BULLETIN

OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PSYCHOANALYTIC INSTITUTE AND SOCIETY

No. 75 Published Quarterly November 1985

35th Anniversary Issue

TABLE OF CONTENTS

226 NORTH CANON DRIVE
S.L. Pomer, M.D.

After the split the Americanization of psychoanalysis was more evident in our Institute than in the Los Angeles Institute since they retained lay analysts in prominent positions. Further, someone such as Franz Alexander found a receptive audience within our group as we were more open to examination and revision of psychoanalytic tenets.

Looking back at the early years of our Institute, I see golden years of psychoanalysis. I share with my contemporaries the memories of when psychoanalysis in Los Angeles was young, when to be accepted for training was special. We elevated training analysis to a high level of achievement and knowledge and we read Freud. There were implicit promises. Psychoanalytic training was filled with exciting solutions. We were revolutionizing the treatment of neuroses, psychosomatic ailments, and even psychoses. In those days the Institute had second floor offices on Canon Drive where we met for seminars in the evenings, after work. Classes were full. Much of our learning went on as well after class at the cafes nearby. We all attended every meeting. Shortly upon acceptance by the Institute nearly everyone had a waiting list of analytic patients and all was well in the world of psychoanalysis.

STUDYING PSYCHOANALYSIS IN BERLIN, TOPEKA, CHICAGO, MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. ARMY, AND IN THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE

Martin Grotjahn, M.D.

Relatively early in my life, I recognized the necessity for analytic training so that I could hope to understand what I was doing in my profession. When Franz Alexander lived for a few years in Berlin, he announced a course about "Ich-Analysis" (1927). (Today we would call it perhaps, "Psychoanalysis of the Ego and the Self.") I mistakenly thought Alexander meant "Self-Analysis" and his lectures would be a "Do It Yourself Introduction" into psychoanalysis.

Well, I realized my mistake quickly and waited some more years to start formal analytic training. Already at that time I reviewed psychoanalytic publications for professional journals and newspapers.

I applied for admission to the Berlin Institute and was interviewed by Karen Horney and Wilhelm Reich (who did not even ask me to sit down because the interview lasted only one or two minutes).

The third interviewer, whose name I forgot forever, did not approve of my being already an assistant in the Department of Psychiatry at the University. He would have preferred -- so he said -- any theologian. His attitude insulted me so much that I once more postponed the beginning of my analysis for several years, even though I was accepted.

Finally (1931) I started analysis with Ernst Simmel and terminated it after Simmel's emigration with Felix Boehm.

Like so many analysts who tried to evaluate their own analysis (Helene Deutsch, Kardiner, Grinker, Smiley Blanton, and many others), I did not think that my analysts recognized my "charm" as effective defense to keep them in safe distance.

But again, like other analysts, I give full credit to my training analysts for having opened the doors to my unconscious. It was then up to me to walk through these open doors. After having finished the formal terminal part of my analysis, I started my interminable, informal, self analysis, which I continue to this day, fifty years later.

Psychoanalysts cannot and probably should not live in analytic isolation (as different from social isolation, to which many of us are inclined). I continued my self analysis with an analysis of my dreams, of my marriage and of my relationship as father to a son and as a colleague to other analysts. I continued my self analysis in sickness and in health, in happiness and depression, on my weekend hikes with my "walking friends," even in my loving care for my small flower gardens.

More importantly, and here again I suppose that most analysts agree, I continued my own analysis by analyzing my patients. Every patient with whom I try to deal analytically was also a continued attempt to gain insight into myself. I learned from Theodor Reik to analyze myself as if I were my own patient and I analyzed my patients as if they were parts of myself.

It is not my intention to describe the details of my self analysis here, since I want to describe the learning of psychoanalysis by teaching it at different analytic institutes, especially during the thirty-five years of lecturing in our institute. It taught me how to clarify my mind and how to continue and deepen my self analysis. The difficult task to describe my lifelong analysis is attempted in my memoirs. (My Favorite Patient: The Memoirs of an Analyst," Peter Lang Publisher, 34 East 39th Street, New York, NY 10016. 1986.)

In March 1936 I became a member of the International Psychoanalytic Association and was as such registered in the International Journal for Psychoanalysis. I never wanted to become a member of the Institute in Berlin which by now excluded my Jewish colleagues and friends.

Six months later, September 1936, I immigrated from Berlin to the Menninger Clinic in Topeka, Kansas. I could claim that the main learning experience in Topeka was to learn how to speak English and to work for my medical license -- and this work left little or no energy for further self analysis. This is, however, only partially true: Not to

understand the language of everybody else makes one feel like a small child, who doesn't understand the language of the grown-ups. Trying to come to terms with Karl Menninger, a father image for anybody's unconscious and to be assigned the role of child and perhaps of a favorite child, was an additional, new analytic experience. Adjusting to a new psychiatric environment, demanded new efforts in self analysis. So my energy was divided between attempting to adjust to the reality in which I lived and the reality of my mind.

I learned to know a new kind of psychoanalytic pioneer in Topeka, quite different from the European variety. The American pioneers were patient directed and treatment oriented. The questions of psychoanalytic principles, theories, of definition and terminology took definitely second place.

I was deeply impressed by the attitude of the American psychoanalytic pioneers and even wrote Sigmund Freud a letter about it.

I think I remained loyal to the basic analytic principles of understanding. The basis of psychoanalysis is the basis of all treatment and consists in the understanding of conscious and unconscious motivations. To extend the attempt of understanding to the new dimension of the unconscious marks treatment as analytic.

After two years working with the Menninger Clinic in Topeka, we -- that means my wife, my son and I -- moved to Chicago. There I got my first teaching assignment: a seminar on Freud's "Jokes and Their Relationship to the Unconscious." From these lectures developed my first book, Beyond Laughter. It seems only logical to revise and rewrite this book now for a second edition at the end of my analytic career. I also started then my seminar on Contemporary Psychoanalytic Literature.

From Chicago I went into the Medical Corps of the U.S. Army; this happened a few days after I had become an American citizen, having been registered as an "enemy alien" (since Pearl Harbor). In the Medical Corps my "Americanization" of psychoanalysis was continued. I discovered the therapeutic efficiency of analytic group and family therapy. By now I had given up the safe place of observing the American scene from behind the couch. I had to learn how to work at the hospital ward, this time with military background. I found an active, analytic, therapeutically effective way of treating acutely sick soldiers, similar to the treatment of war neuroses by Simmel, Jones, Ferenczi, and Abraham.

I never had a loyalty conflict with the basic principles laid down in the methods of psychoanalytic thinking. The attitude of trying to understand conscious and unconscious motivation is the essence of psychoanalysis. Only this new dimension of the unconscious makes the attitude of the therapist an analytic creation.

One day the war was over. Since we could not go "home" again, we decided to immigrate once more, this time to Los Angeles where I participated in the separation of the psychoanalytic institute. We called the new institute the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute.

I continued my analytic education by giving a course on "Contemporary Psychoanalytic Literature." I started to give this course already in Chicago (1938) and took it up again when I came to Los Angeles. I gave this seminar for more than thirty-five years.

