

THE BEGINNINGS OF PSYCHOANALYTIC SUPERVISION: THE CRUCIAL ROLE OF MAX EITINGON

C. Edward Watkins Jr.

Psychoanalytic supervision is moving well into its 2nd century of theory, practice, and (to a limited extent) research. In this paper, I take a look at the pioneering first efforts to define psychoanalytic supervision and its importance to the psychoanalytic education process. Max Eitingon, the “almost forgotten man” of psychoanalysis, looms large in any such consideration. His writings or organizational reports were seemingly the first psychoanalytic published material to address the following supervision issues: rationale, screening, notes, responsibility, supervisee learning/personality issues, and the extent and length of supervision itself. Although Eitingon never wrote formally on supervision, his pioneering work in the area has continued to echo across the decades and can still be seen reflected in contemporary supervision practice. I also recognize the role of Karen Horney—one of the founders of the Berlin Institute and Poliklinik, friend of Eitingon, and active, vital participant in Eitingon’s efforts—in contributing to and shaping the beginnings of psychoanalytic education.

KEY WORDS: Max Eitingon; psychoanalytic supervision; psychoanalytic education; Berlin Poliklinik; Karen Horney.

DOI:10.1057/ajp.2013.15

In the process of becoming a [psychoanalytic] psychotherapist or psychoanalyst, the supervisory encounter is second in importance only to the clinical encounter itself.

(Jacobs *et al.*, 1995, p. 1)

Now well over a century old, psychoanalytic supervision has enjoyed a rich, eventful, and storied history (Watkins, 2011a). As it has evolved, the psychoanalytic supervisory endeavor has been and is now considered to address several crucial, fundamental objectives: (1) the development and enhancement of analytic technical skills and conceptual abilities; (2) the development and crystallization of an “analytic identity”; (3) monitoring quality of analyst treatment efforts and, where necessary, “gatekeeping” (i.e., not sending an

C. Edward Watkins, Jr., Ph.D., Department of Psychology, University of North Texas.

Address correspondence to C. Edward Watkins Jr., Ph.D., Department of Psychology, University of North Texas, 1155 Union Circle, PO Box 311280, Denton, TX 76203; e-mail: watkinsc@unt.edu

unacceptable candidate forward); and (4) monitoring and safeguarding patient care (DeWald, 1987, 1997; Fleming and Benedek, 1966; Kernberg, 2010; Lane, 1990; Szecsody, 2003; Wallerstein, 1981; Windholz, 1970; Zachrisson, 2011). Indeed, psychoanalytic supervision maintains a pivotal if not preeminent place in the "making" of psychoanalytic practitioners and has proven to be "... an indispensable medium through which psychoanalytic knowledge is passed from one generation of psychoanalysts to the next" (Ogden, 2005, p. 1265).

As Fleming and Benedek (1966) have aptly noted, supervision has "been a formal part of the education of an analyst since it was 'invented' by Eitingon ... in the early 1920's at the Berlin Institute" (p. 6). Although Eitingon may have "invented" supervision, or at least formalized and institutionalized it within psychoanalytic education, Freud is typically credited with having first breathed life into the possibility of supervisory practice by means of three events: (1) consultations or peer supervisions (during the 1890s) with Breuer about their patients' hysterical symptomatology (Hess, 2008); (2) the holding of weekly theoretical and case discussion meetings in his home beginning in 1902 (Freud, 1914); and (3) the tutoring or supervising of Little Hans' father in how best to work with his son, who was experiencing a host of psychological problems at the time (Freud, 1909). Freud's Wednesday night discussion meetings have come to be thought of as the "informal" beginnings of supervision (Frawley-O'Dea and Sarnat, 2001), whereas his work with Little Hans' father has been considered supervision's more "formal" beginning (Jacobs *et al.*, 1995). Although Freud never articulated a theory of supervision (Leader, 2010), reportedly did not like doing supervision himself (Chagoya and Chagoya, 1994), and wrote minimally if at all about supervision (Ogden, 2005), he still tends to be thought of as our "first supervisor" (see Frawley-O'Dea and Sarnat, 2001). Frawley-O'Dea and Sarnat have even gone so far as to say that Freud is "the archetypal supervisor to whom we all maintain a transference of some kind" (p. 17).

Yet whatever might be Freud's effect on instigating supervision, history suggests that Max Eitingon was the preeminent figure early on who provided the nurturance, guidance, and sustaining influence that contributed to the evolution and fructification of psychoanalytic supervision and, ultimately, its place of prominence in psychoanalytic education today. During the 1920s and 1930s, the voice of and for psychoanalytic supervision was decidedly Eitingon's. But what precisely did Eitingon do in those early years to locate supervision within the triumvirate (didactics, training analysis, supervision) of psychoanalytic education? In this paper, I would like to consider that question. In many ways, Eitingon largely remains an unappreciated man in psychoanalysis. In what follows, I primarily provide an assembling and appreciation of some of his many contributions from the 1920s to

psychoanalytic supervision. Since Karen Horney, founding editor of this journal, was friend to Eitingon and intimately involved in contributing to that evolving psychoanalytic scene during 1920s Berlin as one of the founding members of the Berlin Institute and Poliklinik, I will also provide reference to their relationship and briefly identify her substantive contributions to psychoanalytic education then. I conclude with mention of a post-Eitingon psychoanalytic supervision complement and psychoanalytic education controversy for consideration in these contemporary times.

