

# FOOTNOTES

## Comments received on the first draft of the report

### METHODOLOGICAL REMARKS

Footnote1

**Representatives of RC:** If one of the three members of the RC group wanted to add a personal statement, we put this into footnotes and attributed it to the author by name.

Footnote2

**Representatives of RC:** All footnotes are attributed to the authors by name. The footnotes following the meeting on September 5 are underlined.

### REPORT (SECOND REVISION)

#### 1. Different roles of participants

Footnote3

**Jean-François Simoneau:** According to me it would be important to say something about the concerns of some members of the group, mainly from the Europeans Societies, that the term research had to be questioned and the emphasis was put to the necessity of continuity of the process.

**Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber:** Because this feedback was not clear to me, I asked Jean Francois for clarification. He answered in a mail (August 18):

“I wanted to say two things in the same time.

First, some members of the European societies questioned the term research, saying that for them it meant a comparison on psychoanalytical processes involving metapsychology in the three settings (PA/TA and HA). In some ways that is what we have done throughout the day without answering the questions that were sent before.

The second topic was that some members said that it was difficult to understand why we would change the groups after one day of that kind of « confrontation » that was enhancing the differences between the participants and settings. At one point, I said that these differences that were underlined were « our » point of views and that it could be difficult for other participants to identify themselves with our differences.

Hope it is clearer.”

**Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber:** These comments suggest to me that there might be a fundamental misunderstanding as to why the Research Committee decided to opt for this kind of research, the so-called *Action Research project*. We therefore needed to discuss whether we should explain this again in an introductory paragraph to this report or whether the new paragraph 11 inserted in this revision already provides sufficient clarification. We decided to attach my introductory statement to the webinar with the IPA Board on May 17, 2025 to the Appendix in which I summarize in detail our arguments for choosing Action Research instead of a design of classical psychotherapy research ([see Appendix 5](#)) (see also introductory part of the Open Door Review summarizing different research cultures within the IPA which can be downloaded from the IPA website).

Footnote4

**Dominique Suchet:** I continue to think that talking about "two groups" implies the idea of confrontation and controversy, which is not in line with the idea of common research. I think, as you point out, that the project that brings us together is in a perspective of shared reflection; This is not an easy task and the group's dynamic has nevertheless been able to build up with more confidence in this perspective.

Footnote5

**Jean-François Simoneau:** What was underlined by the moderator was that the group dynamics forced some topics to be put aside, example of the self-presentation of the participants

Footnote6

**Representatives of RC:** In order to limit the complexity of the first Action Research Cycle, the RC proposed after the presidential meeting during the EPF conference in April 25 that the ARC in Lisbon should be limited to representatives favoring PA on the one hand and representatives remaining open to the integration of exclusively TA representatives *from one institute each*. Ralph Fishkin succeeded in recruiting five colleagues from his institute in Philadelphia. Dominique Suchet was unable to do so due to time constraints. However, she managed to recruit three additional colleagues from French-speaking countries, all of whom prefer PA. Some of the participants felt that this change in the group composition created an imbalance. Suzanne Benser writes e.g.: Realities that affect the generativity of psychoanalytic training programs add another dimension to our discussion. We share many of those realities, but there are undoubtedly many that we may not. As others in my group mentioned, having only members from our institute and Chuck Fisher from the US, with all others from European countries, certainly adds a feeling of “us/US” vs “EU/you.” It also might introduce factors that are specific to PCOP and not generalizable to other US institutes.

Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber: This topic was discussed again in the Zoom meeting September 5. Understandably, joint reflection on these framework conditions of the Action Research cycle in Lisbon and its limitations gave rise to a desire for further action cycles (e.g., with a broader selection of US American institutes and South American colleagues). However, this report shows that Action Research can only be successful methodologically if the number of members in the group is limited. Otherwise, it will not be possible to take into account the opinions, reactions to the process, etc. of each individual member. This characteristic feature of Action Research Cycles has to be taken into account in further plannings.

## 2. Note on group dynamics

Footnote7

**Dominique Suchet:** I agree with your *point 2 Note on group dynamics*. In my opinion, the lack of trust you felt at the beginning was not between people (which one can fear when reading the report) but in the possibility of productivity of the group!

Footnote8

**Ralph Fishkin:** This list (above) and particularly the phrase, “mutual insinuations,” obfuscate the central tension of the entire meeting: frank disagreement about the legitimacy of online training analysis. Proponents of PA insist that training psychoanalysis can only take place in the room. Proponents of TA insist that training psychoanalysis can take place both in the room and online.

Footnote9

**Richard Cruz:**

The meeting seemed divided between proponents of In Person Analysis arguing for the superiority of bodily presence of analyst and analysand in the room and proponents of Teleanalysis arguing that analysis can be effective both in person and online. The discussion went to extremes of purely in person training analysis versus purely virtual training analysis, when in reality the program that we from Philadelphia presented is a program that primarily involves in person analysis for our local candidates with a smaller component of online analysis for primarily Chinese candidates at a great distance.

## 3. Approaching each other through a short exchange on the history and current situation of each Institute

Footnote10

**Ralph Fishkin:** Under the umbrella of the IPA, and despite the differences in the history of psychoanalysis in the USA and France, the differences in the training in these and other areas of the world have already been accommodated by the creation of the three training models, the Eitingon, the French and the Uruguayan Models. Common essentials have already been recognized by the IPA and many differences have been accepted. It is an exaggeration therefore, to say that the disagreement over one aspect of training, the use of teleanalysis in the training of analysts, represents an “extremely different idea of good training.” This only will make it harder for the IPA Board to achieve the goal of accommodating the difference and preventing a split. It would be better to frame the question as, “Will it be possible, under the umbrella of the IPA, to accommodate this small, specific difference in training into the existing heterogeneous training models, which already have been accepted by the IPA?”

#### 4. Is training analysis only possible in a personal encounter in a room, or is it also possible via screen?

Footnote11

**Dominique Suchet:** I regret that *the notion of transference* does not appear. Perhaps this has not been mentioned very clearly; Yet it is only with the introduction of transference that we can understand how the *concept of embodiment* can be useful in psychoanalysis. It is through him that the analytic situation is not like any new interpersonal situation. It is the listening to the transference in the Freudian sense, that is to say to the repetition of psychosexuality, that makes the analytic situation propose something other than a cathartic repetition, thanks to the possibility of the interpretation of the transference, (or in the transference).

And it is also the reference to transference that introduces the relevance of the reference to the “après-coup”.

And it is also because the notion of transference is central that if we want to continue our work together, we will not be able to avoid submitting clinical presentations, in person or remotely, of analysis or supervision, to the group's work of reflection.

Footnote12

**Bernard Chervet:** Comparison to be discussed: does the expression "making love" apply to all forms of sexuality? What aspects (objectality, solitary phantasmatic auto-eroticism, auto-eroticism for two, auto-eroticism without fantasy, search for calm, etc.) are privileged by proximity and distance?

Footnote13

**Ralph Fishkin:** The report equates PA with classical analysis. This is an overgeneralization, since both TA and PA can be conducted either by means of classical psychoanalysis or more recent clinical approaches and metapsychological theories. PA should not be defined as classical and TA as something else, nor should French psychoanalysis be considered classical and American psychoanalysis non-classical. In other words, classical analysis occurs when practiced by a *classical analyst*, regardless of whether that analysis takes place in the room, or via teleanalysis. Another variation of analysis occurs when practiced by an analyst who embraces that version, whether it takes place in the room or via teleanalysis. This applies to all analysts whether they practice according to the theoretical systems of Freud, Klein, Bion, Winnicott, Kohut, Green or others.

During the meeting we were asked for a definition of psychoanalysis. A French analyst responded with “two people in a room.” No one else attempted a definition. I think that had to do with the unexpected request and the necessity for a complex answer to do the question justice. I have since thought about how I would answer that question and I think we should all be asked again to come up with a definition that would move the discussion forward. Here is my definition:

Psychoanalysis is a theory of the mind, an intensive and open-ended method for examining the mind, and a body of knowledge that has accumulated as a result of its practice. The method depends on an established setting wherein the analyst and the patient freely attempt to experience and examine the thoughts, feelings and behavior that arise spontaneously during the process. The process reveals defenses against other such

emotions and behavior including those about the setting, and the underlying thoughts and feelings that evolve in the transference and countertransference whose meanings are conveyed by means of interpretation.

Footnote14

**Bernard Chervet:** The relationship to perception is to be explored. Perception can be avoided (phobias) or, on the contrary, used to treat internal traumatic experiences (clinging to perception). Hence the aspirations to "stay away" or on the contrary "cling to protocol".

Footnote15

**Ralph Fishkin:** This section, beginning on P.3 and continuing on P.4, is unbalanced against teleanalysis, giving long examples in explanation of the hypothesis that PA is essential for training. I suggest that the final sentence on P. 3 become the start of a new paragraph to demarcate it from the argument for PA, and should be arranged slightly as follows:

In contrast to the view that embodied memory occurs only when two people are together in a room, another member referred to his own clinical experience, in which an analytic candidate in an in-person analysis spoke vividly of her bodily feelings of invasion reaching into her chest and pelvis while she conducted an online psychoanalysis with a patient of hers.

In addition to this, it has been commonly accepted (both by proponents and critics of TA) that in some cases, things that can be said in a teleanalysis cannot be said in the room because the accompanying feelings are too intense.

Furthermore, although it was not mentioned in the meeting, a member of the group subsequently recalled, with respect to intensity in the teleanalysis situation, that there is a possibility of "*sleeping with...or killing,*" even though enacting such a tragic development would, of necessity, be deferred. He recalled an ethics case (not in APsA) in which an analytic supervisor and a student developed sexual feelings for each other, consummated their relationship in multiple in-person visits and eventually married

Footnote16

**Richard Cruz:** There were statements about the inferiority of online treatment which were questioned by analysts with experience with online treatment. There was discussion of intense bodily transference and countertransference reactions being possible with online treatment. Online patients can have a sense of privacy and can free associate. Patients treated online can have intense reactions to interruptions and separations in treatment, raising doubts about the illusion of omnipresence and omnipotence. Boundary violations are also possible with online analysis.

There were arguments that Teleanalysis is less intensive, faster, and inferior to In Person analysis for candidates. Concerns about intensity of training analysis providing the candidate with grounding for analytic work with patients, are in part addressed by Analytic Institutes policies about the frequency of candidate analysis. At PCOP, candidates are expected to be in analysis a minimum of 4 times weekly while doing their supervised clinical work. This applies to both in person and online candidate analyses.

Footnote17

**Jean-François Simoneau:** It is important to recall at this point that we are talking of analyst in training and not of the value of PA or HA for patients that don't intend to become analyst

## **5. Was COVID an exception in terms of life and death, or an unexpected opportunity to discover and develop psychoanalysis in a new medium in an innovative way?**

Footnote18

**Dominique Suchet:** Yes, Covid and lockdown were a historic opportunity for analysts to discover, not only new frames but also to discover the place taken by death in their mind, and their analytic thinking.

These new frames are probably not representative of a possibility to change in method. We cannot overlook the fact that a law (above the regulations of analytic societies or those of the analysts themselves) forbade travel and had instituted the possibility of death in the field of reality. This modified the psychological equilibrium of psychic energy between ideal and superegoic instances. In everyone, analysts, patients, supervised...What about "peacetime" in a way, that is a real question.

