal statement, described the inhibiting influences of traditional training: "For many years … 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). I (Joseph Schachter) remember that when I started my analytic practice I too tried to emulate exactly the way my analyst had worked with me. It took me decades, probably including the mourning noted by Craige (2002), to gradually develop my own style of working analytically.

Anecdotal materials indicate that candidates identifying with their training analysts also are likely to end up emulating those training analyst's traditional views not only on psychoanalytic treatment, but on theoretical and organizational issues as well; these need to be addressed separately.

Many have been aware that even a non-reporting training analyst has institutional power when playing a role in institute administration. Recognition of this reality probably affects the course of the candidate's training analysis, thus making that different from the experience of being psychoanalyzed by an analyst not connected to the candidate's

institute structure. In contrast, for example, how analysis of a cardiologist proceeds, whose professional career continues in a separate orbit from his analyst; they meet as professional peers. Transference and idealization then have a different flavor and can be dealt with more easily than in the analysis of a candidate,

Pyles (2017) cites a different critique of the training analysis: "The result is often collusion between analyst and patient to avoid the negative transference, resulting in narcissistic idealization of the analyst, identification with him, and a desire to become like him and protect his belief against all comers." (p. 228). He then concludes, "the training analysis system produces a situation which is essentially anti-analytic, seriously compromises the quality of the analysis, and creates large areas of unanalyzed material, particularly those relating to training, analytic and organizational matters, which probably goes a long way toward explaining the endless political conflicts in most of our analytic groups" (p. 228).

Effects of the Training Analysis System Upon American Psychoanalytic Association (ApsaA) Members' Morale and Coherence

The training analysis system, in addition to its individual impact on candidates, is most damaging in its effects upon the morale and professional involvement of APsaA members. Kirsner (Personal Communication) uses the illuminating image of training analysts being 'anointed' rather than appointed, thereby illustrating how the training analyst system creates two classes of analysts, separating out that minority of APsaA members, 25%, who are training analysts, as, *first class members* (superior), while the large majority of non-training analysts, 75% of APsaA members, who may teach or hold administrative positions, are perceived of as *second class members (*inferior). Lussier (1991) pointedly questioned "Can the science of psychoanalysis, by definition, admit, without inner inconsistencies of two classes of analysts: The High Priests and the ordinary ones? … What a fertile ground for idealization, unconscious magical participation to a special power through identification, a pathogenic transferential relation that can hardly be analyzed." (p. 16). Reeder (2004) wrote, "In that way the training analyst institution will easily become an aristocratic club for mutual admiration, which will put its members in "a position that carries with it the connotation of 'superiority'" (p.158). Blum (2017), too, asserted that "the two-class system of training and non-training

analysts, those in power, and those with less influence and status inside and outside the institute, would have long range repercussions. The division of the institute and society into 'haves' and 'have nots', higher and lower status groups was bound to lead to disappointment and discontent". (p. 40). He added, "The stage is set for submission and/or rebellion by the alienated non-training analysts" (p. 41). Zagermann (2017a) added that "by creating a two-class *status quo society* … we have produced an oedipal fixation of inclusion and exclusion which paralyzes institutionalized psychoanalysis by tying our attention to the internal conditions of power and power shifts" (p. xxiii). Berman (2017) observes that "the image of the training analyst as a superior analyst is still prominent in the literature, and much has been written about the outstanding properties expected of training analysts"(p.5). Fornari Spoto (2017) describes how "The dissatisfaction with a *status quo* in which power is perceived as being unequally distributed can lead to very painful feelings of exclusion" (p.102). Kernberg & Michels (2016) conclude that "The real problem is not so much the training analyst system as the 'non-training analyst' system, the institute graduates who are viewed as not quite good enough to analyze candidates. This leads to a two-tier profession, hurt feelings, internal conflict, and

understandable challenges to the procedure for selecting training analysts." They urge that, "With appropriate criteria for graduating from an institute and becoming an analyst, every analyst would be a training analyst" (p.480). If candidates are given a wide choice of analysts, they may well survey the field and select an analyst who provides an optimal psychological patient-analyst fit.

It's not easy to understand why this *arbitrary* hypothetical categorization of two classes of analysts has persisted for 100 years. *Arbitrariness*, Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary states, is based on one's preference, notion or whim. (Kächele & Schachter, 2017). Practitioners are at special risk of placing greater confidence in a theory than the evidence available may justify, asserted Bowlby, (1979, p.4.) The *arbitrary* nature of this categorization of two classes of analysts reflects an underlying failure to achieve a consensually-agreed definition either of psychoanalytic process or of psychoanalysis itself, or of possible differentiation of psychoanalysis from psychoanalytic psychotherapy, presents every analyst with these epistemological quandaries (Kächele, 2010). These uncertainties "we hypothesize, evoke a defensive reaction formation of intense certainty or conviction that the fundamentals of psychoanalysis are solidly based, beyond those of

many other professions – which J. Lear has termed "knowingness". (Kächele & Schachter, 2017, p. 75).

