

C O P Y

January 4, 1950

Edward Bibring, M.D.
Boston Psychoanalytic Institute
82 Marlborough Street
Boston 16, Massachusetts

Dear Dr. Bibring:

You asked me to write you an unofficial and confidential letter explaining the reasons which led to the present split in the Philadelphia Psychoanalytic Society, and mention the facts which for various reasons seem inadvisable to publish at the present time. To do this I must attempt a short historical sketch which may be subject to inaccuracies but is partly documented by the enclosed exhibits.

In January 1945, we were a relatively small group. I had had in training a few men, perhaps half a dozen, two of whom had been accepted as associate members, while others were still continuing their analyses. I believe Dr. Maeder had one student in analysis. Dr. Katz had two others and Dr. Smeltz in Pittsburgh also had a student whom he was training. Otherwise we were devoting our time to private practice. There were comparatively few problems which were disturbing the Society at that time. Dr. Maeder carried on most of the administrative work and I was Chairman of the Educational Committee. No regular minutes of the meetings of the Committee were kept. The chief problem was that of deciding how best students should be qualified to become members, and what procedures to use. Some of us felt that there was a dearth of clinical discussion. There also existed the question of whether to introduce a training analyst from the outside, which met with considerable opposition by certain of the group (in particular, Dr. Maeder). But on the whole there was no hint of disruption, and in fact those of us who have decided to split off at present were then for the most part opposed to the idea of having more than one institute in a given area.

In the spring of 1945, Dr. Maeder requested me to take over the administrative details of the Educational Committee. On this occasion I took the opportunity of laying down certain broad guiding principles (June 13, 1945) copy appended) which should be adopted for training students. In this I stated the desirability of working through common agreement and by virtue of esprit-de-corps rather than having to depend on rules and by-laws. Already there were beginning to be criticisms on the part of several of us of what seemed to us a very slipshod fashion of handling the relation between analyst and patient, especially on the part of Dr. English. For instance, in two cases he had accepted remuneration in kind in lieu of monetary payment. In one of these the patient was turned over to another analyst when he had insufficient funds to continue the analysis and was later taken back when he was able to afford a larger fee. In still another case of a student whom I was analyzing, Dr. English wished to insist on my telling him the student's attitude towards his wife in order that he, Dr. English, might advise the wife, whom he had in analysis at that time, whether or not she should get a divorce. These incidents could be verbally corroborated though there is no documentary evidence. It was because of such happenings that I brought up certain topics for discussion; e.g.:

1. The relation toward students on beginning the analysis.
2. The problem of participation by the analyst in the current conflict by giving active support to one side of the conflict.
3. The convention of social relations to the patient outside of the analytic conference.

4. The question of altering the environment of the patient; i.e., giving advice to the relatives in regard to the patient, etc.

The policy in all these matters was strictly defined in the paper of June 13. Needless to say, since this time there has been no unanimity either in word or action. As regards one topic, viz., the relation toward students on beginning the analysis, Dr. Maeder since that time has made a constant practice at the beginning of every student analysis of interviewing the marital partner. In a recent seminar which was reported to me though an analysant, Dr. English in a particular case advised that the patient's wife be consulted as to a trip which the patient was intending, and that advice be given to the patient accordingly.

About this time the problem of post-war student training began to loom on the horizon, and as you may remember there was a meeting in New York of delegates from the different Societies where the matter was discussed. During the autumn of 1946, with the aid of Drs. Pearson and Katz, a plan had been set up which was to serve as the nucleus for an analytic clinic. Patients were referred to this clinic and, if suitable, were put on a waiting list and allocated to students for supervised work with instructors. An autonomous committee subject to review by the Educational Committee was organized (cf. exhibits for establishment of "Supervisory Committee") and had begun to function. The members of this Committee were Drs. Katz, Pearson and myself. We now took over the work of interviewing, screening and selecting the students, hoping eventually to do some research on this subject. Later on the Supervisory Committee, or Advisory Committee as it came to be called, became the target of repeated criticism and it was stated on several occasions that authority had been stolen from the Educational Committee through trickery and deception and that the Committee was attempting, in a high-handed manner, to railroad measures through the Society by underhand means. I can only say that the exact opposite is more nearly the truth, and that measures which were brought up individually by Drs. Katz, Pearson and myself were obstructed again and again by the use of proxies and lobbies. The most outstanding example of this was the situation that transpired with Dr. Leon Saul. Dr. Saul had come to Philadelphia as a visitor in the fall of 1945, and at my suggestion had been invited to give a seminar to the students on dream interpretation, since I knew that he had given similar courses in Chicago and was interested in this phase of analysis. In a short time there were rumors that the students were confused, and that he was departing from the orthodox manner of dream interpretation. Also he had attended a private seminar of which I was a member where several of his views met with opposition. On November 26, 1945, I received a note from him that he was planning to start a training analysis with Dr. Earl Saze. I did not know at this time that he was intending to settle in Philadelphia and, understanding that he was still a member of the Chicago Institute, wrote him that the Philadelphia Institute could not take cognizance of this since he was not a member of our Society. In January, 1946, he made a formal application to become a member with the intention of being accepted as a training analyst. As his orientation in regard to analytic technique had become fairly well known by that time, and as many of us did not see eye to eye with some of the new innovations which were being introduced by Dr. Alexander, we decided that a uniform practice should be inaugurated of interviewing and examining any analyst who should wish to transfer from another group. Consequently, Dr. Saul was interviewed (April 30, 1946) by Drs. Katz, Waelder and myself. In spite of certain objections which were raised Dr. Saul was duly elected at the next meeting of the Society and constituted a training analyst. The incident aroused a great deal of antagonism on the part of Dr. Saul and Dr. English, and at the May meeting in Chicago, which most of us were unable to attend because of the railroad strike, there was considerable caucusing. As a result of this, at the June meeting of the Society the Educational Committee was suddenly and quite unexpectedly packed. Drs. Smith, Appel, Saul and Smeltz

