

The ouster of Ernst Simmel did not have the expected effect ^{the "opposition"}. The "recent ~~advancists~~" did not find it smooth sailing in their attempts to introduce what they liked to call "flexible" techniques into the training ~~methods~~ methods. Since they were unable to change the rules which were, anyway, laid down and fixed by this time by the Board On Professional Standards of the American Psychoanalytic Association they resorted to ways that gave the surface impression of complying with the standards, but made it possible de facto to circumvent them. This relates ^{f.i.} to the number of hours of training analysis per week as well as ^{to} deviations from the rule of abstinence. Some of these differences were, no doubt, based on honest scientific convictions. But in some instances the deviations were simply ^{due to} confusion and incompetence. In some other instances the main motivations seemed to be clearly based on expediency and the wish to compromise scientific principles for more profitable practices. ~~THIS WAS~~ When, f.i., the particular analyst insisted that his patient, candidate or private patient, could not afford so many sessions per week ~~XX~~ he should have more honestly stated that he, the analyst, could not afford to see the patient at a reduced fee. Another "reform" which perhaps more properly should be called corruption was that some training analysts, in particular Grotjahn, were wont to circumvent the rule that an applicant had to be approved by the E.C. first before he might choose his analyst, by simply telling the applicant during the preliminary interview that he found him acceptable, that he would be glad to take ^{him} into analysis, and that he could begin his analysis right then and there.

As stated earlier, there were some differences based on real scientific convictions. In these cases the insistence of the majority of the E.C. that the established ~~XXXX~~ technical rules be maintained led to the accusation, mainly voiced by Milton Miller, that "academic freedom" was being demolished. That the majority was bound by their "rigidity". Why not ~~may~~ be "flexible" and say that 2 plus 2 equals 5? This would be more flexible and human. It also would be more human, accord-

according to May Romm, to see to it that "no patient ever / leave his session unhappy!"

It is obvious that the teachings by people con- used like this, and the contradictions that confronted the students in their classes with teachers of such oppos- ing views created a great deal of bewilderment and ~~666~~ un- desirable conflicts in the students. All this was, of course, sharpened by the students' ~~natural~~ transference ties to the different training analysts. They were in no position yet to exercise independent scientific judgment and were torn ~~to and fro~~ by ~~the~~ what they were taught and by their loyalties.

As the years went on the situation became more and more impossible. This was often stated and discussed, and it was sometimes said that something should be done, but nobody just seemed to know what should or could be done. / 9

It became known that the situation in Los Angeles was by no means unique. It was known, f.i., that similar problems existed in Philadelphia and in London. Here it was the conflict between the Anna Freud group and the followers of Melanie Klein that caused trouble. It also became known that ~~XXXXXX~~ ~~XXX~~ in Philadelphia a split had occurred in the year... that led to the establishment of two separate societies and institutes.

Finally, early in 1949, E.L. decided ~~XX~~ that some action was inevitable. He did not feel that a complete split-up as in Philadelphia was the best solution. This for several reasons. For one, he felt that such a split would be a very hard thing to take for the candidates. For another, just because he be- lieved that ~~XXXX~~ of the conflict was due to honest scien- ^{much} tific convictions that ought to be taken seriously and not just squelched, a solution that would ~~would~~ be tolerant of deviant views within reason would be preferable. He had by then learned of the way the London analysts had tried to solve their problem. Their solution consisted of the creation of two subgroups within one and the same institute. This enabled the two groups to give courses independently, accord- ing to their convictions, together with some joint courses.

Utilize here, or from here on
by Kandelin on the "split
May 13, 1962.

Through correspondence with in those groups E.L. obtain of information about these

g to May Romm, to see to it that "no patient ever /
s session unhappy!"
vious that the teachings by people con-
ke this^e, and the contradictions that confronted
ents in their classes with teachers of such oppos-
s created a great deal of bewilderment and 66f un-
e conflicts in the students. All this was, of course,
d by the students ~~natural~~ transference ties to
erent training analysts. They were in no position
ercise independent scientific judgment and were torn
by ~~the~~ what they were taught and by their loyalties.
he years went on the situation became more and more
e. This was often stated and discussed, and it was
said that something should be done, but nobody just
o know what should or could be done. / 9
known that the situation in Los Angeles was by no
que. It was known, f.i., that similar problems existed
elphia and in London. Here it was the conflict
he Anna Freud group and the followers of Melanie
t caused trouble. It also became known that ~~XXXXXX~~
iladelphia a split had occurred in the year.
to the establishment of two separate societies
tutes.
arly in 1949, E.L. decided ~~ix~~ that some action was
e. He did not feel that a complete split-up as in
ia was the best solution. This for several reasons.
e felt that such a split would be a very hard thing
r the candidates. For another, just because he be-
t. ~~XXXX~~ of the conflict was due to honest scien-
much
ictions that ought to be taken seriously and not
ched, a solution that would ~~would~~ be tolerant of
ews within reason would be preferable. He had by
ed of the way the London analysts had tried to
r problem. Their solution consisted of the creation
groups within one and the same institute. This
e two groups to give courses independently, accord-
eir convictions, together with some joint courses.