I do not know for certain what my students think about my way of teaching, whether they liked it or whether they were just entertained, but not informed. In the annual evaluations of the teachers by their students, I almost always received favorable responses. I remember a remark by Werner Mendel, who wrote approximately: Grotjahn does not only inform but he has the gift to stimulate enthusiasm for learning. This is what I felt I was trying to do. To the best of my knowledge I got only one negative response. Somebody wrote: Grotjahn talks too much about death. That is depressing and he should stop it. I found this critique justified and only now since I have death

sitting on my back, I begin again to write and to analyze death fear and death anxiety. With that I have almost reached the limits of self analysis.

I would like to write much more what it meant to read all the contemporary analytic literature, to have it reviewed by my students or to review it myself; then to discuss it, to try to understand it and to explain it and to interpret it. In this seminar we met Sigmund Freud, at least in his writing, and Erik Erikson, Theodor Reik, Otto Rank, Wilhelm Reich, Helene Deutsch, Therese Benedek, Smiley Blanton, Georg Groddeck and many others. Finally I got my friends together and in joint editorship with Franz Alexander and Sam Eisenstein, the book on Psychoanalytic Pioneers, was written. Every analyst of our Institute at that time worked on this book, together with the rest of us.

Since five years (1980) I am retired. I have retired from teaching and in a way from learning. I have not retired from self analysis, the results of which I occasionally publish.

I wish the Psychoanalytic Society and Institute of Southern California a long and successful life. May its teachers get as much joy from teaching and learning in the next thirty-five years as I received from my work.

ALBERT KANDELIN, M.D.:

The Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Study Group was founded in 1935, California's first psychoanalytic organization; in this Simmel was the prime mover and became the first president. This group had no official relationship with the American Psychoanalytic Association nor was its membership restricted to the analysts. Its constitution made no mention of a medical qualification; several of its original members were intelligent and enlightened persons in professions apart from analysis, psychiatry or psychology. Essentially the one qualification was "sufficient knowledge and understanding of Freudian analysis." Especially excluded were persons who attempt to practice psychoanalysis without training as prescribed by the Freudian School. This exclusion was timely, aimed at the considerable number of opportunists who proclaimed themselves analysts with little or no qualification. Within these guidelines the Study Group commenced a productive existence and attracted a growing membership. By 1940 new lay members included Frances Deri, Hanna Heilborn (later Fenichel), Christine Olden and Edgar Daniels. Also joining the group were the first physician analysts (after Simmel). From Europe came Otto Fenichel and the Haenels, Jaochim and Irene. The earliest American-trained physician analysts were Charles Tidd and May Romm.

The Study Group's activities, which included some training of analytic candidates, were sanctioned and under the official aegis of first the Chicago Psychoanalytic Institute (founded in 1930), and later the Topeka Institute (founded in 1938). Topeka and Los Angeles had close links; Simmel, Fenichel and Tidd were charter members of Topeka. The Topeka jurisdiction over the California activities lasted until 1942, the date of founding of a first official society on the West Coast. This was the San Francisco Psychoanalytic Society, given the name of the northern city although it included members from there and Los Angeles alike.

Excerpted from:
Kandelin, A. "California's First Psychoanalytic Society." Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 30, 6, Nov., 1966, 351-357.

HIGHLIGHTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PSYCHOANALYTIC INSTITUTE AND SOCIETY

Sigmund Gabe, M.D.

The Southern California Psychoanalytic Society and Institute came into existence as a result of an organizational split in the pre-existent Los Angeles Society and Institute. From 1946 to 1950 all analysts in Los Angeles belonged to the Los Angeles Society and all training of future analysts was carried on in its Institute. In February 1950 the Educational Committee of the Institute announced that as a result of serious differences that have arisen in its ranks that have paralyzed its functioning, it was decided that the existing organization should be split two ways, and two separate societies and institutes be established in its place.

To understand the centrifugal forces that produced this crisis, we need to take a look at the special way psychoanalysis started in Los Angeles; at the composition and background of the membership; and at the scientific and professional controversies that were agitating organized psychoanalysis in the post-war period.

Psychoanalysis in Los Angeles began as a lay movement in the late 1920s. It was represented by a Study Group composed of lay people, some of whom were practicing analysis. In the middle 1930s, they brought over from Europe Ernst Simmel, Otto Fenichel and Madame Frances Deri, who had to flee the Nazi menace. These three began to do some training, under the aegis first of the Chicago Institute, later of the Topeka Institute, and between 1942 and 1946 under the San Francisco Institute.

When World War II ended, there began a trek of medical analysts, most of whom were trained in America, from the centers in the East and from Chicago to Los Angeles. In 1946 the Los Angeles Society was organized and it had both lay and medical members. Tensions quickly arose and grew between the lay members and their European allies with their students in one hand, and the American-trained analysts on the other, over the issue of lay analysis, and out of the ingredients: original settler vs. newcomer, European-trained vs. American-trained. To give you the flavor of the atmosphere that was generated, let me give you a quote from one of the partisans. Dr. May Romm, the first American-trained medical analyst to settle in Los Angeles, described the prevailing atmosphere, as she remembered it, in the following words:

> These newcomers, including myself, had California licenses to practice medicine, in contra-distinction to the European members, most of whom were lay people...It got to the point that it was most unpleasant for the new members to attend any meeting whether it was a general one or an educational one. We were treated as interlopers and completely ignored... It became obvious that those of us who were trained in the U.S.A. were considered by those who were trained in Europe as being of inferior quality and beneath their notice.

No doubt, a partisan from the other side would completely reverse the picture.

Another major factor generating dissension was an ideological one. In the post-war period Alexander and his group in Chicago advanced an innovative set of ideas concerning the conduct of psychoanalytic therapy which came to be summarized under the rubrics "flexibility" and "corrective emotional experience." These ideas became the focus for a protracted scientific controversy in the American Psychoanalytic Association. The "old group" in Los Angeles was bitterly opposed to the Alexandrian ideas, regarding them as a threat to the very essence of psychoanalysis. They looked upon the group who had come from Chicago and all those associated with them as subversives and charged them with advocating "innovations in technique which may be of value as a form of psychotherapy but are not in accordance with the dynamic processes in psychoanalysis proper." The spokesmen for "the new group" denied that they discarded any of the basic tenets and principles of psychoanalysis as defined by Freud. They did admit that some of them had reservations about the validity of some of the theoretical superstructure of psychoanalysis, e.g. the libido theory, and

---

*Unpublished paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association, May 1, 1975.

about some of the ritualistic aspects of technique. They felt they could have lived with these differences; however, what they could not tolerate was the authoritarian, doctrinaire spirit of the other group which made scientific discourse and inquiry impossible.

These personal and ideological conflicts found their sharpest expression in the Education Committee. Two factions crystallized. The deliberations of the Educational Committee became highly politicized. A struggle for power ensued. Whatever was proposed by one group was almost automatically opposed by the other. An impasse was reached. Then both sides concluded that a separation into separate organizations was the only way out. The membership of the Society split twelve for one side, ten for the other. The majority group retained the name Los Angeles Society; the new group proceeded to set up a new organization and chose a new name.