Footnote19

**Suzanne Benser:** I briefly mentioned in our meeting that the increasing average age of our training analysts is a factor in our being more open to teleanalysis, since health concerns are less of a barrier in teleanalysis. But on reflection, I wonder if we are outliers compared to many other institutes. PCOP has an unusually tech-savvy group of training analysts, the Fishkins being premier examples. Another example is one of our most beloved training analysts who, in his 90s, is seeing candidates in analysis, supervision, and teaching, all virtually. He would not be able to do this in person due to his age.

The Fishkins led PCOP in considering taking on distance candidates, with discussions throughout the Center and Institute for a year. We accepted our first group of distance candidates from China in 2016, and have monitored our ability to deliver excellent training to all our candidates every year since then. There was a steep learning curve for teaching in the hybrid environment, and several years during which we did not accept distance candidates. This experience allowed many of us to both teach and practice psychoanalysis in the virtual setting before being forced to do so during the pandemic. It also highlighted the differences in our older analysts' abilities to teach remotely.

We have found that having the ability to train a few psychoanalytic candidates who live in areas of Pennsylvania that are too inaccessible to Philadelphia for in-person only access, as well as a limited number of Chinese candidates, has added to the richness of the training for all our candidates.

Another benefit of conducting analyses remotely is that it makes four sessions a week for candidates with young children or those working in demanding mental health service environments more feasible. These hybrid analyses are typically conducted with occasional tele-analysis sessions or a schedule with tele-analysis sessions on specific weekdays. Switching between in-person and tele-analysis introduces variables that must be addressed analytically, as do all variations in the analytic frame.

From my experience overseeing our analytic training program, I believe some older training analysts may be much less comfortable with technology, and that PCOP is unusual in having several older training analysts who are adept. I wonder if a lack of experience in screen use may be a factor in the de facto belief that tele-analysis is unequivocally superior for all candidate analyses in all situations.

Footnote20

**Jean-François Simoneau:** This sequence is not clear to me and, again, it is important to recall that we are talking about analysts in training and not the value of PA/HA for regular patients.

## **6. Fear for the death of psychoanalysis and the IPA**

Footnote21

**Charles Fisher:** On the other hand, it may be critically important to maintain high quality psychoanalysis as an essential element in psychoanalytic training (and treatment) within the realm of TA as a needed base of psychoanalytic presence in cyberspace. If TA is effective for Psychoanalytic Training and treatment, a psychoanalytic presence online could serve as a powerful contrast to the fast, cheap, and mechanized "treatments" that are currently being offered in cyberspace.

Footnote22

**Ralph Fishkin:** TA is not faster than PA. TA advocates do not contend that it is better than PA, though the reverse is true. I do not see how such a casual and superficial hypothesis can be seriously considered in this report, and I suggest that it be removed.

Footnote23

**Ralph Fishkin:** The parenthetical clause above is misleading and unbalanced, because it omits what Philadelphia reported: That while distance candidates sustained the institute during the few years before the pandemic, it too experienced an increase in local candidates eager and able to attend their analyses in person, after the pandemic, and currently.

Footnote24

**Ralph Fishkin:** By characterizing APsA's consensus as -rather American – are the writers sending a dog whistle to the rest of the IPA that such a proposal, and teleanalytic training itself, should be rejected because it comes from “America”? Condescension toward APsA has been current in the IPA for a long time. “Live and let live” is close to the French *laissez faire*, an attitude of letting things take their own course. It arose in France as an economic system in the 17<sup>th</sup> century – rather before the USA existed. That it is “-rather American -“ betrays the view that, at best, APsA analysts are not valued for their rigor and dedication to psychoanalysis, but merely for being a large group of IPA dues paying members.

## 7. "Less is more" – elitism versus social responsibility

Footnote25

**Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber:** These questions touch on the central issue of whether it is important for the IPA to adhere to minimum standards for analytical training in the sense of a regulatory body, also in order to protect psychoanalysis. Harriet Wolfe gave an impressive example of this problem in her panel presentation on Saturday, August 2, 2025: The fundamentalist evangelical supporters of Bolsonaro in Brazil offered a three-month training course to become a “psychoanalyst.” The IPA, as a psychoanalytic organization, wrote several letters to politicians and the press, making it clear that such short-term training has nothing to do with a serious understanding of psychoanalysis according to IPA standards, but is rather a political misuse of the label “psychoanalysis.”

Footnote26

**Dominique Suchet:** It seems to me that we have been able to emphasize that the question of social responsibility concerns the practices of analysts (well-trained) and not that of the training of analysts (and we also have a responsibility to psychoanalysis!)

The "shuttle analysis" for training is a good example of an exception in the continuity of the presence; This shows that the natural background of the cure is "in presence", the remote sessions are a derogation from a basic rule. This gives a special meaning to "absence" or "distance".

Footnote27

**Anne Malone:** I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this important discussion. My Philadelphia colleagues have all responded to the summary with useful comments. I will respond as the one social worker in this group and as the creator of PCOP's course on the history of psychoanalysis.

As a clinical social worker, my training stressed the value and importance of providing services to marginalized and underserved populations. Our roots as a profession are in the Settlement House movement of the early twentieth century which served impoverished recent immigrants. Those early clinicians practiced what they called psychoanalytic social work. By training analysts at a distance where in-person analysis is difficult if not impossible, we continue that valuable tradition.

At PCOP, our Psychotherapy Training Program grew over about 30 years to the point where, today it exists as both a stand-alone program and/or an onramp to full analytic training. Until about 15 years ago, students and graduates of the Psychotherapy Training program were denied the vote in our elections of officers and

on bylaws matters. Members of that group often felt like step-children. Eventually, there was an online debate which resulted in their being recognized as full members of our voting community. That argument is the root of my remarks about our “democratic” emphasis in Philadelphia. I support clear definitions of fully trained psychoanalysts but would not want to designate distance analysis as less-than.

From a historical point of view, we have always argued among ourselves, in person, via letters and more recently online. Much as I respect and teach Freud, I would not like us to do anything which echoes Freud’s rejection of Rank, Adler and Jung or which repeats the past exclusion of non-medical analysts in America.

Footnote28

**Patrick Miller:** You point out: “Outreach” here comes forward as an ethical responsibility for alleviating suffering from mental problems in deprived regions”. First, this has nothing to do with the topic of the research. Secondly it was often said, including by our US colleagues, that TA might find a limit in traumatized patients. 1) In order to do analytic work with traumatized patients, you need to have been able to reach your traumatized parts, 2) If TA doesn’t allow that, how are you going to reach those parts in yourself and help traumatized patients?

Doing outreach to deprived and traumatized populations is important and interesting, but why call it “psychoanalysis”? During our meeting I quoted Winnicott: “When I cannot do analysis, I do something else, as an analyst.” It’s even more difficult than doing analysis.

I have insisted on the very problematic issue of doing TA with patients in totalitarian regimes (mainly, in such instances, China). On one end there are analysts who ignore what it means to live in a totalitarian regime, on the other end patients (and would be analysts) who know that there are millions of people employed by the Party to spy on citizens through all kinds of technological means. I specifically said that, under such conditions, patients cannot follow the fundamental rule of psychoanalysis and that continuing to do analysis under such circumstances is a disavowal of psychoanalysis. I would like this to be written in the report in so many words.

Footnote29

**Siri Erika Gullestad:** In Europe, there is a long tradition of shuttle analysis, e.g. in the training of candidates from Eastern Europe. In Norway, the new procedural code now leads to discussion whether shuttle analysis/ condensed analysis/ may be part of «exceptions» for candidates in analytic training who e.g. live far away from Oslo, the capital, (with the only Psychoanalytic Institute in Norway).

Footnote30

**Charles Fisher:** It is not widely known that the practice of something like Shuttle Analysis was prevalent in the United States in the years prior to about 1965. At that time, there were fewer psychoanalytic training centers in the US than there are today. Typically, candidates remote from a training center travelled by train for long weekends or condensed periods of analysis in a training center.

Footnote31

**Ralph Fishkin:** I scarcely know where to begin with this section. Once again, TA is equated with “less” and it is considered in the report merely as expedient for the purpose of social responsibility. The idea that training by multiple IPA societies of significant numbers of candidates and future IPA members in countries where psychoanalysis is widely unattainable benefits the IPA itself, and sustains the future of psychoanalysis, is not considered here or in Section 8. There, the discussion is limited to the ethical aspects of providing psychoanalytic treatment, not the training of psychoanalysts. Such training, however, was stated repeatedly at the meeting, and appears in this report, as the main justification for the limitation of teleanalysis. What has not been recognized in the report or at the meeting is that “demanding training” is conflated with excellent training. The possibility that “demanding” might also represent institutionalized sadistic identification with the aggressor is not considered. For example, “Shuttle analysis,” per se, was eliminated in the latest Procedural Code, but it continues namelessly, as evidenced by the numerical requirement for a

certain number of sessions per year. Of course, TA is less expensive than leaving one's country, one's family and one's practice, but why is it characterized as "cheap," a term of devaluation?

Footnote32

**Ralph Fishkin:** What does the above question at the bottom of P.6 mean? What injustice?

## 8. Use of technology – the question of confidentiality

Footnote33

**Bernard Chervet:** *The use of "distance" (tele) during training.* Our mission is to focus on the question of the use of "distance" in psychoanalytic training

Even if decisions can focus on training, it is impossible during our reflection to refer only to so-called "training analysis" without referring to the psychoanalytic cure itself; this is for various reasons:

> not to separate two types of psychoanalysis

> The French model envisages only one type of analysis: personal analysis; and this must begin before the training request; hence the impossibility of anticipating during a treatment whether or not a patient will ask to become a candidate.

For supervised analysis, the same.

Footnote34

**Dominique Suchet:** Once again, we cannot neglect that these opinions, this vigilance over confidentiality, the assessment "that there is no problem", are given by experienced analysts who also have training and practice in the field. Would analysts trained remotely have the same vigilance? the same attention?

Footnote35

**Ralph Fishkin:** With respect to the issue that the possible risks of the use of technology would hamper free association, the report again is unbalanced. Why should the risks of those favoring PA be emphasized, as the report states? Are they really risks, or are they anxieties rationalized by the opponents of TA? That possibility is left out of the report. Three things that were suggested at the meeting have not been included in the report:

1) The question of fear of spying and consequent avoidance of free association could be researched by an inquiry of candidates who have completed their teleanalyses.

2) Like any resistance to free association in patients and in analysts, it should be investigated during every teleanalysis in which it appears. Another point made at the meeting also failed to appear in the report: Many candidates in teleanalysis and teleanalytic supervision have reported their own political views frankly, without hesitation or harm, suggesting that resistance could play a role.

3) The same criticisms made about confidentiality are also present in the concern that was raised about the so-called "illusion of the analyst's omnipresence." Like in any analysis, setting up the analytic frame allows for requested or enacted deviations from that frame to be analyzed. This has not been included in the report. It should be added that similar pressure may appear when patient and analyst are in the same room. In other words, the underlying issue is whether or not "genuine psychoanalytic contact" (whatever that means) is available in TA AND PA! Perhaps these concerns would be assuaged if, as the report wisely recommends, it is necessary for analysts to gain experience with TA during their training, and I would add, before they judge it one way or the other.

## 9. Is communication between psychoanalytic cultures and their central beliefs regarding training at all possible? Concrete example: metapsychology

Footnote36

**Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber:** Other central concepts with different cultural interpretations, which were shortly mentioned, were e.g. Nachträglichkeit (après-coup, deferred action), unconscious phantasy, early trauma, concept of the negative, negative hallucination, transference.

Footnote37

**Patrick Miller:** The issue of metapsychology:

You write: " In France, the term (metapsychology) means something like the essentials of psychoanalytic theory that is internalized, making it possible for the analyst to function as an analyst in clinical hours."