The *arbitrariness* of this view is demonstrated by the failure to acknowledge the fact that the only empirical studies of training analysis (Schachter et al., 2013; Schachter et al., 2014) have demonstrated that treatment of analysts by non-training analysts was *equally satisfactory* to the analyst patients as treatment by training analysts. There is no contrary evidence showing that training analysts are more effective analysts than non-training analysts.

APsaA's multiple analytic practice surveys indicate that training analysts consistently earn substantially more income than do non-training analysts, enhancing the two-tier categorization of training analysts and non-training analysts. Although candidates may be relatively low-fee patients, this limited part of a practice is balanced by a status leading to more frequent and highly paid referrals from outside and within the internal, informal network of training analysts.

The Costs of the Training Analysis System

The cost of the required training analysis itself comprises the largest proportion of the expense of psychoanalytic education, a financial commitment that must be considered as a component of the overall

decline in the number of candidates at APsaA institutes. One of the five APsaA New York City psychoanalytic institutes currently has no new candidates for this fall, as psychiatric residencies are increasingly committed to pharmacological and short-term treatments. At the same time the pool of traditional psychoanalytic patients from the general population has diminished steadily for many years, resulting in fewer patients for candidates and decreased income for many analysts. Increasingly, graduate analysts supplement their income by developing other areas of specialized expertise. Simultaneously, the increasing proportion of female candidates has improved the profession's gender equality but also included fewer highly paid professionals. Thomä (1993) concluded that the training, undertaken alongside a job, exceeds the average work capacity of women who also work as mother and housewife. "A little reckoning soon shows that women may or may not be the primary wage earner in the family, often tending to have less disposable income available for the expense of psychoanalytic training. In society as a whole, time commitments acceptable to men impact differentially women candidates" (p. 9, 13). Thus, substantial expense plus intensive time requirements of psychoanalytic education and limited psychoanalytic referral options, may selectively impact potential

women applicants, or interfere with women candidates continuing in psychoanalytic training, thereby adding to the decline of American psychoanalysis. Many of these same discouraging factors affect the choices of prospective 'diversity' candidates, leading to persistence of a still predominantly white, if more female, candidate population.

On Research Education: The Impact of the Training Analysis System

The Eitingon model makes no reference to psychoanalytic research. No current APsaA institute is directed by a psychoanalytic researcher, and few APsaA institutes offer courses in psychoanalytic research. Thomä (1993) refers to Holt's (1989) proposal to bring already trained and committed research behavioral scientis; Holt concluded that it had been tried and it didn't work.

The problem was that training analysts are, by design, senior psychoanalytic clinicians, and often have little or no interest in such research, while perhaps harboring unconscious hostile attitudes toward psychoanalytic research. Schachter & Luborsky (1998) tested that hypothesis in a study that showed that analysts with higher degrees of conviction about psychoanalytic theory and treatment read fewer research papers than analysts with lower degrees of conviction. The

authors, in attempting to understand this result, proposed that analysts with higher degrees of conviction might be compensating for an underlying sense of uncertainty about their analytic work. Concerns that psychoanalytic research might challenge and raise doubts about their strongly held convictions and techniques engendered reactive unconscious hostility and diverted them from exposure to psychoanalytic research. Psychoanalysts' common refusal to provide permission to enable their patients' participation in psychoanalytic research may also reflect this concern about harm. Because few APsaA candidates have access to a formal course on psychoanalytic research or read research papers, they remain unaware of this significant gap in their psychoanalytic education (Teller & Dahl, 1995).

Today, a field deficient in basic research, especially one as controversial as psychoanalysis, lacks competitive standing in establishing or maintaining the respect of both the general and scientific communities, thus furthering the decline of prestige and interest. Kernberg and Michels (2016) also emphasize, "This grave neglect of research interest and training in psychoanalytic institutes and the related lack of initiatives to obtain financial support for psychoanalytic research are powerful negative influences on psychoanalysis as a science"(p. 478).

They add, echoing the Schachter & Luborsky paper, that "Perhaps most disturbing, an increasing number of analysts seem to have little interest in empirical research, and believe that it offers nothing to their work" (p.143).

