



Psychoanalysis and the university: A difficult relationship

Otto F. Kernberg

Director, Personality Disorders Institute, New York Presbyterian Hospital, Payne Whitney Westchester.

Professor of Psychiatry, Weill Medical College of Cornell University

Training and Supervising Analyst, Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research USA

21 Bloomingdale Road, White Plains, NY 10605 USA –

okernber@med.cornell.edu

A critique of present-day isolation of psychoanalytic institutes and of their lack of emphasis on research and scientific development is followed with concrete proposals for reorienting psychoanalytic education toward university settings, with the ultimate purpose of bringing together psychoanalytic theory and scientific contributions with the contemporary contributions of neurobiological science and the humanities. Efforts already under way in this direction and practical recommendations for further steps to integrate psychoanalytic education and research within university settings are outlined.

Key words: psychoanalytic training, university settings, professional isolation, neurobiology, research

The problem: I. External reality

The pressing need for psychoanalysis to establish or re-establish a strong relationship with universities and academic centers of higher learning has become broadly acknowledged and accepted by the psychoanalytic community in recent years – at least, in principle. Statements by leading educators and scholars of the International Psychoanalytic Association have underlined this need, and have called for action in this regard (Auchincloss and Michels, 2003; Cooper, 1987; Ferrari, 2009; Garza Guerrero, 2006, 2010; Glick, 2007; Holzman, 1976, 1985; Levy, 2009; Michels, 2007; Paul, 2007; Wallerstein, 1972, 1980, 2007, 2009). The reasons for these alliances are quite obvious: psychoanalysis has been accepted as a major contribution to the culture of the 20th century, but its future role as a science and a profession is uncertain and being challenged (Kernberg, 2006, 2007).

Attacks from academic and cultural centers, challenging the scientific status of psychoanalysis and its effectiveness as a treatment, have become fashionable as psychopharmacology and cognitive-behavioral treatments have gained ascendancy, offering as they do, short-term, less costly alternatives to all manner of psychopathology once the exclusive province of psychoanalysis. From a simple economic viewpoint, the restriction of payment for extended psychotherapies on the part of insurance companies and National Health Service systems have particularly affected psychoanalysis, reinforcing its negative image within the professions of clinical psychology

and psychiatry. Psychoanalytic institutes, in regions where they have long been established, have experienced significant reduction in candidates seeking psychoanalytic training, and in patients seeking analysis (Thomä, 2010).

The fundamental contributions that psychoanalysis has made to the related fields of psychology and psychiatry have been absorbed and integrated by those disciplines, but are less and less cited as scientific and professional contributions of psychoanalysis. The most recent example, perhaps, is the important development of attachment theory. Bowlby, steeped in the psychoanalytic tradition, saw attachment paradigms as intrapsychically central to development across the lifespan. Attachment theory is increasingly being explored from a predominantly behavioral perspective, ignoring the development of intrapsychic structures and unconscious fantasy. The description of major personality disorders, such as the narcissistic, masochistic and borderline personality disorders, that stem from psychoanalytic research, are acknowledged, but tend to get incorporated into classificatory systems and theories of etiology that, again, bypass the developmental history of unconscious intrapsychic structures. Psychoanalytic contributions to the understanding of early sexuality, gender-determined differentiation of psychological development, and disturbances in sexual functions have equally been absorbed and reformulated in a combination of neurobiological and cognitive-behavioral perspectives. The psychoanalytic basis of psychodynamic psychotherapies has expanded this field into a broad spectrum of autonomous psychotherapeutic institutions and applications that have become disconnected from their original psychoanalytic sources.

Also, important psychoanalytic contributions to the field of early childhood development, as well as personality studies, psychopathology, and psychotherapy, have been carried out by psychoanalysts embedded in university settings as professors of social work, psychiatry, and psychology. Many such academic positions have disappeared over the years, particularly in countries where psychoanalysis had managed to have a firm basis in the university, such as in Germany and the United States. In recent generations of psychoanalysts we see a decreasing number of academically active, scientifically engaged professionals. In fact, a major problem posed in the development of new academic leadership in psychology and psychiatry is that it has become more and more estranged from psychoanalysis, as few psychoanalytic scholars are able to compete academically for such positions. To some extent, this process has not been as pervasive in the humanities, where interest in psychoanalysis persists in areas such as linguistics, literary analysis, and the arts, but it is painfully clear in the mental health sciences. All this reflects the social and cultural environment that psychoanalysis is facing at this time. These challenges are compounded, unfortunately, by important internal realities affecting the psychoanalytic community.