I do not recognize myself in this summarized position. My wish to address this issue was mainly a wish to address the differences in metapsychologies. To try and make it short: one doesn't have the same approach to psychoanalysis and what is at stake within an analysis (hence within training) if one's metapsychological reference is the drive theory and what has come to be known as the structural model of the psyche or if one is referring to a relational model, or a Lacanian structuralist approach. I believe that one is more inclined to see very little difference between TA and PA if one is referring to a relational model or a Lacanian structuralist model where "discourse" is prevalent. This is, to me, at the core of the research.

One doesn't listen analytically with an ear that is virgin of theory, explicit or implicit. It doesn't mean that we "apply" theory to the psychic events happening during the session. As Freud said, our attention is "gleich schwebende", but mainly schwebende from Cs/Pcs to Ucs, from secondary processes, to primary ones, to unrepresented states and primitive agonies, i.e. our capacities for regression.

What makes it "possible for an analyst to function as an analyst in clinical hours" cannot be boiled down to "internalized metapsychology", it is far more complex because it implies a psychic work of de-identification, hence also of disconnecting from theory.

In any case, I do not accept the categorization "French" in general, and for myself in particular. The need to tag "the French" may be a bias that needs to be addressed. It would restrict the value of the research a lot if it was reduced to a caricatural opposition between "French" and "American" psychoanalysis. If the four of us, French colleagues, began to talk together, we would see significant differences come up, but certainly, also, a common ground. And, to address the issue of "the split": there are differences, obviously, between European analysts, but I'm sure that we have a common ground among us which may not be the same as our American colleagues. The fact that we are on the one hand, four European analysts working in the "French Model" and French speaking versus five US analysts (in addition all from the same society) can become, in my view, problematic and may increase the risks of reductionism. I think it is also important to stress the fact that two among the French, are really struggling a lot with English. This reduces considerably their possibility to express nuances that are so important (like, for instance, in the discussion about metapsychology).

Footnote38

**Bernard Chervet:** The work of mentalization (which includes dream work, play work, work of free association, etc.) has two parts: in presence and in absence; with many intermediaries and nuances that take place in childhood and in session: physically present-psychically present; physically present-psychically absent; physically absent-psychically present; physically absent-psychically absent; etc.

The psychoanalytic cure is based on such alternations and oscillations.

What are the modalities developed by physical in-person sessions, and those developed at a physical distance?

... an addition of a reflection on the *theory of psychoanalytic work in session*, a theory that is necessary to differentiate between working with physical presence and working with physical distance.

I wanted to emphasise the functions of the Nebenmensch in the growth of the child, then in the acquisition of its identifications, functions that are involved again in psychic treatments.

The translation of the word Nebenmensch deserves attention: the « other close human », who is the object of satisfaction, the object of hostility and a 'power' that helps (the person who is well informed and who gives the adequate response and the model of identification).

The word close has two meanings: close physically and close psychologically as a human being with a psychic life

Footnote39

**Ralph Fishkin:** "Even worse?" This topic has been extensively disputed in American psychoanalysis, notably by Morris Eagle (1984), who makes the point that while metapsychology can be defensively used to avoid experience-near manifestations of transference and countertransference, it is an error to dismiss more abstract psychoanalytic theory, i.e., metapsychology, because that is part "of a continuum of levels of abstraction, comprehensiveness, and depth and power of explanation. (See also Holt, 1972, on the tension within psychoanalytic theory of Freud's mechanistic and humanistic images of man.)"

References: Eagle M.N, (1984). *Recent Developments in Psychoanalysis: A Critical Evaluation*. Chapter 13, Clinical Theory and Metapsychology, 147-153. Cambridge MA and London England. Harvard University Press. Holt R.R. (1972)., Freud's mechanistic and humanistic images of man. *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Science*, 1972, 1,3-24. New York: Macmillan.

Footnote40

**Richard Cruz:** I was concerned about the characterization of American metapsychology involving primarily 50's and 60's ego psychology.

American institutes like PCOP currently teach the perspectives of British Object Relations Theorists, French analysts, Self Psychologists, and Relational and Intersubjective Schools. On line analysis and in person analysis is informed by many perspectives.

#### **10. Does the APsA want to reopen the procedural code debate? -- Prejudices and realities. The five-year moratorium as an opportunity**

Footnote41

**Dominique Suchet:** This is undoubtedly the open door for future reflection. To the themes you take up, I would emphasize or add *the question of our theories or our conceptions of language and speech (speaking)*, according to the idea that has been said that for "Europeans" the conception of language is active in listening to the analyst, that it is not a secondary intellectual formation. 'I remember giving the example of how, during the meeting, I heard my colleague say about a patient, 'she was talking about her absence, she was saying she wasn't there,' and how those words 'absence,' 'wasn't there' had multiple meanings and levels simultaneously in my listening) Indeed, the question of the negative and the negative hallucination raised by the situation at a distance is important only because it modifies (or perhaps does not modify ?) the nature of language and speech, its relationship to "the thing". It is a whole section of Freudian theory that is concerned.

Perhaps it is in this part that we were able to say the *difference between "variation" and "exception"* and that for some (including me) it was important that the IPA maintain the firmest definitions that can have exceptions but that the notion of variation is not retained because it alters the definition.

Footnote42

**Siri Erika Gullestad:** The question could have been directed also to the French group, as many European colleagues also question the new procedural code (cfr letter to the president signed by many European presidents). Harriet Wolfe said after the presidents' meeting that one of the presidents said that he felt «trampled upon by the new procedural code». It would have been interesting to discuss what would happen if there came to a split between American and European psychoanalysis, that some Europeans see as necessary. My prediction is that this would lead to fighting between e.g. English psychoanalysis and e.g. French. There is no consensus about what is «European psychoanalysis».

Footnote43

**Ralph Fishkin:** The above needs clarification. Philadelphia is offering TA training to two gifted candidates in the upcoming academic year. There are 9 other teleanalytic candidates in other years, including advanced candidates that were admitted during the pandemic, but we decide each year how many teleanalytic candidates to admit. All in all, we have graduated 5 such candidates. The reasons for the limiting the number in teleanalytic training each year is that we recognize that we must have a significant number of local candidates in order to replenish our faculty with future analysts who are available to teach, supervise and analyze our candidates in the future, so that our institute can flourish.

Footnote44

**Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber:** It is important to know that APsA members can follow their existing training standards for the next five years and remain IPA members while doing so. This was an aspect of the compromise achieved through the IPA-APsA Work Group and accepted by the IPA Board alongside the revision of the procedural code. Charles Fisher: While not all APsA institutes allow training by TA under Local Option, there is a shared value within APsA of permitting freedom within limits. Hence the importance of a compromise in five years that takes this APsA value into account (see Appendix 4)..

Footnote45

**Ralph Fishkin:** The adoption of Local Option had more to do with the long-time dissatisfaction with 70 years of oligarchical control of training by the sunsetted APsA Board on Professional Standards than it does with a «revolutionary spirit of freedom in the US. » That spirit had relevance in 1776, but not in 2016, or now, for that matter. Local Option was approved as a correction, not a revolution. What is the purpose of the researchers' gratuitous assertion of «American revolutionary spirit» in this report? While Local Option allows APsA's approved institutes to determine their own psychoanalytic training criteria, they must do so within the limits of the APsA Educational Standards, which recognizes the IPA's Standards. The requirements of some approved institutes are more stringent than the minimum requirements of APsA and of the IPA as well. In Philadelphia, we require candidates' training analyses at no less than 4 times a week, and we require 3 credited cases for graduation.

From the APsA Standards and Principles for Psychoanalytic Education (P.3):

APsA is responsible for creating a frame and a foundation for psychoanalytic education in its Approved Institutes. APsA Standards establish principles of psychoanalytic education and provide guidelines for institutes to implement those principles. APsA's model of education respects the integrity and competence of its institutes to implement the principles of psychoanalytic education and recognizes that each institute has the right to adapt procedures to its culture, environmental circumstances, and practical needs, providing they are consistent with APsA Standards.

APsA uses the IPA's training requirements as a baseline for its Standards for qualification and admission to membership. APsA standards are primarily qualitative; where quantitative requirements are necessary, they should be regarded as threshold standards indicating that psychoanalytic education continues, rather than concludes, upon graduation.

## **11. Could intensive discussion of clinical material from training analyses (PA/TA) help in making institutional decisions**

Footnote46

**Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber:** Paragraph 11 was added to the first draft of the report, because Phil Stokoe told us in his feedback that this topic was omitted in the first draft of the report.

Footnote47

**Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber:** For this reason, various research groups have focused on this issue in their clinical and conceptual work in recent years. To mention just one example: The EFP working party on Theoretical Issues investigated the role of private theories, see Canestri, J. (Ed): (2006): *Psychoanalysis: From*

*Practice to Theory*. NY: Wiley, or Canestri, J. (Ed): (2012): *Putting Theory to Work: How Are Theories Actually Used in Practice?* London: Karnac.

Footnote48

**Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber:** The most famous example in history are for me the controversial discussions within the British Society during World War II. The presentation of clinical case material did not motivate representatives of the “Middle Group” to switch to the Kleinian group, for example. On the other hand, arguments (possibly illustrated by clinical observations) contributed to a greater understanding of the other position and thus prevented a split in the British Society.

Footnote49

**Charles Fisher:** In the Open Door Review of Outcome and Process Studies in Psychoanalysis, Third Edition (2015), Dominic Scarfone discusses Laplanche’s approach to problems in psychoanalytic theory. He proposes that “a well documented conceptual debate ... could possibly diminish the theoretical distance between different ‘schools’,” (Open Door Review, p. 35). The Action Research Cycle in which we are engaged, with its richly detailed presentation of differing psychoanalytic points of view, can evolve into such a well-documented conceptual debate rather than a mere conflict between theories. One specific issue that can be explored in that way is the question of embodiment. Is it present for analyst and analysand in Teleanalysis as well as in In-Person Analysis?

## 12. Splitting: solution or capitulation

Footnote50

**Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber:** As we know, this attack on Western democracies always includes attacks on the separation of powers (e-g- independent courts, press, education) but also art, culture, and science (cf. e.g., experiences under National Socialism, but unfortunately also in today's Russia and under the current Trump administration). I am therefore personally very grateful that, thanks to the efforts of numerous colleagues over the last three decades, it has been possible within the IPA to resolve many controversies and lead to a differentiated understanding of *psychoanalysis as a science* (as opposed to a worldview or a religion). (cf. the summary statements on different scientific cultures in the IPA in the introduction to the Open Door Review by Dominique Scarfone on the French tradition, Ricardo Bernardi on the South American tradition, Peter Fonagy on the Anglo-American tradition, and Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber on the German/Swiss research tradition). This prevented a threatening split between “clinicians” and “researchers” in the IPA at the end of the 20th century. Instead, structures such as the Research Committees were established, which are now also called upon by the IPA Board with their specific knowledge to investigate institutional conflicts (as we are attempting to do in the ARC). In the best case, such established institutional structures can help to ward off attacks on “psychoanalysis as a science (“Wissenschaft”)” and its global institution (the IPA), attacks that we must expect worldwide in the current situation in society as a whole.