SOME BACKGROUND

To set the stage for our supervision reflection, let us begin by first looking at a few facts of historical record about Eitingon and how he found his way to psychoanalysis (see Brill, 1943; Danto, 2005; Fine, 1979; Ginor and Remez, 2012; Jones, 1943; Makari, 2008; Moreau Ricaud, 2005; Pomer, 1966; Rubins, 1978). On June 26, 1881, in what was then Austrian Poland or Mohilev, Russia, Max Yefimovich was born to Chaim and Chasse Eitingon, an orthodox Jewish couple. His father, a trader in sugar and furs, moved the family (which included two sisters and one other brother) to Liepzig, Germany when Max was 12. It was there that Chaim made his fortune, became a most generous benefactor to the Jewish community, and even came to be dubbed by some as the Rothschild of Leipzig.

Young Max, hampered by a speech impediment, experienced early trouble in his schooling, but with the proper approach applied found success and became quite proficient in a host of languages. He later studied at several universities and began his medical training at the University of Leipzig shortly after the turn of the 20th century. He interned with Eugene Bleuler at the Burghölzli Clinic in Zurich, beginning 1906. There he became acquainted with Carl Jung, who is said to have not only introduced Eitingon to psychoanalysis and Freud but helped him complete his doctoral thesis, one of the requirements of obtaining a medical degree. During that period, Eitingon (with Bleuler's blessing) went to Vienna, visited Freud, and attended the Wednesday night meetings at Freud's home (the first being January 30, 1907; Jones, 1955). An enduring partnership was born: Smitten with and later analyzed by Freud, Eitingon was to become his most loyal and devoted follower. Seemingly fueled by that association, Eitingon went on to play a pivotal role in the realization of two major achievements: The establishment of the Berlin Poliklinik and the International Training Committee (ITC) of the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA). As Schroter (2002) has indicated, it may be necessary to focus on organizational matters to truly get glimpses of Eitingon's brilliance. But when that particular focus is brought to bear, his organizational prowess and stellar contributions clearly abound.

THE BERLIN POLIKLINIK

Jones (1943), in Eitingon's obituary, stated: "... in 1920 he performed the greatest deed of his life, one which will never cease reverberating" (p. 190); he was referring to the fact that Eitingon—being "the only psychoanalyst in the world of that time with independent means" (Pomer, 1966, p. 52)—provided the donation that allowed for the founding of the Poliklinik. The significance of that moment in psychoanalytic history should not be underestimated: Opening on February 16, 1920, the "Berlin Poliklinik was the first [free] clinic for psychoanalysis in the world, and the model for future institutes. It was the first establishment to use analysis as a treatment ..." (Moreau Ricaud, 2005, p. 358). Eitingon was forever a powerful, indefatigable force in the life of the Poliklinik—"its heart and soul" (Sachs, 1943, p. 454)—until the latter part of 1933, when he left Berlin for Palestine due to the growing stranglehold of Nazism.¹

The tripartite training model of psychoanalytic education was also introduced. Thus, another Poliklinik chief objective—in addition to service—was preparing psychoanalytic practitioners, and it was the first establishment to provide such training (Danto, 2005; Makari, 2008; Moreau Ricaud, 2005). Under the able guidance of Eitingon, that preparation was determined to best involve three crucial components: Seminars/didactics (grounding in theory/conceptualization), training analysis (personal experience of psychoanalysis), and supervised practical work. That model, the "mother of all models" (to paraphrase Balint, 1948), was then and continues to be referred to as the Berlin, Eitingon, or Eitingon–Freud model (Kächele and Thomä, 2000; Kernberg, 2000). Over a generation ago, Fine (1979) stated that:

The Berlin system ... became the model for all future analytic institutes. Its core of tripartite training ... [has] remained essentially unchanged to this day. Whatever its limitations, its logic is so compelling that virtually all analytic institutes ... have followed suit. (p. 95)

In large part, that continues to be the case even now: "... the road to becoming a psychoanalyst of any 'stripe' ... is, in format, [still] the same ..." (Frank, 2010, p. 938). But the Berlin model has also been increasingly subjected to discussion and debate, particularly surrounding the training analysis component, and some alternate visions have even been proposed and implemented (see Richards, 2010; Wallerstein, 2010). Still, the basic ideas that underlie the Berlin model—know yourself, know your theory, and know your practice (through supervision)—seemingly remain quite sound and continue to be widely accepted now as supremely important for and integral to effective psychoanalytic education.

