

LAYMEN IN CALIFORNIA.

The contribution of California to the controversy about lay analysis is an interesting one. It has many of the factors common to this controversy at other places plus a few unique to the California scene. Simmel's position was central; he was the first physician analyst to come to California and did so upon the invitation of the pioneer group, all lay analysts. This group was made up of the Libbins, Thomas and Margrit (later ^{Munk} ~~Munk~~), Marjorie Leonard, Estelle Levy, and led by David Brunswick. Only Thomas Libbin had reservations, fearing medical men would seize power and exclude lay practice. Anyway Simmel came in 1934, and in the following year the Los Angeles Study Group was ~~and~~ organized under his leadership. For the next four or five years it enjoyed an uneventful and productive existence, the original lay group being supplemented by physician analysts who~~x~~ were moving to Los Angeles, either trained elsewhere ^{in AMERICA} like Charles Tidd and May Romm, or immigrants from Europe like Fenichel and Joachim and Irene Haenel. By 1940 the lay group had grown too and now included Mrs. Deri, Mrs. Fenichel, Christine Olden and Edgar Daniels.

It was in 1940 that Karl Menninger wrote to Simmel: "You organized the psychoanalytic movement in California but you were handicapped by a necessary association with lay analysts who still have a certain claim upon you or think they do, in spite of the fact you no longer (as I understand it) champion their point of view. In his reply Simmel said: "The non-physician analysts of Los Angeles should be considered the founders and pioneers of Freudian psychoanalysis in Los Angeles. It was Brunswick, Leonard, Margrit Munk and Estelle Levy who invited me to come to Los Angeles to start a medical center for psycho-

The contribution of California to the controversy about lay
analysts is an interesting one. It has many of the factors com-
mon to this controversy at other places plus a few unique to
the California scene. Himmel's position was central; he was
the first physician analyst to come to California and did so upon
the invitation of the pioneer group, all lay analysts. This group
was made up of the Lippins, Thomas and Margrit (later Lippin), Mar-
jorie Lippin, Estelle Levy, and led by David Brunswick. Only
Thomas Lippin had reservations, fearing medical men would seize
power and exclude lay practice. Anyway Himmel came in 1934, and
in the following year the Los Angeles Study Group was organized
under his leadership. For the next four or five years it en-
joyed an uneventful and productive existence, the original lay
group being supplemented by physician analysts who were moving
to Los Angeles, either trained elsewhere like Charles Tild and
Ray Penn, or immigrants from Europe like Fenichel and Juchacz and
Irma Fenichel. By 1940 the lay group had grown too and now included
Fenichel, Mrs. Fenichel, Christine Lippin and Roger Fenichel.
It was in 1940 that Karl Menninger wrote to Himmel: "You
organized the psychoanalytic movement in California but you were
frustrated by a necessary association with lay analysts who
still have a certain claim upon you or think they do, in spite of
the fact you no longer (as I understand it) champion their point
of view. In his reply Himmel said: "The non-physician ana-
lysts of Los Angeles should be considered the founders and suc-
cessors of Freudian psychoanalysis in Los Angeles. It was I
who, Fenichel, Margrit and Estelle Levy who invited me
to come to Los Angeles to start a medical center for psycho-

analytic training.....through their work the first generation of physician analysts is rising in California.

The Study Group constitution made no mention of a medical qualification for membership and indeed did not restrict membership to analysts, but included friendly and intelligent persons of several professions. Essentially the one qualification was "sufficient knowledge and understanding of Freudian analysis". And excluded were "persons who attempt to practice psychoanalysis without training as prescribed by the Freudian School". The last reference was timely and aimed at the large number of opportunists who proclaimed themselves psychoanalysts with little or no qualification.

By the end of 1940 tensions had arisen leading to the exchange described above with Menninger. It was ^{on} ~~in~~ December 30th that Simmel wrote a memorandum titled REGARDING THE FUTURE PSYCHOANALYTIC SOCIETY IN LOS ANGELES and in it described the growing controversy as follows: "The ill feeling existing against acceptance of lay analysts as ordinary members of the Psychoanalytic Society in California may be based on three reasons, or fears. 1. The fear if lay members were accepted this would create a hole through which all lay analysts rejected elsewhere could enter the Los Angeles Society and then become members of the Psychoanalytic Association. 2. The fear Lay analysts would outnumber physician analysts. 3. The fear of stimulating conflict with the medical authorities."

Simmel was attempting to clear the air because a movement was commencing to organize in California an official Psychoanalytic Society largely at the behest of the Topeka group who were becoming weary of the arduous and complicated job of supervising the

analytic training....through their work for the first generation of
analytic analysts in California.

