

May 11, 1950

MEMORANDUM I

TO: ERNST LEWY

FROM: RALPH GREENSON

We have to consider the present situation from two separate standpoints:

- 1) From the standpoint of the Education Committee
- 2) From the standpoint of the Institute

The Institute situation revolves around the following points: Three members of our Institute have applied for recognition as a new institute. They were told by the Board of Professional Standards that they should operate as a new institute but they will not be approved until they have been investigated. Therefore, all official actions will have to be carried out through our Institute. This means that all training activities which are to be vouched for by the Los Angeles Institute will have to have the approval of the entire Executive Committee (the Executive Committee is identical with the Education Committee of the Los Angeles Society.) It is now up to the Executive Committee to decide how much leeway it will give the new group and still vouch for them. We certainly will not vouch for any training analysts that they might appoint. We will also not approve the acceptance of any applicants unless they have been approved by a majority of the Executive Committee. We also will insist upon examining and approving of the qualifications of all candidates who want to be graduated from our Institute. As far as lecturers and curricula is concerned, I am not sure how strict an attitude we want to take. Will we give credit to candidates who take courses from Marmor, Levy, Briehl, etc.?

These questions are raised because it hits at the central problem: the Board of Professional Standards has suggested that they work independently except when it requires official action by our Institute. We will impede their independence if we insist upon sanctioning every course and every lecturer they may appoint. I think it would be more helpful to allow them to appoint lecturers and to give courses however they please, although it might put us in the position, if they are rejected, that we will then have to approve of courses given by lecturers we consider inadequate. By allowing them to choose their own lecturers and courses, we are helping them form an independent group, so that their return to our old Institute is all the more

May 11, 1950

unlikely. Since they have openly stated at the Executive Council meeting and at the Board meeting that they cannot work with us, I doubt that even if they were to be rejected would they attempt to remain within our framework. It seems much more likely that if they are rejected they will become affiliated with some other Institute.

However, I think we should remain firm on the three other points: appointment of training analysts, acceptance of applicants, and approval of candidates' training.

This brings us to the question of Norman Levy. He was appointed a training analyst by our Executive Committee. He has not been given permission by our Executive Committee to do training analyses or supervisory work. I think we should stick to this point: the Executive Committee has appointed him a training analyst for technical reasons but will not approve of supervisory hours or training analyses done by him. This gives him the right to do training analyses and supervisory work for the new group, and I think he should act on this in accordance with his own wishes.

This brings up the question of Dr. Van der Heide. Dr. Van der Heide was appointed a training analyst by the Executive Committee, and we as the majority of the Executive Committee have the right to permit him to do training analyses and supervisory work for this Institute. I think this should be done officially at the next Executive Committee (Education Committee) meeting.

The Executive Committee of the Institute will approve the fulfillment of requirements by every candidate who applies to it. We shall graduate a candidate from our Institute if the majority of the Executive Committee so feels. The approved candidate whose acceptance is based in part on a paper that he will present should have the choice of presenting his paper to whichever Society he prefers. However, his paper should be read by all members of the Executive Committee since they have to vote on its adequacy. The student may ask to read his paper before both Societies which would then give all the members of the Executive Committee an opportunity to hear the paper. The important point is that all members of the Executive Committee have an opportunity to hear or read the candidate's paper.

The Society questions involved are complicated at this moment because the Education Committee is a Society function and some members of our present Education Committee belong now to two different Societies. It is suggested that the best way out of this dilemma would be the following: the new Society ought

to have their own Education Committee which will meet with our Education Committee for official matters only. At election time, the training analysts of the Los Angeles Institute, which includes four members of the proposed new group, should vote for new Education Committee members. In this way we will get rid of 2 of their members and have an Education Committee which consists of 6 of our Education Committee and 1 of theirs. It would be expected that their single member will resign. We would then have a situation of two different Education Committees working under one Institute, which I think would clarify matters.

Candidates graduated from our Institute will then have the choice of applying to either or both Societies. I don't think we should take a dogmatic attitude about this, but I do think we should indicate that we prefer to accept members with loyalties to only one Society. This would apply to the three candidates whom we have recently graduated. They have the right now to apply for membership in any Society in the United States and to any number of Societies, for that matter. I don't think we should be dogmatic about forbidding dual membership. Nevertheless, I do feel that in actual practice we will reject applicants who wish to be members of both groups.

