

Keep this in file, too

EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING

February 2, 1950

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 P.M. by Dr. Lewy, Chairman. Present were Dr. Brunswick, Mrs. Deri and Drs. Greenson, Grotjahn, Lewy, Miller, Romm and Tidd.

I. Guest Lecturers.

Dr. Lewy Reported that Dr. Knight declined the invitation. He will be in Los Angeles for his vacation but feels that the necessary preparation for such lectures would interfere too much with his vacation.

Dr. Greenacre accepted the invitation to lecture but will give a definite answer a little later. The first two weeks in June would be good. Dr. Lewy asked for suggestions for a topic for Dr. Greenacre's lectures. Dr. Brunswick stated that she has written on "Development of Anxiety," Greenson: "Pathological Weeping," "The Effectiveness of Restraint on ~~EMOTIONAL~~ Infants."

II. Dr. Grotjahn recommended that Drs. Fromm and Lester be authorized to start controls. It was the consensus

III. Graduation

The question of the oral examination was discussed. Dr. Lewy reported receiving a letter from Dr. Windholz in which he stated that the San Francisco Institute has discarded the oral examinations and only require a thesis.

Dr. Grotjahn suggested that the oral examinations be done away with. Graduating candidates are well known to all Education Committee members; they have been in analysis, attended seminars and done controls. Oral examinations cannot change the E.C.'s ~~MINOR~~ opinion about a certain candidate. Dr. Grotjahn felt that the required paper would be a good for them as a last assignment given to them. It would also give the Society members not belonging to the Institute a chance to look at them.

Dr. Brunswick felt that the oral examination was an incentive to candidates to read, to get an over-all view of the literature.

Romm: Isn't that treating a man like a junior in highschool.

Tidd: The oral examination would not change the opinion. Dr. Brunswick's point has merit.

Lewy: I think the only merit is that they have to prepare themselves.

Dr. Greenson felt that although he knew some of the graduating candidates pretty well, that about others, who did not do controls with him or did not say very much at seminars he knew much less. Some of the candidates were not trained here.

Dr. Tidd suggested that any member who was not certain about a candidate have a conference with him.

Dr. Greenson, agreed in principle that no oral examination should be necessary.

Dr. Grotjahn felt that this was a matter of principle, one's attitude toward the students. He considers them as physicians, as grown-up men who should not be put through an oral examination. Those people who are in favor of oral examinations are the ones who doⁿ't want students to review papers for the Quarterly and and that they should not analyze M.D.'s.

Dr. Lewy stated that he remembered only that doubts were expressed about applicants' going into analysis with candidates.

Dr. Greenson felt that the question of oral examinations hinged on the problem of the counter-transference of the analyst to the candidate

Gro: "countertransference" indiscrete.

POINTS VIII

Dr. Lewy stated that it seems that a rift has existed for a long time - partly due to very serious scientific differences and partly due to personal factors. This has developed to the point where everybody has felt this very strongly. The work ~~has~~ of the E.C. has been done under constant strain and hampered greatly by discord. We have to have find some way of alleviating this. The first step is to come out into the open and state that this rift exists. Dr. Lewy felt that the E.C. owed this not only to themselves, in order to eliminate the very intense hostility and friction which has been the result of this, but they also owed it to the students. He felt very strongly concerned not only about the students' not being taught everything they should be taught, but also about the fact that the students are not completely unaware of this rift. They are confused and disturbed, ~~and~~ even more by attempts to smoothing these differences over. It would be much better to let it come out into the open. At this point it would be unfair to the students to let happen what happened in Philadelphia - a complete split-up, which was not planned in the beginning. Dr. Lewy felt that if everybody was willing to cooperate a way could be found to solve this problem without a complete split. This would cause a number of technical difficulties and great hardships on the students. He felt that the only and best way for practical and other reasons would be to attempt something similar to the way the differences of opinion have been solved in the London Institute.

Dr. Miller asked for explanation in detail.