Footnote51

**Ralph Fishkin:** The IPA has tried unsuccessfully to deal with the conflict over teleanalytic training by formulating and reformulating numerical restrictions. This has proved to be unsuccessful in resolving the conflict, because numerical compromise has failed to address the mutually exclusive conceptions of psychoanalysis that exist in the IPA. In my view, many difficulties and differences are conflated in the conflict about teleanalysis, and I hope we will come to recognize that teleanalytic training of candidates is not a critical or major determinant of the essence of psychoanalysis. Once its importance is put into proper perspective, I hope The IPA Board will arrive at *laissez faire*, as a previous Board did when it created the three models of training

Footnote52

**Dominique Suchet:** I would like to add here a reflection that I did not have during our meeting and that I am inspired by reading your report. The splits that our companies have had (in France) have been made "in relation to the IPA", i.e. it is to be integrated into the IPA (APF), or not to be there (IV° Group) or to return to it (SPRF). This presupposes reflections within the societies which then address the IPA as a "superior" instance. It is not the same as thinking of a split within the IPA. (there is the same difference as between conflict and splitting ; conflict is fruitful, splitting no).

Footnote53

**Lana Fishkin:** Feedback from Action Research meeting in Lisbon, Portugal on Tuesday July 26, 2025

Sadly, I came away from this meeting with a pervasive sense that the "deck was stacked" against the adoption of local option of teleanalysis as a modality in analytic training. The French participants DEFINE psychoanalytic treatment as "two people in the same room". End of story! Where does one go from there? A significant factor in this imbalance was that all five of the proponents of teleanalysis were from the same institute, Philadelphia, and each of our counterparts were from different French institutes. That didn't seem appropriate or balanced and wasn't part of the original proposal.

There was an underlying air of condescension from our French counterparts that was palpable to me during the meeting, and it seems reflected in the attitude of the Research Committee in the summary report. None of them seemed to have extensive clinical experience with teleanalysis, whereas the Philadelphia group have all gained extensive experience. My first teleanalysis, with a Chinese MD PhD in Beijing, took place 18 years ago. It was extremely productive and gratifying to analyst and patient. I have continued to work in this modality ever since. How can you persuade a colleague who refuses to be persuaded as to the efficacy of a mode of analytic treatment for future analysts?

Ralph Fishkin referenced the IPA's already endorsed 3 separate models of training, the Eitingon, the French and the Uruguayan. I don't understand why it can't incorporate the substantially equivalent modality of exclusive teleanalysis as an option, when necessary, under the IPA umbrella. Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber: I agree that it was indeed a great achievement on the part of the IPA Board over many years to describe the three different training models and accept them as three different training models under the umbrella of the IPA (see my historical remarks below). However, in the years that followed, it became apparent that it was not possible for the IPA to centrally control the associated (implicit and explicit) quality criteria for the various training models (e.g., through sight-visiting committees). This institutional fact seems, in my perspective, relevant to our current discussion.

Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber: Lana Fishkin brought up this issue again in the Zoom meeting September 5. She postulated that the IPA—similar to the solution to the conflict just described—could also accept three different models: predominantly PA, hybrid analysis, and exclusively TA. The analogy between the current decision to integrate TA into psychoanalytic training and the 2007 decision to accept three different training models is historically problematic. As is well known, until the beginning of the 21st century, the Eitingon model (with 4-5 weekly sessions) was the only training model officially accepted by the IPA. The French model was accepted in the sense of a so-called "grandparent clause": which meant that in France, three-session training was permitted on the condition that this model would not "spawn offspring", i.e., be transferred to other IPA societies. French President Daniel Widlöcher (2001-2005) in particular advocated for the French model to be fully recognized by the IPA. After intense controversy, the IPA Board accepted the three models—Eitingon, French, and Uruguayan—in 2007, all of which contained the essentials of psychoanalytic training (training analysis, supervision cases, etc.). Thus, the fundamental principles of psychoanalytic training were not put to the test at that time.

However, in practice, it became apparent that despite several oversight committees, the IPA was unable to monitor compliance with the model-specific criteria. This was one of the reasons why the IPA Board accepted the 3-5 rule in 2017 (see e.g. Loewenberg, P., Thompson, N.L.(2011): 100 Years of the IPA. London: Karnac. In contrast to the situation 2007: One dimension of the current conflict seems to be that many of our European colleagues are convinced that exclusive TA training analyses are not possible, as significant unconscious conflicts can only unfold, be observed, and be worked on in a personal relationship between analyst and analysand.

Footnote54

**Siri Erika Gullestad:** In 2017 the IPA Board reached a compromise concerning training models, accepting varying session frequencies (3-5 sessions a week). Lana Fishkin argues for a similar compromise concerning TA, accepting 100% TA in training as one of several training modalities – implying a “live and let live” attitude. In my understanding, the two are not comparable: Accepting varying session frequencies does not imply a different understanding of what is essential in psychoanalytic process, whereas 100% TA, with no embodied encounter in the room, for many analysts implies not fulfilling what we mean by a psychoanalytic process. What is at stake, is the definition of what kind of method psychoanalytic treatment is, and what should be the minimal training criteria for calling oneself a psychoanalyst. This seems to be the essence of the letter by several European presidents expressing strong concern about the new procedural code.

Footnote55

**Patrick Miller:** It's been a great pleasure to be part of this working group, even though it was a difficult group. Despite the benevolent ending of the day, I thought in hindsight that our differences run so deep that they might be irreconcilable indeed. They are differences in culture, at large, in psychoanalytic culture and in what we think is at stake in an analysis and is demanded of an analyst to enable a genuine working through. My overall impression of your report was that it is benevolent and most often accurate, although I find a certain tendency to smooth over some difficulties, differences and conflicts. I think it was difficult for the group to keep a focus on the object of the research, i.e. is tele-analysis acceptable for the analyses of candidates, or training analyses. As was pinpointed: The question is about standards for *training* to become a psychoanalyst. There is a marked tendency in our American colleagues to introduce a "moralizing" stance in order to justify remote analysis (outreach, moral and social responsibility, traumatized populations).

Footnote56

**Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber:** During the discussion of the revised report at the joint Zoom conference on September 5, 2025, it became very clear to me that some of my European colleagues were far more concerned about a split in the IPA—triggered by the future integration of 100% TA into psychoanalytic training—than some of my American colleagues (see also the fact, that around 30% of the European IPA members have been voting in the last IPA elections in contrast to only around 20% of the APsA members). For many Europeans, the current compromise in the Procedural Code (at least 25% PA) already represents a painful compromise. According to some European colleagues in the group, the demand to accept 100% TA in psychoanalytic training would lead to a split in the IPA. In contrast, two of the colleagues from Philadelphia who were present emphasized that, although they would like the IPA to find a way to integrate 100% TA under its umbrella, they do not want to forego this opportunity at present, even if it could result in a split in the IPA. One factor here is that APsA, as a large institution that has been more or less independent of the IPA to date, could exist without the IPA. In my view, this highlights the current political conflict in all its severity: Will the IPA succeed in resolving it after the five-year moratorium? Will these conflicting views on psychoanalytic training still exist in all their severity after five years?

I was impressed by how, on the one hand, the sharply contrasting convictions were represented with great passion in our meeting of September 5th, but at the same time there was a noticeable increase in interest in understanding each other's psychoanalytic views, concepts, and clinical experience.

For example, Richard Cruz was interested in an in-depth dialogue with Dominique Suchet about her understanding of transference in relation to the bodily presence of the analyst and analysand in the same room. Raph Fishkin was interested in the concept of negative hallucination. This increased openness to others suggests that further Action Research cycles could be promising.

## **Additional comments received after 5 September Zoom meeting**

### **Richard Cruz:**

There were 3 points I wanted to highlight from the Sept 5 discussion.

1) 2 positions were articulated on teleanalysis: Teleanalysis alone for analysts in training should be allowed as an accepted model vs Teleanalysis alone should be allowed only as an exception in certain circumstances with the norm being some minimal hybrid requirements of a certain number or percentage of in person analytic sessions being required. It is hoped that this conflict won't lead to an IPA/APsA split.

2) It would be helpful to explore differences in how members conceptualize in person vs virtual treatment including concepts of absence and negative hallucination and how this relates to depth and effectiveness of analysis.

3) It would be helpful to have input from candidates and recent graduates who have had distance analysis and input from other American and non-American analytic training programs with distance components.

### **Dominique Suchet:**

The Zoom meeting confirmed that we could/wish to move forward together in a deepening of the questions posed to psychoanalysis by the new modes of communication. Beyond the technical and/or practical questions that may divide us, we have been interested together in metapsychological questions, that is to say in the foundation of psychoanalysis.

The following lines are in addition to the remarks I sent on 2 September following the reading of the report of the meeting in Lisbon. They do not cancel them but complement them.

Perhaps we do not agree on the temporality to "adapt" or not the new technical modalities to the very particular speech device of the psychoanalytic method. Some think that this can be done, and that it is being done, right now without consequences, others (including myself) think that an adaptation of this style (which concerns the presence in person to speak) is based on a theoretical conception of the life of the mind that is at odds with Freudian metapsychology or at least questions it. This is why, from my point of view, there is a separation to be made between the political positions that belong to the IPA executive and the theoretical deepening of research that must be able to be done freely and allow the executive to decide. It is this freedom that we were able to envisage and experience during our face-to-face meetings in Lisbon and then by zoom

It can be seen that this possibility implies *the construction of a climate of mutual trust*. This observation reinforces the desire that we are not hired once to testify but engaged in a work process.

The questions that have come to light are about *transference* and *incarnation (embodiment)* in transference. This supposes, in order to deepen, that perhaps we explore together clinical *testimonies that we could share* in order to understand the characteristics of the patient's speaking and the analyst's listening in one or the other situation. How incarnation is different, how *formal and topical regressions* occur. Because the fundamental question is that of *speech (language) in psychic life*, its foundations, its nature. (And it is on the subject of language that the history of psychoanalysis in France has been built)

In this regard, it has been said that "the French" say that analysis is "two body in the same room" I agree that this is reductive! the reference to Freud (1925) is in "Profane Analysis" where he writes "They are together, and they speak"

All these questions (transference, language, regression, incarnation) had already been considered, but it turns out that we have begun to have a discussion and a more precise and deep reflection on a very particular point that is both theoretical and clinical: that of *the negative hallucination*. I agree with Ralph Fishkin in thinking that with this question we can approach both the topical, dynamic and economic questions that are at the center of the issues of speech in analysis, and correlatively of the construction of the psychic apparatus. We started to think about it together.

I am grateful to the Action Research cycle and the first report for having sparked increased interest in this fundamental issue.

### **Ralph Fishkin:**

Our research subject groups came together as strangers speaking different languages and straining to speak and understand each other's choice of words and the concepts we were discussing. In addition, we experience each other as functioning in different psychoanalytic training models that we imperfectly understood. I join Dr. Suchet in her wish that our discussions will continue, and I hope that we find that the metapsychological terms and concepts that at present seem strange to our ears may not be so different when explored in depth.

In her statement issued after the September 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, Dr. Suchet referred to, "the very particular speech device of the psychoanalytic method." I gather that she is referring to "this style (which concerns the presence in person to speak) is based on a theoretical conception of the life of the mind that [she believes] is at odds with Freudian metapsychology or at least questions it." I ask her and any reader of this document to define for our mutual understanding, beyond my conviction, based on my experience, that the "life of the mind" can be understood in teleanalysis, how my views of embodiment and the importance of establishing and analyzing deviations of the analytic frame are "at odds with Freudian metapsychology or at least questions it," and what impediments they present to the development of "a climate of analytic trust."

