

**From:** Dolores Morris dmmorrisphd@gmail.com  
**Subject:** History of the Program  
**Date:** June 13, 2017 at 5:54 PM  
**To:** Dolores dmmorrisphd@gmail.com



<http://as.nyu.edu/postdocpsychoanalytic/training/history-of-the-program.html>

## History of the Program

**Bernard N. Kalinkowitz, Founder & Director (1961-1992)**

**Revised (November 2011) by Lewis Aron, Director (1998-present)**

When the New York University Postdoctoral Program in Intensive Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis (Postdoc) was introduced in 1961, *The New York Times* - among other city newspapers - publicized it as a training program of merit, and mentioned our low-cost clinic as a needed service to the community. Dr. Bernard N. Kalinkowitz, Coordinator of Graduate Training in Clinical Psychology at NYU, was appointed as acting director of the new Program. We were the **first** university-based psychology program for training psychoanalysts and intensive psychotherapists, and we have since graduated the greatest number of psychologist-psychoanalysts of any program in the country. In time, Postdoc became a national model for training psychologist-psychoanalysts.

The program was announced by James M. Hester (Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Science and later President of the University) who worked closely with Dr. Bernard N. Kalinkowitz (affectionately known by all as "Bernie"). James Hester was also responsible for inviting Bob Holt and George Klein from Topeka, Kansas to launch the Research Center for Mental Health at NYU, and he later brought David Rapaport as a visiting scholar. In addition, he worked closely with Bernie to revise the state licensing laws for psychology so as to authorize psychologists for the independent practice of psychotherapy.

As far back as 1952, Bernie, together with Avrum Ben-Avi and Erwin Singer, had put before New York University a proposal for a postdoctoral specialization program. At the time, they were matriculants at the William Alanson White Institute. While appreciative of the good training they were receiving, as psychologists they felt troubled that the psychiatrists in their classes were to receive certificates as trained psychoanalysts while they were to receive certificates attesting to the fact that they had completed courses in clinical psychology (years after they had been awarded Ph.D.s), despite the fact that their training was identical. Furthermore, they were just three of a privileged few who were permitted to receive such training; too many fellow psychologist colleagues could not gain admission. If the University allowed them to develop a training program within the Department of Psychology, they hoped that they could admit many more psychologists and not have to disguise the fact that they were being trained as psychoanalysts. (A decade or so later, the W. A. White Institute began to offer identical certificates to members of both professions and offered admission to a much wider number of psychologists.) The 1952 proposal, however, was premature; the University was not prepared to assume the financial and academic responsibility at that time.

In 1957, Bernie, who had by then become the Coordinator of the NYU Doctoral Program in Clinical Psychology, revived the idea with an additional agenda. Stuart Cook, at that time Chair of the Psychology Department, Rollo May, Albert Thompson, Herbert Zucker, and Gordon Derner (who soon after would begin the Adelphi Postdoc modeled on NYU's Postdoctoral program), along with Bernie, were deeply involved in the effort to pass the Certification law for psychologists that was finally approved by the New York State legislature in 1957. But the sponsor of the law, the New York State Department of Education, quickly pointed out that none of the doctoral programs in New York (including NYU's) was willing to state that their Ph.D.s were trained for the independent practice of psychotherapy.

By the early 1960s there were a few psychoanalytic training programs run by psychiatrists that accepted a token number of psychologists. These psychologists, however, either had to sign a statement, after going through a "waiver process," that they were only there to learn research and would not practice psychoanalysis (e.g., The New York

Psychoanalytic Institute) or, as at the W. A. White Institute, they received certificates that they had finished advanced courses in **clinical psychology**, with no mention of psychoanalysis, though the training was identical for psychiatrists and psychologists. In establishing the Postdoctoral Program, Bernie created a center for psychoanalysis run by and for psychologists, a "home" for psychologists interested in advanced training in psychotherapy and psychoanalysis, and the University made a statement to the New York State Department of Education that psychologists now received training which qualified them for the independent practice of psychotherapy.