Dr. Lewy explained that there were the two different groups, Melanie Klein and Anna Freud, and an intermediate group which was joined by all those who did not agree in every point with one or the other group. In Philadelphia there was one similarity - Dr. Waelder wanting to go with both groups. Each of these groups here would have to organize their own training program. There would be the possibility that some of the lectures and seminars might be attended by students of both groups. He felt there should be two sub-committees consisting of those who feel that they agree on these certain point and can and want to work together successfully and constructively. The E.C. should be retained as an over-all executive committee of the Institute, and would retain certain prerogatives and functions. All this would have to be worked out in detail.

This outline is only a tentative idea. The main idea is that there would be two sub-groups of those who feel they belong together. Dr. Lewy said that he did not have any clear idea yet of how this would be handled as far as the students are concerned, whether to call a meeting, etc. In London and in Philadelphia the students have some idea of the difference of opinion between the two groups and make their choice accordingly. Of course those who are in analysis are fixed.

Dr. Miller felt that this could be worked out in such a way so that the students are not hurt at all as far as their credentials, plans and careers are concerned. Everybody should be aware that there would be increased difficulties on the part of the students in analysis and would work additionally hard to analyze this through.

Dr. Romm felt that the criticism has come from one side only, not from both sides. The criticism came from one group, Dr. Greenson being the spokesman. It is up to you to say wherein you are dissatisfied, but not to put us in a position equivalent to the critics becoming, let's say, the Anna Freud group and those of us will become the MelanKie Klein group

Dr. Lewy: The criticism has come from both sides, very definitely. This group has been accused of being rigid, orthodox, inflexible, closed-minded to so-called recent advances. I think your statement is not correct.

Dr. Romm: Drs. Carlson, Rosanoff, Solomon, have all asked Dr. Greenson to control them. It is very interesting that not one control case did I ever get from Dr. Greenson, Dr. Brunswick or Mrs. Deri. If I had thought that Greenson is orthodox, rigid, or whatever else implications, I would not do this

Dr. Lewy: Whenever such points as the pamphlet, proposals to the Board of Professional Standards, etc. were discussed, we had the difference of opinion on orthodoxy, cutting down hours, manipulation, etc.

DR. TIDD: I am wondering about the course of discussion

Romm: The point is whether we can be a unit or whether we cannot be.

Greenson: I would like to say the following about criticism. I have taken many opportunities to express the differences of opinion I had on some of the points of view taught during the seminars. Also at times I have asked when controversial issues came up for a clear statement about what a person felt would be basic in a new point of view and what he felt to be experimental. I have been outspoken in my feelings. I think I understand at least what is

meant by psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic teaching and have been puzzled with what has been taught, and in great disagreement with it. I have worked with candidates who came to me, having been taught by others with different opinions. I admit that I would not ask a candidate to go somewhere for control where I think he would not get what is basic in psychoanalysis. I think at this point in their development one should not have the attitude towards the candidates of "you can learn something from anybody."

DERI: Dr. Romm said that I had never sent her a candidate. I do not send my candidates to anyone.

(to MER) LEWY: If nobody recommends to candidates who they should control with, how can you make a point of this?

I think the discussion is being pushed in the wrong direction, of criticism in a much too personal way. The point is: are there controversial issues? We should eliminate the personal questions and sensitivities entirely.

TIDD: I do not think you can do it. I am not entirely convinced that it is only a matter of theory that is involved. I think the personal differences are more important than the other. If it is correct that this present state of being is due to personal difficulties we ought to face that and do something about it.

LEWY: I stated that there are both kind of difficulties; but there are serious theoretical difficulties.

GREENSON: Why don't we start with the scientific and then see if we need to bring up the personal?

TIDD: The first question is: can we work together?

GREENSON: Can we work together as we have been going or do we need a new way?

MILLER: There are certainly differences of opinion which should exist and do exist in every psychoanalytic organization. The peculiar thing about this group is the sharp demarkation, one group versus another group. You can call either side whatever you wish, the fact remains. For example, an attitude is met at first with "a peculiar idea"; "it is correct psychoanalysis," or "it is not correct psychoanalysis." These terms really don't apply. Psychoanalysis has still room for a great deal of investigation, both theoretical and clinical. Many the(oretical) points are still up for revision in theoretical and clinical experience.