were nominated by each other and elected, which included every full member of the Society. Drs. Smith and Appel were nominated on the basis of their being important and influential persons in the psychiatric world, since actually they do not practice analysis. They never attended any of the meetings of the Educational Committee except on one or two rare occasions when their votes were required. This also more or less holds true for Dr. Saul and to some extent for Dr. English.

From this time onward I might say that there has been continuous disagreement about most measures. There was a growing feeling on the part of Drs. Katz, Pearson and myself that the students were not being properly trained. There was no adequate means that could be devised by which qualifications could adequately be certified. One of the students of Dr. English, who had finished analysis, behaved publicly in a very indiscreet manner. E.K. was also known to socialize with her patients, to intercede with the relatives, and to give all kinds of advice. Judgment did not appear too good and it was considered that there was a depressive make-up. Her application to membership was rejected and further analysis was advised. This was undertaken with Dr. Saul who, after a relatively short period of further analysis, endorsed her as qualified. It was difficult to interfere since the particular person had spent years in training (since 1942). However, some of our misgivings seems subsequently to have been justified.

It was attempted several times to resolve the differences in technique by free and open discussion of clinical case material. These attempts, however, were either blocked or rendered futile. Dr. Katz, by way of introducing this endeavor, read a paper on September 18, 1947 (see exhibit). This, however, was not accepted. Further discussion were arranged but the matter was taken out of Dr. Pearson's hands and delegated to Dr. Brody who then scuttled the program and substituted a course of topics on original scientific issues which left the moot points unsettled.

During the last two years the problem of fees created another and more serious conflict. Since 1946 I have on several occasions proposed different plans which would lead to some kind of uniformity of practice in charging fees to students, both for personal and control analyses. The arguments in favor of this were roughly threefold: First, that owing to the economic bottle neck (few instructors and large number of applicants) it would be unfair to many students who were often willing to mortgage their future by borrowing; secondly, that it raised a spirit of envy and factionalism among the students, enhanced any latent tendencies toward sibling rivalry, and set poor standards for them to follow; thirdly, that there would be an inevitable pressure placed on the training analyst to take the part of his own student in case there was any question as to his qualification. The last of these arguments became painfully evident as time went on.

The question of fees came to a head in a somewhat dramatic manner. Lt. Colonel Gatto, who was a member of the Armed Services, started an analysis with Dr. Maeder on March 1, 1939. On April 12 Dr. Pearson, as Director of the Institute, received a letter from Headquarters, Second Army, which in essence ordered Dr. Gatto to stop his analysis if he were paying a higher fee than that allowed him by the Army, which was \$15 per hour. Dr. Gatto was paying \$10 additional out of his own pocket, making a total of \$25 an hour, which was the usual fee which Dr. Maeder was charging. At this juncture Dr. Maeder flatly stated that he would refuse to continue Dr. Gatto's analysis unless he should pay him the fee originally demanded (i.e., \$25 per hour). Dr. Gatto was a student who had received an 'A' rating by the Admissions Committee, which meant that he was one of the small number of candidates whom the Committee had fully endorsed and virtually promised an analysis. When he appealed to the Director of the Institute it was attempted to find him another analyst. I promised at that time to take him in analysis at the first opportunity available and postponed a prior engagement with another patient who was better able to wait. Shortly after this, however, in May, the

Second Army Command rescinded their previous order and wrote a letter permitting Dr. Gatto to continue with his analysis and supplement the fee allowed him from his private resources. On receiving notification of this new change of policy I had a second interview with Dr. Gatto and informed him of it. Dr. Gatto stated at that time that he was perfectly willing to be analyzed by Dr. Maeder but would prefer to be analyzed at the reduced fee of \$15 which we had agreed upon a few weeks before. I told him that I could not agree to this since another patient was waiting to be analyzed, and I thought he should continue with his analyst if the latter could find time to take him on. Dr. Maeder, however, refused to do this until it was definitely cleared with the Educational Committee, in which criticism of his actions had been expressed.