The problem: II. Internal reality

A major problem is the discrepancy between the general recognition, on the part of the psychoanalytic community, that a move to approach the university and establish a closer link with it would be highly desirable, while, in

practice, very little, if any, move in that direction has taken place, because the main center of educational activity and potential research interests would naturally be linked to the tasks of psychoanalytic institutes, the educational enterprise of psychoanalysis, rather than to psychoanalytic societies, the professional side of the field. Universities, of course, have as their major mission to transmit knowledge and to create new knowledge, education and research being their major, intimately linked functions.

Psychoanalytic institutes, on the contrary, are strongly focused on transmitting knowledge, but reluctant to carry out research to develop new knowledge. In so far as all research implies questioning what is known to this point, as part of the process to advance further knowledge, this challenge has actually been reacted to as a threat by the general culture of psychoanalytic institutes (Cooper, 1995; Kernberg, 2004).

The history of psychoanalysis may shed some light on the antagonism to psychoanalytic research within institutes: having developed outside university structures, the sense of frailty of the independently developing new science of psychoanalysis has determined, I believe, a defensive stress on the maintenance of traditional theories and approaches. Particularly, the hierarchical organization of psychoanalytic education linked to the training analysis system has been pointed to as a source of authoritarian tendencies, dogmatism regarding locally dominant approaches, and discouragement of independent thinking and original research work as part of psychoanalytic education. The regressive effects of the training analysis system carried out within an institution where candidates, training analysts, and those graduates not, or not yet, designated as training analysts live together has as its effect the exacerbation of dynamics of idealization, submission, paranoia-genesis, and rebelliousness, reinforcing the regressive features of the personal analysis and, eventually, promoting the infantilization of candidates. This contributes to reducing the curiosity and emphasis on critical evaluation and development of new knowledge.

The scientific isolation of institutes from the development in science at the boundaries of psychoanalysis generates a further, threatening, implicit insecurity regarding new knowledge, and distrust of external sources of knowledge that might influence or even threaten psychoanalytic thinking. A fearful attitude regarding any challenges to traditional psychoanalytic thinking reflects the sense of isolation and implicit frailty of psychoanalytic institutes and stimulates the phobic attitude toward empirical research that still dominates large segments of the psychoanalytic educational enterprise, rationalized most frequently on the basis of the 'uniqueness of each long-term psychoanalytic encounter' that defies generalizations and efforts at quantitative assessment.

The regressive effect of a personal analysis does not only operate upon the student body in inducing anxiety, excessive idealizations and paranoia-genic reactions, but also affects the training analysts. Immersed in a social atmosphere of candidates whose personal intimacy they know, and over whom they wield unchallenged decision-making authority as to selection, supervision, progression, graduation, and, above all, evaluation of analytic competency, all of this creates gratifying power for the training analysts'

body, on the one hand, and distrust of an external world that may challenge this power and this entire structure, on the other. A permanent ambience of transference and countertransference reactions is reflected in the establishment of guru-like figures, on the one hand, and vehement critique of alternative theories to those that dominate within a particular institute, on the other. Add to this a basic anxiety about the firmness and stability of cherished convictions and approaches and you have a breeding ground for conservatism, ideological monopolies, and a petrified intellectual atmosphere that runs counter to the generally growing conviction within the psychoanalytic community at large that a major *rapprochement* with the university is essential for the future of psychoanalysis (Kernberg, 1986).

In short, the basis of the major potential of transmission of knowledge and development of knowledge, of potential research on psychoanalytic theory and technique and on its application to a broad spectrum of related disciplines in the humanities and in neurobiology and medicine, as well as to psychotherapeutic approaches in general as major contribution to the mental health professions, resides precisely in the same institutions where opposition to change, and, at best, a defensive indifference to it are maximal. Thirty years ago psychoanalytic candidates in many countries were implicitly or explicitly dissuaded within psychoanalytic institutes from following parallel careers in psychiatry and psychology and other fields. Only after the more recent decrease of candidates interested in psychoanalytic training, and when the aging of the profession throughout established psychoanalytic societies made it clear that we are at risk of becoming irrelevant to a younger generation, has this negative attitude slowly begun to change.