THE INTERNATIONAL TRAINING COMMITTEE

The ITC of the IPA was established in 1925, its purpose being to develop international standards for psychoanalytic training. Eitingon was president or chairman of the ITC for close to 15 years. For Balint (1948), the ITC was Eitingon's "favourite creation" (p. 169). As with the Poliklinik, Eitingon could certainly be thought of as the tireless leader and shepherd, the "heart and soul", of the ITC. At its immediate outset, the ITC was designed to promote institutionalized psychoanalytic training according to the Berlin model (Schroter, 2002). Under Eitingon's direction, the ITC agenda was filled with a host of important matters (e.g., lay analysis, conditions of admission, length of training, separation of training and control analyses) that were given educational consideration for the first time. While the ITC's history may clearly reflect stunning successes and abysmal failures (Balint, 1948), "... Eitingon's principal goal, the implementation of training institutes as an IPA-wide norm, was ... achieved" (Schroter, 2002, p. 890). As Jones (1943) eulogized, "... his name will live in the history of the psychoanalytical movement most of all for the ardour with which he first initiated and then developed the high standards of training that were his life's ideal" (p. 191).

HORNEY AND EITINGON

In her excellent historical exposition, Danto (1999) referred to the Poliklinik's many clinical innovations as "startling", its staff roster—which included Karen Horney, among many distinguished others—as reading like a psychoanalytic hall of fame. At the Poliklinik, Horney proved to be highly supportive of and helpful to Eitingon in many ways, and her contributions were significant and substantive. On the personal side, the two were "fast friends", and Eitingon often visited at her home: "The children recall his formal friendliness, courtly behavior and impeccable dress. He would so often bring a bouquet of roses to the house that they nicknamed him 'Der Rosenmax'" (Rubins, 1978, p. 61). On the professional side, Horney was the only woman among the six founding members of the Klinik and first woman to teach there. She was involved in training and curriculum organization (Horney, 1930). She treated patients, gladly taking on non-paying cases and, in this analytic rich environment, further developed her thinking about female psychology and cultural influences. Egalitarianism and social justice—two values that were core to Horney's practice then and remained so throughout the entirety of her career—were on display at the Poliklinik. Interestingly enough, when the Karen Horney Clinic (see Paul, 2010) was dedicated in New York City in 1955, its objectives and core guiding vision nicely reflected the progressivism and social conscience so prominently at the heart of the Poliklinik in the 1920s (Rubins, 1978).

Horney was also instrumental in advocating for Eitingon's tripartite training model. In his 1924–1925 Klinik report, Eitingon acknowledged her in helping carry out 80 control analyses during that time period. She served as a member of the Klinik's Education Committee and crisply articulated the specifications of the tripartite vision (Danto, 2005). She also proved to be a good ambassador, later helping to establish the model in America upon her move there in 1932 (Schroter, 2002). While Eitingon was the person at the forefront of the Poliklinik and ITC efforts, he was helped immensely by many people, and Karen Horney clearly did her part on both fronts.

EITINGON ON SUPERVISION

Patient care and clinicians in training

Eitingon (1923) stated in his report, given at the 7th International Psychoanalytical Congress in Berlin, on September 26, 1922:

We entrust to students who have already made good progress by means of theoretical study and being analysed one or more cases known to us from consultation and suitable for beginners, and on these we let the young analysts at once try their hand alone. By means of detailed notes which learners have to make, we follow analyses closely and can easily detect their mistakes and gradually eliminate the whole host of errors which the inexperienced analyst makes in consequence of a mistaken conception of the aim and method and an all too rigid attitude towards single theories and results of psycho-analysis (p. 268).

We see in this quote several supervisory features of historical import that are seemingly addressed for the first time: (1) the significance of carefully screening and selecting cases for the beginning analyst (cf. Kovacs, 1936); (2) the supervisor's window into the analytic situation as being provided by the detailed notes that the supervisee reconstructs; (3) supervision as a process of "detection and elimination" of errors and mistakes; and (4) supervisees' mistakes as often resulting from inflexibility and faulty conceptions of treatment process. These features, in whole or in part, remain in place and have force in psychoanalytic supervision today. Case selection, process notes, and correcting errors and misconceptions are all still important parts of supervision, just as they were in the 1920s.

Eitingon (1923) also located ultimate authority and responsibility for patient care with the supervisor: "We protect the patients who are entrusted to beginners by the control we exercise over their treatment and by always being ready to take the case away from the learner and go on with it ourselves" (p. 268). While analysts today may not as readily co-opt or take over their supervisees' patients themselves, this sentiment of protecting patient welfare above all else and closely monitoring the analytic process

for that purpose lives on in contemporary psychoanalytic supervision. As supervisors, we realize, much like Eitingon did 90 years ago, that the ultimate responsibility for the supervisees' patients lies with us.

Control analysis

The idea of control analysis, or what we now think of as psychoanalytic supervision, was first introduced around 1920 by Eitingon, Karl Abraham, and Ernst Simmel (Balint, 1948): "Eitingon's first work ... on the Berlin Poliklinik [Eitingon, 1923], a text of historical importance ... was the first time that the question of control during training had been raised" (Moreau Ricaud, 2005, p. 353). This introduction was no small matter because, as Schroter (2002) has noted, the control analysis "is sometimes [still] considered the most important of Berlin's contributions to the history of psychoanalytic training ..." (p. 877)

Eitingon (1926) was certainly psychoanalytic supervision's most abiding champion. Consider the following passage, where Eitingon provided his rationale for doing control analyses:

The beginner in analysis can only learn all of this [analytic process] in time and by roundabout ways, which are too long and too costly (especially for the patient). Moreover, there is a great danger that the mistakes and lack of skill of his first independent work will, either directly or by their over-compensation for them, develop into constitutional defects [The] young analyst probably has not the least idea of how much he (sic) lacks ... he ought to go ... into a psycho-analytical workshop and enter into a longer and firmer relationship of work and study with an experienced, independent analyst, as his apprentice, his assistant, or ... his journeyman (pp. 133–134).

