

STATEMENT FOR THE CANDIDATES' MEETING, MARCH 3, 1950

This communication is designed to present a clear definition of those factors responsible for the decision to change the structure of the present Education Committee and Institute. The views expressed herein represent the deliberations of the following training analysts: David Brunswick, Frances Deri, Ralph Greenson, Ernst Lewy and Charles Tidd.

It is the function and responsibility of the Education Committee and the Training School to teach the basic principles of psychoanalysis. We feel that disagreements about these important concepts make it impossible in the present framework to accomplish this aim. Our group feels that inroads have been made against what we consider to be good analytic practice and teaching.

After much consideration, all the members of the Education Committee concluded that in order to eliminate interference with what each group considers the best standards of psychoanalytic teaching, the formation of a separate Institute was indicated. The following scientific concepts are involved in this controversy:

1) We believe that the analysis of the infantile neurosis is essential to achieving a structural change within the personality of the analysand. Changes of behavior achieved in any other way we consider transitory and not structural.

2) In our opinion, the libido theory, which describes the instinctual development of man in terms of zone, aim and object, is a basic component of the genetic point of view. The interaction of the culture upon these drives determines the structure of the personality. We believe that important amplifications of this theory will be made,

but at the present time attempts to discard the libido theory are premature. Adherence to this point of view has been construed as "orthodox," "rigidity," and "obstructionism." Actually, the use of such terms obscures the fact that the truly scientific attitude requires rigorous testing before major changes in theory are accepted.

3) We have found that transference phenomena, in order to be of maximum therapeutic value in analysis, must be consistently interpreted. Every other manipulation of transference, particularly transference gratification, complicates the analysis of the transference neurosis.

4) It is our opinion that working through is an essential part of the psychoanalytic therapy and requires a high frequency of visits and an analysis of long duration. As yet no substitute method has proven to be effective.

5) We maintain that the single most important element in the candidate's training is his personal analysis, for it is here that he has the opportunity to experience the Unconscious, Transference, and Resistance. No other training opportunity is equally as valuable. We recognize that seminars and controls are important adjuncts in learning certain aspects of theory and practice, but only after sufficient personal analysis.

6) We believe that it is our responsibility to teach those basic principles of psychoanalysis which have withstood the critical tests of time and experience, as against those which have not. The innovations in technique as suggested by individuals of other institutes may be of value as a form of psychotherapy in certain cases, but are not in accordance with what has been considered the dynamic processes

in psychoanalysis proper. Therefore we believe that at the present time the classical procedures of psychoanalysis should be employed in training candidates. It is the responsibility of all teachers of any subject to teach basic principles and to differentiate them from hypotheses and experimentation.

These points represent the views of the training analysts named above. It is our opinion that each member of the other group disagrees with one or more points which we consider basic. Working together for three and a half years has failed to diminish the disagreement on principles, but has made the maintenance of training standards more difficult. It was therefore reluctantly agreed that only the formation of a new Institute would make it possible to maintain the high standards of psychoanalytic teaching and practice. It has been agreed that all candidates shall be allowed to participate in the seminars of either group until the exact and final policies of both Institutes have been worked out. There is no change or delay contemplated in training or graduation procedure during the period pending the recognition of the new Institute.

The question of personal and emotional factors as the basis for this separation has been frequently raised. There is no doubt that personality factors are interwoven with the scientific differences, which does add to the incompatibility. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that whatever their origin, the differences of opinion about fundamental issues are essential and warrant a change in the structure and function of the Education Committee and

Institute. It is believed that the formation of two separate Institutes will make possible a more cordial scientific atmosphere, since it will do away with much of the latent hostility that existed until now.

This statement is submitted to the candidates in this written form since we feel that it does present the content of the controversy of ideas in the most dispassionate way. If there still remain any important unanswered questions, we hope that every candidate will feel free to approach any member of this group. If the candidates prefer meeting as a group with one of our representatives, this can be arranged through the Students' Committee.

DAVID BRUNSWICK

FRANCES DERI

RALPH GREENSON

ERNST LEWY

CHARLES TIDD