The candidates were stunned by the decision to "split." No one had prepared them for the crisis. After listening to the arguments from both sides, they concluded as a body that what they had heard from their mentors did not justify splitting the Institute. Their plea had no effect, and they faced the agonizing choice with which group to go. Nearly all chose the side to which their training analyst belonged, which suggests that the choices were made more on the basis of transference ties rather than scientific considerations.

The new Society was formally launched in March 1950, and was accepted as a Constituent Society of the A.P.A. in April 1950. It settled on the name: "The Society for Psychoanalytic Medicine of Southern California." By including the designation "medicine" in its name, it meant to inform the world that it is a society of physicians only and to distinguish itself from the other society which harbored lay analysts. One of its first official acts was a resolution that membership would be open to physicians only. These two facts bespeak how importantly the lay analysis issue loomed in the minds of the organizers of the new Society.

This resolve to keep the Society an exclusive domain of the medical analyst remained unassailed for ten years. In 1960, an additional category of membership -- affiliate membership -- was enacted in the By-Laws, and the first Affiliate Member, Mrs. Marie Briehl, was voted in. Mrs. Briehl was a Child Analyst trained in Vienna under Anna Freud. From the inception of the Southern California Institute, she was an active participant in its training program, creating and teaching courses in Child Development and Child Analysis, and finally succeeding in developing a Child Analysis Training Program. Yet she had no official standing in the Society. Repeated proposals that she be given some form of membership were blocked by the influence of some of the founding members. The leadership had to undergo some metamorphosis, and a sufficient number of younger members had to join the rank before the first lay-analyst could be granted official recognition in the Society.

It took an additional two years and a determined campaign on the part of some of the newer leadership before the organization could be persuaded to drop the designation "medical" from its title and simplify it to "The Southern California Psychoanalytic Society and Institute."

It took considerably longer to get a Research Training Program started in the Institute. Officially the Institute seemingly accepted the policy of the A.P.A. to train specially qualified non-medical scholars for research. But year after year we found fault with all the applicants and turned them all down. The bias against lay analysis was still operating strongly albeit not so openly. It was only in 1966 that we began in earnest to build a Psychoanalytic Training Program for Lay Researchers. Each year since then we have accepted one or two applicants into the program, assisting them with free tuition and some of them with monetary stipends. The Program is working well and is a source of pride to the Institute.

When the Society set about organizing the Institute, two different plans of organization were proposed. One plan, which took the Chicago Institute as its model, would have the Institute be virtually independent of the Society; it would consist exclusively of a faculty and director and have sole and total responsibility for the training program. The alternate plan called for an Institute organically linked to the Society by giving each member the right to become a member of the Institute whether or not he was part of the faculty. This plan was adopted. It aimed at preventing a concentration of power in an elite, such as occurred in the Education Committee of the parent Institute and led to its disruption. It has been successful in that aim. No clique or faction has ever come to dominate the affairs of the Institute. A case in point was the power to appoint new training analysts which was vested in the Education Committee. This power to appoint recently came under fire because many members came to feel that it made the Education Committee a self-perpetuating body. The membership debated the issue and decided to divest the Education Committee of the power to appoint. Now, the membership as a whole, through a periodically selected Selection Committee, does the selecting of new training analysts.

The Institute started with an Education Committee consisting of the four training analysts who had been appointed prior to the "split" -- Drs. Grotjahn, Levy, Miller, and Romm -- plus two faculty members who were not yet training analysts, Drs. Frumkes and Marmor. They elected Martin Grotjahn as Chairman. They set to work with zeal and energy to select a faculty, develop a curriculum, choose the student body and set up all the machinery required for the conduct of a Training School. They carried immense burdens of analysis, supervision, teaching, administration. To cope with the rapid growth of the student body, new training analysts were appointed. From among the local members came George Frumkes, Judd Marmor, Sigmund Gabe, Eugene Mindlin, Harry Nierenberg, Bertram Spira; from the outside came: Philip Wagner from the Baltimore-Washington Institute, and Franz Alexander, George Mohr and George Wilson from the Chicago Institute. Alexander had come to Los Angeles to assume the Directorship of the Department of Psychiatry at the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. Although Alexander was unquestionably a man with considerable prestige among the members of the Education Committee, he made no attempt to exercise undue influence or garner power. He attended Educational Committee meetings regularly and shared in the work the same as any other member. His main interest and energy were centered in a research project which he undertook, known as the Ford Project, a multilevel investigation into the therapeutic process in analysis. Although the research was not under the jurisdiction of the Institute, nearly all the investigators were members of the Institute. The project was almost completed when Alexander unexpectedly died.

Let me now say a few words about some of the founding members. I shall start with Dr. Grotjahn. Martin Grotjahn had been one of the youngest candidates to graduate from the Berlin Institute. On immigrating to the United States he became a training analyst in Chicago, and later in Los Angeles. He devoted full time to training and over the years analyzed a great many members of the Southern California Institute. He considered himself an analyst in the classical framework of Freudian psychoanalysis, but he jealously guarded the freedom to think for himself. As he himself expressed it at the time of the "split:"

> I chose to go with that part of the analytic family that will allow me the greatest personal and scientific freedom to think and to create.

Grotjahn was an intuitive thinker. He had little interest in systematic theorizing. He was fascinated by the manifestations of the unconscious and had an abiding interest in symbolism, about which he has written and lectured extensively. He was an inspiring teacher. But administration was not his forte and after five years as Chairman of the Education Committee, he was glad to relinquish the post to Philip Wagner.

Wagner was a superb administrator. He converted the Training School from a night school to a day school, brought order into the curriculum and systematized the bibliographies

of courses so as to minimize duplication. He had a Sullivanian orientation and he had an opportunity to expound it in a seminar on "Modifications." But he attracted few followers for his point of view. He early became interested in developing and directing a mental health program for one of the trade unions, devoted full time to it, and ceased his training activities in the Institute.

Milton L. Miller, President of the Institute from 1950 to 1959, when he left to become Professor of Psychiatry at the University of North Carolina and to help set up a psychoanalytic institute there, was a man of great dignity, bordering on aloofness. He was an erudite student of the classical psychoanalytic literature. He trained in Chicago and was a training analyst there before coming to Los Angeles. However, despite his expressed adherence to Alexander's ideas, in his teaching and supervision he was quite classical, always stressing the transference manifestations of the Oedipal conflict and sibling rivalry.

May Romm was admired and appreciated for her warmth of personality, wit, and fighting spirit. She had been associated with Rado before coming to Los Angeles. She had a strong interest in psychosomatic medicine and intense feelings against lay analysis. She was an enthusiastic clinician, and in her training often introduced clinical vignettes from her extensive experience. She would drive home the points she wished to impress on her students with apt jokes and bon mots from her endless repertory, which made her seminars great fun to most of her students.

Norman Levy, another of the founding members, had trained in Chicago and worked under Roy Grinker, who influenced him greatly. Levy had a strong background in Neurology and General Psychiatry. In his teaching and supervision, he focussed more and more on the transactional process and what goes on in the "here and now." He has become nihilistic about analytic theory and prides himself on being an eclectic. His approach has found favor with some of the members and, of course, has impressed itself on his analysands.