Whatever controversy might have originally been fueled by his "control" idea (e.g., should training and control analyst be the same individual), Eitingon persevered and was successful in convincing others of the supreme value of supervision, including such psychoanalytic pioneers as Anna Freud, Helene Deutsch, Otto Fenichel, and Wilhelm Reich (Balint, 1948). Indeed, control analysis does appear to have been "unanimously recognized" and increasingly incorporated into the psychoanalytic education process during the 1920s. For instance, if we check in on later ITC proceedings, we can readily find reports about control analyses routinely being conducted from London to Chicago, Berlin to Budapest (e.g., Eitingon, 1935).

But how did Eitingon accomplish this change? By all accounts, he was a devoted, passionate, and persuasive figure, having been described as possessing "iron will" (Sachs, 1943) and "ardour" (Jones, 1943). He knew how to deftly combine his passion with reason and make a most convincing and compelling case for his causes.

Eitingon was clearly concerned about quality of both analytic services and analytic education (cf. Eitingon, 1923, 1928). From his perspective, quality analytic services would only come with quality analytic education. His educational approach appeared to accentuate the value of constructive and instructive mentoring over an extended period of time. To a great extent, our ideas about psychoanalytic education today continue to loudly echo those convictions, and current supervisory practice ideally reflects the implementation of such a mentorship model.

In making the case for control analysis, Eitingon also mentioned some of the student problems that can emerge in the educational process. He described two particular groups: The slavish followers and the anxiety-ridden trainees:

Some of the more gifted students accept *en bloc* the technique of their own analyst, which they have certainly observed, but they follow him (sic) too slavishly, and do not realize that the particular line taken by their own individual analysis, and its concrete features, have been largely determined by the peculiarities of the object, that is, of themselves Then there is another group of students: those who are too diffident and too ready to wait. They display an excess of caution and anxiety, which naturally carries with it the risk that they will let slip the moments in which the real analysis of the individual case must actually begin. (1926, p. 133)

This description is of historical import as well, because to my knowledge, it is the first to consider the role that student personality and learning issues can play in the training/supervision process. Eitingon linked such problems to the need for control analysis. Whenever young analysts were not up to the task of treatment, the supervisor had to be there to make that call (see Eitingon, 1923). Eitingon's attention to potential supervisee learning/personality issues presaged later efforts on that subject that would appear across subsequent decades and that continue to this day (Bibring, 1937; Ekstein and Wallerstein, 1958, 1972; Fleming and Benedek, 1966, 1983; Landauer, 1937; Lane, 1990; Wallerstein, 1981; Zachrisson, 2011). In that respect, he broke new ground—conceiving the scope of supervision as including *both* patient and supervisee dynamics. While that may be a far cry from the triadic relational perspective of much contemporary supervision, it at least seems to have been a bit of a beginning in that direction.

The length and extent of supervision

How long should supervision last? On how many cases should each analytic candidate be supervised? In a 1933 ITC Report (with Eitingon in his role as Chair), which also included a report from the Sub-Committee on Admission and Training of Candidates (chaired by Ernst Jones, with Eitingon as member), the following was proposed and approved: "Two control analyses

extending over at least a period of a year are necessary" (Eitingon, 1933, p. 158). Those benchmarks set the minimums in both cases. In the American Psychoanalytic Association (along with didactic studies and training analysis), the following is now expected with regard to supervision:

Three adult non-psychotic cases, including both male and female patients is the minimum number of cases needed to meet this requirement. The supervision of each of at least three cases should occur over a sufficient length of time to allow the candidate to develop sufficient knowledge and skill to independently and competently conduct psychoanalysis.

(Board on the Professional Standards of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 2010, p. 6)

Eitingon's influence, to some degree, continues to be reflected in how we think about the amount of supervised experience that candidates now need during analytic education.

PSYCHOANALYTIC SUPERVISION POST-EITINGON

Although Eitingon's contributions still positively resonate, what subsequent and substantive changes have occurred across the decades in analytic training and supervision that merit mention if we are to contemporize our discussion? If we were to consider his Berlin and Weimar Republic contributions through our contemporary lens, what would we see that might be different now? In answer to those questions, I would like to: (1) address one psychoanalytic complement—parallel process—to Eitingon's supervisory vision; and (2) consider one psychoanalytic education controversy—the training analysis—that bears upon Eitingon's tripartite model. That complement and controversy both seem particularly pertinent to any review of Eitingon's psychoanalytic legacy.

