

HISTORY COMMITTEE

June 7, 1962

recd. 7/11/62

Fund-Raising Project 1950 - 1952

by

Albert Kandelin, M.D.

This memorandum is compiled from Doctor Lewy's file on the Fund-Raising Project of 1950 - 1952. I shall attempt to condense and summarize from the relatively large bulk of letters, memos, proposals, pamphlets, etc. The project itself is interesting, equally or even more so is the insight into the personalities, and the status of psychoanalytic organization at this period. In itself, it is another example of the peculiar resistance encountered by fund-raising attempts in the field of psychiatry and mental health.

A preliminary project began in August, 1938, with the incorporation of the Psychoanalytic Institute Foundation of Los Angeles, by David Brunswick, Walter Hilborn, Ernst Simmel, Arthur Timme, and Paul S. Epstein. The aim of this group was to organize the first Psychoanalytic Institute in Los Angeles. A part of their organization effort included plans for fund-raising. Authorization was given by the Topeka Psychoanalytic Society in May, 1940, and a brochure was published shortly thereafter describing the proposed Institute, its activities, and its financial needs. The proposed divisions: Clinic, Sanitarium, Children's Division, Division of Criminology, Research Division, and Training Division. Budgets were offered for clinic, sanitarium, and nursery school.

The 1950 - 1952 project had its beginnings late in 1950. Doctor Lewy made a note on February 15, 1951 describing a meeting with Tidd and Greenson. Already, so early, the title of his memorandum was ominous, and foretold the course of subsequent events: "History of the Drive Against Fund-Raising and Related Matters". In the memorandum he refers to certain frictions which arose early, especially with Doctor Greenson, with whom he had differences of opinion regarding procedure, etc. It appeared that Greenson put much emphasis on organizing the Institute better, so as to merit the solicitation of contributions, before a formal drive was launched.

Meetings were held in November and December, 1950, which included the above-mentioned analysts, but in addition brought into the picture prominent laymen, including Jack Y. Berman, Clore Warane, James Allen, Emanuel Lippett, and others.

(continued)

51 !

1951
On March 6, 1961 Ernst Lewy, in a letter to Jack Berman, refers to the need to have a pamphlet to describe the Institute, and also makes reference to the need to complete the organization of the Institute itself, such as by writing by-laws, electing a Board of Trustees, etc. A memorandum proposing this pamphlet is dated March 29, 1951. It commences with a blurb about the problems of adolescence, and develops this as a basis for a proposal to raise funds to make a larger study of this for a proposed Clinic. In addition, the Institute, its training program, and its existing Clinic are described in considerable detail, and the propositions are raised for expansion, principally of the Clinic, which would then have a full-time Director, an executive secretary, psychologists, social workers, and even provisions for five residencies. A subsequent memorandum by Doctor Lewy dated March 30, 1961 comments on this proposed draft, attributing it to Mr. James Allen (in my opinion it was probably the work of Doctor Greenson). Doctor Lewy emphasizes the need to expedite the plans and complete them as soon as possible, so as to begin the drive for funds in the summer of 1951. Again I suspect a note of urgency in his emphasis on this latter point, no doubt in reference to delays and resistances that he was aware of.

On June 1, 1951 there is a letter from Doctor Greenson to Doctor Lewy, with apologies for "bogging down in the matter of fund-raising," but stating eagerness to proceed. He enclosed a memorandum to show how he would use funds if raised, and here the emphasis is largely on expanding the existing Clinic, with mention made of permanent housing for the Clinic, an administrative staff, the need for facilities for psychological testing, social workers, residents in training, with provision for supervision of therapy and a program of research. Proposed research projects: Study of Treatment Methods of Adolescents, Study of Psychosomatic Disease in Young Adults, Psychoanalytic Study of Patients who have had Psychotherapy, and Study of the Offspring of Analyzed People. This memorandum appears to be closely related to the one of March 29, 1951.

On June 13, 1951 Doctor Lewy wrote to Mrs. Phyllis Nelson of La Jolla, describing the Institute and its proposed programs, and inquiring about the possibility of receiving her assistance. He mentions the relative success of the Institute to date, with reference to sixty-five physicians having received training, eight of them having completed their training. Similar letters were written to Viola Seff and Stanley Marsh.

Jack Berman announced in October, 1951, as Secretary pro tem, "The Friends of the Los Angeles Institute for Psychoanalysis are now ready to commence operation," and made an announcement for the first formal meeting in that month, stating that important business was to be transacted. No

(continued)

notes have survived, but E.M. Lippett emerged as Chairman of the Fund-Raising Committee. By June, 1952 Mr. Lippett was able to report cash received at \$1469.00, with cash and pledges totaling \$3950.00. By December, 1952 he reported cash at \$3021.00, and combined cash and pledges \$9063.00. In retrospect, it can be seen that the results of so much work were very modest.

A summary of the fund-raising attempt was made by Mr. Lippett to the Board of Trustees on October 8, 1952. Again it strikes a pessimistic note, where he stated that out of the eight or ten original workers only three remained. Yet he tries to be optimistic by reporting the financial results, modest as they were. More significant was his calling attention to the resistances encountered in fund-raising for projects of this type. He quotes from the article by Lawrence Kubie in "Science" in September, 1952, where some of these resistances are pointed out by Kubie. Lippett proposed efforts to overcome these resistances by education and orientation of the public. He asked for more autonomous authority for the lay group, he asked for more effort from the analysts to submit names of persons to be solicited, and then to authorize the fund-raising group to proceed independently. Clearly his frustration is shown by the following: "The problem is whether you need the funds and whether you desire to expand the Institute now. If the time is not propitious, then you must dissolve the Committee until such time as you might choose to launch a new drive. If you feel you want this, work together on your need to supply us the idealism. We want to feel your interest is at least equal to ours."

Paralleling the frustration above, Doctor Lewy, in a memorandum of November 5, 1952, describes the frustrations of Mr. Lippett, Mr. Berman, and Mrs. Seff, who did not feel like continuing their effort for the drive, and who were complaining of lack of support from the analysts. He stated that they found no stimulus from the analysts, and even suspected that there existed critical attitudes among the analysts.

Very interesting is a letter from Karl Menninger, dated November 20, 1952, to Doctor Lewy, where he confirms the existence of these resistances to raising money in the psychiatric field. "I doubt if you have any idea what an expensive and difficult and complicated and technical job is ahead of you. We have had some very expensive and very painful experiences." He felt the principal resistance was public suspicion that funds contributed were used in the training of physicians who were going into private practice.

Mr. Lippett submitted his resignation as Chairman of the Fund-Raising Committee to President Walter Hilborn on January 23, 1953, with the

(continued)

suggestion, "All members of the Institute and Board of Trustees should pledge financial and moral support before anyone else is asked to assume this job."

In summary, the fund-raising drive can be said to have been a failure, and at first sight rather surprisingly a failure, considering the great resources of talent and energy which the original founders of the Institute had shown earlier in setting up the organization. Also very evident was the great zeal of the lay group. The differences of opinion on procedure and aims seem to have been largely involved in the failure of the project. Very conspicuous is the frustration and disappointment among the lay group, whose complaints were heard regarding the lack of efficient cooperation from and even among the analysts.

AK/jh