Sometimes one has to invent a theory to fit the particular situation if you wish to make a theory, and clinical adaptability is necessary regardless of the theoretical problem. There are many things we don't know, and I want to know a lot more. I cannot foster this urge of mine in this atmosphere; it is just impossible. My conclusion has been that there is only one possibility as far as a real solution is concerned, and that is that there has to be a complete split. I have considered the position of those people who are part way through the training, etc. I think it would be worked out amicably. Two institutes can be functioning, the members of both institutes could be civil and helpful. I would be more comfortable in a situation like that.

TIDD: I agree that if there is an organization in which an individual feels he cannot air his views regarding a scientific subject, regardless of what ~~XXXX~~ they are, there should be some change. I wonder why you feel that way. For instance in the Society meetings where there have been several persons discussing a subject, it is obvious that there are differences of opinion. What idea have you advanced that has been dismissed?

MILLER: It has always been by implication. I was formerly a member of the staff of the Chicago Institute and coming here I have met with all kinds of peculiar ideas

DERI: These things did not come up at the E.C.

MILLER: If these things were discussed at the E.C. - but the critical atmosphere makes discussion impossible.

TIDD: Alexander gave a paper here in the Society. People expressed their opinion openly.

ROMM: Dr. Lewy walked out in the middle.

DR. LEWY: Very good personal reason *which I explained to Mrs. Alexander.*

TIDD: There was heated criticism of Alexander, but this happens in many scientific meetings. I have not heard one instance, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ DR. Miller, with reference to the E.C. where you brought forth an idea which you thought should be brought forth and which was dismissed.

MILLER: Dr. Lewy used the terms rigidity versus flexibility. Always certain suggestions which were made by Romm, myself and Grotjahn voting like us, which met with a 4:3 vote. Example: when I brought up the question of Norman Levy for training analyst I asked for a vote. ~~XXX~~ I did not get it, but got a counter-proposition - Dr. Fenichel. I sensed immediately that this was a trade, a political play. That is not scientific, it is not doing it in the best way.

ROMM: Another example: I am sure Dr. Marmor would not have gotten on the teaching staff unless Dr. Newhouse was assigned. That is a revolting reaction towards something that is a scientific matter. You are not supposed to trade horses.

GREENSON: I agree it is revolting. This is why we must make some change. I think it is wrong to scarifice your principles for some expediency. I firmly believe in the right of everyone to question and doubt every scientific theory, but I also believe that one must clearly differentiate hypothesis and experiment from what has up until now seemed to be the closest approximation to fact. Certain of our members have used new ideas which were experimental as though they were proven facts. When challenging this I got no answer, I was accused of being dogmatic, etc., which may be true, but does not make my thoughts wrong. I have disagreed with Alexander, French, Kardner, many times and it was never met with a forthright answer but passed off as crackpot, orthodox, rigid. We must find another way since we cannot get together without bringing up personal differences.

LEWY: We should accept that each group has a scientific opinion, and each group is concerned about the candidates. It is not a personal aversion against the person as such, but against the teaching and the confusion it causes in the students' minds. There is a certain body of scientific facts which I think should be taught to the students, ^{first} and not hypothesis and experimental ideas. They should not be presented to the students in the beginning. I think they have to be taught what we consider a body of scientific facts in psychoanalysis. ~~There are differences of opinions about these facts - and this confuses the students.~~

GROTJAHN: I think Dr. Lewy's statement is utterly in contrast with the conception of academic freedom. I think the Greenson group doubts our motives. I think confusion is healthy. It is not the task of the E.C. to watch that nobody gets confused.

TIDD: Wouldn't you agree that it is wise for us to get together on as many of the fundamentals in the beginning as possible.

ROMM: I doubt that there is controversy about the fundamentals.

GROTJAHN: In This atmosphere fundamentals cannot be discussed.

TIDD: I would like to know why.

GROTJAHN: When I discuss oral exmainations, Dr. Greenson's first words are counter-transference. Dr. Lewy quotes sentences out of context.

LEWY: An example: students were told there is no such thing as anal libido; it can be explained on cultural and social grounds.