It would be unfair, however, to describe psychoanalytic institutes as places where no new knowledge and experimentation occur. After all, important new psychoanalytic theories and techniques have evolved, and the exploration of the psychoanalytic situation has led to significant advances in knowledge regarding early development, psychopathology, diagnosis and treatment, as well as creative ideas regarding the application of psychoanalysis to other fields.

In all fairness, in spite of the organizational and cultural restrictions operating in the realm of psychoanalytic education, psychoanalytic institutes and societies have witnessed the development of important new knowledge, innovative new theories and their applications to psychoanalytic technique and derivative psychotherapeutic procedures. The second half of the last century witnessed the development of Kleinian and neo-Kleinian, particularly Bionian theory and technical innovation in psychoanalysis in Great Britain, the emergence of relational psychoanalysis in the United States, the influence of Lacanian concepts on French psychoanalysis, new applications of ego psychology to a vast field of psychoanalytic psychotherapy, new knowledge regarding the psychopathology of severe personality disorders, sexual pathology, the application of psychoanalytic psychotherapy to group, couple, and family therapy, advances in the application of psychoanalytic understanding of group processes to the study of ideology and political processes, and, more recently, progress in the understanding of the relationship between neurobiology and psychodynamics of affects, with particular

reference to depression. In the humanities, psychoanalytic concepts were applied to the study of linguistics and literary criticism, and to the analysis of the social pathology related to totalitarian regimes.

However, the conservative and restrictive atmosphere within psychoanalytic institutes precluded research into the implications of these new developments within the institutes themselves, or developing comparative studies on the differential effects of alternative new psychoanalytic formulations, indications and limitations of the expanding modalities of psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapies. Within psychoanalytic institutes, alternative theories to the locally dominant one were initially ignored, and subsequently attacked, such as the 'wars' between Kleinian and ego psychological institutes and authors during the 1950s through the 1970s. More recently, in an ecumenical spirit that reflected the gradual intellectual opening of psychoanalytic institutes, alternative theories were taught and comparative discussions regarding them tolerated within many institutes themselves. But the resistance against formalized research has led to a passive acceptance of multiple, in many ways contradictory approaches, with an implicit devaluation of the scientific importance to advance in the knowledge of their true value. At times, theories have been treated as metaphors, contrasting them with the practicality of psychoanalytic technique itself. At the same time, however, systematizing psychoanalytic technique to a degree that would permit empirical study of the relation between alternative technical approaches and outcome has been lacking. Empirical research regarding psychoanalytic psychotherapies has been carried out within college and university settings by psychoanalytically trained researchers, but not within psychoanalytic institutes proper. The theoretical work of applying psychoanalysis to the study of group and social processes, religion and philosophy, the understanding of artistic language, have for the most part occurred in university settings unrelated to psychoanalytic institutes. As mentioned before, psychoanalytically based new knowledge and derived research were incorporated by other disciplines and became disconnected from the mainstream of psychoanalytic endeavors. Within the clinical realm, the development of independent institutes centered on psychoanalytic psychotherapy, competing with psychoanalytic institutes proper, has represented the clinical side of this paradoxical growth and alienation of psychoanalytically derived knowledge.

The transformation of psychoanalytic institutes: Some general preconditions

If the preceding overview of the challenges that psychoanalysis faces the internal dynamics of the training analyst system within psychoanalytic institutes, the paradoxical development of psychoanalytic knowledge, on the one hand, and a stultifying absence of scientific spirit, and educational stagnation of institutes, on the other, represent an adequate overview of the present situation, some interrelated strategies for overcoming the present crisis of the psychoanalytic profession and science seem promising. Several major contributions to a potential response required at this time have signaled the components of such an approach.

1.