Today, and certainly in New York City, there is no particular need for more access to psychoanalytic training for psychologists. The situation changed radically for psychologists only after the establishment of the Division of Psychoanalysis (39) of the American Psychological Association in 1979, and especially following the settlement in 1988 of "The Psychoanalytic Lawsuit" (a Federal Anti-trust Class Action lawsuit brought about by four psychologist plaintiffs against the American Psychoanalytic Association [APsaA], the International Psychoanalytic Association and two institutes that were affiliated with these associations). Finally it was only in 1991 that the APsaA modified its by-laws to eliminate its "waiver process" for full clinical psychoanalytic training for doctoral level psychologists and social workers. Thus, while we at New York University were pioneers, many others have followed and our position is not a unique one in the above two aspects.

There was, however, a still more fundamental reason to establish the Postdoctoral Program within a University setting. In the few medically run training programs that had accepted psychologists even under the restrictive circumstances described before, psychoanalysis was offered as a single paradigm and training was much too narrow. Most of them trained in the Freudian tradition, but even the exceptions followed a single path. The New York Psychoanalytic Institute taught the Freudian approach; the American Institute limited itself to teachings of Horney (with the proper obeisance to Freud), and the W. A. White Institute stressed the teachings of Sullivan and Fromm - the Interpersonal approach. Rarely were in-depth discussions of comparative approaches offered. By contrast, from its beginning our Program emphasized pluralism and dialogue.

A university, with its long tradition of open discussion among a diversity of ideas, was the ideal setting for an in-depth investigation of the assumptions and premises of the varying orientations. In line with the academic tradition and the empiric open-minded approach of psychology, in a university we could analyze the contrasting metapsychological assumptions of the differing theories, compare such clinical constructs as transference, countertransference, and resistance, and contrast the different therapeutic approaches and the rationale for the differing "techniques."

Inasmuch as we were initiating a new program, we had a golden opportunity to think through our aims, requirements, and curriculum. Because we were university-based and housed in a psychology department, we did not have to mimic criteria established by the medical training programs which, by and large, took candidates with no psychological backgrounds. We did not have to please a central accrediting body (the American Psychoanalytic Association) - a group which historically opposed the training of psychologists as psychoanalysts and which periodically occasioned rifts in the developing profession by threatening to expel members, e.g., Erich Fromm and Karen Horney, who did not accept certain metapsychological assumptions. Unlike the great majority of training institutions, we did not have to limit ourselves to one particular view of psychoanalytic theory; in fact our plan was to house, under one roof, differing paradigms of psychoanalysis. Under the auspices of a major university, our program readily fit into the long tradition of open discussion among a diversity of views, and around a certain catholicity of approach. A number of us believed that many of the training institutes had become too parochial, too wedded to metapsychologies that tended to remain unchallenged because the fresh supply of teachers and supervisors came only from among their graduates. Thus we would select the "best" faculty that we could recruit to provide the opportunity for students and faculty alike to re-examine the host of premises, theories, "knowledge" and data, and to subject these to a healthy skepticism and intensive examination.

Our planning committee consisted of representatives from the W. A. White Institute, namely, Avrum Ben-Avi, Harry J. Bone, Erich Fromm, Rollo May, Ernest Schachtel, and Herbert Zucker; George Kaufer from the Postgraduate Center;

and representing the Freudian point of view Esther Menaker, George Klein and William Menaker. Esther Menaker who studied in Vienna with Anna Freud, taught one of the first classes. Shortly after our beginning we added a number of medical-analysts, namely, Arthur Arkin, Leopold Bellak, Emmanuel Ghent, Edwin Kasin, Saul Miller, Chaim Shatan, and Edward S. Tauber. Other psychologists who were with us from almost the beginning were Sabert Basescu, Ruth-Jean Eisenbud, Kenneth Fisher, Rosalind Gould and Erwin Singer. Thus the criteria for admission and graduation, as well as the nature of the curriculum, were debated for almost six months by a most serious and knowledgeable group of psychologists-analysts.

