

February 16, 1950

## I. SCIENTIFIC MEETING

Dr. Eugene P. Mindlin presented a paper on "The Analysis of Severe Castration Anxiety in a Woman."

## II. BUSINESS MEETING

The business meeting was called to order at 9:10 P.M. by Dr. Tidd, President. Present were: Drs. Briehl, Brunswick, Clinco, Mrs. Dori and Drs. Evans, Frankes, Futterman, Greenson, Grotjahn, Kupper, Levy, Lewy, McGuire, Marmor, Miller, Newhouse, Ramm, Tidd and Van der Heide; Drs. Grutcher, Hacker and Sarlin were absent.

A. Announcements

Announcement was made that Anna Freud will address a meeting of the APA Committee on Psychoanalysis of Children and Adolescents, open to members of the APA, on Thursday afternoon at 2:00 P.M.

A letter from Dr. Sendor Lowand was read concerning the training qualifications of the Division of Psychoanalytic Medicine of the Long Island College of Medicine, which has applied for recognition as an affiliate Institute of the APA.

Dr. Frankes mentioned that a letter had been received from Leslie LeCron, offering a course on hypnosis. The members had each received such a letter and the Society would take no action on it.

B. Report of the Education Committee

Dr. Lewy reported that sixteen new candidates have been accepted for training; also he stated that two new training analysts have been appointed, Drs. Norman Levy and Carol Van der Heide.

Dr. Lewy then went on to report on the difficulties within the EC and his proposal of the London Plan and the resulting decision that another Institute would be formed. The Statement to the Candidates Concerning the Formation of Another Psychoanalytic Institute was circulated among the membership.

There was heated discussion about the constitutionality of this decision, and Drs. Futterman, Briehl and Frankes expressed the opinion that this was another instance of the autocratic behavior of the Education Committee.

Dr. Miller pointed out that this decision had been made primarily because of consideration of the students; it was necessary to try to resolve the difficulties in the EC in such a way that the candidates would not be affected. Another Institute's status is dependent upon its acceptance by the APA, and another Institute will soon require another Society. The decision was necessary and the formation of two societies would take care of everyone's scientific interests, etc.

Dr. Greenson stated that the EC had discussed this matter very thoroughly and felt that members should be permitted to withdraw and form another Institute. The statement to the candidates emphasized the formation of another Institute. It was the function of the EC to find ways to work best and the EC felt they would all work better if another Institute were formed. Dr. Greenson felt this was legal.

Dr. Miller said that the procedure for forming another Institute was first to apply to the APA, that this application had to be sponsored by the Institutes, then approved by the Executive Council and Board on Professional Standards, then voted on by the membership-at-large and that the final decision would probably not be made until next December. In the meantime the present Institute would exist as it is, utilizing the time in working out the plans for organization, including necessarily the plans for another Institute.

Dr. Romm mentioned that the split followed a note from the Chairman of the EC to the members of the EC proposing the London Plan; this plan was not acceptable to Drs. Grotjahn, Miller and Romm. They felt that the alternative was the formation of another Institute.

Dr. Marmor asked whether this meant that until the new Institute had been accepted by the APA there would be no split in the Institute and that we would continue on the same basis as always.

Dr. Levy said this was a gentleman's agreement in order to facilitate things for the other Institute and so that the candidates would not have anything missing in their training.

Dr. Marmor then asked whether the first Institute would be a sponsor of the other Institute; Dr. Tidd said this had not come up; Dr. Greenson felt this question was premature. Dr. Marmor asked about the constitutionality of the Institutes operating within the framework of one Society and Dr. Tidd said he thought the constitution mentioned only one Institute, but that he could not be sure of this.

Dr. Marmor asked whether the graduating candidates would be voted upon for membership in the Society. Dr. Romm felt the students ready for membership should not be penalized by the split and if they are ready to become members of the existing Society it is their due to be accepted. Dr. Greenson agreed they should not be penalized but felt it would not be wise to accept members in the Society during this crucial period. Dr. Greenson objected to making this a political issue. Dr. Miller said it was not a political issue for a candidate who completes his work and gives a paper to be admitted here or in any other Society. He said that for the group wishing to form another Institute this was not a political issue. The candidates were mostly interested in membership in the APA, therefore to say that any candidate should be held back because of some kind of political implication was not understandable to him. Dr. Tidd said that everyone in the EC was aware of the difficulties and it had been tentatively proposed that an attempt be made to do away with these difficulties by Dr. Levy, the idea being that at least two sub-groups be formed, and that this would take care of the differences on scientific matters. Dr. Miller had agreed there were differences but felt they were so great that it was not possible to continue as a single Institute and later it developed

that three members of the EC would prefer to withdraw and apply to the APA for permission to start another Institute. After this proposal was discussed a vote was taken and there was unanimous approval. Dr. Miller said he had felt that in a sense it was an ultimatum and in a sense felt it had to happen sooner or later, and that this solution met his personal approval; he said Dr. Lewy had initiated this plan psychologically, that the London Plan proposed by Dr. Lewy would not be accepted.