Judd Marmor was also among the pioneers who had a noticeable impact on the early development of the Institute. He had been associated with Kardiner and Rado before coming to Los Angeles. Except for a brief sally into classical analytic theory with his paper "Orality in Hysteria," he has been an outspoken critic of psychoanalytic theory and practice. He looked to learning theory, communications theory, and the behavioral sciences for correctives for analytic concepts that he felt needed revision. He advocated "flexibility" in practice and argued that

> rigidities of psychoanalytic technique should never become confused with the essence of the analytic process itself.

A polished speaker, a skillful debater, and a capable administrator, he found outlets for his gifts in heading a department of psychiatry in a teaching hospital and becoming a spokesman and leader of the American Psychiatric Association. As a consequence, many years ago, he began withdrawing from training activities in the Institute.

Despite the influence of such charismatic individuals as Levy and Marmor, the general course of the Institute was determined not by them but by a large cadre of training analysts and faculty members whose outlook and teaching were generally in the mainstream of analytic thought and practice. To mention but a few of them: Blumstein, the Briehls, Eisenstein, Frumkes, Gabe, Goodstone, Mindlin, Natterson, Pomer, Saperstein, Siegel, Spira. Quietly but steadily they trained and supervised, developed the curriculum, taught the seminars, followed the progression of the candidates and saw to it that standards of training were upheld. From their ranks have come many of the leaders: the Presidents of the Institute and the Chairmen of the Education Committee.

When Lewin and Ross studied our Institute in 1958, as part of their official Survey of Psychoanalytic Education in the U.S.A., they found the Institute was functioning well within the boundaries of the criteria for an accredited institute of the American. Six years later, in 1964, as part of the periodic review of Institutes undertaken by the American, a Site Visit Team of the Committee on Institutes came to visit us. They stated in their report that the Institute consists of "a dedicated group of psychoanalysts whose devotion to psychoanalysis and whose practice and teaching reflect a consistent pursuit of our discipline in its best tradition."

REMINISCENCE
Judd Marmor, M.D.

It was almost forty years ago, in the summer of 1947, that I came to Los Angeles. As I look back on the psychoanalytic scene from the range of these years, I am heartened by the relaxation of the dogma and the broadening of perspectives among the new generation of analysts now in our midst. The lively interchanges that take place between adherents of various points of view -- Kleinians, classical Freudians, Kernbergians, Kohutians, and a variety of neo-Freudians, is both stimulating and heartening.

It is difficult to convey at this point the quasi-religious fanatacism about classical Freudian doctrine that pervaded the small group of analysts in the original founding group of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society and Institute. Freud's writings and views were regarded as the final word on all matter psychoanalytic, and any questioning of any aspect of his theoretical schema was regarded as truly heretical. I recall that in the spring of 1948, I presented a paper to the Los Angeles Society on the views of Abram Kardiner, one of the pioneers of ego-adaptive psychology and psychoanalysis, who had been my analyst in the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. The paper was received quite cooly, and Ralph Greenson, who was the chief discussant, centered his criticism on the fact that it could not be very good, since of the fifteen biographical references cited in it, only two were to Freud's works! I mention this not to derogate Greenson -- whom I grew to like and respect more and more over the years as his views mellowed and evolved -- but only to illustrate the temper of that era.

It was this early rigidity and dogmatism, more than anything else, I am convinced, that led to the split in the Los Angeles Institute and the formation of the Southern California Institute in 1950. I have often heard it said that it was personality differences rather than ideological ones that led to the split, but the ideological differences were the basic reasons for the personality alienations. A substantial portion of the founding members were older lay analysts with a strong European background. They strongly mistrusted the new crop of younger analysts who were not only all medically trained, but had also been exposed to "deviant" psychoanalytic influences. Thus, people like Milton Miller, Norman Levy and Martin Grotjahn, who had been "influenced" by Franz Alexander and the "radical" Chicago Psychoanalytic Institute; May Romm, who had been analyzed by Sandor Rado; I, who had been analyzed by Kardiner; and Hacker, Frumkes and Briehl, all of whom were tainted with "liberalism" -- were all considered suspect. Consequently, a struggle for political control developed in the Education Committee of the Institute, with the old guard determined not to allow any more of the potential deviants to become training analysts (Grotjahn, Levy, Miller and Romm already were). The resulting impasse stifled the training atmosphere and made a split inevitable. I tried to retain my membership in the Los Angeles Society but was told in no uncertain terms that that would not be permitted, and that they would change their constitutional bylaws to prohibit joint membership if I did not resign voluntarily. (I then did so to save them the trouble!) However, I have never altered my conviction that although it makes sense to have two or more psychoanalytic institutes in one city, it does not make sense to have more than one psychoanalytic society, where all graduates of all the institutes can meet, exchange viewpoints, and benefit from the cross-fertilization of ideas. This is equivalent to having multiple medical schools in one city, but only one medical society.

With this background in mind, the nine founding members of the Southern California Institute and Society (Briehl, Clinco, Frumkes, Grotjahn, Hacker, Levy, Miller, Romm and myself) were determined to create a new kind of psychoanalytic institute -- one in which differences in orientation would be tolerated, academic freedom preserved, and a democratic structure built into the bylaws so that no small group of older analysts could control and stifle the developmental aspirations of the younger members -- as was the case in some of the old line institutes of that day. The healthy growth of our Institute and Society over the past thirty-five years is a tribute to the spirit that motivated those founding members. We enjoy an openness of scientific discussion, a mutual respect for diversity of viewpoints, and a democratic structure that I believe is unique among the institutes of the American Psychoanalytic Association.

I regret only that our cherished friends and charter-colleagues, Walter Briehl, Arthur Clinco, George Frumkes, and May Romm are no longer among us to celebrate this anniversary with us. It would be nice to think that somewhere they are looking down (or up!) with pride on what they, together with all the rest of us, have wrought!

THE GOOD OLD DAYS

Norman A. Levy, M.D.

Thinking about my contribution to the special anniversary issue in the form of some thoughts about the past or the future brings to mind a phone call I recently received from my ten year old granddaughter in which she told me about a homework assignment consisting of getting information about "the good old days," and asking me if I would answer ten questions. Naturally I was delighted to comply, and gave her information about the period prior to World War I, certainly the "old days" but not necessarily "the good old days." In contrast, I can speak of "the good old days" for psychoanalysis and we psychoanalysts here in Los Angeles in the decades following World War II. Why were these the "good old days"? Prior to the late 1940s there was little or no dynamic psychiatry here and the small psychoanalytic study group was quite isolated from the medical and psychiatric communities. The exception was our colleague and friend the late Dr. May Romm. Those decades provided some of us with the marvelous opportunity of being pioneers, the bearers of the light and enlightening the unenlightened. To put joking aside, the people in the psychiatric training programs (residents at the V.A. Hospital in Brentwood, and medical students at USC), the social workers, psychologists and nurses in the psychiatric facilities and in the various social and community agencies, were literally hungry for help in understanding their patients and clients. For the first time they found some with us psychoanalysts as teachers and consultants, in what we knew best, namely the psychodynamics of human behavior. Some of us became very active as faculty members in the psychiatric departments at USC, subsequently at UCLA, Cedars-Sinai, the V.A. and as consultants and lecturers throughout the community. During the fifties and sixties, psychoanalysts appeared to be sort of "elite," and were in great demand not simply as practitioners, but especially as teachers. Those were the heydays for psychoanalysis. Psychoanalytically trained academic psychiatrists were in great demand by medical schools throughout the country, frequently as chairmen of psychiatric departments. Our Institute, founded in 1950, flourished, had many applicants for analytic training, and through our Extension Division, played an important role in teaching and training people in what came to be called the mental health professions. Those were "the good old days" for analysis and analysts.

