

Keep in "split" file
Excerpt from the minutes of meeting
of the Psa. Soc. Nov. 1942 Split

Discussion on Resolution proposed by Doctor Lewy:

The resolution was read by Doctor Allen, Secretary of the Society.

E. L. ^{ewy}: I would like to ask Doctor Harrington to be Chairman during this point. It is my motion and I would like to discuss it freely and to speak up for it.

I think that we have made a mistake in voting so quickly on these proposals on June 20. I think part of the reason for that was that that session was really very much crowded with important business and we rushed it through, in a way, and did not stop and think seriously of the consequences. Very soon I got misgivings about it. I am of the opinion that the safeguards which we thought were in the proposals are not sufficient. I have a more definite idea and information of what we have to expect. We should not flatly reject them but insist that they should be discussed and deliberated by a special committee. The consequences have not been sufficiently thought through. I have exchanged my view with other analysts here and in other places who are of the same opinion. We are in grave danger that teaching of psychoanalysis will not be adequate if we adopt these proposals. Furthermore, what would happen after a period of two or three years to candidates who have started training with one of the unrecognized institutes? Who would bear the expenses of all procedures? Examinations would be done at annual meetings, but we don't know whether we will have annual meetings any more. The first examinations won't be for five years but that makes the point even more important as to what will happen to the students who have started and will be disqualified.

In regard to more than one institute in a community, I think the real motives for this are exceedingly strong personal ambitions and not scientific points. It is not a matter of the freedom of teaching and science at all if we demand that in psychoanalytic institutes there should be a teaching of psychoanalysis and nothing else. I think that these proposals are really a screen behind which there will take place a disintegration of the psychoanalytic movement and teaching. If in spite of these points one would agree to the existence of several institutes in one locality, these points haven't been taken care of sufficiently. If there are different institutes, there should be cooperation. Teachers of one should be allowed to teach in another, for instance. As it is now, it is a complete separation of institutes.

L.G.H.: You have made this in the form of a motion?

E.L.: Yes.

M.O.'N.H. ^{awkins}: I second it.

S.A.: The motion was made that Doctor Lewy wants us to repeal the proposals of Doctor French's committee and to have a committee to consider action on them.

E.L.: I don't want to flatly reject them, but I am convinced that they haven't been sufficiently discussed. I want it to be referred to a committee for further deliberation.

night
R.P.K.: I was on the committee and it was hashed out thoroughly. The proposals do not give up any present safeguards but only add more in the form of periodical examinations. The only thing new is that new institutes can be formed in the same city. It all comes up from the New York situation. They do not work together. The question was being dealt with on the basis of future policy to add safeguards. The point was made repeatedly that analysts should work together but they can't do that.

M.O.'N.H.: It is very hard for me to vote because I'm here in Topeka. I have been in favor of Doctor Lewy's proposal. My reason in a way is a personal one.

aminger
K.A.M.: I don't like those hints you (M.O.'N.H.) and Doctor Lewy give about other analysts. Those allusions to correspondence you have with other analysts bother me. I was absolutely opposed to this in Boston, but there wasn't anything else to do.

David (EL)

I think the consequences in New York would be that, financed by Levy and his dead father-in-law, a new institute will be started anyway. He has already resigned and I think he would do that backed by Alexander in Chicago. Alexander would then resign from the American if a show down would be forced. I am certain Kardiner, George Daniels and Rado would, too. The fact is that they are irreconcilably opposed. New York is that way. New York is so big and a lot of people there want to be important and the city contributes to it and so there is not doubt that if we did not do something like this we would have had another secession. Maybe we can stand another one. I think we could only stand another secession if the lines were very sharply drawn. It comes back to personal loyalties. The pathetic fact is that we have not a sufficient number of people in the American whose loyalties can be counted on, not loyalty to anything but loyalty to essential principles. You can't count on any of the Chicago members. They cannot think independently. In New York you cannot count on people. They won't stay by you. They'll start little personal intrigues. Everybody knew about Horney regardless of theories and regardless of the fact that a good many of the members did not like her. People heard her say that she was being mistreated. People who knew better joined up with her association. We would have the same thing again except that it would be worse. George Daniels is without reproach. Some are convinced that Zilboorg is a rascal and others don't believe so. With that much tension if some outlet wasn't allowed, there would be a schism. It may be a threat, but we had been so ineffectual in controlling the Horney split--anything could happen. If Dave Levy, George Daniels and Rado leave a considerable split would occur. For that reason I withdrew my objections in Boston. The original proposal was greatly modified by the committee.

a report
D.R.: If we would consider that a split is always good if it cleans the table it would be better to let them go. This split wouldn't clean our inner tables. We would still have people who are worse heretics than those we left. We won't clean it as far as theory is concerned. Any kind of repeal of this very important conclusion of the committee in Boston would just be digging our grave.

cheer
E.R.G.: I feel very much like Doctor Levy says--that to have more than one institute is very bad. Could we have a motion that students have much more certainty that what they will be taught will be accepted? That there will be an interchange of teachers among these various institutes?

K.A.M.: Here is the point. It is very difficult to predict what will happen five years from now. It is either going to be controlled by us or a separate institute. You couldn't prevent it. You have Levy's money, Rado's ambitions and skill at making people think he is a good teacher and you have George Daniels' social prestige against you. Opposed to that you have Kubie with his brains, but he undermines his own effectiveness by nagging people until he makes them mad. Zilboorg can't stand it because of his neurotic tendency to get himself into trouble. Now we have one trump card and that is that they know they would have lots of difficulties and they would like to keep their connections with us.