Utilize here, or from here on, the memo
by Kandelin on the "split file", written
May 13, 1962.

Through correspondence with colleagues
in those groups E.L. obtained a good deal
of information about these matters.

E.L. corresponded with a number of people about the matter in order to get as much information as possible of what had been done (Katz, Phila, M, Ruben, London). He came to the conclusion that the best ~~XXXXXXXX~~ remedy for the ailing L.A. Institute would be what he called the "London Plan". Having arrived at this view he then proceeded to prepare such a solution. He ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ knew that it would be necessary to also have the backing of a sufficient number of members of the Psychoanalytic Society to reorganize the Institute. He was sure of certain members of the E.C, as to where they stood, not, though, sure enough of whether there would be a majority in favor of his planned proposals. He did not know, ~~however~~, how many of the members of the Society would decide. Therefore, he proceeded carefully and methodically by approaching the ^{individuals} analysts ~~gradually~~. The first one with whom he discussed his plan was David Br, ^{uswick} he agreed instantly. From then on more of those who were likely to follow were taken into confidence, partly by individual interview, later by a number of ^{caucus like} meetings. ~~These meetings had to be kept unannounced officially~~ Out of town members, as Charles Sarlin, had to be contacted by phone when the time was ripe. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~. Finally, around the end of 1949 a sufficient number of colleagues was rounded up, and, just as important, a sure majority within the E.C. was established.

This would, on the one hand, in satisfactory standard of and, on the other, allow the opposed such standards, to their ideas freely, and serve the unity of the that it would not be enough get the E.C. to take step

(Proceed from here, (again) with Kandelin's memo.) to narrate the sequence of events through the split).

The majority within the E.C. was seen when Charlie Tidd to whom I son had explained the plan decided to stay with the group consisting Brunswick, Deri, Greenson and

We must assume that CWT was faced with a conflict which was difficult to resolve; namely, on the one hand, his opposition to the policy of the "old" fraction to accept analysts as members; on the other hand, being in agreement with the "old" fraction in respect to the principles of training and scientific concepts. He decided in favor of the latter. This was a period of suspense and enabled the group to go ahead with their plan.

onded with a number of people about
 in order to get as much information as
 what had been done (Katz, Phila, M, Ruben, London).
 the conclusion that the best ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ remedy
 ing L.A. Institute would be what he called the
 Having arrived at this view he then proceeded
 such a solution. He ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~
 t would be necessary to also have the backing of
 t number of members of the Psychoanalytic
 reorganize the Institute. He was sure of
 bers of the E.C, as to where they stood,
 sure enough of whether there would be a
 favor of his planned proposals. He did
~~never~~, how many of the members of the Society
 e. Therefore, he proceeded carefully and method-
 approaching the ^{introductory} analysts ~~gradually~~. The first
 om he discussed his plan was David Br. ^{Brunswick} He
 antly. From then on more of those who were
 ollow were taken into confidence, partly by
 interview,, later by a number of ^{caucus like} meetings.
~~ings had to be kept unannounced officially~~
 members, as Charles Sarlin, had to be con-
 none when the time was ripe. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~
 . Finally, around the end of 1949 a sufficient
 olleagues was rounded up, and, just as im-
 ure majority within the E.C. was established. The majority within the E.C. was secured
 eed from here, (again) with Kandelin's memo.)
 arrate the sequence of events through the

This would, ~~one~~ the one hand, insure a
 satisfactory standard of training,
 and, on the other, allow those who
 opposed such standards, to teach
 their ideas freely, and still pre-
 serve the unity of the Institute.
 that it would not be enough to
 get the E.C. to take steps, but

We must assume that CWT was faced with a conflict
 which was difficult to resolve; namely, ~~one~~ the one hand
 his opposition to the policy of the "old" fraction to accept lay
 analysts as members; on the other hand, being in agreement with the
 "old" fraction in respect to the principles of training and other
 scientific concepts. He decided in favor of the latter. This ended
 a period of suspense and enabled the group to go ahead ~~and~~ with
 their plan.