A Poll of APsaA Members Attitudes About Training Analysis

Arnold Richards and Joseph Schachter conducted an unofficial email poll asking APsaA members whether they favored; 1: Maintaining the training analysis designation; 2: Were undecided; or 3: Discontinuing now the training analysis designation? The total of 114 responses constituted a response rate of 12%, significantly lower than response rates to previous official APsaA email polls about analytic practice which were of the order of 35%. Despite the low response rate the results are of interest since they constitute the only data available about APsaA members' attitudes about training analysis.

Results:

14% reported that training analysis should be maintained;

11% reported being undecided whether training analysis should be continued;

74% reported that training should be discontinued now.

Analysts' responses did not vary significantly as a function either of training analysis or non training analysis status of the respondent; or whether respondents had graduated during 1992 or earlier, or later than 1992 (an arbitrarily selected date).

Recommendations to Remove the Requirement for Training Analysis

APsaA is currently undergoing an organizational reorganization which includes a review of APsaA's educational program. We have already described the history of the somewhat arbitrary inclusion of training analysis in our educational standards. It is additionally noteworthy that several analysts have expressed skepticism that substantially extending the length of treatment enhances therapeutic outcome. Glover (1955) considered that extending the duration of analytic treatment did not seem to enhance treatment outcome: "earlier analysts were accustomed to conduct analyses of colleagues and of the public of six to twelve months' duration … (which) did not differ greatly in ultimate result from the result claimed at the present day by analysts who spin their analysis to four or five years." (pp. 382-383). Thomä (1993) also noted this trend in his comprehensive review, and added a question about the value of extending the length of treatment; "average length seems to increase

from year to year and at present approaches some 1000 sessions in Germany" (p.28). He therefore recommended changing to " the range of 300 to 400 [sessions] as a limit to the length of prescribed analysis" (p.61). The candidate might then elect to continue the analysis after reaching that limit.

Reeder (2004) suggests a model "in which candidates and possible candidates can have their personal analysis with any qualified analyst who has, say five years of clinical experience and some five thousand sessions or so behind him" (p. 228). The Chicago Psychoanalytic Institute developed a policy in 2013 that states: a training analysis can be "An analysis with an analyst who meets these recommended criteria: a) The analyst has completed a "substantially equivalent" training program; b) The analyst has 5 years post-graduate experience; c) The analyst demonstrates commitment to the field, through participation in study groups, seminars, publications, etc.; and d) The analyst abides by our code of ethics and has no ethical violations. Approximately 50% of Chicago candidates have selected traditionally appointed training analysts, and 50% have selected analysts approved by this alternative system. Layton (2016) reports that at The Massachusetts Institute of Psychoanalysis (not an APsaA institute)

"Candidates can choose their analysts and supervisors from among all who are certified as graduate analysts, from any institute" (p. 501).

Zagerman (2017b) notes that in regard to the two current IPA alternative models, "the French and the Uruguayan one – arose explicitly as a reaction to the problem of power concentration in the Eitingon model. … the French model does away with the training analyst function totally, while the Uruguayan concept attempts a kind of democratic basis alternative" (p. 333).

The early psychoanalysts who had never been analyzed treated many patients. Freud is considered an example of a competent clinical analyst who has never been psychoanalyzed, and we agree with those analysts who have recommended that candidate analysis should be entirely voluntary. Kächele & Thomä (2000) assert that "In our opinion candidates should be evaluated exclusively on the strength of their performance as clinicians, instead of being diagnosed as patients." (p. 807). Kirsner (2009) proposes similarly, "One radical possibility could be in the direction of abolishing the mandatory training analysis altogether and testing the results rather than the process of achieving them. The proof of the pudding would lie in the assessment alone, in how well trainees conducted analyses with their patients…"(p. 247).

Pyles (2017) also concluded "that it would be a courageous act to do away with the training analyst system in fact, and ideally in name, and consider alternative possibilities." (p. 237).

The conception that a candidate's analysis should be *entirely voluntary* has been elaborated by Wallerstein (2010) who commented that early on Bernfeld (1962) had advocated that personal therapy be "completely voluntary in terms of self-felt need or desire" but also noted that Lipton (1988) "has been the only voice raised in full explicit support of this recommendation" (p. 931). Wallerstein added that "Many of us have encountered psychologically gifted individuals, who with intensive course instruction and psychoanalytically guided supervision, but without personal analysis have come to do substantial psychoanalytic therapy, not readily distinguishable from that done by their trained psychoanalytic colleagues. … My proposal [to make training analysis voluntary] is a gamble, an experiment, but not an unreasoned one" (2010, p. 930).