Psychoanalytic education has to be radically innovated. The hierarchical rigidity and its derivative deadening of intellectual curiosity needs to be overcome. This requires an embrace of the knowledge explosion in boundary sciences by inviting leading faculties of related fields to become part of the teaching faculty of institutes. Structurally, the functions of seminar leaders and supervisors should be separated to recognize those who have demonstrated specific capacity for supervising clinical work on the one hand, and those who have original contributions to make to the understanding and development of the cognitive body of contemporary psychoanalysis, on the other. Personal psychoanalysis should be completely separated from the educational functions of the institute, and politically loaded appointment of training analysts should be replaced with a generally accepted method of certification in proficiency as psychoanalytic practitioner, equivalent to the specialty boards in medicine, with free selection by psychoanalytic candidates of their personal analyst within all those certified by such a generally recognized, supra-institutional specialty board. I have described elsewhere (Kernberg 2006, 2007) the advantages, preconditions and methods of implementation proposed to abolish the training analysis system and to replace it with a functional arrangement for a high quality personal analysis for psychoanalytic candidates.

2.

Formalized research, as an essential aspect of psychoanalytic education, not with the intention of making every psychoanalyst a researcher, but fostering and rewarding research-oriented candidates and faculty, particularly those with academic aspirations, and providing them with appropriate institutional mentoring and support, drawing on the vast clinical material available to psychoanalytic institutes, would lead to the development of new psychoanalytic knowledge. This means, at the very least, the establishment of a department of research in psychoanalytic institutes with the freedom to extend inquiry into every aspect of theory, technique, and applications that is part of the curriculum, and reflecting, at all levels, a concern for critical evaluation of what is taught. Experts in research methodology should become an essential part of the leadership of the psychoanalytic institution. The academic credentials of research methodologists within the psychoanalytic institute would facilitate an alliance with the corresponding academic centers, within which collaborative research with the institute could be carried out. University faculties working within the institute would have access to its human resources as well as clinical material, while collaborative research with the university might provide the funding support that would facilitate candidates and faculty to pursue an academic career, in parallel to their analytic one. Again, such a career would probably hold true only for a small proportion of psychoanalytic candidates, but the benefit of the critical input from related disciplines within the educational atmosphere of the institute would be powerfully strengthened. This development would, of course, imply overcoming the past prejudice against candidates and analysts not dedicated exclusively to their analytic career.

3.

The development of a cadre of scholars within psychoanalytic institutes has been the potentially strongest element in fostering new knowledge in the context of

psychoanalytic education. Radical innovators have come from the intense involvement with psychoanalytic work, and have often been able to imprint an atmosphere of exciting new developments in psychoanalytic theory and technique. Total immersion in psychoanalytic treatment of patients should be fostered and facilitated for those candidates and faculty evincing particular interests and creativity in their clinical work, and related scholarly writing. But this should not be the only path to the development of new knowledge, nor a rationalization for discouraging all other roads to progress.

In the past, original scholars, whose thinking strongly diverged from the dominant ideology of a particular institution, were driven into the periphery of the educational process, leading to contentious splits within the psychoanalytic institution. Rather than merely tolerate originality it should be actively fostered as a stimulus for intellectual productivity by inviting distinguished scholars from fields related to psychoanalysis to join the faculty, with the purpose of stimulating a mutually enriching dialogue. The participation of such distinguished scholars from other fields, as well as from the particular institution itself, requires, naturally, an adequate forum to provide a real opportunity for intellectual interchange rather than an implicit isolation of such scholars from the daily educational enterprise. All this implies open, systematic discussion of new developments and controversial subjects, while strengthening clarity and the realistic potential for theoretical integration, as well as a scientific approach to incompatible hypotheses.

4.

Last but not least, the teaching faculty of the institute should include psychoanalytic practitioners whose clinical practice has been expanded to analytically derived areas, the various forms of psychoanalytic psychotherapy, a broader psychiatric practice oriented within a psychoanalytic viewpoint, institutional work, forensic work, organizational consultation, and the arts. This development would end the widespread, painful alienation of many psychoanalytic graduates who have chosen to pursue other clinical specialties rather than focusing on specific psychoanalytic treatment, and, in general, the disappointed alienation presently prevalent among graduate analysts who were interested in participating in the work of psychoanalytic institutes, and who, not having been appointed as training analysts, constitute an implicitly devalued group within the present ambience of the institute.