Parallel process

In Eitingon's day, the one-person psychology perspective on treatment—where patient transference dynamics were the sole focus of interest and inquiry—was dominant and that in turn determined the slant that supervision was to take. Since the 1980s, however, psychoanalytic treatment has increasingly moved to the two-person perspective, where the intrapersonal and interactional, intersubjective elements of *both* the analyst and patient have been given weight and taken into therapeutic account: The relational tilt has come to increasingly hold sway (Eagle, 2011). That shift, owing much to Ferenczi's seminal work in the late 1920s and early 1930s (Berman, 1997), has also affected how supervision is conceived and practiced, and the three-person psychology of the supervision encounter (patient–analyst–supervisory analyst) has received interactional and intersubjective focus as never before

(Berman, 2000; McKinney, 2000; Sarnat, 2012; Teitelbaum, 1990; Watkins, 2011b; Zaslavsky *et al.*, 2005).

Parallel process is one construct where that sea change of perspective and its lasting impact upon psychoanalytic supervision can perhaps best be seen. First presented by Searles (1955) almost 60 years ago as *the reflection process*, this was defined then as: The tendency for the dynamics of the patient and nature of the treatment interaction to be unconsciously transported by the supervisee into the supervisory relationship and reenacted there. That conceptualization captured a bottom-up trajectory, where the dynamics of concern emanated from the patient and the supervisee served as unsuspecting conduit. Shortly thereafter, Ekstein and Wallerstein (1958) referred to this same sort of reflection as *parallel process*—a term that has endured since then. While Searles and Ekstein/Wallerstein alluded to parallel process in reverse (i.e., that dynamics could also be carried from the supervision relationship back into the treatment situation), it would be another 20 years before that reversal was more fully explored, explicated, and granted equal standing on the supervision stage (Doehrmann, 1976; Gediman and Wolkenfeld, 1980). That revised conceptualization captured a bottom-up, top-down trajectory, where the dynamics of concern could emanate from either the treatment or supervision encounters and then ripple out to the other interaction in turn: Parallel process metaphorically shifted from being a one-way road of transit to a multidirectional, multilane thoroughfare (Watkins, 2011a). Since that revised rendering, parallel process has gone on to become “a dominant, if not *the* dominant (italics in original), idea in the literature on supervision” (Rosbrow, 1997, p. 215) and the “most influential conception in the area of psychodynamic [and psychoanalytic] supervision ...” (Binder and Strupp, 1997, p. 48). A recent landmark study has even provided us with our first compelling empirical data supporting the reality of a bottom-up, top-down parallel process in treatment/supervision practice (Tracey *et al.*, 2012). Parallel process and our three-person vision of supervision, so crucial to contemporary supervisory practice, provide nice complement to Eitingon’s work and could conceivably be seen as a natural extension and evolution of what he first began in 1920s Berlin.

Training analysis controversies

Across the last generation of psychoanalytic education, some of the burning issues that seem to have been and continue to be most concerning include: The need to (1) decrease isolation and isolationism of training institutes and programs (possibly aligning them more with university settings); (2) decentralize the training analysis from its omnipotent position in analytic

education; (3) promote growth through training environments that foster and encourage creativity, openness, and autonomy; (4) increase clarity, specificity, and definition of all facets of analytic training; and (5) restore research to its rightful place, making it an integral part of psychoanalytic education (Auchincloss and Michels, 2003; Cabaniss and Bosworth, 2006; Cabaniss *et al.*, 2001; Cabaniss *et al.*, 2003; Coopersmith, 2010; Garza-Guerrero, 2004; Kächele and Thomä, 2000; Kernberg, 1996, 2000, 2011; Kernberg *et al.*, 2012; Levy, 2009; Reeder, 2004; Wallerstein, 2007, 2011). But of those burning issues, the training analysis—a core feature of the Eitingon model—has proven over time to perhaps be the most troubling source of ever-escalating controversy within the psychoanalytic community (e.g., Bosworth *et al.*, 2009; Coopersmith, 2010).² Wallerstein (2010) has even referred to it as “the central problematic of our entire institutionalized educational structure” (p. 903). At issue here is not disagreement with the fundamental idea of “Know thyself”, which was and is seemingly the preeminent intent of the training analysis. Rather, it is the mandatory and centralized enshrinement of the training analysis within the psychoanalytic curriculum itself that is at issue and the potentially harmful consequences that can follow (e.g., violation of civil liberties; Lothane, 2007).

Some of the most recent recommendations have been to abolish the training analysis system altogether or, at least, substantially overhaul it (cf. Frank, 2010; Kächele and Thomä, 2000; Kernberg, 2010; Kirsner, 2009). The French and Uruguay training models are both examples of such an overhaul, being largely oriented around the decentralization of the training analysis as the core of the psychoanalytic educational experience (Richards, 2010). Yet those models do not necessarily seem to be problem-free either (Kernberg, 2010), and for many psychoanalytic educators, how to best incorporate the personal analysis component into psychoanalytic education if at all remains a most concerning question. Until some remedy is forthcoming, our history suggests that the training analysis will continue to be a perennially conflictual issue (Cabaniss and Bosworth, 2006; Wallerstein, 2010). Perhaps, that is why calls for such a resolution or remedy have seemingly become far more frequent, urgent, and pressing in recent decades (e.g., Auchincloss and Michels, 2003; Coopersmith, 2010; Thomä, 1993). Whatever might be the “fix” or answer, this is an issue that will not go quietly: The fate of the training analysis may well be the most pivotal factor in deciding the very fate of psychoanalytic education itself in the years and decades ahead.³

