

TRAINING ANALYSIS

Dyane N. Sherwood

A training analysis is the heart and soul of analytic training, because a good enough analysis is essential for the future analyst to find a unique personal identity and way of working analytically, a healthy and realistic relationship to the Jungian community, and an ongoing commitment to self-examination and consultation when facing the many challenges of an analytic practice. Jung was the first to recognize the necessity of a training analysis (Kirsch 1995, 437), yet there is a dearth of clinical articles on this topic, no doubt due to the delicacy of writing about clinical work with someone in the same, small analytic community, even should permission be granted.

The importance of undergoing therapy as a part of training for psychotherapy professionals is not the norm in the United States, where symptom-focused treatment using pharmacological and cognitive-behavioral approaches is dominant. In contrast, the psychoanalytic schools view symptoms as unconscious communication and recognize the central role of transference. Much of our analytic literature addresses the power of transference and countertransference, especially ways in which the analyst may conceptualize and work with these intermeshed phenomena. Jungians also emphasize the importance of the symbolic function as a bridge between the conscious and unconscious. Whether we refer to the healing of the soul, psyche, or psyche-soma, we recognize that analysis requires more than technique, education, or insight.

Because of the limitations of writing in any detail about the training analyses of others, I will write about my own experience, which begins with finding my way to Jungian analysis. As a young person, my attitude was rational and analytic, in harmony with the collective *Zeitgeist*. Then, while doing postdoctoral work in neuroscience, I began to remember my dreams. On a holiday in the Engaden, I read *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (Jung 1961). It was a life-altering experience for me, as for so many. Nevertheless, when I made the long-contemplated move from neuroscience research to clinical training, I believed that the only serious and responsible course was to enter a classical Freudian program. Fortunately for me, a lone Jungian analyst taught the introductory clinical process

class. I learned for the first time about typology when he remarked that I was intuitive and asked how I had managed to do the precise and technical intracellular recording required by my research! I began to realize that I had been working in a sensation-thinking field because of my fear of the unconscious. Only later did I see that my decision to study in a very traditional psychoanalytic program had preserved this defense.

What became my Jungian training analysis began seven years prior to beginning analytic training at the C.G. Jung Institute in San Francisco, after a dream led to my ending a Freudian psychoanalysis and letting go of any plans to become a Freudian psychoanalyst. In the dream,

I was lunching at a mountain restaurant in the Swiss Engaden. I ordered a fresh trout, which would be prepared from trout kept live in a tank. It was brought to me whole on my plate, and to my horror it began to wriggle. My first thought was that I knew exactly how to end its agony by taking my knife and pithing it at the base of its brain. Instead I became hysterical and jumped up, crying loudly, "It's alive! It's alive!" I did not know what to do! A man nearby turned the spoon in his cup upside down and said, "It is over."

I believe that only the hysteria of my dream ego could have gotten me off the couch! I ended my psychoanalysis, with great respect for the analyst and recognition that his approach was not the right match for me. After this dream, which signaled that my unconscious was alive—not to be only *analyzed*, cut up—my inner life burst forth in ways that were exciting, bewildering, and at times overwhelming. My former Jungian teacher referred me to a seasoned Jungian analyst, who was a wonderful match for me: a feeling type who brought great empathy and depth to the work. She was strong in just the areas where I needed so much help.

Until I became an analyst myself, I could never have begun to imagine the complexities that my analyst *may* have experienced, not only because of my hard-edged thinking but also because of my wish to enter analytic training. I recall an explicit interchange several years into the work, when I brought up the question of my readiness to apply to the analytic training program. My analyst's tone became firm, and she told me that it was not yet time. When I asked why, she said that I might be accepted on intellectual grounds but that my dreams indicated that I was not ready. She could not explain this to me. Not long after, I had a dream in which various people from the Institute were walking through her consulting room disrupting my session, and I knew that in addition to my not being inwardly ready I was not prepared for the potential intrusions of the life of the Institute into my analytic space. Several years later, I *knew* I was ready to apply, and I would have fought with my analyst had she said otherwise!

Perhaps this is a good point to describe the San Francisco training program, since each program is a product of its founders and the surrounding cultural and professional context (Kirsch 2001; Horne 2007; Kelly 2007). In California, there

are no unlicensed analysts: one must have a professional license granted by the state. This requires a graduate degree in medicine, psychology, social work, nursing, or a master's level counseling program, as well as two to three years of supervised clinical work (usually in a clinic or hospital setting) and written examinations as to general professional knowledge, diagnosis, and ethics. Many train as psychotherapists after pursuing a first career rather than directly after an undergraduate degree. In the early years of our Institute, candidates were accepted in their last year of residency or shortly after being licensed, but the trend over the years has been to admit people only after they have had considerable analysis beyond the 200 requisite hours and when they are already experienced practitioners. Some apply after their children have grown and they have been in practice for thirty years! Therefore, in San Francisco most training analyses now take place during the second half of life.

