

*2nd*  
*(your copy)*

G. Henry Katz, M.D.  
111 North 49th Street  
Philadelphia 39

G O P Y

*Institute*

February 21, 1950

Dr. Ernst Levy  
9629 Brighton Way  
Beverly Hills, California

Dear Dr. Levy:

You are going through the same unpleasant situation, apparently, that we had for so long, with the same doubts and painful decisions involved. Having taken the step, however, we are all pleased, and only regret that we delayed so long.

We, in our group, avoided saying anything whatsoever to the students until the division had occurred. Then we made a statement to them, briefly and factually outlined the ideological differences, told them the division or the group they continued with made no difference in their acceptability in the American or the G.I. Bill of Rights money some were receiving.

I am enclosing a copy of the agreement of the two groups which shows you how we handled some of the questions you have in mind. You see that we arranged to split internally but to remain a single unit externally until each group was assured of individual acceptance by the various outside agencies.

We told the students only the differences in ideology which made it untenable to continue a single organization. We gave them opportunity to ask questions, but they were few, their beliefs being subordinated to their transference, and the whole subject viewed in terms of attack on their analyst and themselves, whichever side they were on.

We terminated what teaching assignments of their students we had as rapidly as possible by taking on the lectures the others were carrying and vice-versa, most of which we then shortly gave up and changed to preceptorship. As the other side had no machinery for carrying on lectures in child analysis, we continue these for the year's course, permitting all students to continue to attend. Controls of their students were continued when they desired but with the proviso we would give no statements to anyone but the students themselves about them.

Our preceptorship method is proving highly satisfactory. Not least of its advantages is the removal of the training analyst from the real position of power as to the student's analytic ambitions. We find the preceptor can determine the ability and shortcomings of the student quite satisfactorily, and so relieve the analyst of responsibility of this nature to the Society, which I thought put an insuperable resistance in the analysis. As to the amount of learning the students get through the preceptorship method, both students and instructors are already impressed by the great gain over the previous method. Our schedule will be printed up soon, and I will see that a copy is mailed you then. You will see that assemblies of all our students continue only for seminars, papers and lectures by out-of-town analysts.

I include copy of the statement we read to the Society preceeding the split. Following this a committee was named, two from each side, to work out practical arrangements. When these were accepted by the Society as a whole, the members each stated which group they chose to remain with. Two chose to stay with both, and this was permitted, temporarily at least, because their personal situations warranted their doing so.

Biddle, Pearson, Sloane and Waelder especially would be intensely interested in your situation, and I hope you can soon give me leave to show them your letter.

I am writing Menninger's to try to get a copy of the Bulletin containing your articles.

Sincerely,

G. Henry Katz, M.D.

Encl.