Our colleague John Gussen was the first chairman of the psychiatric department at Cedars of Lebanon, followed by Franz Alexander, then Judd Marmor, now Saul Brown, all of our Institute and Society, at the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. In the early fifties I was privileged to be instrumental in reorganizing the Psychiatric Department at USC and to introduce psychoanalytic dynamic psychiatry. We were able to recruit many of our analytic colleagues for the faculty and finally a full-time head of the department, Edward Stainbrook, who subsequently had his analytic training in our Institute. In the new medical school at UCLA, the original chairman of psychiatry was Norman Brill, an analytically trained psychiatrist.

Changes occurred during the seventies and more so in the eighties. Our specialized knowledge became part, to some extent, of the general psychological knowledge and part of the culture. Increasingly, social workers and clinical psychologists became psychotherapists with various degrees of psychoanalytic psychodynamic orientations. We were losing our "elite" status and the narcissistic satisfaction that went with it. Then to cap it all, along came the great advances in psychopharmacology and biological psychiatry. They have become predominant in academic psychiatry to a considerable extent. Obviously the advances in the neurobiological sciences and in clinical psychiatry have been enormously beneficial, and will, of course, continue to be so.

Morton Reiser, in his book Mind, Brain, Body asks the question, "does this mean, as some assert, that in the long run full explanations of mental events will be provided by neurobiology and chemicals will replace psychology in the clinic?" Reiser does not think so, nor do I. This is a challenge that we must meet. However, we analysts would not be human if we did not lament a bit the passing of the glories of our "good old days."

ANNIVERSARY THOUGHTS
Milton L. Miller, M.D.

Freud's findings have proven so very durable in various eras and localities that it is not surprising that all three cities and institutes where I studied and taught were similar in their approach to psychodynamic teaching and training. Yet the three cities differed so much in economic factors, climate and transportation facilities, etc., that these were reflected in institute operations. Chicago, the hub of the mid-West, continues to be a greatly expanding medical and cultural center, and a focus of teaching. The group who formed the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute are dynamic and hard-working, and enjoy the special support of the theatrical community. Here, in North Carolina, in Durham and Chapel Hill and surroundings, our analysts and our candidates revolve many activities around University functions. From the window of my previous office at U.N.C. I could see football practice. The Universities function congenially, and we also have the Veterans Administration and Research Triangle business community to provide stimulation. Our training program grows with two thriving medical schools. Ours is the only training program that includes two universities. We have long had an excellent series of visiting lecturers on psychodynamic topics from California, New York, etc.

Lest you think of us as bookish, professorial impractical types with our heads either in the clouds or buried deep into the world of the Id, I would like to recount to you how George Pollock, one of our frequent visiting lecturers, confronted a business executive, the head of a major air line.

George was to lecture at 9 A.M. to our psychoanalytic candidates at the University of North Carolina on a Sunday. He found, after flying from Chicago to Washington, D.C., that the rest of his flight to North Carolina was non-existent, despite his paid-for tickets. His son-in-law, Sandy Ungar, (the journalist), helped him battle in the wee, small hours of Sunday A.M. to find transportation to Chapel Hill. They traced the head of the malfeasant air line to a distant city, and complained to him personally on the phone, until he promised George a free taxi ride, pronto, from Washington, D.C. to Chapel Hill, for the 9 A.M. lecture. The taxi driver was unfamiliar with Virginia and North Carolina roads and got lost a couple of times, but he delivered a sleepless George Pollock to his classroom by 9 A.M., on time to deliver his lecture. George, his usual ebullient, dynamic self, seemed none the worse for a hectic night. He had lunch with us, had his picture taken with our dog, and made his flight back to Chicago with the usual paper work to go over on the way.

I believe the future will bring us problems with third-party payers, and with non-medical trainees, but without doubt we can confront our dilemmas successfully.

BACKGROUNDS OF PSYCHOANALYSIS:

Mary Wilshire, for whose husband Wilshire Boulevard was named, was the first psychoanalyst in Los Angeles. She, reportedly, had Jungian training and had possibly met Freud. She practiced here around 1914.

Ennis, B.B. "Backgrounds of Psychiatry in Southern California." Los Angeles County Medical Association Bulletin. Feb. 15 and March 1, 1973.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY

Alexander S. Rogawski, M.D.

The time of the creation of our Institute was a difficult time for several clinical associates or, as we were called as that time, "candidates." We were aware that there were tensions and conflicts among our elders. But we closed our eyes and hoped that reason would prevail similarly to children before they are forced to face the fact that their parents decided to get a divorce. Well, reason did not prevail. One day we were told that we had to decide whether to remain in the 'old' Los Angeles Institute or to join the 'new' Southern California Institute for Psychoanalytic Medicine. (original title) This demand forced me to make a wrenching decision. My analyst was one of the founders of the new Institute. My supervisors and many of my good friends were members of the old Institute. Several of my classmates took their time before they declared themselves. Dr. Helen Tausend and I shared the same analyst, Dr. Martin Grotjahn. We were the last to state our choice. Helen opted for the old Institute and I went the other way. To his ever lasting credit Dr. Ralph Greenson continued my supervision for another two-and-a-half years with a case which I finally presented as my graduation thesis. Ralph was a true scholar and gentleman who did not allow partisan considerations to dissuade him from fulfilling his professional and didactic obligations.

After so many years the gulf that once widely separated our two groups of analysts has narrowed. Our present relations are amicable and mutually respectful. Gone are the days of intense passions. The "soft voice of reason" (Freud) is triumphing.

But the history of psychoanalysis is marred by 'splits' and dissensions from its very beginnings. This is not the place to ponder the reasons for this phenomenon. Whatever the reasons and unreasons the passage of time reveals that 'scientific' convictions are often nothing but poorly concealed rationalizations for personal ambitions and rivalries. We all can learn from differences of views as long as we keep communications open. Almost a century after Freud first showed us the road to the understanding of unconscious mental processes, we are still mere students of the intricacies of the human mind and human behavior. This realization demands tolerance of deviant views.

I never regretted my decision to join the 'new' Institute. We have been able to maintain among our ranks a climate of tolerance of divergent orientations which has furthered our professional and personal growth. "Fluctuat nec mergitur." (Quote introducing Freud's "On the History of the Psychoanalytic Movement," S.E. Vol. XIV, page 7.)

