

A number of us have felt that our interests have been in the constant attempt to maintain the high standards of psychoanalysis and particularly to maintain that the students of the Psychoanalytic Institute shall have the very best analytic teaching. For some time there have been inroads against what we consider to be good analytic practice and teaching. These have concerned certain basic concepts which, in our opinion, are important in maintaining analysis.

1. Five hours per week or, in extreme necessity, four hours per week are the minimum number of hours for adequate analysis, particularly for training analyses, vouched for both by our experience and Society ruling. At the meeting of the Educational Committee on October 26 at least two students whose analyses were being conducted with fewer hours were permitted by the vote of the Committee to begin Institute courses. There are several training analysts who give their students less than the prescribed hours. We want as a general practice to teach men who have had the prescribed number of hours.

2. We wish also to work with students who have analyzed the Unconscious determinants of their reactions rather than have been educated or given suggestion with reference to them, for we find students who themselves are quite confused as to what constitutes analysis as opposed to suggestion.

3. We want also to work with students who have not had free social contact with their analysts, for it is our experience that this raises unsurmountable difficulties in the analysis of the transference so that it can never be adequately accomplished. We have observed that students who have been so treated by their own analysts are unaware of this.

4. Again, the giving of advice to analysands or their families, we have found is antagonistic to analysis, and we want to be free to work with students for whom this has not been made an accepted concept of analysis.

5. We do not want to work with students who have the resistances roused by having been charged fees out of line with their resources either for training analyses or for control. The fact that the bottleneck induces students to extend

themselves in this way, we believe, increases their conscious or, more often, unconscious resentment, which can hardly be analyzed with the very one who believes justified in the practice.

6. We are unhappy that our efforts to maintain analytic standards have been met with disapproval and that recently secret political moves have banned whatever efforts along these lines some of us were making through the discharge of the Advisory Committee, while with the Educational Committee as constituted at present so divided that almost any action is going to be very weak. We believe that the tendency to tone down or erase the distinct features of analysis will be bad for patients, analysis in general, the Society and each of us as analysts. Time will decide all of these questions finally but immediately the Society has a decision to make.

We tried first limiting the teaching of certain instructors, then we proposed the Advisory Committee, then scientific sessions for discussion of basic differences--the Program Committee did not carry these out--then the unpleasantness of conferences with individual instructors, then we attempted to have the Society pass certain legislation--all to no avail. ~~In order to avoid further unpleasantness we decided to ask the Educational Committee of the N.Y. Psychoanalytic Institute to make a teaching center. We made and then tentatively withdrew the proposal in case the Society intended to do about these matters.~~

We feel that the present way in which the Institute and the Educational Committee exist makes these problems insoluble. We are therefore asking the members of the Society what you wish to do. Before this matter is discussed I would ask the President to have the minutes of the last meeting of the Educational Committee read. When these minutes are read I would like the Society to be told by the recorder of the minutes the exact voting for, against, and not voting, for each motion. I might say here that the action of the Committee in abolishing the Advisory Committee has posed a serious problem for Dr. Biddle, particularly in respect to the United States Public Health Service funds which, after the reading of the minutes, he would like to discuss.

GHJ Pearson