Maurice N. Walsh, M. D.
436 North Roxbury Building
Beverly Hills, California
CResiview 6-2009

January 15, 1968.

Dr. Melvin Mandel, Chairman, Community Education Division, Los Angeles Society/Institute for Psychoanalysis.

Dear Dr. Mandel:

It occurs to me that the audience reached by the Community Education Division of our Institute would be both interested and benefited by hearing a lecture on the influence of Ernest Jones, the biographer of Fraud, on the psychoanalytic movement.

Since I am engaged in writing the life of Mrnest Jones I would naturally be the logical person to deliver such a lecture. In view of this I consider it remarkable that I have not been asked to do so, a situation which would occur in few, if any, other Psychoanalytic Institutes in the world.

But if Ernest Jones is considered too controversial for Community Education audiences it is possible that they might be interested in a talk on the Basic Concepts and Official Roles on the Hopi Tribe. I enclose a paper on this subject, the result of my six summers work among the Hopi.

Sincerely, Marine Walsh

Maurice N. Walsh M. D.

MELVIN MANDEL, M. D. 11665 WEST OLYMPIC BOULEVARD LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA-90064 478-4852

PSYCHIATRY AND PSYCHOANALYSIS

January 21,1968

Maurice N. Walsh, M.D. 436 North Roxbury Dr. Beverly Hills, Calif.

Dear Dr. Walsh:

Enclosed you will find your manuscript on the Hopi Indians returned to you, unread.

For your information, you are a member of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society-Institute. It is important that you learn its proper name; and along with its name, you must learn what it is—an organization of prefessional gentlemen and ladies, operating on high moral and ethical levels—which, incidentally, no one member owns exclusively.

Following the above orientation I wish to make it clear to you that your cover letter of January 15, 1968 is insinuating, insulting, demonstrates bad manners, and is entirely unacceptable. Not one word about the possibility of your making a presentation has passed between you and me in writing or verbally, yet you accuse us all, by strong inference, or harboring prejudicial or persecutory attitudes toward you. Therefore, I consider your letter to be an unprovoked attack on me, the Community Education Committee, and the Society-Institute. You make it difficult indeed for sincere and responsible colleagues who have been approached in this truculent manner to undertake joint discussions with you. And so psychoanalysis suffers.

As a result, I expect forthwith a satisfactory written apology, addressed to me. I would be pleased thereafter to review your Hopi paper, discuss a possible presentation of your work on Jones, and we can forget that your attack--which I hope you didn't really intend your letter to be--ever took place. If you cannot find it within yourself to forward such an apology, please be advised that this matter will be further directed to appropriate bodies for action within a reasonably short time.

Melvin Mandel, M.D.

cc. Community Education Committee

LOS ANGELES PSYCHOANALYTIC SOCIETY AND INSTITUTE

Mardel

344 North Bedford Drive Beverly Hills, California 90210 271-1368 272-1434

Date

March 19, 1968

To:

Board of Directors

From:

Melvin Mandel, M. D.

Chairman, Community Education Committee

Enclosed are three letters, two from Dr. Walsh and one from me, which consitute an exchange of correspondence. Both Dr. Walsh and I are in agreement that we not continue this unpleasant episode. Accordingly I. did not respond further.

Below are closing comments addressed to the Board.

First the fact that I was responding to Dr. Walsh's truculent letter was made known to and approved of by all those members of the Community Education Committee who were consulted and who comprised more than a simple majority.

Second my major purpose in responding to Dr. Walsh as I did was to insist that Society members who agree to operate as elected or appointed officers should be treated with decorum and respect. There is no question about any officer being subject to criticism. Any member: must be able to accept legitimate critique. But he who criticizes carries a simple responsibility, which is to criticize for something which carries significance rather than out of pettiness, petulence, and peeve; my response to Dr. Walsh expresses more of my thinking on this point.

Third and last, I am submitting the correspondence to the Board for its information and files and am making no request for action since I consider this to be a closed issue at this time.

Maurice N. Walsh, M. D. 436 North Roxburg Building Boverly Hills, California Chestriev 6-7449

January 24, 1968.

Dr. Melvin Mandel, Chairman, Community Education Committee, Los Angeles Bsychognalytic Scoiety-Institute, 344 North Bedford Drive, Beverly Hills, California.

Dear Dr. Mandel:

The discourteous and intemperate language employed in your reply to my letter of inquiry of January 15, in which I doubt that either yourCommittee or any other Committee of the Society-Institute would concur, fails to answer my inquiry as to why a senior member of the Society-Institute with special qualifications for presenting an important topic is not asked to do so.

The undignified answer to my letter would appear to have nothing to do with Community Education, which is the special purpose of your Committee. It is therefore I who should ask for an apology.

But rather than wasting time in mutually demanding apologies, which is childish, the more serious issue would appear to be Community Education, which was overlooked in your letter.

I have no interest in further wasting time in engaging in a personal exchange with you. You are at liberty to submit my letter, to which you must append your reply, to any appropriate body" you wish. This will not in the least change the necessity for any official of the Society-Institute to avoid offensive personal remarks and discourteous language in replying to a letter of inquiry from a fellow member, even if he considers it to constitute a criticism.

Sincerely,

Maurice N. Walsh M. D.

Maurin Walsh