Summary comment

In considering this post-Eitingon complement and controversy, the inevitable and expected tensions of growth, development, and conflict in analytic education are clearly in evidence (cf. Dorn *et al.*, 2006). For supervision (the

primary focus of this paper), the chief difference from then to now has been our increasing shift to a three-person vision of supervision, wherein parallel process phenomena are recognized and considered crucial to the conceptualization and conduct of the supervision experience. With that advance and evolution acknowledged, Eitingon's core ideas about supervision from the 1920s and 1930s still seem to hold up quite well and continue to have a place in our current practice of psychoanalytic supervision.

In honor of enduring vision

As we celebrate the first centennial of psychoanalytic supervision, it seems fitting to recognize and celebrate the supervision voice and vision of Max Eitingon. While Eitingon will rightly be forever identified with the Eitingon or Eitingon–Freud model of psychoanalytic education, “the mother and model of all that followed” (Balint, 1948, p. 168), his contributions to psychoanalytic supervision in my view are quite substantial in and of themselves and merit accent accordingly. His thoughts on control analysis continue to find an echo in contemporary practice. As I have hoped to show here, some of what Eitingon introduced gave emphasis to: rationale for supervision, screening, notes, responsibility, supervisee learning/personality issues, and the extent and length of supervision itself. Within the history of psychoanalytic supervision, Max Eitingon's presence and prescience continue to be felt. With this paper, I have wanted to indicate some of how that is so. In my view, Max Eitingon remains our most unforgettable “almost forgotten man” (Moreau Ricaud, 2005, p. 353).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to the Editor and reviewers for their most helpful feedback on an earlier version of this manuscript. I benefited greatly from their ideas about how to expand the scope of this paper and make its content more meaningful.

NOTES

1. The most sensational and scandalous controversy in which Eitingon became embroiled had nothing to do with psychoanalysis. Then as now, speculation has swirled and continues to swirl about his perhaps having been a secret operative for Soviet Russia, maybe even a Stalinist spy or assassin in his post-Berlin days. In an earlier article appearing in this journal, Moreau Ricaud (2005) deftly dealt with those issues and the seeming unfairness of it all for Eitingon and his hard-earned reputation of beneficence. Nevertheless, a recent scholarly paper (Ginor & Remez, 2012)—in which new evidence was used to consider Eitingon's possible Soviet involvement—is sure to once again fan the flames of speculation about that matter.
2. Such debate about the training analysis is by no means new, has been with us down through the decades, and was even present during Eitingon's time. For instance, in the 1930s, Kovacs

(1936)—when presenting the Budapest model as alternative to the Berlin model—argued that: (1) the training and control analyses must overlap; and (2) the training and control analyst must be one and the same person (thereby allowing for countertransference analysis to best occur). As Balint (1948) later indicated, Kovacs' first recommendation eventually found widespread favor, but her second recommendation was hotly debated and proved to be "the main topic of discussions at both Four Countries' Conferences" (p. 166).

3. The way in which the training analysis has evolved across the decades may be a big part of our problem: It has metamorphosed into something far different now from what it was then in 1920s Berlin. As Kirsner (2010) has nicely described, training analysis at the outset was flexible, potentially short, relatively unintrusive, and designed to give the candidate a *sampling* of psychoanalysis. Freud, considered to be the first training analyst, even provided such analysis to Eitingon on their nightly walks in Vienna. Only later did the training analysis come to be viewed as "a means of control instead of liberation" (Kirsner, 2010, pp. 976–977) and the "pseudo-private ... concealed center of everything" (Kächele & Thomä, 2000, p. 807).

REFERENCES

- Auchincloss, E. L. & Michels, R. (2003). A reassessment of psychoanalytic education: Controversies and changes. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 84(1), 387–403.
- Balint, M. (1948). On the psychoanalytic training system. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 29(2), 163–173.
- Berman, E. (1997). Relational psychoanalysis: A historical background. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 51(2), 185–203.
- Berman, E. (2000). Psychoanalytic supervision: The intersubjective development. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 81(2), 273–290.
- Bibring, E. (1937). Methods and techniques of control analysis: Report of second Four Countries Conference. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 18(4), 369–371.
- Binder, J. L. & Strupp, H. H. (1997). Supervision of psychodynamic therapies. In C.E. Watkins, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychotherapy Supervision*. (pp. 44–62). New York: Wiley.
- Board on the Professional Standards of the American Psychoanalytic Association. (2010). *Standards for Education and Training in Psychoanalysis*. New York: APA. <http://www.apsa.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=y05vqUk7jJ8%3d&tabid=219>, accessed May 9, 2012.
- Bosworth, H., Aizaga, K. H. & Cabaniss, D. L. (2009). The training analyst: Analyst, teacher, mentor. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 57(3), 663–675.
- Brill, A. A. (1943). Max Eitingon. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 12(3), 456–457.
- Cabaniss, D. L. & Bosworth, H. (2006). The aim of the training analysis. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 54(1), 203–229.
- Cabaniss, D. L., Glick, R. & Roose, S. (2001). The Columbia Supervision Project: Data from the dyad. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 49(2), 235–267.
- Cabaniss, D. L., Schein, J., Glick, R. & Roose, S. (2003). Progression in analytic institutes: A multicenter study. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 84(1), 77–94.
- Chagoya, L. & Chagoya, C. (1994). The development of a psychotherapy supervisor. In S. G. Greben & R. Ruskin (Eds.), *Clinical Perspectives on Psychotherapy Supervision*. (pp. 189–209). Washington DC: American Psychiatric Press.