I also ask her to explain her use of "incarnation" to explain embodiment in the transference. I understand *that* [emphasis added] she believes that the presence of the analytic couple in the flesh is essential to the development and analysis of transference. Incarnation is a term I have never encountered in any discussion of transference. I do not understand *why* [emphasis added] she is discontent with the conception of embodiment as a complex psychic entity. Also, since speech takes place both in the analyst's office and in the teleanalytic room, and since it is speech in psychic life that is essential to the foundation of psychoanalysis in France, why this speech must only take place in the room? When Freud said in 1925 that analyst and analysand "are together, *and they speak*," [emphasis by Dr. Suchet] he could not have envisioned the Zoom room, and so citing him as an authority requiring co-presence in the room would be the same as saying that all psychoanalytic papers must be written by hand, as he did, and not on a laptop computer, as we can do.

### **Embodiment**

I view embodiment as a process in which the discourse about the body that takes place between the analyst and the analysand on the couch evolves as complex mental phenomena that are configured by the personal history and the desires that are evoked by the entirety of the transference situation. Experiencing and talking about the body is overdetermined in teleanalysis, just as in the office, and it transforms the physical body into a contextualized psychic object there as well. In my experience, the physical co-presence of the two bodies is not required for the development of this mental phenomenon. If the teleanalytic situation is set up to enable the communication of spontaneous association by the analytic pair in the virtual room with the patient on the couch and the analyst positioned out of direct sight, the development and analysis of the transference can occur. Thus, teleanalysis also allows for the retroactive attribution of new meaning to past events according to concepts of *nachtraglichkeit* and *apres-coup*.

### **Impediments to Teleanalysis**

Teleanalysis will be impeded unless we recognize and analyze, not prejudge, our and our patients' anxieties underlying the inevitable distress and defenses against them that arise in the teleanalytic setting. Such interferences to analysis can be recognized and analyzed just as they can in the "customary" psychoanalytic setting. Recognizing these interferences requires the analyst to set up the teleanalytic frame and to observe and address the inevitable deviations that are brought about by the patient and those that arise in the analyst. This part of the work is what every analyst must do to understand the transference/countertransference disturbances that arise in each setting and in every analysis. In every analysis we must be open to recognizing and analyzing those interferences that have to do with the setting itself. Yes, there is a learning curve to working in a new setting. Continuing education, consultation, and experience are necessary to develop skills before deciding wisely whether teleanalysis is an effective setting

for the training of analysts. In that regard, I again recommend that every analyst engage in some teleanalysis during their personal analysis and their training cases. I don't think there is any reason to specify how much. A specific number is a compromise among the rule makers, but becomes an arbitrary choice that provides no option to the users and thus will make everyone unhappy, because for some it is too much, and for others not enough.

#### Our Process

Mention was made during the course of our first meeting of the letter from the European Presidents organization opposing teleanalysis and mentioning the possibility of splitting or withdrawing from the IPA. The Philadelphia group was asked about the possibility of APsA splitting from the IPA. While the spectre of splitting is an important issue, the mention of it at our research meeting introduced a component of political threat that interferes with our efforts to reach mutual understanding, and raises the question of whether there is even any point to continuing to meet and talk, if in the end the issue is going to be resolved by external political pressure on or by the ARC.

#### Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber:

One of the goals of Action Research is not only to address current complex institutional and political conflicts, but also to bring as many related, preconscious and unconscious aspects as possible to the table. The aim is to gain knowledge („Wissenschaft“) — in the sense of gaining knowledge that has previously stood in the way of a productive solution to complex conflicts: The research process brings these latent fantasies and conflicts to the surface of consciousness and thus to shared critical reflection. This is the reason why the danger of splitting within the IPA had to be mentioned, as well as other historical and contemporary aspects of the current controversial discussions within the IPA:

This is a *very specific goal of Action Research*, in contrast to, for example, “classical psychotherapy research,” in which researchers are known to try to examine the research subject as neutrally as possible. Therefore, in response to Ralph Fishkin's statement: Action Research is indeed about understanding the opposing views of colleagues. However, this understanding serves to resolve the current institutional (or political) conflict by the IPA Board and is not an end in itself. ([see Appendix 5](#)).

#### Lana Fishkin:

These are some additional thoughts stimulated by our Zoom meeting on September 5.

- I am now, more than ever, convinced that the Philadelphia position, favoring teleanalysis, and the French position, dismissing any treatment of future analysts that doesn't require “two bodies in the room” as not analysis, will never converge. Therefore I am again recommending that we take a page from our analytic predecessors, who developed 3 equally acceptable training models: the Eitingon, the French, and the Uruguayan. They are all listed, and described, on the IPA website.
- The so-called “compromise” of requiring 25% in-person sessions requires “shuttle analysis” with its 2 or 3 sessions a day, and that, to my mind, seriously distorts analytic treatment. How would the group feel about the Procedural Code requiring all analyses in the room to have 25% of sessions online? I assume that wouldn't be acceptable, but more acceptable might be a statement stating that “some” online sessions in every in-person analysis would be desirable in the interest of further study and exploration of the setting. I think the idea of a number, 25%, or any arbitrary number, is a mistake because that, as we have already seen, it makes everyone unhappy. This is an illusion of a compromise as there is only one choice.

#### Charles Fisher:

I would like to highlight two concepts that have been brought forward in our meetings as potentially differentiating between what is possible in in-person analysis and what is possible in teleanalysis. I think it is important whether and how these phenomena are available for clinical use in teleanalysis. These concepts have been amplified in our email exchanges, as well as in our meetings. I am referring to:

## 1. Psychic embodiment

## 2. Negative hallucination

To amplify a bit on the topic of psychic embodiment, I believe it is helpful to refer to Gallese, V., Eagle, M.N. & Migone, P. (2007) Intentional Attunement: Mirror Neurons and the Neural Underpinnings of Interpersonal Relations. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 55: 131-176. This article elaborates on processes of "unconscious communication, projective identification, attunement, empathy, autism, therapeutic action, and transference-countertransference interactions." The article clarifies and expands on these topics in a useful way. Another useful resource is the book *Finding the Body in the Mind: Embodied Memories, Trauma, and Depression* by Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber (2015).

In connection with the topic of negative hallucination, as it is used in French Psychoanalysis, my own thinking began with Andre Green's concept of "the work of the negative," and a concept of "the ego's active suppression or denial of a perception, resulting in a gap or 'negative' space in reality." Significantly, Dominique Suchet clarified that the concept does not refer only to a defensive process, but rather to a process that is necessary for thinking, "for example how childhood presence/emptiness becomes presence/absence." It is clear how essential this process is for psychoanalytic work.

My overall point in making these comments is my view that we cannot simply assert that psychic embodiment and negative hallucination are or are not present in both in-person analysis and teleanalysis. Rather, we must take these concepts into account to raise the level of our discussion.

### Jean-François Simoneau:

I am very sorry that I was not able to attend to the Action Research meeting last Friday. Actually, and it is to be underlined, I had a shuttle analysis that could not be moved.

I just listened a second time to the zoom meeting and I must encouraged everyone to listen to it again because the polarized positions could be enhanced and explored metapsychologically and politically again and again.

In regards of our mission, I really think that you were able to start the working through of the differences and the political stakes of the topic, not between TA, HA or PA but of the definitions of psychoanalysis according to our roots and own training.

I sustain the report as such with the footnotes, removing the one from our president elect. There are topics that were not addressed from our initial meeting. The first one is that TA was born or initiated out of a fear of death of psychoanalysis or of the institutes that saw there candidates and training analysts dying (according to RL statement at our first meeting) and the second one is that everybody was sustaining that PA was seen as preferable by everybody around the table (quote of Susan) and that the two gifted candidates could not benefit from the group spirit of the training.

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX 1: Ralph Fishkin: *Answers to questions for preparing the first Action Research circle in Lisbon*

### **1. Historical development and current situation of training at your institute**

**Please briefly describe the current training situation at your institute (structure, number of candidates, objectives, etc.). How have these structures developed historically? Is there a particular understanding of psychoanalysis that you would characterize as essential for your institute based on its history, the current anchoring of the institute in national and international psychoanalytic bodies, the local Public Health Care, the relationship with universities, the public, the society etc.?**

Philadelphia is a large city in northeastern USA with health care and research being a major source of enterprise in the region. It struggles with disparities of income and racial inequality between many of its inner city and suburban neighborhoods. Philadelphia has many universities offering undergraduate and graduate programs in psychology and social work. It also has five medical schools and several teaching hospitals with psychiatric residency training programs. These all provide students to our training programs, and our members are teachers and supervisors at many of these institutions.

The Psychoanalytic Center of Philadelphia is affiliated with the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsA) and, through APsA, with the International Psychoanalytical Association. The current Center resulted from the merger of two institutes/societies, each of which had been in operation since 1949, when the Philadelphia Psychoanalytic Society and Institute, which had been established in 1934, split into two organizations, the aforementioned Society and the Philadelphia Association for Psychoanalysis. In 2000, the two organizations reunified after each group recognized that they were competing to divide a finite group of prospective analysts. This was the first such reunification of previously split groups in APsA. Subsequently, two additional American psychoanalytic centers also have reunified, following similar previous splits. The Philadelphia reunification was approved by the two groups after they each separately engaged in a three-year process of discussing the feasibility, benefits and detriments of reunification, along with the practical arrangements and a suitable governance structure. Subsequently, it took an additional 15-20 years of continuing to iron out the remaining tensions to bring about the largely harmonious atmosphere that prevails today. At present, PCOP has 36 candidates, 56 TA/PA/SAs, and 80 analyst members.

PCOP has a collaboration with the University of Pennsylvania (Penn). Our members teach undergraduate and graduate students in Penn's Departments of Psychiatry and Anthropology and sponsor joint programs between Penn and PCOP. The collaboration has resulted in several of Penn's students enrolling in our educational programs and becoming psychoanalysts. We also have an arrangement with Temple University's Department of Psychiatry, in which Temple provides one-year scholarships for 6 psychiatry residents per year to take the first year of our combined psychoanalysis/psychotherapy curriculum. A number of these residents take additional training with us.

When the pandemic hit and our program went online exclusively, we experienced an increase in applications and as a result have been able to expand our student body. This increased interest has continued and the increased revenue from tuition has offset the decrease in revenue from members' dues, resulting from the retirement and death of older analyst members. Because of these opposing trends, and to provide enough analysts and supervisors, we have been encouraging our superior graduating analysts to enter our Developmental Pathway as a form of continuing education that will lead to careers as analysts of candidates, supervising analysts and teachers in our institute. In addition, we have appointed qualified analysts from

other APsA approved institutes, and from IPA institutes as well (Israel and South Africa) as personal analysts, supervisors and teachers.

The mission of the Psychoanalytic Center of Philadelphia is to provide psychoanalytic education and to promote psychoanalytic practice and thought. Its formal educational programs include both adult and child psychoanalytic education as taught from a contemporary perspective. Our curriculum exposes our students to the major theoretical systems currently in use throughout the world. Our educational programs consist of training in both adult and child psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy, and a Fellowship Program offering one- and two-year fellowships to both clinical and academic applicants. Since 2020, we have combined the curriculum of the first two years of our three-year Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy Training Program and our open-ended Psychoanalytic Training Program.

The Philadelphia Psychoanalytic Foundation is a separate non-profit charitable foundation. The Psychoanalytic Center of Philadelphia is the sole member of the Foundation. Its mission is to promote and support psychoanalytic education and training, and to encourage innovative community-based programs and research efforts that enhance the public awareness of psychoanalysis. A principal activity of the Foundation is to provide scholarships to PCOP students. Over the years, these scholarships have been a major factor in assisting candidates to afford psychoanalytic training. This year, the Foundation will make \$60,700 available for scholarships to our students.