GREENSON: The dealing with the candidates and the attitude towards them has been a matter of scientific difference. Many times I found ~~things~~ out things from candidates which were in basic disagreement on my conception of the relationship between analyst and analysand. Certain candidates ~~have the attitude~~ that they are better able to handle patients than the members of the training committee. *that they were told*

GROTJAHN: You have heard that from 3 different people?

claim to have been told

GREENSON: One candidate told me exactly: that Grotjahn says some of us are better analysts than the E.C. Another told me: Grotjahn says this applicant is better off being in analysis with a candidate than with any of these other people. Another candidate said he had been told that he would be a better teacher than some of you members of the E.C.

GROTJAHN: I don't believe a word of what you say.

TIDD: I wonder if Dr. Miller feels still just as strongly that there is no possibility of working out a compromise and a working arrangement.

MILLER: You (Greenson) may feel you have the correct scientific point of view. My own point of view is just as doubtful of theories as yours, just as puzzled by new clinical facts not yet explainable. ~~I feel~~ there is a certain difference of thought and approach which I am used to which I don't find existing here, which always comes down to an emotional outburst, accusations of some kind, or maneuvering. So much time is consumed by this it leaves little time for scientific matters. I feel that the time for a split has come in which each part can freely re-vitalize itself instead of trying to spend energy in keeping together. I do not feel that either of these plans would be acceptable to me. I feel the London plan is not acceptable.

Obviously here there are some who consider themselves more Freudian and us less Freudian. We would be labelled the "Melanie Klein" group, not to the public, but in your own thinking. I doubt if we are going to change. I am not going to change my point of view about what I consider useful psychoanalytic knowledge and experimental attitude. In this plan the governing point is the E.C. with a ~~Director~~ *chairman* which would appoint training analysts. There you have the same difference of opinion again.

TIDD: I, too, feel that there is something wrong with the governing set-up. ~~XXXXXX~~ I talked to Dr. Miller about this and wondered if this were one of the things which makes for difficulty. I have been aware of the voting set-up. For instance, in the case of Dr. Marmor, I would have voted for him, but I would have voted against Dr. *Norman* Levy as a training analyst, because I don't know enough about him. I did not do it on any political basis. Maybe we can do something about re-arranging the administrative set-up. Maybe somebody feels there is something wrong with the setup. Perhaps we ought to take turns at being chairman of the E.C. I discussed this with Dr. Grotjahn almost a year ago.

LEWY: I think what you complain about would be eliminated by this plan. Each group would be free to teach what they want to without interference.

GREENSON: If it is known that I disagree with Romm or Grotjahn about a certain point and this can be stated, this makes for such a clear feeling rather than giving rise to side-taking by the candidates. I don't see how the problem about the appointment of training analysts could be solved under the London plan. Each group should be free to appoint their training analysts. I agree that the only way to obviate all this talk is by openly announcing differences of opinion. If we contemplate such a move, we should write up a short pronouncement of what we disagree about.

ROMM: If we have one institute with this type of division the confusion among the students will be really colossal. If we are separate institutes there is no reason not to be most amicable. I cannot see how this can work with the present candidates - about the transference, etc. I don't think it can work with 2 institutes.

GREENSON: The main point is to work out the transition so as not to throw the students into an uproar. The differences of opinion point to the hypocrisy of pretending it is one Institute, but I think a split is a tremendous step.

LEWY: The reason why I proposed this plan is because it seems to work in London.

MILLER: The situation is entirely different here than in London. If we are to follow the London plan it would mean that both groups would have to consider making lay analysts training analysts. That is one of the principal differences.