"To have lived in Freud's time, to have had the initiative and sense of adventure, to have gone in search of that which always concerned me, the essential profundities of life, to have been accepted as a student of psychoanalysis and shared the oval table seminars with sages and peers was, as I think of it, comparatively more simple than becoming part of organized psychoanalysis in the United States. Can one then sit with the free Gods of knowledge and, despite awe, learn and become part of their search more easily than to become part of the organized machine of men? I think I have had something of this kind of experience and it has proved life giving."

In "Marie Briehl - Child Psychoanalytic Pioneer, Part II." S.L. Pomer and Kato van Leeuwen. Bulletin of the Southern California Psychoanalytic Society and Institute. 42. April 1975, 23.

THE SPECIALNESS OF OUR INSTITUTE AND ITS MEMBERS

Roman N. Anshin, M.D.

To myself, as to many other members of our Institute and Society, the impact and meaning of the total experience of psychoanalytic training has been and continues to be one of the richest experiences of a lifetime. I was accepted in psychoanalytic training in 1961. As I knew of it then, the "new" Institute suited my own professional background, personality makeup, social and ethical value systems, and intellectual proclivities. There existed a well known and exciting atmosphere of informal openness. Flexibility, pragmatism, and honesty were evident. There was little interest in tired, omnipotent formulas that might be found in the dogmatic writings and statements of many "classical" analysts from "classical" institutes. In our group there was a focus not only on culling the best from older ideas in psychoanalysis, but also in developing new ways of approaching intra-psychic issues. Our Institute also wished to appreciate and understand more profoundly the transactional field -- between analyst and patient, patient and the world, analyst and the world.

The Institute cared about social and political problems, unlike some other institutes in the American who felt that this attitude was "anti-analytic." Prior to residency my intellectual and personal heroes included Camus, John Dewey, F.D.R., Einstein, Kafka, Schweitzer, Erich Fromm, and Martin Luther King. In psychiatric training, I fell under the spell of Frieda Fromm-Reichmann and the Chestnut Lodge group, Harry Stack Sullivan, Winnicott, Bowlby, and Franz Alexander, along with the psychoanalytically oriented early writers in family therapy -- Grotjahn, Ackerman, and Lidz.

In my psychoanalytic training and the years beyond, two teachers and colleagues exemplify, to me, the excellence of our Institute. Of course, I could note many other outstanding teachers, supervisors, friends, and colleagues. Perhaps it was twenty years ago that Bob Litman gave me (if my memory is correct) a hierarachy of experience through which we analysts learn: (1) our own analysis; (2) our patients; (3) our supervisors and colleagues; (4) our seminars and reading. I believe Drs. Judd Marmor and Saul Brown would agree with Bob's ideas.

I had the good fortune of first being taught by Judd Marmor in the mid-50s, when I was a medical student. Judd's clarity of thinking, honesty, modesty, openness, and lack of dogmatism, and attempts to bring science to psychoanalysis sparked my interest in psychoanalysis. In the years since then, I have been inspired by a man who cared, not only about his patients, but also about the world through his ubiquitous humanitarian concerns. Judd's searching curiosity has drawn him to, in my opinion, valid non-analytic ways of conceptualizing behavior and motivation, and in attempting to integrate these areas into more traditional analytic theory. His other interests have included learning theory, attachment theory, general systems theory, biological issues, and the importance of cultural and societal concerns, among others. Judd has also importantly conceptualized the universal and non-theory specific factors to be found in psychoanalytic improvement and cure. Hopefully, some future psychoanalytic theory will continue to integrate these and other aspects of human knowledge as Judd has done in such a magnificent and pioneering fashion.

Saul Brown, at Cedars-Sinai, has shown how a psychoanalyst-administrator and teacher can be genuine -- authentic -- in his interaction with his students and staff. Over the years his warm, empathic, and at times necessarily firm "holding environment" has provided me and many students and professional colleagues with a superb model of an optimal professional mental health setting. His own abilities and functioning in problem-solving and staff development, if it were ever studied, in my opinion would be an important contribution to psychoanalytic understanding of small group functioning. You are all familiar with Saul's landmark work in psychoanalytic family therapy and in elucidating the developmental cycle of the family -- as important, in my view, as Erikson's work on the individual life cycle.

I know that by no means would all members of the Institute agree with either my assessment or enthusiasm for Judd and Saul. However the beauty of the our Institute is that in its atmosphere there is a nurturance of respect of others' views -- of learning from others' views, even if there is disagreement with that particular point of view.

FIRST CANDIDATE
John A. Lindon, M.D.

I became the first Clinical Associate accepted by the brand new Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute. When I started seminars a few months later, there were no clearly defined first, second, third and fourth year courses; you signed up for whatever course interested you, in whatever order you wanted. However disorganized that seems now, and may have been at the time, it offered marvelous stimulation toward learning. I remember being in courses with David Morgan, who was then in his fifth or sixth year of psychoanalytic training, and others almost as experienced as he. Not only did I learn how much I didn't know, but I learned a lot from fellow students who were far more experienced in both analytic training and in practice, especially since at the time I had just finished my first year of psychiatric residency. Maybe times have changed or the attitudes toward psychoanalysis, but I recall taking seminars in the evening at the second floor of 226 N. Canon Drive where the Institute had a little office and a seminar room and frequently a group of us would continue the discussion out on the sidewalk for another hour or so. It scared me how much some of the other guys knew, and how little I knew, but it also was a powerful stimulus to learning. I doubt if they benefitted from my being in the seminar, but I know I benefitted by their being in it,and in a way I wonder whether we may have lost something by not allowing this freedom.

Another tradition that we had then, and one I think we should resume, is that your formal graduation from the Institute took place when you read your graduation thesis to a monthly scientific meeting of the Society. In 1955 I was a nervous young man as I went through the ritual of presenting my thesis, but it had great value as a rite of passage, and not only did it offer a culmination to the graduate, but everyone got to know one's colleagues as you heard them present their graduation theses, usually with a formal discussant or two, but some very active discussion from the floor as well.

One other memory -- a sign of the times -- I remember attending my first annual meeting of the Society and Institute, and with over 90% of the members attending we fit comfortably in Norm Levy's livingroom in his home on Stone Canyon!

HAROLD J. DELCHAMPS, JR., M.D. :

1950-1961 saw a peak of psychoanalytic institutes as a potent force in Los Angeles. They turned out good men, brought good men to the staffs of the medical schools; provided postgraduate psychoanalytic training, but medical students became saturated with psychodynamics and psychiatric residents grew unwilling to put out the necessary effort, time and energy to train. This gave rise to a second phase from 1960-1970 in which feelings grew against the length of time and the expense involved in psychiatric resident and subsequent psychoanalytic training.

Beginning in the 1960s psychoanalytic institutes were alarmed with the reduction of applicants for training. In the past five years they have been trying to develop new ways of making it easier to get training and make it more attractive.

Beginning in the 1970s there was speculation whether psychiatry and psychoanalysis were viable as professions. The public's desire for quicker and more glamorous ways of receiving treatment even to the point of supplying its own therapies in extra-professional settings; some of which are injurious, some of which are helpful. But it is a learning public and it will in time come to understand psychiatry and, particularly, the aims of psychoanalysis and psychoanalytically growth oriented psychotherapy.