- Coopersmith, S. (Ed.) (2010). Special issue: The future of the training analysis. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 97(6), 899–1020.
- Danto, E. A. (1999). The Berlin Poliklinik: Psychoanalytic innovation in Weimar Germany. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 47(5), 1269–1292.
- Danto, E. A. (2005). *Freud's Free Clinics: Psychoanalysis and Social Justice, 1918–1938*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- DeWald, P. A. (1987). *Learning Process in Psychoanalytic Supervision: Complexities and challenges*. Madison, CT: International Universities Press.
- DeWald, P. A. (1997). The process of supervision in psychoanalysis. In C.E. Watkins, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision*. (pp. 31–43). New York: Wiley.
- Doehrman, M. (1976). Parallel processes in supervision and psychotherapy. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 40(1), 3–104.
- Dorn, R. M., Stein, H. F. & Moore, B. E. (2006). Genealogy in psychoanalytic education: Reinforced adherence or useful aids toward individuation? *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 23(1), 8–29.
- Eagle, M. N. (2011). *From Classical to Contemporary Psychoanalysis: A Critique and Integration*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Eitingon, M. (1923). Report of the Berlin Psychoanalytical Polyclinic. *Bulletin of the International Psychoanalytical Association*, 4(4), 254–269.
- Eitingon, M. (1926). An address to the International Training Commission. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 7(2), 129–135.
- Eitingon, M. (1928). Report to the International Training Commission. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 9(2), 135–156.
- Eitingon, M. (1933). Report to the International Training Commission. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 14(1), 155–168.
- Eitingon, M. (1935). Report of the general meeting of the International Training Commission. *Bulletin of the International Psycho-Analytical Association*, 16(2), 242–262.
- Ekstein, R. & Wallerstein, R. (1958). *The Teaching and Learning of Psychotherapy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ekstein, R. & Wallerstein, R. (1972). *The Teaching and Learning of Psychotherapy*. 2nd edn. New York: International Universities Press.
- Fine, R. (1979). *A History of Psychoanalysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fleming, J. & Benedek, T. F. (1966). *Psychoanalytic Supervision: A Method of Clinical Teaching*. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Fleming, J. & Benedek, T. F. (1983). *Psychoanalytic Supervision: A Method of Clinical Teaching*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Frank, G. (2010). A commentary on the training analysis. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 97(6), 945–953.
- Frawley-O'Dea, M. G. & Sarnat, J. E. (2001). *The Supervisory Relationship: A Contemporary Psychodynamic Approach*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Freud, S. (1909). *Analysis of a Phobia in a Five-year-old Boy*. *Standard Edition* (Vol. 10, pp. 3–152). London: Hogarth Press.
- Freud, S. (1914). *On the History of the Psycho-analytic Movement*. *Standard Edition* (Vol. 14, pp. 3–66). London: Hogarth Press.
- Garza-Guerrero, C. (2004). Reorganizational and educational demands of psychoanalytic training today: Our long and marasmic night of one century. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 85(1), 3–26.

- Gediman, H. K. & Wolkenfeld, F. (1980). The parallelism phenomenon in psychoanalysis and supervision: Its reconsideration as a triadic system. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 49(2), 234–255.
- Ginor, I. & Remez, G. (2012). Her son, the atomic scientist: Mirra Berens, Yuli Kharton, and Max Eitingon's services for the Soviets. *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies*, 11(1), 39–59.
- Hess, A. K. (2008). Psychotherapy supervision: A conceptual review. In A. K. Hess, K. D. Hess & T. H. Hess (Eds.), *Psychotherapy Supervision: Theory, Research, and Practice*. 2nd edn. (pp. 3–22). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Horney, K. (1930). The establishment of the educational program: On organization. In: *Zehn Jahre Berliner Psychoanalytisches Institut*. Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 48–52.
- Jacobs, D., David, P. & Meyer, D. J. (1995). *The Supervisory Encounter: A Guide for Teachers of Psychodynamic Psychotherapy and Analysis*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Jones, E. (1943). Obituary: Max Eitingon. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 24(2), 190–192.
- Jones, E. (1955). *The life and work of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 2. New York: Basic Books.
- Kächele, H. & Thomä, H. (2000). On the devaluation of the Eitingon–Freud model of psychoanalytic education. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 82(4), 806–808.
- Kernberg, O. (1996). Thirty methods to destroy the creativity of candidates. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 77(8), 1031–1040.
- Kernberg, O. (2000). A concerned critique of psychoanalytic education. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 81(1), 97–120.
- Kernberg, O. (2010). A new organization of psychoanalytic education. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 97(6), 997–1020.
- Kernberg, O. (2011). Psychoanalysis and the university: A difficult relationship. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 92(3), 609–622.
- Kernberg, O., Cabaniss, D. L., Auchincloss, E. L., Glick, R. A. & Roose, S. P. (2012). Three problematic assumptions about psychoanalytic education: A brief communication. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 60(1), 97–102.
- Kirsner, D. (2009). *Unfree Associations: Inside Psychoanalytic Institutes*. New York: Aronson.
- Kirsner, D. (2010). Training analysis: The shibboleth of psychoanalytic education. *The Psychoanalytic Review*, 97(6), 971–995.
- Kovacs, V. (1936). Training and control-analysis. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 17(3), 346–354.
- Landauer, K. (1937). Difficulties in controlling an analysis: Report of the second Four Countries Conference. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 18(3), 371.
- Lane, R. C. (Ed.) (1990). *Psychoanalytic Approaches to Supervision*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Leader, D. (2010). Some thoughts on supervision. *British Journal of Psychotherapy*, 26(2), 228–241.
- Levy, S. T. (2009). Psychoanalytic education then and now. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 57(6), 1295–1309.
- Lothane, Z. (2007). Ethical flaws in training analysis. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 24(4), 688–696.
- Makari, G. (2008). *Revolution in Mind: The Creation of Psychoanalysis*. New York: Harper Collins.