- GREENSON: I am not sure the London Plan works in London. We heard certain repercussions when we were there. If we can work out a way of making this split without jeopardizing the training program, this is the most likely step.
- MILLER: The only technical difficulty would be with the people who are caught in the transition phase. I suggest they continue to receive their diplomas from the Institute as it exists and then on graduation they can chose which Institute they wish to belong to.
- LEWY: In London certain theoretical seminars are attended by both groups. It is the clinical seminars that are divided. We might be able to work it like that here -- this would cut down on the teaching work. This would provide for the academic freedom you desire without interference.
- ROMM: I think all this work without tension would be better than less work with this tension.
- GREENSON: How will you proceed about this. We are the Education Committee, not the Society.
- MILLER: In the first place it would be required to know who is for which institute. That would require a commitment. All you have to do is to have a sufficient number of people who are qualified to meet the requirements of the A.P.A. to set up an Institute.
- LEWY: You have to have four qualified training analysts. The qualifications of the lecturers are not specific. The Society is secondary.
- I feel that we owe it to the candidates as an interim solution to avoid a complete split.
- GREENSON: I think once you make a statement to the students that there are such differences of opinion, you necessitate a split in the E.C, how do you explain staying together. I am in agreement with you that we should split. If you say that our differences are big enough to make a split you can't then go on and stay together and say it is not big enough.
- I don't see any benefit in prolonging something which cause such uneasiness. The moment we talk about a split everybody feels happier and relaxes.
- TIDD: If that is the opinion, it is a matter of making the arrangements.

MRS. DERI: I am wondering how such a complete split can be made without jeopardizing the students' credits.

LEWY: In Philadelphia they found some solution, that the group that split away is technically still connected with the old Institute until recognition is made.

ROMM: Tell them the truth; treat them as adults.

TIDD: We should agree on the truth.

BRUNSWICK: This would mean that the split would be a factual one but not a legal one.

LEWY: You seem to think we can have two Institutes and ~~no~~ *one* Society.

ROMM: That will take care of itself.

TIDD: It seems to me that we should here agree that until the plan is worked out in as much detail as we can that this will be kept within this group.

LEWY: We should have a week's time to consider this a little bit more. We should not do or say anything until then and then meet again.

GREENSON: We should think about how to proceed with this and meet again shortly.

it is decided to have another meeting on Monday, February 13, at which time specific ideas and suggestions will be discussed as to who belongs to which group and how to proceed.

CONTINUATION, III. GRADUATION

ROMM: How about getting a short written report from the control analysts about each student instead of an oral examination

TIDD: We should have a graduation meeting and discuss each person separately. I wonder if this should not come after they give a paper. A round table meeting after they have given their paper. I think some sort of a period of review is a good idea. I dislike the idea of oral examinations.

GREENSON: How would it be if we told these men to discuss a few themes which we would give them, come before the E.C.

Tidd: I think each candidate should have some supervision from a control analyst about the paper.

DIPLOMA: The question of diploma was decided

APPLICATION FEE:

Tidd: It was suggested to raise the application fee to \$25., to be paid on registration. ~~DISCUSSION~~

Discussion

It was the concensus ~~of opinion~~ that the registration fee should be \$25. payable on registration.

GUEST LECTURERS.

Discussion of fee to Dr. Spitz. It was decided to ask Dr. Spitz to come during the middle of June, to give at least three lectures. # 1, 4, 5 of the movies suggested were chosen, subject to change, and a letter will be written to Dr. Spitz, asking him to show these three motion pictures and give a short lecture and hold discussion. The fee suggested was a flat sum of \$500.

Fromm Reichman. (Get suggestions from letter) Last week in June*****

Discussion of Hoffer? Dr. Buxbaum should be written to and explained that we do not pay \$100. per lecture, (flat rate of \$500., or that we could pay transportation from S.F. and \$100. per lecture.

****Dr. Fromm-Reichman should be asked to give a third talk on the same subject.

Tidd: One evening a lecture, the second evening a case discussion, then a subsequent lecture.

C. Dr. Lewy reported that a letter was sent to the newly accepted candidates to whom a therapeutic analysis was suggested and giving them the list of Society members.

Greenson: They should first try members and then candidates.

LEWY: If more rejected applicants call needing consolation, I cannot see them all. I wonder if somebody else can.

LIBRARY FEE: \$5. to candidates and members.

Library only to be used by candidates and members.

ROMM ON CEDARS' CLINIC:

Dr. Rosenfeld is going to take it up and arrange for a meeting so that we can give them some kind of an idea of ~~XXXXXX~~ why a psychoanalytically oriented clinic is necessary. I think they are marking time until Ziskind's term expires.

Discussion of Dr. Romm's seminar is now dated.

It was decided that registration for applicants would definitely be closed for a period of time.

Dr. Miller requested that a list of those candidates who have been accepted be sent out.

Coodley?