Summary: Since the American Psychoanalytic Association has approved of the new Society officially and has suggested that the new Institute function as a new institute except for official matters, it seems to me the best of all policies is as follows: The Los Angeles Institute will express an opinion about the training activities of the four training analysts appointed by this institute only when it is asked to do so either by the American Psychoanalytic Association or by the new group. Otherwise this new group should function any way it wishes. For information of the four training analysts, we state that the Los Angeles Institute would want to express an opinion about the appointment of the new training analysts, the acceptance of applicants who will register in the present Institute and the graduation of candidates trained under this Institute.

May 11, 1950

MEMORANDUM

TO: DR. ERNST LEWY

FROM: RALPH GREENSON

Dear Ernst:

I am sorry that I can't come to this meeting, but I can assure you I have given this matter a great deal of thought.

I am enclosing two memoranda which represent my thinking on the question. The second one is more concise and a later version.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'R. Greenson', written below the word 'Sincerely,'.

May 11, 1950

MEMORANDUM //

TO: ERNST LEWY, M.D.

FROM: RALPH R. GREENSON, M.D.

RE: PROPOSED DRAFT FOR A TEMPORARY OPERATIONAL AGREEMENT

- 1) This statement represents the official policy of the Los Angeles Institute for Psychoanalysis which will hold during the transition period of forming a second institute and will replace all existing agreements.
- 2) The Executive Committee of the Los Angeles Institute shall remain the official training organization of this Institute. Previously this Committee was identical with the Education Committee of the Los Angeles Society. Since three of its members now belong to a new Society, it is suggested that in June elections shall take place as is customary. This will make possible a more homogeneous Executive Committee and Education Committee.
- 3) We should suggest that the other group form their own Education Committee and send representatives to the Los Angeles Institute meetings, which will then in effect be joint meetings of the two Education Committees. In these joint sessions official business will be considered which needs the approval of the Los Angeles Institute.
- 4) The new group shall be guaranteed that candidates in training now and applicants who have been accepted as of now shall be given full credit for training under the new group, provided their courses correspond generally to our old curriculum. If they do not, then this shall be discussed in the joint meeting of the Education Committees.
- 5) Such matters as appointment of new training analysts and approval of candidates' training for graduation shall be discussed in the joint meetings.
- 6) The question of new applicants, I believe, can well be left to the separate groups.
- 7) We agree to give them three-sevenths of the amount of the money in the treasury when their institute is officially recognized. We agree to add to this amount three-sevenths of the cost of the library.

- 8) Candidates graduated by the Los Angeles Institute may apply for membership to either or both Societies. Their thesis, however, shall have been read or heard by members of both Education Committees.
- 9) As soon as the new institute is officially recognized, or as soon as this group has any official affiliation with any other institute, they will resign from the Los Angeles Institute.

DISCUSSION:

In my opinion it will clarify matters greatly if our temporary agreement operates with two separate Education Committees which take care of all the routine tasks and one Executive Committee of the Institute which is the official organ for the Institute. In this way, we can have a minimum of contact and still retain the power legally. In June we can replace two of their members with two of our members, which would give us an Executive Committee consisting of six members from our side. In this way, we are legally and officially in control of the Los Angeles Institute.

By signing this kind of an agreement with them, we also guarantee them that we will accredit the training they do, as long as it stays pretty much the same as it has been. The only doubtful point is the status of Norman Levy. Here we can insist that he was appointed a training analyst but was never given permission to do supervisory or didactic analyses. If he wishes to do so, we will not accredit his candidates, but the new group certainly will. I also believe that we ought to officially approve of Dr. Van der Heide's doing supervisory and didactic analyses. This would make the distinction between the two men very clear.

I don't think we should make a dogmatic rule about dual membership. I think we can judge each applicant on his own merits. I think practically we will certainly prefer people with a single loyalty.

I think we can let the other group handle their own applicants, since practically they do it anyway, and the ultimate fate of these people will be decided by the A.P.A. rulings.

In general, my position is that we should encourage the other group to operate as independently as possible, except when they want or need official sanction from the Los Angeles Institute. Then we have a right to see that our standards are met. By having two Education Committees and one Executive Committee, I think we can accomplish this with a minimum of friction and legal controversy.