Wallerstein (2017) elaborated, "What I am suggesting, and I trust not rashly, on the way to the ultimate full-time university placement for our discipline, is a trial by at least some established psychoanalytic training entity of such a system as I propose: the voluntary

psychoanalytic treatment, as desired or felt needed by the candidate, combined with the strengthened, more rigorous educational program of theoretical and clinical seminars, and together with intensive, properly long psychoanalytic supervisions of an adequately diverse set of control cases – all of this under an intensive years-long monitoring and research study of achieved outcomes in terms of the demonstrated theoretical and clinical competence of the graduates. … *If successful, such a system should overcome the deleterious consequences of the obligatory training analysis system." (p. 287)* (italics added).

Summary

Training analysis has been reported generally to be subjectively satisfactory to candidates, but the system itself has had a notably destructive impact upon the organizational morale of the large majority of APsaA non-training analysts as well as upon psychoanalytic education and research. A recent focus has emphasized that the financial burden of the unlimited length and cost of training analysis, particularly impacting current and potential women and diversity candidates, the proliferation of competing therapies, the pressures of current life and especially the destructive impacts of the training analyst system may all be contributing to the continuing decline of American

psychoanalysis. Thomä (1993) twenty-five years ago came to the same conclusion, “What was once an epoch-making idea has for decades been put into practice in a way that has created wide effects unfavorable for psychoanalysis both as a therapy and as a science.” (p. 4). The ongoing review of APsaA’s educational system should consider whether the damaging impacts of the training analyst system might be avoided by empirically studying the adoption, on a trial basis, of the suggestion that the provision of psychoanalytic self-experience for analytic candidates be made *completely voluntary*. A ten-year pilot study could assess the effects of this innovation.

After all we do not treat our candidates but we try to convey the essence of psychoanalytic understanding and working.

References

Berman, E. (2017). Change from within in a traditional psychoanalytic institute: twenty-five years of debate and transformation at the Israel Psychoanalytic Society. In: *The Future of Psychoanalysis. The*

Debate about the Training Analyst System. Ed. P. Zagermann. London: Karnac Books pp. 1-34.

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

Blum, H.P. (2017). Training analysis and the psychoanalytic institute. In: *The Future of Psychoanalysis. The Debate about the Training Analyst System.*Ed. P. Zagermann. London: Karnac Books pp. 35-52.

Bowlby, J. (1979). Psychoanalysis as art and science. *International Review of Psychoanalysis* 6:3-14.

Craige, H. (2002). Mourning analysis.: The post-termination phase. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 50:507-550.

Fornari Spoto, G. (2017). Psychoanalytical training in flux. In: *The Future of Psychoanalysis. The Debate about the Training Analyst System.* Ed. P. Zagerman London: Karnac Books pp. 89-108.

Freud, A. (1983). Some observations. In: *The Identity of the Psychoanalyst*, Monograph 2, IPA, ed. E.D. Joseph & D. Widlocher. New York: IUP, pp. 257-263.

Freud, S. (1910). “Wild Psychoanalysis”. Standard Edition 11: 219-227,

London, Hogarth Press.

Freud, S. (1912). Recommendations to physicians practising psycho-analysis. Standard Edition 12: 111-120, London: Hogarth Press.

Glover, E. (1955). *The Technique of Psychoanalysis*. London: Bailliere Tindall & Cox.

Goldensohn, S.S. (1977). Graduates' evaluation of their psychoanalytic training. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis and Dynamic Psychiatry* 5:51-64.

Holt, A.R. (1989). *Freud Reappraised*. New York: Guilford Press.

Kächele, H. (2010). Psychoanalysis and psychotherapy: The implications of a unified view for training. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 91:35-43.

Kächele, H. & Schachter, J. (2017). The role of arbitrariness in identity formation and research. *Romanian Journal of Psychoanalysis* 10:69-82.

Kächele, H. & Thomä, H. (2000). On the devaluation of the Eitingon-

Freud model of psychoanalytic education. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 81:806-808.

Katz, D.A., Kaplan, M., & Stromberg, S.E. (2012). A national survey of candidates: I. Demographics, practice patterns and satisfaction with training. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 60: 71-96.

Kernberg, O. (1986). Institutional problems of psychoanalytic education. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 34:799-834.

Kernberg, O.F. (1996). Thirty methods to destroy the creativity of psychoanalytic candidates. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 77:1031-040.

Kernberg, O. (2000). A concerned critique of psychoanalytic education. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 81:97-120.

Kernberg, O.F. (2004). Discussion. Problems of power in psychoanalytic institutes. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry* 24:106-121.