The study group constitution made no mention of a medical
qualification for membership and indeed did not restrict mem-
bership to analysts, but included friendly and intelligent persons
of several professions. Essentially the one qualification was
"sufficient knowledge and understanding of Freudian analysis" and
excluded were "persons who attempt to practice psychoanalysis
without training as prescribed by the Freudian school". The
last reference was timely and aimed at the large number of so-
called "Freudian" psychoanalysts who claimed themselves with little
or no qualification.

By the end of 1940 questions had arisen leading to the exchange
described above with Kanner. It was in December 1940 that
Kanner wrote a memorandum titled "ALTERNATE THE FUTURE OF PSYCHOANALYSIS"

in which he described the growing con-
flict as follows: "The ill feeling existing against acceptance
of lay analysts as ordinary members of the psychoanalytic society
in California may be based on three reasons, or fears. 1. The
fear if lay members were accepted this would create a hole through
which all lay analysts rejected elsewhere could enter the Los Ange-
les society and then become members of the Psychoanalytic Assn-
ation. 2. The fear lay analysts would outnumber physician
analysts. 3. The fear of stimulating conflict with the medical
authorities."

Kanner was attempting to clear the air because a movement was
connecting to organize in California an official psychoanalytic
society largely at the behest of the Los Angeles group who were receiving
many of the serious and complicated job of supervising the

activities of the California⁴ outpost. In August 1941 Robert Knight President of the Topeka Society came to Los Angeles to chair an organizing meeting of a special committee specifically appointed to draw up plans for the new society. In a preliminary letter in July he wrote "one important point to be discussed will be the attitude which the new society should adopt in regard to the lay analysts. A compromise is proposed. Non-physician analysts should agree to renounce ordinary membership and the right to vote. In compensation for this the Society should find some title for these analysts that would identify them as affiliated to it, and as approved and trained psychoanalysts. I propose some title like 'accredited member' or 'non-physician psychoanalyst accredited by the California Psychoanalytic Society'."

Controversy over the status of lay analysts in such a new society delayed its founding for almost another year, and largely for that reason it would ^{be} up with the name of San Francisco Psychoanalytic Society, ^{founded in 1942.} However in spite of its name it functioned as a California society common to the members in San Francisco and Los Angeles alike. And did so until the founding of a separate Los Angeles society in 1946. These new societies were founded in the prescribed manner by the requisite number of physician analysts as charter signers in accordance with the national constitution and then were given autonomy to handle the lay problem almost as they wished. In general the California societies as well as new societies elsewhere in the country followed ^{ed} the compromise procedure as outlined by Knight in his letter of July 18, 1941.

activities of the California outpost. In August 1941 Robert Knight
 President of the Los Angeles Society came to Los Angeles to chair an
 organizing meeting of a social committee specifically appointed
 to carry out plans for the new society. In a preliminary letter
 in July he wrote "one important point to be discussed will be the
 attitude which the new society should adopt in regard to the lay
 analysts. A compromise is proposed. Non-physician analysts
 should agree to renounce ordinary membership and the right to
 vote. In compensation for this the society should find some
 title for these analysts that would identify them as affiliated
 to it, and as approved and trained psychoanalysts. I propose
 some title like 'accredited member' or 'non-physician psychana-
 lyst accredited by the California Psychoanalytic Society'."
 Controversy over the status of lay analysts in such a new
 society delayed its founding for almost another year, and largely
 for that reason it would go up with the name of San Francisco
 Psychoanalytic Society, however in spite of the name its function
 was as a California society common to the members in San Fran-
 cisco and Los Angeles alike. And this is until the founding of
 a separate Los Angeles society in 1946. These new societies
 were founded in the prescribed manner by the requisite number of
 physician analysts as charter signers in accordance with the
 national constitution and then were given autonomy to handle the
 lay problem almost as they wished. In general the California
 societies as well as new societies elsewhere in the country
 followed the compromise procedure as outlined by Knight in
 his letter of July 10, 1941.

As a footnote it may be interesting to quote from a report written by Simmel as late as August 1944: "In particular, ways and means should be found to attract physicians, especially psychiatrists, in order to interest them in the study of psychoanalysis. The psychoanalytic movement in Los Angeles differs somewhat from the psychoanalytic movement in San Francisco. In spite of the fact that Los Angeles is the cradle of clinical psychoanalysis in California, San Francisco shows more progress concerning contact with the medical world.....the emotional resistance among physicians against psychoanalysis there before is stronger in Los Angeles than it is in San Francisco." This holds considerable irony because within a year the two California centers, as was every training center in the country, had a flood of medical applicants for training, physicians who were leaving military service and who in service had become aware of the existence of a psychoanalytic discipline.

About Simmel it can be said he personally had the liberal view about the lay question, in concordance with his European background including contact with Freud. Yet he accepted the American policies which excluded laymen from training after 1938 and thus led to medical dominance of the psychoanalytic science. Although retaining their European bias, Simmel, Fenichel and Bernfeld in San Francisco all recognized the practical need for the new American rule and cooperated fully in its observance.