Here, naturally, the question may be raised whether this is not the task of psychoanalytic societies rather than psychoanalytic institutes proper. The reality, at present, is that educational activities within the society are generally treated as a secondary type of educational activity, mostly the communication of psychoanalytic knowledge 'to the uninformed,' or training in psychoanalytic psychotherapy of other mental health professionals, often given to teachers as a 'consolation prize' for those who have not become training analysts. Distrust and fear of the introduction of teaching psychoanalytic psychotherapies within the setting of the institute proper play an important role and, with it, the striking paradox that analytic candidates are being trained to carry out a treatment geared to only a minority of the patients they will see, while their main practice of psychoanalytic

psychotherapy remains largely unaddressed and is being taught at competing institutions.

Practical solutions underway

If we examine jointly the required preconditions proposed as the basis for the urgently needed change within our training institutes, the relationship of psychoanalysis to academia emerges as the central pillar of the establishment of a new system of psychoanalytic education. Psychoanalysis needs the university although it is not clearly aware of it at this time, and I believe that, in the long run, failure to establish these alliances will constitute a severe threat to the future of the psychoanalytic profession and science (Cooper, 1987; Garza Guerrero, 2006, 2010; Thomä, 2010). By the same token, a case can be made for the benefit to academia of psychoanalyses as a science that illuminates the impact of unconscious determinants on psychic life, in the world of the humanistic disciplines as well as in the psychosocial and the naturalistic sciences, particularly in the interface between neurobiology and the functions of the mind. But academia can, of course, very well survive without psychoanalysis while it is questionable whether, in the long run, psychoanalysis can survive without this link (Auchincloss and Michels, 2003; Michels, 2007). I believe that this fact is gradually being recognized throughout the psychoanalytic community and has led to a number of attempted solutions.

First of all, an 'internal' solution, totally in the hands of the psychoanalytic community itself, is a new relation between the training institute and the psychoanalytic society. There has tended to be a destructive ideological barrier between the psychoanalytic institute as the 'elite' of psychoanalysis and the psychoanalytic society as a second-class body, that threatens the preservation and development of psychoanalysis. Within the United States, the concept of the development of a 'psychoanalytic center,' that is, an integration of the educational, professional, application, and outreach functions that jointly constitute the psychoanalytic enterprise has fostered a new organizational model on the basis of a shared and integrated direction of all the activities of such a center (Wallerstein, 2007, 2009). It facilitates the teaching of psychoanalytic psychotherapy as part of the regular educational program of the institute, using the clinical expertise as well as theoretical developments of the society members mostly engaged in some form of individual, group, or couples psychotherapy, and the application of psychoanalytic approaches to psychotherapeutic as well as psychiatric consultation.

The center fosters the participation of senior faculty in outreach involvements organized by the society in the form of symposia and conferences that relate psychoanalysis to its local community. It facilitates the development of specialized seminars of interests to both candidates and members of the society, involving candidates early in their training in society activities as well as their participation in important clinical or theoretical new interests or controversies within the society life. It also facilitates the dismantling of the traditional assumption that anointed training analysts are the best seminar leaders and supervisors. If the leadership of such an integrated

psychoanalytic center is constituted, at least, by the director of the institute, a representative of the faculty at large, the president of the society, a representative of the outreach division, the chairperson of the society's program committee, and a representative of the research enterprise (if and when such a specialized department has been developed), in addition to a representative of the candidates' organization, then a workable cooperative and functional structure may evolve.

This model does not resolve the isolation of the center from the university but may be an important step toward greater awareness of the reality faced by the psychoanalytic practitioner in the external world in the current socio-cultural environment. Exciting conferences and scientific activities carried out jointly by society members and students, clinical conferences of candidates and members, joint study groups and supervisory experiences foster a stimulating atmosphere for the educational enterprise. Psychoanalytic institutes and societies in Philadelphia and in San Francisco have reorganized their structure to implement a center model, with various features among those outlined here.