## ***2. In person (P-A) versus tele- training analyses (T-A)***

**What regulations exist regarding the question of whether one's own training analysis can be carried out in person or as teleanalysis? In what context have these developed (Corona crisis? Development of modern media? Situation of psychoanalysis in the current social situation? Attractiveness for the next generation? Competition with other psychotherapeutic schools? Regulations by state institutions? Etc.)**

In 2016, our first hybrid cohort of analytic candidates consisted of 4 Chinese and 6 local students. This proved challenging for many of our teaching faculty, but within a few years, we improved our technology, and our faculty became more proficient in the hybrid teaching environment. We also became more experienced and astute in our acceptance and progression of Chinese applicants. Like elsewhere in the world, the historical impact of COVID 19 on psychoanalysis in the US was volcanic. The experience that we had already developed with distance teaching and online analysis was extremely beneficial for our training programs and made the necessary transition to online work much less difficult than for other American institutes that lacked this experience.

Currently, PCOP does not offer a formal distance learning program, but will consider qualified distance applicants in exceptional circumstances, such as having a disability or illness that prevents in-person attendance. Additionally, qualified international or non-local applicants who lack access to a local institute and are proficient in English will be considered, if PCOP can provide analysis and supervision, or if the applicant can secure a qualified analyst or supervisors to fulfill those functions.

Regarding training cases, our policy states: "Candidates may have one 3 time per week training case. It may not be the first training case, except for distance learners, in which case it can be, depending on their practice environment. The candidate must explain to the CPC, [Candidate Progressions Committee] with input from the Supervisor and in the form of a case report, or through oral explanation to the CPC, why 3 times per week is needed for this particular case. The case must demonstrate an analytic process, independent of frequency, to be acceptable for graduation. Candidates may conduct online one of the three training cases required for graduation. If the candidate is deemed ready to proceed with a training case and already has experience with online treatment, online and in-person training cases may be undertaken in any order. However, it is recommended that the first case be in-person. The Progressions Committee will take an individual candidate's situation under consideration."

To date we have accepted distance analyses for American as well as Chinese and other international candidates. With local candidates, we have left the decision of the balance between online and in-person

sessions to the analytic couple. Our explicit expectation is that there should be as much in-person analysis and as much immersion (4-5 times a week) for candidates and their patients as possible. But we have come to recognize that effective analytic work can take place in-person, online and with combinations of the two, and that it is often not possible to attribute competence to one or the other modality. We recognize that certain analysts work, and certain patients are best treated, in one or the other modality, and recommend that such considerations should guide the analytic pair in making their decision about which modality to use. We also think that optimal training includes supervised work in each modality.

Currently there are no national or state regulations that affect online treatment or training of international students. Within the United States, licensure requirements vary from state to state. There is a national agency that is developing and coordinating reciprocity of licensure between states, and it currently includes most states in the USA. Pennsylvania has recently joined that coalition. Information about these requirements is readily available. The state and national agencies regulating practice have been flexible about online mental health treatment because of a shortage of available professionals. On the other hand, for-profit health insurance companies act as gatekeepers, rationing and limiting care, and this decreases the numbers of patients who can afford treatment, even as it forces our students and members to reduce their fees.

### ***3. Experiences and evaluations of P-A and T-A***

**What experiences have you had with both approaches (advantages and disadvantages, etc.)? How are these experiences shared and reflected upon? How is the bodily presence understood and have considerations about this topic influenced the discussion? Are there systematic evaluations? Internal, external? Do you feel implicitly or explicitly committed to local, national or international psychoanalytic institutions in the design of training and the question of P-A and/or T-A?**

We implemented “Local Option” as defined by the APsA Educational Standards some years ago for evaluating and appointing Personal Analysts. Local Option means that an APsA Approved Institute can decide either to follow the standards of the AAPE (the old BoPS Standards, which require Certification through the American Board of Psychoanalysis) or the current APsA Educational Standards (which do not require certification). Local Option is the result of a long process of conflict within the American Psychoanalytic Association which, while interesting, is beyond the scope of this report. Graduates of our program who seek to analyze or supervise analytic candidates have three options: they can seek appointment as a PA-SA if they are more than 5 years post training and have had 3 cases in analysis, or they can seek certification through the American Board of Psychoanalysis, in addition to those requirements, and be eligible for TA-SA appointment. In addition, PA-SA appointments can be attained through our Developmental Pathway, modeled after programs such as those in Boston and New York (Columbia). There have been no recent TA-SA appointments because that process requires board certification by the American Board of Psychoanalysis. Few of our graduates seek it, because certification was no longer required by APsA, upon the sunseting of the Board on Professional Standards (BoPS), and because many have viewed that certification process as flawed. We are a nonreporting institute, meaning that the candidate’s analysis is strictly confidential except for asking the name of the analyst and start and completion dates.

### ***4. Relationship to the IPA***

**How are the ties of the institute to the IPA? What is the influence of the IPA’s policies (including procedural code changes)? Is your institute involved in broader psychoanalytic networks of committees? In what way could the IPA be helpful in shaping analytical training or in regulating the desired/permitted ratios of in-person analysis/teleanalysis. Is there a desire to belong to an international psychoanalytic network with a shared history, a shared responsibility in this global world, etc.? Is there openness to suggestions through international exchanges, discourses at congresses, conferences, through research? To a guarantee that candidates can continue their training in institutes worldwide? To guarantee members can continue to work with patients as psychoanalysts in case of moving to other countries etc.? To oversight committees?**

**Orientation through clear regulations? Binding or voluntary evaluation systems?. Are there areas in which the IPA should not “interfere”? Is there a “red line” in your institute that the IPA must not cross?**

The Psychoanalytic Center of Philadelphia is tied to the IPA through its affiliation with APsA. Currently and for the next 5 years, according to the arrangement between APsA and the IPA in conjunction with the reclassification of APsA from a Regional Association to a Constituent Organization, we will follow the APsA Educational Standards and APsA’s policies. It is not clear what will happen at the end of that 5-year period. Our institute is involved in the APsA network of Approved Institutes. Participation in this Precongress is the first instance of direct involvement of our institute with IPA and with another IPA institute. We have also made use of the funds provided by the IPA for international speakers, and have had analysts from Italy, France, Brazil and Mexico. Some have come in-person and others appeared via Zoom. Some individual members of our institute have been active in the IPA in the past. Newell Fischer and Ralph Fishkin were North American Representatives to the IPA Board. David Sachs was IPA Vice President during the Presidency of Otto Kernberg, and he also took part in IPA New Groups for Korea.

***5. Visions about the future of psychoanalysis, your institute, the IPA***

**What fantasies, thoughts, discourses do you have about the future of psychoanalysis? Of your own institute? Of the IPA? Should the IPA continue to exist as a global psychoanalytic institution? Why? Why not? How? How absolutely not? In what situation, due to which conflicts, would you leave the IPA?**

By 2016, we recognized that the future of our institute was in jeopardy as a result of several years of reduced applications for psychoanalytic training. The adoption of Local Option by the American Psychoanalytic Association gave us, within the limits of its standards, greater control of our training standards and policies. The advent and increasing quality of online modalities made it possible to train candidates from beyond the Philadelphia area, including candidates from other countries (principally China). Admission of these candidates enabled us to fill yearly cohorts, supplied needed income from tuition, and allowed us time to plan for the future. The aging, retirement and death of our older members and the increasing needs for analysts, supervisors and teachers of newly increased numbers of candidates, forced us to face another problem that distance training would not address: the need to train local candidates to assure that our Center faculty would not wither away. We recognized that the future of psychoanalysis in Philadelphia depended on both a viable institute faculty and a viable local psychoanalytic community. We believe that the same thing holds true for all psychoanalytic institutes and, indeed, for national and international organizations.

So, yes, the IPA should continue to exist as a global institution, but what kind of a global institution should it be and will it truly be global? We hesitate to offer our suggestions. We have recently seen that when American analysts offer their ideas based on their experience, the ideas are immediately, prejudicially and resentfully dismissed out of hand as continuing evidence of “American exceptionalism”. Nevertheless, as a part of this exercise, we offer our experience and our recommendations and will be up to the IPA to make what it will of it, and to accept the consequences of its future decisions.

APsA had 60 years of conflict between the central agency regulating training, the Board on Professional Standards (BoPS), and APsA’s affiliated institutes and the APsA membership. The conflict centered primarily around the certification credential, offered by the BoPS’s Certification Committee. This hurdle on the route to the approval to analyze and supervise candidates was widely seen as flawed by its inconsistency and subjectivity. BoPS was widely seen as an oligarchy that perpetuated a narrow view of psychoanalysis. Because of its ambiguous position in the APsA bylaws, its leaders claimed the authority to regulate training, and that BoPS was not subject to the authority of the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors tested this by approving a temporary national list of Training and Supervising Analysts under the authority of the Board of Directors. The BoPS leaders then sued APsA and won, but in his opinion, the judge wrote that if the members wanted the Board of Directors to have authority over the BoPS, they could vote to change its

bylaws, and they did. At that point the BoPS agreed to sunset as a part of the APsA Six Point Plan, which as a part of its new “Live and Let Live” philosophy, included several major changes. Local Option allowed its approved institutes to set their own standards within the parameters of the revised APsA Educational Standards. Certification remained as an institute option but was removed as an APsA requirement for TA-SA appointment. A consultative but non-regulatory Department of Psychoanalytic Education was created to replace the BoPS. Regulation now took place under the oversight of the Board of Directors. Several Board committees were created to deal with approval of new institutes, revision of educational standards, and the provision of institute advisory and consultation, functions that had previously been under the oversight of the BoPS.

This reorganization ended many years of conflict over education and training. Institutes could now pursue policies that would allow them to grow, continue to provide psychoanalytic education, meet local needs, and train qualified applicants from locations where there were no institutes or training analysts available. When it became apparent that the IPA wanted to regulate training in APsA institutes by eliminating its Regional Association designation and thereby bring American institutes under IPA restrictions on distance analysis of candidates and their patients, and prevent international students educated simultaneously alongside American candidates from becoming IPA members, it raised the specter, in APsA, of reinstated centralized rigid control over training.

As an alternative, many in APsA, including APsA members who are also members of non-APsA American institutes, offered the suggestion that the IPA follow its own example, set when it approved its three training models, the Eitingon, the French and the Uruguayan Models. Following a “Live and Let Live” approach, the IPA could allow its Constituent Organizations the latitude to set their own training standards. Even more than in the United States, local conditions vary dramatically across the world. In such heterogeneous situations, restrictive, centrally imposed rules limit the expansion of the IPA itself by preventing the training and membership of qualified future analysts. The IPA Board of Directors, however, was not receptive to this proposal and that is why we are here, attempting to plan research that would settle the question of whether the competencies of analysts and their patients treated on-line, and analysts and their patients treated in the office show varying analytic skills that can be discriminated. We believe that this is a tall order and that the task, even if it can be accomplished, will not settle disputes that are primarily political and territorial. In the end, a political solution will have to be reached, or the IPA will face a situation where existing institutes will choose independence, and new institutes will grow and prosper outside of the IPA’s jurisdiction.

## **APPENDIX 2: Dominique Suchet: *Short historical overview APF***

**The APF (French Association)** was founded in 1964 by choosing to leave the Society (SFP) founded after the split from the Paris Society in 1953. The founders made this difficult choice because they were leaving Lacan with the wish to **be recognized by the IPA**. It can be said that our ties of belonging to the IPA are at the foundation of our Association with the conviction that analysts, to be analysts, must get rid of situations of mastery (no master) and ensure relationships with peers.