Meanwhile a committee was appointed to try to thrash out the matter of fees, including fees paid by men who were being analyzed for the Army or Navy. This Committee was composed of Drs. Katz and myself and Drs. Maeder and English, and also Dr. Smeltz, who was unable to attend (July 1939). No agreement could be arrived at. During the meeting Dr. Maeder stated that he had not refused to continue the student's analysis and had only done so because the Director of the Institute (Dr. Pearson) had advised him to do so. This statement was later repeated in a Society meeting and was denied by Dr. Pearson, who produced evidence to the contrary. Dr. Maeder at first refused to take Dr. Gatto back in analysis unless the Educational Committee would specifically instruct him to do so. Drs. Katz and I, however, refused to do this since it would make it appear like a whitewash, and instead we would only agree to a statement of permission.

In October, Dr. Pearson introduced a series of motions which attempted to place ceilings on fees for students' analyses, and also on the fees for supervised analyses. In general, the ceiling for student analyses was fixed at \$15 and the fee for a control analysis was to range between \$10 and \$15. This was voted down by a somewhat narrow margin.

Shortly after this it was accidentally discovered through the secretarial accounting of the V.A. money that many of the students who had been going to Drs. Saul, Maeder and English had only been averaging two, three or four times a week. This was contrary to the agreed rule which is printed in the Bulletin, that students in analysis must have a minimum of five hours a week. To cap the matter, several of Dr. Maeder's and Dr. English's students had written notes stating that they had had five hours a week.

At a meeting of the Educational Committee, which again had been packed for a second time, there were a series of motions passed which abrogated not only the Advisory Committee but all legislation which had been passed that had been introduced by any of the members of that Committee. This, incidentally, had the effect of abolishing the clinic and the entire system which had been set up of allocating low fee cases to the students.

It was at this point that Drs. Katz, Pearson and myself decided that we could no longer in decency to ourselves or in our responsibility to our students endorse what was being done. Many of the students themselves seemed bewildered at what appeared to be a diversity of techniques amounting almost to different schools of thought, whereas other students reflecting various rumors that arose, complained of the impositions of having to do too many controls, of having to accept patients at low fees because they were deemed more satisfactory for teaching purposes than other patients who could pay higher fees, but came to analysis because of current problems produced by character difficulties where any clear-cut symptomatology was lacking. One element in the student organization recently went so far as to request a meeting between the representatives of the student body and the Educational Committee, and petitioned among other things that the number of

controls be reduced, and that the selection of cases for such supervised work be left entirely within the discretion of each individual supervising analyst, which rather strongly suggests that factions were present, and that the men were beginning to take sides and align themselves in relation to different members of the faculty.

Matters were finally brought to a head by a declaration of differences in regard both to methods of teaching, and to methods of administration (question of fees). After much discussion, it was finally decided in a full Society meeting to appoint a committee of four, of which Dr. Waelder was to be a non-partisan chairman, which should attempt to create appropriate machinery by which the Society and Institute could operate in an analagous fashion to that of British Analytic Society containing two autonomous groups. The committee was composed of Doctors Maeder and English, on the one hand, and Dr. Katz and myself on the other. At the meeting, Doctors Maeder and English declined to make any initial proposals and Dr. English stated flatly that he would not be party to any such endeavor unless it was clearly understood and so stated, that such a plan should merely operate pro tem, and that the intention to separate from the old institute and form a new one at the first available opportunity should be explicitly set forth. In other words, we were forced into the position of insurgents instead of defenders and there was no other choice at this moment except to accept an ignominious withdrawal and, if we chose, try to argue the matter before the American and ask them to interfere in the local matters of an affiliate society. Rightly or wrongly after much consideration, we chose the former plan, and have acted accordingly.

I think this sketch covers the salient points, and it grieves me to set them forth on paper, since they appear to involve recriminations and washing of dirty linen. I am sending you in addition to this letter, certain exhibits which will tend to document the various things I have stated. However, if they should not prove adequate, I think I can assure you that there is much reserve material which could be adduced.

Thanking you again for your very kind assistance that you have given us, I am

Sincerely yours,

Sydney G. Biddle