However, as mentioned before, the model of the psychoanalytic center does not resolve the basic problem of the isolation of the psychoanalytic institution from the world of science and academia. A more direct and organizational relationship with university settings may offer many more opportunities, and the possibility of a qualitative transformation of psychoanalytic education and, with it, of the science and the profession as well. A close relation with university settings facilitates creation of departments of research within the psychoanalytic institute, the availability of experts on research methodology from the university, and the linkage with technical and financial resources from the university in a mutually beneficial interaction *rapprochement* between the faculties of both institutions. The fact that models involving this with universities have already been developed and are flourishing is an extremely encouraging and promising development of psychoanalysis (Levy, 2009; Michels, 2007, Wallerstein, 2007, 2009).

One obvious model is that of a psychoanalytic institute which is part of a university department of psychiatry or psychology. The Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research is such an institution that, for many years, has been part of the Department of Psychiatry of Columbia University, with financial and space support from the Department of Psychiatry, and a corresponding commitment to participate actively in the education of psychiatric residents and trainees, and participation in the research enterprise of the Department of Psychiatry. The director of the Psychoanalytic Institute is appointed by the chairman of the Department of Psychiatry, on the basis of the proposal by a committee constituted of representatives from the Department of Psychiatry, the medical school, and the institute faculty. The faculty of the institute is eligible for university appointments, following the general rules and regulations for academic promotion, with heavy emphasis on the research and educational background of candidates for academic promotion. A department of research within this Psychoanalytic Institute stimulates and coordinates research activities including faculty and psychoanalytic candidates, as well as selected trainees

within the department of psychiatry. Important publications in the area of research on education have been achieved, and the intellectual atmosphere of the Institute is remarkably open to absorbing new theoretical formulations and technical developments within the psychoanalytic realm. The Association for Psychoanalytic Medicine, the Psychoanalytic Society of the Columbia Psychoanalytic Community, is an independent institution that has been involved, jointly with the Columbia Psychoanalytic Institute, in outreach activities including the provision of teachers within various colleges of Columbia University, interdisciplinary activities in the form of public conferences involving faculty from the psychoanalytic community as well as other university colleges.

Another variation of this model is offered by the Psychoanalytic Center of Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia, in the United States (Levy, 2009). This is a complex structure that includes a psychoanalytic institute within the Department of Psychiatry of the medical school, and an autonomous center dedicated to facilitate psychoanalytically oriented education and research throughout the entire university, offering consultation and teaching to various university departments, and arranging for the participation of interested students throughout the university to participate in classes of the Psychoanalytic Institute. All institute seminars, with the exception of the supervision of clinical cases and seminars on psychoanalytic technique, are open to all Emory students, and the Center organizes specific educational activities and conferences for the university at large. This original program seems an ideal solution to the problem and challenges outlined above.

A major problem with this model is that it is difficult to replicate at this time. A psychoanalytic institute, in order to become eligible to function within or in relation to a department of psychiatry or clinical psychology of a major university would require the availability of senior, academically productive and recognized members of the psychoanalytic community whose curriculum vitae would permit them to compete successfully for faculty positions – or even chairmanships of university departments in those disciplines. The lack of a strong body of psychoanalytic academicians within a younger generation of psychoanalysts makes this a major constraint: hopefully, it might become a more generalized model in the long run, if and when academically active and recognized psychoanalytic candidates for senior faculty positions and for chairmanships become again available, as was the case for an earlier generation of psychoanalysts in countries such as Germany and the United States. A more viable variation of this model, however, is the possibility of a more loose and flexible association of an independent psychoanalytic institute with a university department of psychiatry or psychology, with teaching commitments of the psychoanalytic faculty in return for voluntary faculty positions affiliated with the university. The cooperative arrangement between the New York University Psychoanalytic Institute and the Department of Psychiatry of the New York University Medical School represents this type of the university-linked model.

An alternative model is the development of an autonomous university institute within or related to a major university setting, the psychoanalytic