Dr. Frankes said there was something wrong from the point-of-view of the Society, which he would like to see held together; he objected to presenting this fait accompli and thought it significant that this should occur right after we had decided on a more democratic constitution and by-laws; he also felt this decision of the EC should be rescinded and that the Society should not be forced to split. He thought the constitution should be amended in such a way that the Society should elect the EC members. Dr. Brunswick said that the fact that we have a constitution and by-laws showed we are not only a scientific but also a political organization, and that the more there was difference of opinion between groups the more it would be a political organization and the less it would be a scientific organization.

Dr. Miller moved that until the organization plans are completed and accepted by the APA all candidates eligible for admission be admitted in the usual and regular fashion without political implications.

Dr. Lewy felt this motion was motivated by political implications and said it was the proof of there being no possibility of the two groups getting along.

Dr. Greenson said that while he didn't like dragging in politics (in answer to Dr. Marmor's statement that in a social situation Dr. Greenson had asked him where he stood politically) he would remind the Society of the June 1948 meeting when Drs. Clinco and Evans came up for membership and Dr. Marmor had insisted on voting on them in alphabetic order because he had feared if Dr. Evans had been elected first, Dr. Clinco might not have been elected.

Dr. Marmor answered this was true and asked to go on record as having voted for Dr. Evans. He said that aggression had not come from his side. The question now was whether he would permit our candidates to come up for election in an orderly fashion.

Dr. Grotjahn seconded Dr. Miller's motion and said that unless it was passed the eight candidates ready for admission to the Society would be blocked from membership in a psychoanalytic society for at least a year.

Dr. Van der Heide said he would vote against Dr. Miller's motion because anything that could be done to spare the candidates' being involved in this deadlock in the EC should be done.

Dr. Miller replied that it would take some time to form another Society and the candidates' main wish was to become members of the APA.

Dr. Tidd said that in the event this motion were defeated he wondered if it might not still be possible for candidates to become members of the APA, that they needed only the endorsement by an Institute.

Dr. Miller said that according to the constitution a member is endorsed for membership in the APA by the local society.

Dr. Romm said she was ashamed to think that we must vote on such an issue and that she would be embarrassed to discuss it in the APA, since such penalization of candidates was without precedent.

Dr. Futterman suggested Dr. Miller withdraw his motion and assume that we proceed as usual about electing members. He pointed out the provision in the By-Laws for a Board of Trustees, the majority of whom should be members of the Society, and also that the Director of the Training School is responsible and must act with the approval of the Board of Trustees, but no Board of Trustees had been appointed. This whole thing was illegal, and it was also illegal for an autonomous body to (illegible word) on themselves.

Dr. Newhouse asked whether there would be a year's delay in membership in the APA.

At this point Dr. Norman Levy pointed out that Dr. Miller's motion was out of order, since what he proposed already existed.

Dr. Brunswick asked whether another Institute would also mean another Society and Dr. Miller said the organization of the Society was dependent upon recognition of the Institute. Dr. Tidd pointed out that application for recognition for an Institute and Society could be made simultaneously. Dr. Levy said that any ten members could form a new Society and a group with four training analysts may apply for recognition as an Institute.

Dr. Levy asked why the statement was being sent to the candidates at this time, and Dr. Levy said it had been the decision of the EC. The work of the EC had been hampered because of inner conflicts, that there were difficulties because some of the training analysts kept their candidates out of certain seminars, etc.

Dr. Briehl said that in the constitutions of every other Society, unlike our own, the Institute was subordinate to the Society.

Dr. Futterman moved that there be a closed ballot to the effect that the L.A. Psychoanalytic Society resolves that the EC should try out the organization that will be suggested in the revised constitution and by-laws for a year or two before deciding to split. Dr. Frumkes seconded this motion, and it was defeated by a vote of nineteen against and two for (two proxies - Dr. Sarlin's to Dr. Levy and Dr. Crutcher's to Dr. Rahman).

Dr. Van der Heide suggested that the President inquire of the Executive Council whether individual membership in the APA might be made available to candidates who had completed their training but were not members of the local society at this time. The members did not object.

It was pointed out there was a routine procedure for graduation which the EC would follow. Dr. Lewy said there was question about the necessity for oral examination.

C. Report of By-Laws Committee.

It was decided that under the circumstances this report should be tabled.