Our idea was that we could have an effective compromise. At least nominally we can still retain control over them. They are answerable to us. There isn't any way to promise that a student will be safe. They have to run the risk. You can't promise the students something. You have to know what your faculty is and if they are keeping up to set standards.

M.O.'N.H.: The reason that I voted in favor of this proposal in the first place was on account of the reasons given today. The reason that I feel somewhat against it today isn't on account of students but on account of loyalties, etc. I am afraid that if they allow this separate institute to start in a temporary way, then people won't have enough loyalty to refuse recognition when the time comes. That's the only new point that I have.

K.A.M.: You can't tell who you can depend on--who will be loyal to you.

earnings
W.C.M.: If the Council has thought it out carefully, I feel that I don't know enough about it to overrule the judgment of the Council. Something has always been wrong that we are so damned exclusive. We have something that cannot be shared. I don't know why we should have institutes share professors. Medical schools don't.

albeit
H.G.: Is Horney's group out of this?

K.A.M.: Yes. While I thought they are aggressive, I don't think any of them would be dishonest, but Horney is absolutely dishonest and our feeling was that if we were too rigid against these dissenters they would effect an alliance with Horney. Horney hoped that we would not make any such provisions. Horney would get their support. Then we would have a formidable opposition.

E.L.: Nobody told me what I should do. It was solely my own conviction in this matter that made me act, but I was free to communicate with others. They were Simmel, Gerö and Lorand from out-of-town colleagues. I think what is going on is the purest form of "The Return of the Repression." I think in these institutes anything will be taught. It is a matter of conserving psychoanalysis. We have through analysis gained certain scientific possessions which will be given up. I think the only way would be to let

this slough off. I think before long it will be a disintegration of psychoanalysis. It is again a repetition of the well-known dropping of certain unpleasant truths in order to gain advantages.

R.P.K.: That point sounds formidable but doesn't move me much. If a scientific point is sound it holds out.

When Horney left without making any appeal to the American, the chief objection was that she should have taken it up with the American and had a decision there before she simply left. These people bring it to the American. If we adhere to only one institute in a city then we adhere to a weak point that can gain many followings. We have to give way on this point. If we don't amend that provision then we maintain a vulnerable position. Many people would fight that point.

M.O.'N.H.: My fear that this thing is allowed to start and we know the kind of institute that would be started, then the people later on won't have enough loyalty to disapprove of the school and candidates. Then it will be even harder to disapprove of a school. But the very reasons that Doctor Karl brought up as reasons to do this can be reasons not to do it.

E.L.: What is going to happen in five years if a committee consisting of analysts from different sections of the country have to examine students of Levy's and disqualifies them?

The reason that psychoanalytic organizations are so exclusive is not because they want to be, but because of the very nature of the subjects of the science of psychoanalysis. The same resistance which we encounter in patients we know we also encounter in teaching psychoanalysis to other doctors because of the same emotional difficulties involved. While there is no emotional resistance to the acceptance of the existence of the tubercular bacillus, there is a strong resistance against the facts which psychoanalysis teaches and that is the reason for the difference in admitting people to medical and to psychoanalytic organizations.

K.A.M.: We felt that the difficulty really arose out of the fact that New York is so crowded with analysts. About 100 are in New York and about 150 members of the American in the rest of the country; therefore, the rest of the country has a more influential vote. New York is disturbed about that. They put Dunbar in as Treasurer and she gets to sit on the Council. Now they have two representatives. Even then New York is hugely outvoted. Supposing Levy, etc. had an institute. The students would not be examined either by a couple of friends or enemies from New York but somebody of the Executive Council which is 5/6 non New Yorkers. You have national control of something which at the present time is only a local feud. Then we would have national control over a local institute. That's one of the things involved. The other is that if that is the main principle, they can have twenty institutes if they want to.

9/15 } I agree with everything Doctor Lewy said. We ought to make up our minds whether or not to let them resign. Maybe we were a little scared. I held out to the end almost for letting these fellows resign--what do we care--but some of them seem to us to be honest fellows and you never know how much influence they have that we don't know about. There are

so many analysts now who are being trained that will in five years be members. If our association had 500 members then a new society would think twice about getting started. The American would be more influential.

I don't think there is any objection, instead of repealing what we did, to recommend that Doctor Lewy express our concern about the detailed documentation and checks and regulations, etc. of the new plan. My point is that I quite sympathize with Doctor Lewy because I fought against this. Doctor Lewy might do a service if he could suggest certain definite checks which could be added. If he would outline those and present them to the Council meeting. It seems to me that the thing to do is accept the trend of the times.

They have to have the same qualifications to start with that they have now. The question is how you can keep them up to that standard. Before we had nothing to keep them up. Now we have supervision.

I admire Doctor Lewy's doubts and sympathize with him. Maybe we were wrong but the danger certainly looked realistic to me. I agree with you in principle. If everyone was loyal it would not arise. New York is a big city and sooner or later they clash. I wish it were more true in Chicago. There isn't much evidence of that in Chicago. Alexander placates them. They do what they want to.

E.L.: We have to either adopt or reject the resolution of mine. After that I can appoint a committee to formulate ideas to present to the Executive Council of the American Psychoanalytic Association.

W.C.M.: I think it would be very helpful to the Council to have this discussion passed on to them.

Resolution was rejected by a vote of 5 to 3.

Doctor Allen moved that the President appoint a committee of three to draw up the opinions of the Society on the question and forward it to the Secretary of the American Psychoanalytic Association.

The motion was seconded by Doctor Hawkins and was carried.