institute taking on the responsibility of developing a full fledge program – say, in clinical psychology, acceptable as part of the educational and professional standards of the university, within the rules, regulations, and overall control of the university of such a program. Large psychoanalytic societies may have sufficient intellectual resources to be able to carry out such a program, and this is the model adopted by the Psychoanalytic Association of Buenos Aires (APDEBA), who have developed an Institute of Psychology granting a Masters Degree in Clinical Psychology, under the sponsorship and control of ABDEBA, following the general Argentinean rules and regulations governing private universities, and in close professional interchange with the Association of Private University Institutes (Ferrari, 2009). The Psychoanalytic Institute provides the faculty that is committed to teach all the requirements for a Masters Degree in Psychology of the University, with a particular accent on psychoanalytic theory and its applications. The students acquire knowledge of psychoanalytic theory and its development, the epistemological questions raised by the study of the dynamic unconscious, the evidence supporting psychoanalytic theory, as well as controversial aspects of it, and a theoretical knowledge about the application of psychoanalytic theory to diagnosis and treatment of the major types of psychopathology within the realm of a psychoanalytic approach. They do not receive clinical training in psychoanalysis proper but are encouraged, if they are so interested, to undergo a personal psychoanalysis or psychoanalytic psychotherapy. The success of this program is reflected in the increasing awareness of and attention to psychoanalysis within the overall university ambiance, an increase in interdisciplinary activities, and, last but not least, many students seeking their own analysis, regardless of their eventual career choices.

A somewhat similar program has been initiated in Berlin, with the creation of the International Psychoanalytic University, an independent University Institute that offers a Bachelor's Degree in Psychology and a Master's Degree in Psychology, fulfilling all the requirements for granting these degrees by the German law governing university mandates and requirements, including the teaching of a comprehensive spectrum of psychological theories and approaches and the development of a research program and corresponding research training that satisfies the general criteria of standards of research training in German university settings (Körner, 2009, personal communication).

This program does not include clinical teaching of psychoanalytic techniques nor psychoanalytic psychotherapy, but its graduates, hopefully, will be able to apply psychoanalytic theory to the diverse specialties they will be involved in later, and provides an important gateway to psychoanalytic training proper for some of them. The impressive initiative of the International Psychoanalytic University in Berlin was funded by a private donor, a senior, highly respected training analyst who had for many years held the chairmanship of a department of psychology of another university in Germany.

Financial constraints remain, in general, a major factor that limits innovative programs in university settings. At the same time, however, collaborative efforts between university departments interested in research development

and with access to particular sources of funding, on the one hand, and the willingness of psychoanalytic institutes to provide both faculty time, patient material, and even space for joint research and educational programs, on the other, should offer realistic possibilities.

Another significant constraint may be the hostile reception of psychoanalysis in many departments of psychiatry and psychology, particularly under conditions when long-term competitive struggle between psychodynamic approaches and cognitive-behavioral approaches have characterized the mental health field. I believe it is the task of psychoanalytic institutes and societies to try to reverse the bias against psychoanalysis derived from such an intellectual background. Particularly in the United States, the historical dominance of psychoanalysis in many leading university departments of psychiatry in the 1950s and 1960s that was characterized in some cases by gross neglect, (if not outright opposition to) of the parallel development of biological psychiatry – led to a corresponding ‘revenge’ once biologically oriented psychiatry gained ascendancy, while a parallel process shifted departments of clinical psychology from a psychodynamic into a cognitive-behavioral direction. Here patience and political action are required, opening up the psychoanalytic institute to influences from the university, and the institute offering faculty and space, and patient material resources for joint projects with university-based disciplines.

The programs referred to in this presentation are major illustrations of viable models of integration or reintegration of contemporary psychoanalysis into university settings and academic life. The enormous resistances of psychoanalytic institutions against change, and the slowness of the process throughout the international psychoanalytic community should not deter us from working in pursuit of this objective. As mentioned before, I believe the future of psychoanalysis as a science and a profession depends on it, even while the contribution of psychoanalysis as a body of knowledge to the cultural development of humanity may already be assured.

First steps

What follows are some early developments in the creation of new relationships of psychoanalytic institutes with university settings that, I believe, are open to institutes now, and are realistic possibilities in many countries. To begin, it would be helpful, in the acceptance of candidates for psychoanalytic training, to foster the selection of academically interested and active applicants, such as psychiatrists and psychologists interested in academic careers in research in specialized fields at the boundary sciences of psychoanalysis, as well as distinguished scholars in the humanities and the social and natural sciences. It would be desirable to combine a selection process for candidates that includes students interested exclusively in psychoanalysis as well as students with other creative professional interests who may wish to apply psychoanalysis to their specialty field. Naturally, the latter group of candidates needs to be supported in their efforts to apply psychoanalysis to other specialty fields.