During the national debate over Senator Eagleton's mental state, newspapers had contact only with those members of the American Psychiatric Association, and psychiatrists and hospitals who practice under a different theoretical background, known as "organic" psychiatrists. As yet to my knowledge, no mention was made of the alternate and less stringent, aggressive or disruptive techniques of psychoanalysis. The media is unable to distinguish psychoanalysis from other psychiatric techniques or to realize the creative aspects of psychoanalytic involvement and the enhancing of the individual by personal development. This enlightenment will have to wait the course of time. And a more vital communication force between psychoanalysis and the public.

Excerpted from:
Ennis, B.B. "Backgrounds of Psychiatry in Southern California." Los Angeles County Medical Association Bulletin. Feb. 15 and March 1, 1973.

SELECTED HISTORICAL COMMENTS

GEORGE FRUMKES, M.D.:

When we separated from the Los Angeles Institute and Society in 1950, I was secretary of the former society. I had not really expected the split. At the final business meeting there were 22 members of whom only 2, Dr. Futterman and I, (both of us originally from New York) voted against the split; the vote finally was 12 to remain with what became the Los Angeles Society and Institute and 10 to leave and form the new institute and society. Dr. Futterman remained with the old group and I went with the new group. I had had meetings with some members who later formed the Society and Institute for Psychoanalytic Medicine. We had previously met to organize a group to express our views in oppositon to what we felt were doctrinaire and rigid policies of Dr. Greenson and his close associates.

I submitted to Dr. Grotjahn, who became Chairman of the Education Committee, a classification of Freud's writings under seven headings, e.g. The Neurosis and other clinical papers, Ego Psychology, Psychosomatic Disorders, Applied Psychoanalysis. Dr. Grotjahn appointed me as his assistant to organize the curriculum and to perform other administrative duties including the writing of a constitution. I was de facto Secretary of the Institute. Dr. Miller alternated with Dr. Romm as President. This arrangement persisted until about 1955 when Dr. Wagner became Chairman.

As for my position in the spectrum of ideologies and factions in psychoanalysis, I would say I was at a Freudian position rather than that of Alexander and Fromm. [1]

MAY ROMM, M.D.:

The L.A. Psychoanalytic Society and Institute was formed in 1946. I was one of the training analysts. As more psychoanalysts came here the situation became more and more tense. The newcomers, including myself, had California licenses to practice medicine; in contradistinction to the European members, most of whom were lay people. It became obvious that the original psychoanalytic settlers in Los Angeles who were trained in Europe by Freud or his disciples, considered those of us who were trained in the U.S. as being of inferior quality. [2]

MARVIN OSMAN, M.D.:

The Psychoanalytic Clinic was established (November 9, 1954) according to the Institute By-Laws for the purpose of "providing psychoanalytic therapy for persons of limited economic means and to utilize the clinical material for training and research." Harry Nierenberg was appointed the first Director. ...Miss Beatrice L. Kotas, M.S.W., came aboard in December 1955.

In the early days the Clinic Committee, consisting of Drs. Nierenberg, Carlson, Gabe and later Rogawski, met monthly at members' homes...Characteristic of the Committee throughout its history has been an esprit de corps, a basic comradeship, often punctuated by lively discourse, sometimes even contention, frequently stimulating, and rarely dull. [3]

ALFRED COODLEY, M.D.:

Since I was born in Los Angeles, it was indeed exciting to return here in 1949. During my fellowship years in Cincinnati, I was exposed to psychoanalytic thinking because of Maurice Levine, Milt Rosenbaun and Tillie Krug. So I kept thinking about and fantasizing what joining the analytic institute here would mean for me. And so, naturally, I rushed to apply to the L.A. Institute which was the only one in existence at the time... the critical choice was who would be your training analyst...the most intuitive and experienced...Martin Grotjahn.

I chose the Southern California Institute since Martin did the same...At the time many of us younger analysts-to-be thought we could have solved the problems and prevented the split. In retrospect, I doubt seriously if we could have done any better than our senior analysts did then...As the years have gone by, we can see that there are orthodox and liberal analysts in both institutes... The joint meetings have restored friendships and developed new ones. I have always respected the faculty members who taught me before the split and who stayed with the Los Angeles Institute. [4]

WALTER BRIEHL, M.D.:

When the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society was accepted as an Affiliate Society by the American on 26 May 1946, with a strict organizational program of standards of membership and qualifications of the members of the Educational Committee for the training of candidates, who were by then very numerous, the latent conflict flared into the open. The newcomers were strictly M.D.-oriented. The previously-established M.D. analysts had a strong bond of loyalty to their non-medical members of the Study Group. The issues were rationalized on scientific and theoretical differences, but it was in fact a matter of domination and power politics as to who should and would control. Neither group would approve a training analyst of the other group, an issue which was only temporarily mitigated by subsequent agreement to appoint a training analyst from each group, to maintain a balance in the Education Committee. [5]

SAMUEL EISENSTEIN, M.D.:

And what of the candidates? The candidates who at the time had their own organization, protested the split and tried to convince the members to compromise and stay in the same Institute. They called a meeting in March 1950, inviting the representatives of both sides to explain the recent developments and the divergences. There were 67 candidates at the time, and Eugene P. Mindlin was President. Drs. Romm, Grotjahn, and Miller were present. The "other side" was not present, but sent a position statement explaining their view about the disagreements. Generally speaking, the candidates were unhappy about the split and when the separation came, with two or three exceptions, the candidates' decision which Institute to join was influenced by their analyst's decision. To quote a senior candidate at the time, Sigmund Gabe, "The student body was not as well prepared as it might have been for the split...when it came. I am afraid that the choice of which group to go with was not always based on a clear appreciation of the differences in theory and practice, but was perhaps strongly influenced by personal loyalties." [6]

S.L. POMER, M.D.:

Two courses, Introduction to Child Analysis and a Continuous Case Seminar, were given by Marie Briehl at her home. Informal supervision of candidates interested in child analysis followed. Later she was joined by Dr. George Mohr who came from Chicago in 1957 to head the small analytic group. Marie's skill and enthusiastic teaching inspired some candidates to continue in the field. An angel (a parent whose experience with child analysis had been most rewarding) established the Rosanoff Fund to train more child analysts. In 1959, Marie was appointed Supervising Child Analyst. Still later, in 1963, Dr. Irene Josselyn commuted from Phoenix to join the faculty. Between Dr. Josselyn and Marie, a fine alliance grew from their shared feelings for and approach to children and their problems. The elective course on Metapsychology attracted students from the Los Angeles Institute as well as our own, and resulted in exciting contributions to the field.

With her youthful enthusiasm still undimmed, Marie feels she has "grown, shared, communicated creative ideas, helped to develop the skills and original talents of my students and, in turn, learned from their challenges and responsiveness and knowledge." [7]

FOOTNOTES

In: Bulletin of the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute and Society. 42. April 1975. (25th Anniversary Issue)

1. Frumkes, G. pps. 14-16.

2. Eisenstein, S. "The Birth of our Institute." p. 3.

3. Osman, M.P. p. 19.

4. Coodley, A. p. 14.

5. Briehl, W. p. 13.

6. Eisenstein, S. p. 4

7. Pomer, S.L. and van Leeuwen, K. "Marie Briehl. Part II." p. 23.

Excerpts compiled by Carol J. Horky.