- McKinney, M. (2000). Relational perspectives and the supervisory triad. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 17(3), 565–584.
- Moreau Ricaud, M. (2005). Max Eitingon and a question of politics. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 65(4), 353–366.
- Ogden, T. H. (2005). On psychoanalytic supervision. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 86(5), 1265–1280.
- Paul, H. A. (2010). The Karen Horney Clinic and the legacy of Horney. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 70(1), 63–64.
- Pomer, S. L. (1966). Max Eitingon: The organization of psychoanalytic training. In F. Alexander (Ed.), *Psychoanalytic pioneers*. (pp. 51–62). London: Transactions.
- Reeder, J. (2004). *Hate and Love in Psychoanalytic Institutions*. New York: Other Press.
- Richards, A. K. (2010). Training analysis and training analyst status: Where are we now? *Psychoanalytic Review*, 97(6), 955–969.
- Rosbrow, T. (1997). From parallel process to developmental process: A developmental/plan formulation approach to supervision. In M. H. Rock (Ed.), *Psychodynamic supervision*. (pp. 213–238). Northvale, NJ: Aronson.
- Rubins, J. L. (1978). *Karen Horney: Gentle Rebel of Psychoanalysis*. New York: Dial Press.
- Sachs, H. (1943). In memoriam: Max Eitingon. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 12(3), 453–456.
- Sarnat, J. (2012). Supervising psychoanalytic psychotherapy: Present knowledge, pressing needs, future possibilities. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 42(3), 151–160.
- Schroter, M. (2002). Max Eitingon and the struggle to establish an international standard for psychoanalytic training. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 83(4), 875–893.
- Searles, H. F. (1955). The informational value of supervisor's emotional experience. *Psychiatry*, 18(2), 135–146.
- Szecsody, I. (2003). To become or be made a psychoanalyst. *Scandinavian Psychoanalytic Review*, 26(2), 141–150.
- Teitelbaum, S. H. (1990). Supertransference: The role of the supervisor's blind spots. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 7(2), 243–258.
- Thomä, H. (1993). Training analysis and psychoanalytic education: Proposals for reform. *Annual of Psychoanalysis*, 21(1), 3–75.
- Tracey, T. J. G., Bludworth, J. & Glidden-Tracey, C. E. (2012). Are there parallel processes in psychotherapy supervision: An empirical examination. *Psychotherapy*, 49(2), 330–343.
- Wallerstein, R. S. (Ed.) (1981). *Becoming a Psychoanalyst: A Study of Psychoanalytic Supervision*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Wallerstein, R. S. (2007). The optimal structure for psychoanalytic education: A feasible proposal? *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 55(4), 953–984.
- Wallerstein, R. S. (2010). The training analysis: Psychoanalysis' perennial problem. *The Psychoanalytic Review*, 97(6), 903–936.
- Wallerstein, R. S. (2011). Psychoanalysis in the university: The natural home for education and research. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 92(3), 623–639.
- Watkins, Jr. C. E. (2011a). Celebrating psychoanalytic supervision: Considering a century of seminal contribution. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 98(3), 401–418.

- Watkins, Jr. C. E. (2011b). Toward a tripartite vision of supervision for psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapies: Alliance, transference-countertransference configuration, and real relationship. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 98(4), 557–590.
- Windholz, E. (1970). The theory of supervision in psychoanalytic education. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 51(3), 393–406.
- Zachrisson, A. (2011). Dynamics of psychoanalytic supervision: A heuristic model. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 92(4), 943–961.
- Zaslavsky, J., Nunes, M. L. T. & Eizirik, C. L. (2005). Approaching countertransference in psychoanalytical supervision: A qualitative investigation. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 86(4), 1099–1131.

Copyright of American Journal of Psychoanalysis is the property of Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.