In the San Francisco Institute, there is no special category of training analyst, and the candidate is free to choose any analyst member of the institute. This means that there is no need to disrupt an analysis at the beginning of training because the analyst in question is not a training analyst. In fact, it is generally agreed that an applicant will benefit from a well-established analysis with a strong working alliance in order to contain and process complexes stimulated by the evaluative, personal, and group stresses of training. Our policy contrasts to that of our local Freudian psychoanalytic institutes, which require the training analyst to be chosen from a select group of analysts. Some institutes also permit an earlier analysis with a training analyst to fulfill the analytic requirement, but most often the training analysis may begin at the same time as training. I have psychoanalytic colleagues who have waited years to apply in the hopes that their analyst would become a training analyst so that they would not need to change analysts or undergo a second analysis.

A Jungian training analysis in San Francisco, then, takes place while the candidate is practicing and leading a full adult life, perhaps raising a family or caring for elderly parents. The candidate attends four years of seminars, a clinical case conference, and group process, and undergoes a period of intensive supervision of analytic work culminating in a paper and a meeting with a board. The time to complete the program ranges from six to more than fifteen years, and during this entire time the candidate is expected to remain in individual analysis. The candidate may work sequentially or concurrently (rare) with more than one analyst, in addition to analysts who consult about the candidate's clinical work.

Special consideration is sometimes given to candidates who have a spouse who is already an analyst or candidate, allowing them to see an analyst from outside our institute. Presumably, this protects the candidate from contamination caused by projections (positive and negative) onto the spouse or his/her reluctance to discuss the spousal relationship because the spouse is a colleague or student of the personal analyst. While the incest archetype is a part any analysis, if it is too concretely present it can be iatrogenic.

This brings me to mention the intensification of incestuous and narcissistic complexes that accompany a training analysis. In our institute, the training analysis is considered sacrosanct and entirely confidential, a sealed alembic, and the analyst is not allowed to give training committees any input whatsoever regarding the analysand. Of course, this does not mean that the training will not contaminate or present special challenges to the analysis. The analysand and analyst in a training analysis are part of a larger community in which the analyst is already a full member and the analysand is aspiring to become a member. This can activate authority complexes in both.

Moreover, the analyst has her own opinions, reactions, and projections with regard to the institute, its various members, and its training program. How are these managed? At times, a small digression from an analytic stance in the form of a carefully phrased question or comment or a raised eyebrow can, in my opinion, be helpful. The danger is that such an intervention can short-circuit an exploration leading to the candidate's developing confidence in her capacity to make judgments and navigate the complex views and relationships within the group.

Some analysts openly share their disdain or admiration for certain colleagues, for certain ways of doing analysis, and for the institute itself. This can foster collusion between analyst and analysand of being the inflated outsider, or the consummate insider, who sits in judgment. The analysand is in a position of either joining with the analyst or risking confrontation and rejection; it also deprives the analysand—and the analyst—of facing potential shadow or idealization issues that are being carried by the group or by some individuals or ways of doing analysis. Defensive splitting can protect the pathological narcissism of both, which no doubt would encounter painful challenges should genuine engagement with the group be attempted. This recalls Guggenbühl-Craig's commentary on the analyst-as-sorcerer:

sorcerers . . . are unwilling to tolerate any colleagues or competitors. . . . Fascinated by this inner figure, the average analyst would like all those in need of help to turn exclusively to him. . . . [T]he fantasy that he is the best and most powerful of sorcerers, makes it impossible for him willingly to send cases to colleagues of equal status, . . . [A] devilish little sorcerer within him lays claim to being the only one . . . who really understands anything about analysis. (1971, 39–40)

Training analyses in particular are subject to this danger. The trainee may remain an "apprentice" for the rest of his life, that is, an admirer and imitator of his training analyst. Or he may try to become a master sorcerer himself, which leads to bitter recriminations between old master and former apprentice; the younger analyst harbors deep resentments against his older colleague, while the latter feels himself betrayed. The two can no longer work well together. (1971, 40)

It should be added that analysts may consciously or unconsciously try to "convert" their candidate-analysands into apprentices or apostles, to the "true" or "right" way of working, thus violating the analysand's need to discover her own

unique potential as a human being and as an analyst. This can be a particular problem if the analyst identifies strongly with the analysand.

If a parental transference/countertransference remains unresolved, some training analyses can last for the lifetime of the analyst or analysand, but not because it has remained a valuable interchange in service of the analysand's individuation. I have seen some analysts come into their own only after the death of an analyst-mentor. Another scenario is that the analysand may assume, unconsciously or consciously, a caretaking role toward an aging or ill analyst—in order to meet the analyst's needs for relationship, validation, and/or income—at a point in time when the analyst should have retired from practice. (I am aware of a startling number of analysts who had hidden worsening disabilities or terminal illnesses, which denied their analysands the opportunity of a related ending to the work.)