Institute leadership should attempt to approach chairpersons of departments of psychiatry and clinical psychology of universities to explore the possibility of collaborative projects. Inviting leading scientists and scholars to teach relevant subjects at the institute, while offering institute faculty for teaching and supervision at those university departments, and holding jointly sponsored public conferences, may be confidence-generating, mutually helpful initiatives. Particularly experts in sciences at the boundary of psychoanalytic theory and developments may enrich psychoanalytic education and create an atmosphere favorable to possible collaborative studies and research.

Sometimes the ideal area for a productive collaboration resides in the humanities: literature, cultural anthropology, linguistics, and philosophy. Interdisciplinary approaches, of course, have to be based on an honest desire for mutual learning ... it cannot be a one-way street. The area of psychosomatic medicine offers an opportunity for collaboration as both psychiatry and psychoanalysis can benefit from one another's contribution to the understanding of this issue.

Opening up courses at the psychoanalytic institute to students and faculty of a university with which the institute is engaged in some collaborative effort may be an optimal channel for young academicians interested in a psychoanalytic career: such interest has already been actualized in some of the initiatives mentioned such as the Emory Center and the German International Psychoanalytic University (Levy, 2009).

In short, opening the psychoanalytic institute to a genuine attempt at *rapprochement* with the university may be a viable beginning for creative and really essential new avenues for the future development of psychoanalysis as a science and a profession.

References

- Auchincloss EL, Michels R (2003). A reassessment of psychoanalytic education: Controversies and changes. *Int J Psychoanal* **84**:387–403.
- Cooper A (1987). Changes in psychoanalytic ideas. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* **35**:77–98.
- Cooper A (1995). *Discussion: On empirical research*. In: Shapiro T, Emde RN, editors. *Research in psychoanalysis: Process, development, outcome*, 381–91. Madison, CT: International UP.
- Ferrari H (2009). IUSAM-APdeBA: A higher education institute for psychoanalytic training. *Int J Psychoanal* **90**:1139–54.
- Garza Guerrero C (2006). *Crisis del psicoanálisis. Desafíos organizativos y educativos contemporáneos [Crisis of psychoanalysis. Contemporary organizational and educational challenges]*. Mexico: Textos Mexicanos.
- Garza Guerrero C (2010). Psychoanalysis: Requiescat in pace? A critique from within and a radical proposal. Unpublished manuscript.
- Glick RA (2007). Psychoanalytic education needs to change: What's feasible? Introduction to Wallerstein. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* **55**:949–52.
- Holzman PS (1976). The future of psychoanalysis and its institutes. *Psychoanal Q* **45**:250–73.
- Holzman PS (1985). Psychoanalysis: Is the therapy destroying the science? *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* **33**:725–70.
- Kernberg OF (1986). Institutional problems of psychoanalytic education. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* **34**:799–834.
- Kernberg OF (2004). Resistances to research in psychoanalysis. In: *Contemporary controversies in psychoanalytic theory, techniques, and their applications*, 86–93. New Haven, CT: Yale UP.
- Kernberg OF (2006). The coming changes in psychoanalytic education: Part I. *Int J Psychoanal* **87**:1649–73.

- Kernberg OF (2007). The coming changes in psychoanalytic education: Part II. *Int J Psychoanal* **88**:183–202.
- Levy ST (2009). Psychoanalytic education then and now. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* **57**:1295–309.
- Michels R (2007). Optimal education requires an academic context: Commentary on Wallerstein. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* **55**:985–9.
- Paul RA (2007). Optimal education requires an academic context: Commentary on Wallerstein. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* **55**:991–7.
- Thomä H (2010). Remarks on the first century of the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA) and a utopian vision of its future. Unpublished manuscript.
- Wallerstein RS (1972). The futures of psychoanalytic education. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* **20**: 591–606.
- Wallerstein RS (1980). Psychoanalysis and academic psychiatry-bridges. *Psychoanal Stud Child* **35**:419–48.
- Wallerstein RS (2007). The optimal structure for psychoanalytic education today: A feasible proposal? *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* **55**:953–84.
- Wallerstein RS (2009). Psychoanalysis in the university: A full-time vision. *Int J Psychoanal* **90**: 1107–21.