Kernberg, O. (2006). The coming changes in psychoanalytic education.

International Journal of Psychoanalysis 87:1649-1673.

Kernberg, O. (2010). A new organization of psychoanalytic education. *Psychoanalytic Review* 97:1-24.

Kernberg, O. (2014) The twilight of the training analyst system. *Psychoanalytic Review* 101:151-174.

Kernberg, O.F. & Michels, R. (2016). Thoughts on the present and future of psychoanalytic education. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 64:477-493.

Kerr, J. (2004). "The Goody-Goods are no good". Notes on power and authority in the early history of psychoanalysis, with special reference to training. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry* 24:7-30.

Kirsner, D. (2009). *Unfree Associations. Inside Psychoanalytic institutes.* New York: Jason Aronson.

Kirsner, D. (2017). The training analysis: still a roadblock in psychoanalytic education. In: *The Future of Psychoanalysis: The Debate About the Training Analysis System.* Ed. by P. Zagermann. London: Karnac Books pp. 161-178.

Klauber, J. (1982). Psychoanalytic societies and their discontents. *International Journal of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy.* 9:675-689.

Layton, L. (2016). Commentary on Kernberg & Michels. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 64:501-510.

Lear, J. (1998). *Open-Minded: working Out the logic of the Soul.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Lipton, S.D. (1988). An argument in favor of making training analysis voluntary rather than mandatory. *Annual of Psychoanalysis* 16:11-17.

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

Mallet da Rocha Barros, E. (2017). Rethinking psychoanalytic education; some critical points for reflection. In: *The Future of Psychoanalysis. The Debate About the Training Analyst System.* Ed. P. Zagermann. London: Karnac Books pp. 179-196.

McCarroll, J. (2007). A candidate's perspective. *Psychoanalytic Dialogue* 17:589-594.

Meyer, L. (2017). Training analysis as institutional enactment. In: *The Future of Psychoanalysis. The Debate about the Training Analyst System.* Ed. P. Zagermann. London: Karnac Books pp. 197-219.

Nunberg, H. (1960). *Memoirs: Recollections, Ideas, Reflections.* New York: Psychoanalytic Research and Development Fund.

Pyles, R. (2017). Still crazy after all these years. In: *The Future of Psychoanalysis. The Debate about the Training Analyst System.* Ed. P. Zagermann. London: Karnac Books pp.221-259.

Reeder, J. (2004). *Hate and Love in Psychoanalytical Institutions. The Dilemma of a Profession.* New York: Other Press.

Schachter, J. & Luborsky, L. (1998). Who's afraid of psychoanalytic research?: Analysts' attitudes towards reading clinical versus empirical research papers. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 79:965-969.

Schachter, J., Gorman, B., Pfäfflin, F., & Kächele, H. (2013). Comparison of vignette-based ratings of satisfaction with training analysis and non-training analysis treatment by training analysts s and by non-training analysts. *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 30:37-56.

Schachter, J., Gorman, B.S., Pfäfflin, F. & Kächele, H. (2014). A questionnaire/interview comparison of satisfaction with training analysis to satisfaction with analysis by a non-training analyst:

implications for training analysis. *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 31:367-374.

Shapiro, D. (1976). The analyst's own analysis. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 24:5-42.

Teller, V. & Dahl, H. (1995). What psychoanalysis needs is more empirical research. In *Research in Psychoanalysis. Process, development and outcome. Ed.* Shapiro, T., Emde, R.N. (pp. 31-50). Madison, CT: International Universities Press.

Tessman, L. (2003). *The Analyst's Analyst Within.* Hillsdale, N.J. The Analytic Press.

Thomä, H. (1993). Training analysis and psychoanalytic education: Proposals for reform. *Annual of Psychoanalysis* 21:3-75.

Wallerstein, R.S. (2010). The training analysis: Psychoanalysis' perennial problem. *Psychoanalytic Review* 97903-936.

Wallerstein, R. S. (2017). Can organized psychoanalysis create an optimal education? In *The Future of Psychoanalysis. The Debate About the Training Analyst System.* Ed. P. Zagermann London: Karnac Books pp. 261-290.

Zagermann, P. (2017a). Introduction: How do we want to train? In *The*

Future of Psychoanalysis: The Debate About the Training Analyst System. London: Karnac Books, pp. xxi-xxvi.

Zagermann, P. (2017b). Theses on the heart of darkness. The unresolved Oedipus complex of psychoanalytic institution formation. In: *The Future of Psychoanalysis: The Debate about the Training Analyst System.* London: Karnac Books, pp. 311-337.