

DRAFT

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL PROJECTS COMMITTEE RE: JOINT SAN DIEGO TRAINING,

The Special Projects Committee met twice, on October 21, and again one week later on October 28, to consider the feasibility of establishing a joint program with the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute, to sponsor the training of candidates from San Diego.

The charge to the committee, according to the minutes of the last meetings of the Coordinating Council, was for the committee to set up the ground rules for such a joint activity. This action had been suggested in a letter from Dr. Ekstein, and concurred in by the Council.

After reviewing the history of the matter, our initial discussions took much the trend of the prior deliberations at the Council. These revolved around questions of the type of authority which might be granted to the joint executive body, the probable make-up of the faculty, of curriculum, the relation to the parent body, ~~the parent body~~, and so forth. Soon, however, other, more basic questions were asked. These were essentially questions about the purpose of entering into such a joint activity; what advantages might accrue to psychoanalysis locally; what would be in the interests of the prospective candidates; what would be the fate of the changes which our Society-Institute has recently won, in such a joint effort; would we wish to expand our ideas on training and administration into a new training facility?

As a result, our committee has decided to offer the Coordinating Council various alternatives,, along with a brief statement of our thinking which led to these alternatives. The committee believes that the Council must seriously consider the ~~the~~ disadvantages which are likely to result from joint action. The adverse effects on the candidates are most evident. Since there are now so many vital differences between the two Institutes regarding curriculum, philosophy, concepts of the role of training analysis and of the relation of the training analyst to the council, attitudes toward administration and so forth, we could ~~we~~ foresee great confusion

For final draft

add: distinct possibility that in interests of all concerned he might insist that we run the program alone, rather than jointly in S. Calif. — if so, this might not preclude having personal analysis via T.A. in other group — the TA would have to function under the procedures of whichever group were in charge —

for the candidates. They should really be entitled to training conducted under one philosophy, by one body.

These disadvantages will be present if the governing body of the joint effort will be subject in any significant way to the parent bodies--- the E.C. of the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute, and our Coordinating Council. It is very hard to conceive how anything but confusion and conflict can result from an attempt to force an alliance between our two groups, especially now, when our concepts of education and administration are so different. If our goal is to increase harmonious activity between the two groups, this may be the poorest way to achieve such cooperation. Training issues bring us too close to gut ~~xxx~~ matters too quickly--we would do better with more benign efforts and some prior successes.

The only viable alternative is to proceed with a joint effort by setting up a body which would be given absolute autonomy. It would require freedom to make all decisions pertaining to training, from admission through graduation, without being questionable by either of the parent bodies. This was the starting point for the arrangement which was in process as a result of the agreements worked out between Drs. Ekstein and Gabe. The members of such a joint body should be contributed by both Institutes; they should have indefinite tenure, or very long terms, so as to maintain constancy of outlook, and be free from the need for frequent confirmation by the parent bodies.

There are other, lesser, alternatives. We could insist that the joint governing body be modelled after our image--or allow the older E.C. to ~~provide~~ form the model. This could work, but it would do away with any idea of a 'joint effort.' Or, as a last alternative, we could abandon any efforts to become part of the training program in San Diego, on the grounds that the effort would drain too much of our energy away from our

young operation, and that ~~there would be little prospect~~ we would do better to concentrate on revamping our curriculum, improving our Institute's administration, etc.

If some sort of 'joint effort' is felt to be necessary, the setting up an independent, autonomous body would destroy any 'joint effort' except for the efforts by the few who would be involved in the San Diego training operation. There seems to be little prospect of a profitable collaboration in any case.

In summation, it appears that setting up a joint committee with the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute for the sake of beginning training in San Diego is feasible only if such a committee is given independence, autonomy, permanence, and is not required to seek confirmation for its actions from either parent governing body. This would destroy the pretense of a 'joint effort'. If an alternative effort to organize a joint committee which would be responsible to its parent bodies would be made, we think it probable that it will prove confusing to the candidates, that it will lead to many conflicts, and much wasted energy. In essence, we believe that a joint effort is not feasible, unless the joint committee would be autonomous in the true sense of the word.