ROSTER OF OFFICERS, 1950–1985

The Charter Members were as follows:

Dr. Walter Briehl
Dr. Arthur A. Clinco
Dr. George Frumkes
Dr. Martin Grotjahn
Dr. Frederick Hacker
Dr. Norman A. Levy
Dr. Judd Marmor
Dr. Milton L. Miller
Dr. May E. Romm

Presidents of the

Southern California Psychoanalytic Society

Dr. Milton L. Miller, 1950-51
Dr. May E. Romm, 1951-1953
Dr. Martin Grotjahn, 1953-1955
Dr. Norman A. Levy, 1955-1957
Dr. Walter Briehl, 1957-1958
Dr. Philip S. Wagner, 1958-1959
Dr. Harry H. Nierenberg, 1959-1960
Dr. Judd Marmor, 1960-1961
Dr. Alex Blumstein, 1961-1962
Dr. Alexander S. Rogawski, 1962-1964
Dr. Arthur A. Clinco, 1964-1965
Dr. George Frumkes, 1965-1966
Dr. S.L. Pomer, 1966-1968
Dr. Alfred E. Coodley, 1968-1969
Dr. Arthur Marshall, 1969-1970
Dr. John S. Peck, 1970-1971
Dr. Donald M. Marcus, 1971-1972
Dr. Joe Yamamoto, 1972-1973
Dr. Sigmund Gabe, 1973-1974
Dr. Winthrop C. Hopgood, 1974-1975
Dr. Lawrence Greenleigh, 1975-1976
Dr. Irving Berkowitz, 1976-1977
Dr. Marvin P. Osman, 1977-1979
Dr. Arnold W. Wilson, 1979-1980
Dr. David Markel, 1980-1981
Dr. Norman D. Tabachnick, 1981-1982
Dr. Leonard Comess, 1982-1984
Dr. Albert Schrut, 1984-

Presidents of the

Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute

Dr. Milton L. Miller, 1950-1955
Dr. Judd Marmor, 1955-1956
Dr. Milton L. Miller, 1957-1959
Dr. Philip Wagner, 1959
Dr. Sigmund Gabe, 1960-1963
Dr. Norman Levy, 1964-1967
Dr. Daniel Siegel, 1968-1970
Dr. Joseph Natterson, 1971-1973
Dr. Herbert Linden, 1974-1975
Dr. Leonard Comess, 1976-77
Dr. John Lindon, 1978-1979
Dr. Samuel Eisenstein, 1980-1981
Dr. Paul Click, 1982-1983
Dr. J. Victor Monke, 1984-

Chairmen, Education Committee

Dr. Martin Grotjahn, 1950-1954
Dr. Philip Wagner, 1955-1957
Dr. Harry H. Nierenberg, 1958-1959
Dr. George Frumkes, 1960-1961
Dr. Harry H. Nierenberg, 1961-1963
Dr. Sigmund Gabe, 1964-1968
Dr. Samuel Eisenstein, 1969-1976
Dr. Ruth Aaron, 1977-1981
Dr. Daniel Siegel, 1982-1984
Dr. John Peck, 1985-

Chairmen, Library Committee

Dr. Alexander S. Rogawski, 1956-1957
Dr. Louis Paul, 1958-1969
Dr. Burton Wixen, 1970-1971
Dr. Merril B. Friend, 1972-1975
Dr. Roman N. Anshin, 1976-

Lists compiled by J. Victor Monke, M.D.

ROSTER OF GRADUATES, 1975–1985

Chairmen, Clinic Committee

Dr. Harry H. Nierenberg, 1952-1956
Dr. Carroll Carlson, 1957-1959
Dr. Fred Feldman, 1960-1964
Dr. Gerald Goodstone, 1965-1967
Dr. Philip Becker, 1968-1969
Dr. Melvin Schwartz, 1970-1973
Dr. Marvin P. Osman, 1974-1978
Dr. Laila Karme, 1979-1982
Dr. Richard B. Rosenstein, 1983-

Chairmen, Extension Division

Dr. Norman A. Levy, 1952-1957
Dr. John Mergener, 1958-1963
Dr. Leonard Comess, 1964-1968
Dr. Herbert Linden, 1969-1970
Dr. Paul Click, 1971-1974
Dr. Roman N. Anshin, 1975-1979
Dr. Arnold I. Gilberg, 1980-1985
Dr. Barry Panter, 1985-

Editors, Bulletin

Dr. Louis Paul, 1960-1962
Dr. John Peck, 1963-1965
Dr. Gordon Saver, 1966-1967
Dr. August Kasper, 1968-1970
Dr. Ernest Masler, 1971-1973
Dr. Roman N. Anshin, 1973-1976
Dr. S.L. Pomer, 1976-

Chairmen, Committee to Select Research Clinical Associates

Dr. Sigmund Gabe, 1971-1973
Dr. S.L. Pomer, 1973-1979
Drs. S. Eisenstein/P. Loewenberg, 1979-1981
Dr. Louis Breger, 1981-

Chairmen, Research Committee

Dr. Martin Grotjahn, 1952-1957
Drs. R. Litman/N. Tabachnick, 1967-1974
Dr. Norman Tabachnick, 1975-1980
Drs. J. Natterson/L. Breger, 1981-

1976-1977
Doryann M. Lebe, M.D.
Sita Huff, M.D.
Laila Karme, M.D.

1977-1978
Raymond Friedman, M.D.
Stephen S. Marmer, M.D.
Evelyn H. Motzkin, M.D.
Charles L. Edwards, M.D.

1978-1979
Alan Blanc, M.D.
Kenneth House, M.D.
Albert Hutter, Ph.D.
Barry Panter, M.D.
Irwin Lyons, M.D.
Richard B. Rosenstein, M.D.

1979-1980
Louis Breger, Ph.D.
Thomas Preston, M.D.
Oscar Thomsen, M.D.
Lawrence Warrick, M.D.

1980-1981
Bradley Daigle, M.D.
David Simon, M.D.

1981-1982
Loren Woodson, M.D.
Thomas Dale, M.D.
Benjamin May, M.D.

1982-1983
Scott L. Carder, M.D.
Stephen Dickstein, M.D.
William Kaz, M.D.
Clinton Y. Montgomery , M.D.
Janice Rule, Ph.D.
Jay Martin, Ph.D.

1983-1984
Ariel Compton, M.D.
Stephanie Geller, M.D.
Don DeFrancisco, M.D.

1985
Gary A. Chase, M.D.
Winifred Meyer, M.D.
James T. Scott, M.D.
E. Victor Wolfenstein, Ph.D.
Jeffrey L. Drezner, M.D.
Chris Minnick, M.D.
Robert Werner, M.D.
Peter A. Gelker, M.D.
Warren R. Procci, M.D.
William J. Winslade, J.D., Ph.D.
Sidney Russak, M.D.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PSYCHOANALYTIC INSTITUTE
9024 OLYMPIC BOULEVARD BEVERLY HILLS, CALIFORNIA 90211