The Association has **32** training members and **48** associate members, **25 affiliated psychoanalysts** (non-members) and **151** analysts in training registered with the **Training Institute**.

APF follows the French training model. Unlike the Eitingon model, the French model does not include a “training psychoanalysis”. Candidates admitted to training institutes that practice the French model must have done a personal analysis before their training request. Any personal analysis may make it possible to request admission to the Institute if it has been followed for a sufficient time, that it is coming to an end, and that it has taken place regularly at least three times a week. The admission process is recognized for the analytical quality of the process in a personal analysis coming to an end where the desire to become an

analyst has been subject to transference issues and their interpretation. The admission in training is done without reference to knowledge or assumptions as to who was the candidate's analyst.

**This independence is vital as a principle of extraterritoriality, that** is to say that institutional and analytic processes **are separated**. The APF applies this principle as much as possible throughout the training course by leaving the candidate very free to organize and follow his or her training path, according to his or her own pace, without injunctions, without prescriptions from the Training Institute. And also, APF has no anchoring in the local Public Health Care, no relationship with universities, the public, the society etc.

Once admitted, the analyst in training (called elsewhere candidate) begins what is best described as their own analytic journey. They are free to take advantage or not of the education part of the training presented by the Education Committee (which are: seminars offered by the members of the Association, the working groups proposed by the analysts in training -this is a particularity of our association-, the educational activities offered by the Association (the training institute) (clinical group, reading of Freud, etc.). Analysts in training have access to the scientific activities of the Association. None of the working parties or seminars are compulsory nor the order in which they are taken. Only at the end of his training course and when applying to join the Association is he asked to report their background. They will then be able to give an account of his/her choices during two interviews with trainers by engaging in a reflection on what will have changed in him/her throughout this path and on the appropriation of the quality of analyst of the Association. During the training, the analyst in training must follow two successive supervisions. He/she is free to choose his/her controller from the list of training analysts of the Association. He/she can start his/her second supervision when the first one has been validated. We ask for two adult supervised treatment three times a week, in person. The validation of the controlled analysis, the first as well as the second, is done at the request of the analyst in training. The supervisor does not have an institutional power to validate the work in the controlled analysis. Here we find the principle of extraterritoriality, which is almost an identity in our association in coherence with its radical interpretation of the French model. This is akin to the analyst's rule of abstinence. Which may lead to the saying that the analyst must aim to analyse rather than cure and during training to transmit psychoanalysis rather than graduate.

It is a very mobilizing analytical journey. It is not uncommon for the analyst in training to take up another analysis during this time.

During this journey, supervision and the relationship it establishes between the supervisor and the candidate, plays the preponderant role as the "analyst in training" learns his own analytical position. So much so that we have the same formal requirements for supervision as for the analysis who made it possible to formulate the application for admission: the regularity of weekly, in-person sessions in the same room. We believe that supervision is an analytical experience in its own right.

This situation is inherently analytical, since the issue in question is always identifying and analysing the unconscious, transference and counter-transference processes at work.

Each of the paths in the three training models tries to propose a confrontation of the analyst in training with the inevitable resistance to fantasy and the unconscious. And in the same way, it proposes to supervisors the modalities of dealing with the confrontation with his/her own resistances, calling into question his/her model and the defensive idealization he/she has of it.

In the French model training course there are no quantitative criteria, nor obligation criteria, which makes it difficult to compare with training according to the Eitingon model by evoking quantities and forces us to talk about Freudian theoretical references which are shared by all. Because, it's my opinion, one or the other model tries to allow analysts in training to go beyond resistance to transference, resistance to the unconscious with its own logic and its overall coherence including personal analysis, teaching and supervision.

There is no one model that is better than the other, to protect against this. The only protection is to remain faithful to its similar organizing principles: the search for unconscious, repressed infantile sexual processes, by way of transference and its interpretation. The difference between models is not a hierarchy. Under these conditions, both models are faced with having to think of a practical and current adaptation in the modes of communication: remote communication. In our Association we believe that this introduces an essential difference, which distorts the situation.

The question that arises with distance is whether our training modality (French model) allows us to keep Freud's core idea, that is that unconscious levels of psychic functioning make themselves known in psychoanalytic sessions via resistances and symptoms which become we can put it become "present" (not only representation) in patient, in analyst, in training, also in the supervisor.

### **APPENDIX 3: Bernard Chervet: *A short history of psychoanalytic training in France in the Ipeiste societies (SPP, APF, SPRF)***

> Foundation of the SPP in November 1926 by Marie Bonaparte under the aegis of Freud. The CPLF (first the Conference and then the Congress of French Speaking analysts) had been created in August 1926; then in 1927, creation of the RFP (our Journal)

The training takes place according to the IPA standards newly established by Eitingon. Lay analysis is possible. The Training Institute attached to the SPP was officially created in January 1934. Marie Bonaparte was the first director.

> Influence of the 2nd World War

\* The last CPLF before the war took place in 1938 with the theme of masochism; the first post-war CPLF was held in 1948 on the theme of aggressiveness!

\* 1938: cessation of all activities of the SPP and the Institut. The SPP continues to exist but without activity.

\* 1945: resumption of scientific and training activities

\* The Baby Boom effect:

After the war, the number of requests for cures exploded, as did the demand to become an analyst. With the agreement of the IPA, a clause was decided to respond to this request. This clause responds to pragmatic needs. A French training model is not yet envisaged.

The clause:

- training analyses can be done at 3 sessions per week of 3/4 hours per session

- Creation of collective supervision

- Supervised cures of 3/4h take place at 4 sessions per week

- Ordinary cures continue to be done at a minimum of 4 sessions per week.

\* 1953: creation of a new training institute under the impetus of Marie Bonaparte and didactic analysts. A crisis then took place within the SPP. It is centred on training and opposes Lagache and Nacht, who defend different orientations.

Lagache, a professor of psychology, supports a training model based on that of the university. Nacht defends an independent model influenced by more medical references. Marie Bonaparte rallied to Nacht's project.

A split took place with the creation of the French Society of Psychoanalysis, which did not become a component society of the IPA. Lacan left the SPP and joined the SFP, which he animated with all his virtuosity. In France, this was followed by a lively stimulation of thought about training because of the sessions of variable duration advocated by Lacan (the "scansion").

\* 1964: Split of the SFP and foundation of the APF (Association Psychoanalytique de France) which rallies to the IPA and the Eitingon model. Then the end of the didactic analysis: the APF denounced the didactic analysis as well as the SPP. There is only one type of analysis, personal analysis.

\* 1986: the Institut becomes the training body of the SPP and no longer an independent association.

\* 1994: introduction of the "all couch" and renunciation of the obligation to carry out an analysis with a trainer: anyone in analysis with a member of the SPP or the IPA can now apply for the training course.

\* Fundamental principles of training:

- All analysis is a personal analysis

- non-interference of the analyst in the candidate's training (no "reporting")

- freedom of choice of analyst, supervisors, training seminars.

\* 2004: recognition by the IPA of a French training model

\* 2004: foundation of the SPRF (Psychoanalytic Society for Research and Training) recognized by the IPA.

\* 2007: the SPP introduces a trainer function for a limited period of time (10 years) renewable.

## **APPENDIX 4: Heribert Blass: *Short Summary of the IPA Decision of the Five-Year Transition Period (for APsA)***

Because during our First Action Cycle it became obvious that the members of the group don't have precise information on the Procedural Code and its concrete meaning for the contemporary psychoanalytic training in the US, the RC asked the current president of the IPA to send us a short summary. Here it is:

Heribert Blass: The current agreement is the following: until the end of the 5-year transition period all candidates who reside inside the USA can become members of the IPA according to the APsA Standards and Regulations. All APsA candidates who reside outside the USA must correspond to the new Procedural Code to become members of the IPA. That means, if they want to finish their training within this period, they must have at least 25% of their training analysis sessions in person. If they have a full TA training, they cannot become members of the IPA (despite of APsA). Similar regulations refer to their supervised cases: at least one case must be conducted with a majority of in-person sessions (51%). The other, second, cases must have at least 25% of in-person sessions. There is still this difference between those candidates who reside INSIDE and those who reside OUTSIDE the US. - By the end of the 5years period, all candidates must follow the then agreed PC, except those APsA candidates INSIDE the US who have started their training before the deadline. This means: if the IPA should exclude TA from training, candidates from outside the US with a full TA would have no possibility to become members of the IPA. If the IPA should accept a full TA training, they could become IPA members. If the IPA accepts only a part of TA, like it is the case now, they must fulfill these requirements to become members of the IPA. Thus, it is uncertain for them now, if they don't do at least 25% of their own training and 51% of one supervised case and 25% of a second supervised case in person. - This is a change and an advantage for APsA insofar as according to the old PC no online sessions for candidates outside the US were accepted. Thus, these candidates would have never had the chance to become members of the IPA. If they now manage to do the required part of their training in person (traveling to their training analyst in the US), they can become IPA members until the end of the next five years because the current PC is valid at least until then.

At the same time, all APsA candidates INSIDE the US who had started their training before the end of the 5years period can finish their training according to the 'old' APsA regulations.

The regulations after this date have to be discussed and decided during the next 5 years, also in connection with the results of the Action Research.

## **APPENDIX 5: Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber: *Introductory Statement to webinar with IPA Board, May 17, 2025: Why Action Research?***

Dear Board members,

Thank you very much for inviting me to this Zoom-meeting. I am glad to have the opportunity to discuss the planned Action Research Project with you and to discuss any questions you may have.

Katy Bogliatto asked me to explain in a short introduction and a research example of my own what the thoughts of the Research Committee were on proposing an Action Research Project to the IPA.

***Why Action Research?***

Katy has already told you that the Research Committee, chaired by Siri Gullestad, has held several intensive discussions on your request to facilitate your decision on the future structure of psychoanalytic training by research. We have come to the decision that the question, if and how Teleanalysis (T-A) should be integrated in psychoanalytic training, cannot be researched using a “traditional research design”, but that methods from the field of so-called Action Research are more suitable. To briefly summarize the most important arguments once again:

- a) Traditional group-statistical comparative studies are common in psychotherapy research but use instruments (questionnaires, psychological tests, etc.) that are not differentiated enough to capture and investigate the sort of complex phenomena you are interested in. Your goal is complex. You aim to compare the outcomes of two, actually three, approaches to psychoanalytic training: in-person analysis (P-A), teleanalysis (T-A), and hybrid analysis (H-A, a mix of the two). In numerous comparative studies (including the LAC Depression Study, for which I was responsible), it has repeatedly been found that studies using these methods always show that different (psychotherapeutic) approaches lead to equally good results. Existing differences, e.g. in the outcomes of psychoanalysis and CBT, are hardly captured by such methods. In psychotherapy research, this phenomenon is referred to as the *Do-Do-Bird phenomenon* - based on Alice in Wonderland: Everybody has won! Everyone deserves a prize!

With regard to our research question: Studies following such designs would find that all three training approaches, P-A, T-A, and H-A, lead to the same or very similar results. This would please the colleagues who prefer T-A. They would say: *“Look, empirically there are no differences - the colleagues who prefer P-A are ideologically biased and want to hold on to old prejudices.”* The representatives of P-A would counter this - with a certain justification: *“Now we have the proof: obviously empirical research is not suitable for investigating relevant psychoanalytic questions!”* This would reinforce their skepticism towards empirical research.