How does an analyst provide a safe and reliable analytic container while dealing with issues of personal, physical, financial—and most important—analytic vulnerabilities and limitations? These questions become even more crucial during a training analysis. Once an analysand has entered a training program, she is in a position to learn more about the analyst—whether fact, projection, or gossip. Likewise, the analyst may hear others discuss the analysand. Hopefully, the analyst is capable of holding and processing the material, but will the analysand feel able or willing to bring up negative information about the analyst? Will positive opinions or projections onto the analyst by colleagues and candidates inhibit the need for the analysand to address real and projected inadequacies and failures on the part of the analyst? The analysand may become aware of events and situations, private or professional, that are highly charged and painful for the analyst (such as death of a family member, marital infidelity, divorce, hostility from colleagues, and so on), requiring careful attention to countertransference reactions that interfere with the analysis of the candidate's material.

Joseph Henderson, who entered an intensive analysis with Jung in 1929 at the age of twenty-six, has given an account of the way his personal complexes fixed upon the well-known break between Jung and Freud:

At that time it was generally supposed that the rupture of their relationship was due to a father-son conflict, Freud being the father and Jung the son. . . . [I]t was natural that the father-son aspect of the Freud-Jung relationship mobilized my own ambivalence toward the father. In the light of my early transference to Jung, I was inclined to see him as the misunderstood son of an authoritarian father; but then, since Jung was a father figure, too, I found plenty of room for considerable resistance to him. In such a state of resistance, I felt that Jung was the bad (or at least unsympathetic) father and Freud the good (or, shall we say, misunderstood) father. And then it all turned around, and Jung became the good father again.

I soon realized that the Freud-Jung controversy was inhibiting the process of separation from, or repair of, my own parent images and, if allowed to go on, could become itself a kind of false parent. Jung was very good about understanding this problem and

helping me to disidentify with what was in the projection of my father image. But in spite of his help, a certain problem remained, because I felt that some of the personal suffering that C.G. and Emma Jung experienced following the break with Freud still existed. (Henderson 1982, 3–4)

Henderson later came to his own understanding of the break between Freud and Jung through the study of historical materials, having remained on good terms with Jung after his analysis came to a completion in 1939.

In a training analysis, the analyst and analysand may attend conferences and meetings and observe one another interacting with others. These situations are presumably handled on a very individual basis, with the analyst taking into account the state of the transference at that point in time. When I was a new candidate, I mentioned to my analyst that I was going to attend a small group lecture at the Institute. At the meeting, people seemed surprised that she was not present. When I brought this up at my next analytic hour, she told me that she chose not to come after finding out I would attend. I was very moved by the sacrifice she had made when, unknowingly, I was participating in a small group which she had attended for many years. Some years later, we both became aware that we were comfortable attending a small, nonclinical professional meeting. Other situations may involve larger events where the analyst and analysand may observe one another interacting with colleagues or speaking. It is important that the analysand feel free to bring up any reactions.

Joseph Henderson described to me a similar shift in his transference to Jung. Sometime in the early part of his work, Jung happened to be driving from his house into town immediately after Joe's analytic session, and he offered Joe a ride. Joe accepted, but sat stiffly, not knowing what to say when he found himself in this strange situation outside the consulting room. He was relieved when the ride was over, and the situation was never repeated. Some time later, however, he was invited to a formal dinner, which Jung also attended. He felt perfectly himself in this situation. Later, after his analysis had ended, he described what he called a resolution of the transference into a "symbolic friendship." He believed—and I agree—that, having been analyst and analysand, it is not possible to move to the mutual intimacy of an ordinary friendship. Yet, another kind of warm and mutually respectful relationship sometimes develops of its own course.

Issues of love and hate, competition and envy, anger and fear, shaming and humiliation, wounding and being wounded, joy and sadness are present in every deep human encounter. In a training analysis, these can be complicated or exacerbated. How will the eros be expressed? If the analysis includes a period in which the patient, analyst, or both fall in love, the pain of not being able to act upon this feeling can be intensified or mitigated if they cross paths outside analysis, especially when a partner or spouse is present.

Sibling rivalry and also feelings of kinship may develop when an analysand discovers that a fellow trainee is also seeing the same analyst. I recall dreaming that I entered a beautiful cathedral, entirely alone, and saw my analyst sitting next

to a candidate analysand whom I considered to be much more mature, interesting, and well-related than myself. It was a terribly painful dream, as I truly believed that my analyst much preferred working with her and would never share a deep connection to the numinous (represented by the cathedral) with me, as she surely did with my sister trainee. My analytic work then involved an exploration of these feelings and my coming to a greater acceptance of my own shortcomings but with fewer feelings of inferiority, as well as a new appreciation of my unique relationship with my analyst—not through reassurances but through her caring attention to our work.

On the other hand, as an analyst I frequently feels pangs or jabs of envy when an analysand tells me of the wonderful help that a consultant gave her or expresses admiration for the unique abilities of the consultant or of another analyst. At times, this can get in the way of my reflecting on the meaning of that communication at that time. Is my envy projective identification or my personal complex? It is a delicate balance to watch for counter-therapeutic splitting, acting out, and dilution of the transference or countertransference, while avoiding the inflation of believing that the analysis is not only central but all-important. I am frequently reminded that if I am a good enough analyst the analysand will need to find additional symbolic and interpersonal avenues for development. Each candidate will require multiple mentors to develop a unique way of working and an analytic flexibility in order to engage with different patients. Every analysand, in a sense, needs to outgrow, or grow beyond, the training analyst.

This leads to the issue of “termination,” the ending of a training analysis. I recall from my courses taught by traditional Freudians that the “termination” of an analysis precludes future contact, in order that the analysand work through issues of loss and mourning. Although this view is no longer stringently held, I can appreciate its value, especially the value it could hold in facing existential issues. This structure also avoided concretizing the question of what kind of relationship might *actually* develop after “termination,” leaving the pair more open to exploring fantasy material. In a training analysis, this lack contact is not possible, as both will remain in a small community, possibly for the rest of their lives. In a large institute, analyst and analysand may have minimal contact and avoid serving together on committees. In smaller institutes, this may be much more difficult.

A bad ending can affect an analyst’s or analysand’s comfort in attending institute events. Since a bad ending usually involves highly charged and unresolved complexes and the failure of a capacity to symbolize, the hate may last a lifetime. The analyst may feel especially vulnerable, since the analysand is free to talk about the analysis to colleagues, perhaps with significant distortions, and some analysts have had their practices affected adversely by such talk, to which they are prohibited from responding because of confidentiality. On the other hand, the analysand may feel vulnerable because he feels he has lost the esteem of a

respected or powerful analyst; or he may feel contempt or disgust because such a disappointing analyst is still a member of the institute. At best, it may take many years for the analysand (and also the analyst) to begin to understand what happened and to initiate some kind of meeting or resolution; at worst, the analysand finds another analyst who colludes with projections onto the previous analyst. (In recent years, some analysts from within and outside our institute have done specialized impasse consultation to both analyst and analysand, with very helpful results.)

My own training analysis ended in a very natural way, several years after I completed my analytic training. I had become deeply engaged in research on alchemical imagery and symbolism, which came to hold the same powerful cathexis for me that my analysis had held for so long. The image that comes to mind as symbolic of this shift in my psyche is that of a woman gracefully riding a fish or dolphin, found on the ancient Celtic Gundestrup Cauldron.



Detail of the ancient Celtic Gundestrup Cauldron
(National Museum of Denmark)

The analytic process has a life of its own now, continuing as I learn from my patients, from my colleagues, from nature, and from what my Lakota friend Pansy Hawkwing calls *Wakan Tanka*, "The Great Mystery."

My training analysis was not a cure, nor did it make me whole or complete. It did completely change my experience of being alive, helping me to accept human limitations and to discover possibilities. I am grateful for my analyst's depth of understanding, kindness, and calm empathy. Most essential were her integrity and her carefully focused analytic attitude.

REFERENCES

- Guggenbühl-Craig, Adolf. 1971. *Power in the helping professions*. Dallas, TX: Spring Publications.
- Henderson, Joseph L. 1982/1995. Reflections on the history and practice of Jungian analysis. In *Jungian analysis*, ed. Murray Stein, 3–28. Chicago: Open Court.
- Horne, Michael. 2007. There is no ‘truth’ outside a context: Implications for the teaching of analytical psychology in the 21st century. *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 52, 2: 127–42.
- Jung, C.G., with Aniela Jaffé. 1961. *Memories, dreams, reflections*. New York: Random House.
- Kelly, Tom. 2007. The making of an analyst: From ‘ideal’ to ‘good-enough’. *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 52, 2: 157–69.
- Kirsch, Thomas B. 1982/1995. Training analysis. In *Jungian analysis*, ed. Murray Stein, 437–50. Chicago and LaSalle, IL: Open Court.
- . 2001. *The Jungians: A comparative and historical perspective*. London: Routledge.
-

DYANE N. SHERWOOD, Ph.D., is a member and on the teaching faculty of the C.G. Jung Institute of San Francisco. She is co-author, with Joseph L. Henderson, of *Transformation of the Psyche: The Symbolic Alchemy of the Splendor Solis* and the editor of *Jung Journal*.