While many institutes were defining sharp and fine distinctions between psychoanalysis and intensive psychoanalytic psychotherapy, we eschewed such activities. There was to be no monopoly on psychoanalytic "truth," no exclusive definition as to what constituted psychoanalysis. Teachers would be free to present their own outlook. Students were to be free to take courses reflecting differing points of view and, in fact, were encouraged to do so. It was also considered desirable for students to have supervisory experience with faculty of diverse approaches. Students were left free to select courses as well as the sequence in which they were taken. We did not want to pre-empt judgment as to what constituted "the best" training program. Clearly the goal was to set up a training program in psychoanalysis and psychotherapy, but it was not to be modeled after a traditional psychoanalytic institute. We did agree, of course, with the primary importance of the personal analysis, supervision, and instruction in theory, research, and practice - we were not nihilistic. However, we were trying to set up an improved atmosphere for searching thought and discussion and, ultimately, a more meaningful set of standards for evaluating completion of training than the traditional quantitative ones.

It was in our curriculum that we best expressed the function of a university, for our courses represented offerings in Freudian, Sullivanian, and Frommian traditions, as well as subjects that cut across all sectarian points of view, such as psychoanalytic research and "female psychology." (In the early years of the program, the only required course was a two-semester sequence on the methodology of psychoanalytic research that was expected to lead to a research paper). The Program's first graduate was Dr. Martin Nass who received his certificate in 1965. Since Marty was the only one graduating, Bernie asked him to wait a year and graduate with others, but in 1966 there were still no other graduates and so Bernie relented and there was a graduation for one graduate - done in grand style! Marty then founded and was the first president of The Psychoanalytic Society, the organization of our graduates.

By 1966 and through the early 1970s, responding to the complaints and suggestions that emerged from candidates during the program's first decade, two separate educational tracks or orientations emerged: the Freudian track and the Interpersonal-Humanistic track. Later our course offerings expanded to include British Object Relations theory, Self Psychology and new currents in psychoanalytic thought. Cutting-edge courses in gender and sexuality proliferated in the 1980s. A radical inquiry into gender and sexuality opened up questions of gender and sexuality within psychoanalysis and culture as they had never been discussed before. In 1991, the first feminist course on gender was taught at Postdoc by Jessica Benjamin. In 1994, the first feminist course on sexuality was taught at Postdoc by Muriel Dimen. In 1998, the first GLBT and psychoanalysis course was taught by Ann D'Ercole.

In 1988, the Relational track was founded in an attempt to provide a home for what was quickly emerging as an important new paradigm in contemporary psychoanalysis. The Relational Track was originally sponsored by 5 faculty members: Emanuel Ghent, Stephen Mitchell, Bernie Friedland, Philip Bromberg, and Jim Fosshage. In addition, there has always been an Independent track representing a pluralistic, "non-aligned" educational philosophy.

It was always a great disappointment to Bernie that the program became organized around distinct tracks. He believed it would have been more fruitful if dialogues among psychoanalysts with differing points of view led to constructive evaluations of varying metapsychologies and methods of treatment. In recent years, a great effort has been made to increase cooperation, dialogue and debate among the tracks in line with Bernie's vision, while maintaining independent organizational structures to insure that each orientation can represent and further develop psychoanalysis in accordance with its own viewpoint.

**It has remained a matter of principle that students were never to be required to declare allegiance to**

**one or another point of view but to be free to explore without prejudice the various offerings in the program as a whole.**

We fully anticipated that by the time candidates received their certificates they would have developed a systematic theory, a therapeutic approach derived from their theory, and, hopefully, a respect for points of view differing from their own. It was precisely because we agreed with the primary importance of the candidates' personal analysis that we protected that experience by accepting as personal analysts graduates of other training institutes who have been in practice five years after graduation. In contrast to most other programs, we do not designate "training analysts," so candidates may choose analysts from among our graduates or from the graduates of other institutes. The ultimate test of the success of any analysis (for training purposes) is to determine how well the candidate works with her or his patients, as judged by the supervisors and faculty. Certificates are awarded, not for time served in supervision or analysis or in classrooms, but for assessed readiness to function independently as psychologist-psychoanalysts. Also, in the spirit of the university we have always followed the principle of choosing faculty by recruiting the best people available for the position rather than based on where they trained and graduated.

Another important institutional innovation followed from a series of "Town Meetings" under Bernie's leadership. The Faculty, in 1971, established a Senate constituted by elected candidates, graduates, and faculty to serve as the Program's governing body. Under the leadership of the Director, the Senate deliberates about educational policy, faculty selection, and course approval. One of the unique features of the Postdoctoral Program has thus been its truly democratic and participatory nature. Bernie always maintained an open door and open ear to candidates, faculty and graduates. He was quick to respond to these groups, and it was not surprising that he established a forum for candidates of color to express their experiences and concerns regarding the program. The Multi-cultural and Multi-ethnic Psychoanalytic Committee consisting of Rafael Javier, Annie Lee Jones, Kirkland Vaughns, Rose Marie Foster Perez, Jackie Lopez and Dolores Morris began meeting with Bernie on a regular basis in the late seventies and early eighties until after his death (in 1992) when Ruth Lesser and Rose Marie Foster Perez became co-chairs. By 1987 the discussion focused on three areas: the increase of minority representation in the Postdoctoral community; sensitivity to racial and ethnic issues; and finally, an increase in acceptance and utilization of psychoanalysis as a treatment option by the minority community.

A wonderful example of the kind of interdisciplinary activities undertaken by the program featured our teaming up with the Institute of African-American Affairs to design and host a series of meetings on race, including a major conference. The year-and-a-half-long collaboration culminated in six workshops and was made possible by \$140,000 in grants, including \$117,000 from the Ford Foundation and the rest from the Louis and Anne Abrons Foundation, the Yip Harburg Foundation, the Eugene Garfield Foundation and the NYU Humanities Council. Spearheading the collaboration were Neil Altman, Ph.D., an associate clinical professor at Postdoc, and Adelbert Jenkins, Ph.D., an associate professor of psychology and affiliate faculty member of the Africana studies program at NYU. In 2002, a conference on psychoanalysis, social policy and the sociocultural meaning of race attracted about 150 faculty members and students from a range of disciplines who gathered to discuss unconscious racism. These activities were featured in an article in the APA Monitor in April, 2004. Soon after, Marsha Levy Warren and Neil Altman began teaching a class on Psychoanalysis and Race. The Committee on Ethnicity, Race, Class, Culture, and Language (CERCCL) is the current iteration of the earlier diversity committee. In whatever CERCCL undertakes, its members hope to avoid a situation in which the awareness of diversity issues gets segregated into a committee. The goal is to encourage awareness of cultural diversity throughout the Postdoctoral Program. CERCCL wants all members of the community to share in the responsibility for consciousness-raising on these matters.

In 1993, *Perspectives on Homosexuality: An Open Dialogue*, perhaps the first psychoanalytic conference of its kind, was held at Postdoc. The organizers were two candidates, Ronnie Lesser and Tom Domenici, and the conference widely acclaimed as groundbreaking. The conference resulted in the publishing of *Disorienting Sexualities*, a collection of essays from the conference that combined a feminist critique with gay and lesbian scholarship, postmodernism and psychoanalysis. Numerous scholarly and interdisciplinary seminars, courses, and conferences are now an ongoing part of Postdoc life, featuring members of the NYU Postdoc community.

## Bibliography

- Jones, Annie Lee and Obourn, M. (2014). Object fear: The national dissociation of race and racism in the era of Obama. *Psychoanalysis, Culture, and Society*. 19 (4):392-412.
- Lifton, Robert J. (2017). *The Climate Swerve*. New York: The New Press.
- Pivnick, B.A. (2017). Creative analysis: Art, creativity, and clinical process by George Hagman. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 86, 2, 508
- Reisner, Steven. (1999). Freud And Psychoanalysis: Into The 21st Century. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*. 47. 1037-60.
- Vaughns, Kirkland, and Spielberg, Warren. (2014). *The Psychology of Black Boys and Adolescents*. Toronto: Praeger