To summarize this line of argument: *We think that outcomes of such a research design would not be very suitable to help you in the current situation.*

- b) A second argument is more pragmatic: Perhaps sophisticated research designs could be developed, for example in the area of so-called translational research, using methods to “objectively” examine existing differences in the outcomes of different training models. In the MODE study, for example, differences in the outcome of low compared to high frequency psychoanalyses are examined using hard methods of brain research (fMRI), which are much more subtle and less suggestible than, for example, answers in questionnaires, psychological tests etc. However, such studies are extremely costly in terms of funding, time, personnel etc. and only produce initial results after years. We are convinced that the IPA cannot wait 5-10 years to answer the politically decisive question of the role of P-A, T-A or H-A in psychoanalytic training.

Therefore another research approach is much more promising - not to replace - but to *facilitate the process of decision finding*. It is the so-called *Action Research (AR)*.

Action Research was first conceptualized by Kurt Lewin in the 1940s - to investigate complex, burning issues (political, institutional, social, educational). It is a model designed to find solutions through a *joint, participatory research process*.

In Wikipedia you find the following definition of AR:

“ It is a research method that aims to simultaneously investigate and solve an issue. In other words, as its name suggests, Action Research conducts research and takes action at the same time. It was first

coined as a term in 1944 by MIT professor Kurt Lewin. A highly interactive method, Action Research is often used in social sciences, particularly in educational settings. Particularly popular with educators as a form of systematic inquiry. It prioritizes reflection and bridges the gap between theory and practice. Due to the nature of research, it is also sometimes called a **cycle of action** or a **cycle of inquiry.**" (p1)

### ***Action Research – a well-established research tradition even in psychoanalysis***

In the meantime, Action Research has been applied in many different fields and has led to many differentiations, which are discussed in various handbooks for Action Research, papers and books. Action Research has also been widely applied in psychoanalysis mainly for studying unconscious conflicts and fantasies in groups and organizations. If you enter "Action Research" in PEP, you will get almost 1500 hits. One problem is that the specificity, as defined by Kurt Lewin, is somewhat lost in some applications of AR. Kris (1951), for example, referred to psychoanalysis as a whole as Action Research, because the so called "Junktim Research" in psychoanalysis (the combination of healing and researching in the psychoanalytic situation) could be characterized as a kind of participatory field research.

Much more specifically, the Tavistock Clinic has taken up Kurt Lewin's tradition in numerous projects. Katy Bogliatto has sent you a summary of this impressive research tradition.

I hope that I can briefly illustrate the specific aims, procedures and possible outcomes of Action Research by summarizing my own experience in an Action Research Project. Because I was the only member of the Research Committee who had practical experiences with such a project, Siri and her colleagues asked me to be part of the preparation group for the first Action Research Cycle in Lisbon and also to offer this Zoom meeting.

Of course my AR project was realized in a very different societal and institutional context than the AR of the IPA which we are planning now. However, I hope that the concrete research example might illustrate some of the central features of AR in contrast to "traditional research".

- AR simultaneously investigates and solves complex issues.
- AR is a participatory and interactive way of conducting research in organizations and other systems (see definition on website of the Tavistock Clinic).
- AR emphasizes the importance of including participants and fostering an iterative cycle of planning, acting, observing and reflecting.
- Theory and practice are highly interwoven in AR.
- AR tries to improve communication between polarized positions. It prevents, in the best case, splittings (by installing a research attitude of openness, curiosity, listening to each other, containing and holding in professionally moderated groups).
- In the best case, AR can lead to unexpected, innovative and sustaining solutions in hot, complex political and institutional crises.

### ***STEP-BY-STEP: an example of an Action Research project***

You probably all remember the dramatic images of the hundreds of refugees, mainly from Syria and Afghanistan but also from African countries, who walked to the German border in the summer and fall of 2015 or of the drowned three year old Syrian refugee boy, Ayan Kurdi. at the Greek coast. Due to the terrible history of National Socialist Germany, it was not possible for the then Chancellor Angela Merkel to turn back the refugees with barbed wire fences or other violent actions at the German borders. Her sentence "Wir schaffen das..." ("We can do it...") initiated - to the astonishment of many - a "Welcome Culture" that lasted for months.

It was a historically unique, dramatic situation. At the time, I was the director of the Sigmund Freud Institute (SFI) in Frankfurt, a psychoanalytic research institute that is closely linked to German history, the murder and persecution of Jewish psychoanalysts, flight and trauma.

Identified with this tradition we carried out a whole series of large empirical research projects, which we called "Psychoanalysis Reaches Out" (Aufsuchende Psychoanalyse). In all these projects we tried to make psychoanalytic clinical knowledge fruitful for population groups living at the edge of our society, especially for traumatized families with a migration background. In our Opening Ceremony of the new building of the SFI, during the climax of the refugee crises (September 25, 2015), we talked about all this in the presence of representatives of the Hessian Ministry, probably the main reason why those responsible for the traumatized refugees in Hesse approached me in October 2015. These representatives of the Ministry asked me to conceptualize and carry out a project to care for traumatized refugees in the "Michaelisdorf" (the village of Michael), an initial reception facility, where the Red Cross hosted 800 refugees in tents at that time. Based on psychoanalytical and interdisciplinary trauma research, I conceptualized the STEP-BY-STEP (SbS) project, an Action Research Project in which we supported refugees between 2015 and 2017. We were a team of 40 colleagues and students from the SFI and 30 students from the Department of Education of the Goethe University under the direction of Sabine Andresen. In 2016 and 2017 between 400 and 250 refugees lived in the Michaelisdorf in temporary buildings.

I can't go into detail about the project here but have to refer to our publications. Rose Palmer also made a film about it, which can still be viewed on YouTube.

What is important for our discussion here is that - of course - *the ministry expected us to evaluate the project scientifically* (in order to legitimize the project to opposition politicians and our behavioral therapy colleagues). I was at first quite at a loss in this situation, because it was clear that in this acute, complex, politically hot situation "traditional research" (e.g., cluster randomized design of the EVA prevention studies) would not be appropriate or feasible. Consultations in the Interdisciplinary Research Center IDeA (where we worked together with 150 other researchers) led us to conduct an *Action Research project instead of "traditional evaluation study"*. What did that mean concretely?

Before starting the project, we sat down with those responsible at the ministry and representatives of the opposition and discussed what evidence of the outcome of SbS they wanted (and needed) in order to scientifically evaluate the project, not only to legitimize it politically, but above all to learn from practical experience and develop long-term care perspectives for traumatized refugees in initial reception facilities.

This alone shows one of the key differences between traditional research and Action Research. As is well known, "traditional research" attempts to proceed as "objectively" as possible. Researchers should adopt a perspective that is independent of the object of research and not influenced by it, precisely in order to achieve "objective" results that can be replicated by other researchers. The influence of sponsors is viewed particularly critically. For example, research teams must always disclose possible "conflicts of interest": their research should not be influenced by the funders of the study, for example. In contrast, in AR, an intensive exchange with those affected, those responsible and potential critics of the project participate from the very beginning. In SbS, we included all these different groups of persons into the research process in a participatory manner.

Without being able to mention details here: Following this participatory, iterative process of gaining knowledge ("Wissen-schaffen" als "Wissenschaft", creating knowledge as "science") – we carried out various action cycles, which were constantly evaluated. Based on these evaluations, then the next steps were planned.

Based on knowledge from psychoanalytic and interdisciplinary trauma research, continuously applied and evaluated in these “action cycles”, we successively offered many different modules for the refugees with the aim to avoid social isolation, passivity, withdrawal and re-traumatization (e.g., language courses, groups for mothers with babies, therapeutic painting groups for traumatized children and adolescents, different activities like renovation and design of the accommodations, sports, cooking, music groups etc. as well as medical and psychoanalytic crisis interventions). We gradually developed a network of psychoanalytical supervision and communication structures for all professional groups involved in the Michaelisdorf (medical doctors, social workers, psychologists, teachers, but also security staff, administration etc.) as well as for the around 140 lay helpers. We asked them to document their work systematically and to discuss it first within their professional group and then with us as a research team. The research team evaluated these documentations and reports, presented them to the refugee groups involved and discussed them with them. This resulted in various events in the Michaelisdorf with the refugees as well as in public, media reports, the aforementioned film and publications in local, national and international journals, and finally the important final report of the project to the Ministry (which at the same time was published as a book in cooperation with the responsible persons of the Ministry).

It is important for our discussion here that it was not the publications in journals with high scientific rankings that were the main outcomes of the SbS project (as is usually the case in “traditional research”). The main outcome was the *political decision based on them to introduce the SbS as a state-wide model for coping with traumatized refugees and - in Hesse - to establish four Psychosocial Centers based on it, which adopted and further developed SbS in practice.*

As you know, the xenophilia of the Welcome Culture has unfortunately now turned into a xenophobic social atmosphere that is being weaponized by right-wing political parties such as the AfD (Alternative for Germany). Against this background, it is absolutely crucial that the Psychosocial Centers are firmly anchored institutionally. Therefore – thanks to the SbS Project - traumatized refugees are still offered professional, psychoanalytically based support there - regardless of the different zeitgeist in the last few years

In this very concrete, “real” outcome of SbS, I see an analogy to the planned IPA Action Research Project: in the best case the outcomes of the project can enrich the decision-making processes in the IPA Board and facilitate the search for *sustainable* structures for psychoanalytic training

### **Concluding thoughts:**

Before we get into the discussion, allow me to make a personal comment about why I am involved in the IPA's AR Project. I fear that the controversies surrounding the integration of T-A into psychoanalytic training within the IPA could threaten our global psychoanalytic organization and, worst case scenario, lead to a split. Perhaps my fears are exaggerated - but we live in a political world in which destructive attacks on globalized, democratic institutions as well as the unimaginable contempt for empathy and care for human beings of “end times fascists” (Naomi Klein) can be observed worldwide. The IPA, in other words, all of us, do not live beyond these political realities, but are, as we know, consciously and unconsciously shaped by them.

This reminds me of painful experiences for me during my psychoanalytic training in Zurich, namely the split of the Psychoanalytic Seminar in Zurich (PSZ) from the Swiss Society for Psychoanalysis in 1977. The split was not intended by anyone, but was the result of group dynamic processes with many causes that no one reflected on critically and which could therefore ultimately no longer be controlled. One of the factors that particularly concerns me given our current sociopolitical context is that many of us were influenced by the left-wing student movement at the time. But part of this protest movement at the beginning of the 1970s led to the violent Red Army Group, which filled us with powerlessness and horror and caused, in my view, severe identity crises connected with basic uncertainties and anxieties in many of us.

In retrospect, the defense against these feelings of powerlessness and helplessness were probably some of the unconscious sources of why we were (preconsciously) attracted by the feeling that we could “actively, powerfully – without ambivalent feelings – without empathy into the positions of the Others - fight for the pure, good cause”, e.g. by vehemently fighting conservative psychoanalytic colleagues at the PSZ and thereby unconsciously contributed to a split in the organization. In a kind of displacement, our own feelings of powerlessness and despair caused by the current socio-political situation were not recognized and led to wild enactments in our psychoanalytic institution - with destructive consequences until today (cf. Kurz, 1993).

I am therefore very sensitive to the danger of splits in psychoanalytic institutions. Of course you all know that splits of psychoanalytic organizations have not only taken place in Switzerland but—as George Makari (2008) and others have described—belonged to Psychoanalysis from the beginning. Therefore I would like to make a small contribution in the AR project to the search for other - in my view more productive - solutions. For me, the IPA as a worldwide umbrella of psychoanalysis is a valuable historical achievement that must be protected.

Frankfurt a.M., May 16, 2025

Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber