

the point of view of the medical members of the Association.

5. Your comment, "I believe the difficulties have come, not from training by laymen, but from the training, suspected and actual, of laymen," is by and large true; though it is also true that, in a few instances outside of Los Angeles, there has been suspected or actual training by laymen.

6. I especially regret having referred to Milton Wexler as "an instructor in supervised psychoanalysis," as this was an error in facts I was clear about. Perhaps you are right that the strength of my feelings caused me to exaggerate your "wickedness," but I should hope that you would respect the fact that, in this specific case, such feelings did come from my sharing the opinion of the Board that this man should be refused appointment because it would then constitute official approval of the Los Angeles Institute's appointment of a lay instructor who was engaged in private practice. This I think is the real difficulty.

We accepted the Board's decision, of course!

Except for this last detail, I certainly feel heartily inclined to endorse your clear statement in your letter of the consistent purpose of the Los Angeles Institute for Psychoanalysis to support the training standards of the American Psychoanalytic Association.

Sincerely yours,



Ives Hendrick, M.D.
President

IH:el

cc: Dr. Ernst Lewy
Dr. Carel Van der Heide

THE AMERICAN PSYCHOANALYTIC ASSOCIATION

IVES HENDRICK, M.D., PRESIDENT
MAXWELL GITELSON, M.D., PRESIDENT-ELECT
RICHARD L. FRANK, M.D., SECRETARY
ROBERT T. MORSE, M.D., TREASURER

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
84 MT. VERNON STREET
BOSTON 8, MASS.

February 22, 1955

Dr. David Brunswick, President
Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society
360 North Bedford Drive
Beverly Hills, Calif.

Dear Dr. Brunswick:

I appreciate your being glad that I wrote you about the correspondence with Dr. Noyes, and I also appreciate the clarification in your letter of some details I should have been more clear about. You certainly are quite right that, whereas I had addressed the Los Angeles Society, it was really more a matter of the Los Angeles Institute for Psychoanalysis. I hope, therefore, you will extend my appreciation to Dr. Lewy and to Dr. Van der Heide for collaborating in your reply.

I am sure you will be glad to know that I eventually had a friendly letter from Dr. Noyes, reporting the brief discussion of this problem by the Executive Committee of the American Psychiatric in consequence of its having been brought up by a single member, and commenting that the matter was not taken too seriously by them. In case there is any possible residual confusion, I should like to comment briefly on some of the details you mention:

1. Your comment that you do not teach "psychotherapy" but "psychoanalysis" is a bit confusing semantically. I myself consider psychoanalysis as a method, the best method, of psychotherapy, rather than as a completely different subject; I do not imply by this that I think psychoanalysis and psychotherapy by other methods are identical.

2. I especially appreciate your highlighting the fact that the criticism referred to was based on the 1952-53 Annual Report, and is not up-to-date.

3. I am certainly glad to have definitely in mind that Mrs. Margarete Ruben, lecturer and supervisor in child analysis, as well as you three lay training analysts, are all eligible under the 1938 "grandfather clause." (It seems to include grandmothers too.)

4. Though I did not quote paragraph 3 of the 1938 Resolution completely, I think I did, in my discussion of it, make clear that those lay members of our Association under this clause had not caused later difficulties from

ROBERT T. HOFFER, M.D.
RICHARD L. HOFFER, M.D.
TOTAL PSYCHOANALYTIC ASSOCIATION
140 WEST 11TH STREET
NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
140 WEST 11TH STREET
NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

February 22, 1958

Dr. David Brunswick, President
Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society
380 Westchester Drive
Forest Hills, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Brunswick:

I am sure you will be glad to know that I eventually had a friendly letter from Dr. Meyer, reporting the brief discussion of this problem by the Executive Committee of the American Psychiatric Association in connection of its having been brought up by a single member, and commenting that the matter was not taken too seriously by them. In cases where it is possible to reach a mutual understanding, I should like to comment briefly on some of the details you mention:

Your comment that you do not favor "psychotherapy" but "psychoanalysis" is a bit confusing somewhat. I shall consider psychoanalysis as a method, the basic element of psychotherapy, rather than as a completely different therapy, as implied by this title "psychoanalysis" and psychotherapy by other methods are identical.

I especially appreciate your highlighting the fact that the criticism referred to was based on the 1955-56 Annual Report, and is not up-to-date.

I am certainly glad to have definitely in mind that you, together with your supervisor in child analysis, as well as your three lay training analysts, are all eligible under the 1955 "amendment clause." (It seems to include grandmothers too.)

Thank you I did not quote paragraph 2 of the 1955 resolution completely, I think I did, in my discussion of it, and it is clear that some lay members of our Association were this clause had caused later difficulties from