

RE GENTLEMAN'S AGREEMENT

Excerpts from the February 2, 1950 EC Meeting:

Dr. Lewy stated that the work of the EC has been seriously hampered because of scientific differences; he felt that it would be unfair to the students if there were a complete split-up and suggested that if everyone were willing to cooperate it might be possible to avoid this; he suggested that the best practical solution would be to attempt something similar to the way the differences have been solved at the London Institute, and explained the groupings and the organization of the London Institute. If the L.A. Institute followed a similar plan, there would be two sub-committees consisting of those who agreed on certain points and felt they could work successfully together. The EC would be retained as the Executive Committee of the Institute and would select training analysts, etc. The students would be informed about the differences and make their choice; those candidates in analysis would be fixed, at least temporarily.

Dr. Miller felt it was most important to avoid jeopardizing the students' credentials, plans and careers, and that in his opinion the only solution was a complete split. He went on to say that even with two sub-groups conducting their own training program, the EC would still appoint training analysts and this would again make for differences of opinion. Dr. Romm felt that with one institute with this type of division there would be even greater confusion among the candidates, but if there were two separate institutes, relations could be most amicable. Dr. Lewy felt it was important to attempt a re-organization rather than a split, in the interest of the candidates. Dr. Tidd suggested it might be possible to alleviate some of the difficulties by re-arranging the administrative set-up.

Dr. Miller suggested that during the transition phase students should continue to receive diplomas from the present institute and upon graduation could choose which Institute they wished to belong to. Dr. Lewy said that in London some seminars were attended by students of both groups.

Re the procedure Dr. Miller said that all that was necessary was to have a sufficient number of people who met the APA requirements for the organization of an Institute; Dr. Miller said it was necessary to have four qualified training analysts. A split was agreed upon and question was raised about how to effect this without jeopardizing the students' credentials. Dr. Lewy mentioned that in Philadelphia the group which split was technically still connected with the old institute until they receive recognition of the APA. Dr. Brunswick said that would mean the split would be de facto but not de jure.

Excerpts from the February 13, 1950 EC Meeting:

Much discussion about statement to the candidates; final decision to send the attached statement and to explain to individual candidates the reasons for the split; the candidates no longer in analysis are free to question any training analyst.

Another institute must apply to the APA for recognition, must be acted on by the Board on Professional Standards and if approved must be voted on by mail by the membership at large so that it will probably be December before it is finally decided.

An institute must have four training analysts and in order to facilitate application Dr. Miller proposes that Dr. Norman Levy be appointed a training analyst; the group consisting of Dr. Brunswick, Mrs. Deri, and Drs. Greenson, Lewy and Tidd felt they would vote for Dr. Levy only in order to help the other group out, but not otherwise, that this would be a conditional appointment.

Dr. Van der Heide was appointed training analysts by the present institute group (Brunswick, Deri, Greenson, Lewy and Tidd); and Dr. Norman Levy was appointed by the second Institute (Grotjahn, Miller and Romm).

RE GENTLEMAN'S AGREEMENT

Excerpts from the February 2, 1950 EC Meeting:

Dr. Lewy stated that the work of the EC has been seriously hampered because of scientific differences; he felt that it would be unfair to the students if there were a complete split-up and suggested that if everyone were willing to cooperate it might be possible to avoid this; he suggested that the best practical solution would be to attempt something similar to the way the differences have been solved at the London Institute, and explained the groupings and the organization of the London Institute. If the L.A. Institute followed a similar plan, there would be two sub-committees consisting of those who agreed on certain points and felt they could work successfully together. The EC would be retained as the Executive Committee of the Institute and would select training analysts, etc. The students would be informed about the differences and make their choice; those candidates in analysis would be fixed, at least temporarily.

Dr. Miller felt it was most important to avoid jeopardizing the students' credentials, plans and careers, and that in his opinion the only solution was a complete split-up. He went on to say that even with two sub-groups conducting their own training program, the EC would still appoint training analysts and this would again make for differences of opinion. Dr. Romm felt that with one institute with this type of division there would be even greater confusion among the candidates, but if there were two separate institutes, the relations could be most amicable. Dr. Lewy felt it was important to attempt a re-organization rather than a split, in the interest of the candidates. Dr. Tidd suggested it might be possible to alleviate some of the difficulties by re-arranging the administrative set-up.

Dr. Miller suggested that during the transition phase students should continue to receive diplomas from the present institute and upon graduation could choose which Institute they wished to belong to. Dr. Lewy said that in London some seminars were attended by students of both groups.

Re the procedure Dr. Miller said that all that was necessary was to have a sufficient number of people who met the APA requirements for the organization of an Institute; Dr. Lewy said it was necessary to have four qualified training analysts. A split was agreed upon and question was raised about how to effect this without jeopardizing the students' credits; Dr. Lewy mentioned that in Philadelphia the group which split was technically still connected with the old institute until they receive recognition of the APA. Dr. Brunswick said this would mean the split would be de facto but not de jure.

Excerpts from the February 13, 1950 EC Meeting:

Much discussion about statement to the candidates; final decision to send the attached statement and to explain to individual candidates the reasons for the split; those candidates no longer in analysis are free to question any training analyst.

Another institute must apply to the APA for recognition, must be acted on by the Board on Professional Standards and if approved must be voted on by mail by the membership at large so that it will probably be December before it is finally decided.

An institute must have four training analysts and in order to facilitate application Dr. Miller proposes that Dr. Norman Levy be appointed a training analyst; the group consisting of Dr. Brunswick, Mrs. Deri, and Drs. Greenson, Lewy and Tidd felt they would vote for Dr. Levy only in order to help the other group out, but not otherwise, that this would be a conditional appointment.

Dr. Van der Heide was appointed training analysts by the present institute group (Brunswick, Deri, Greenson, Lewy and Tidd); and Dr. Norman Levy was appointed by the second Institute (Grotjahn, Miller and Romm).

There was much discussion about the appointments of these training analysts and Dr. Lewy said a way should be found to determine that Dr. Levy is a training analyst of the other institute, inasmuch as we are not sure what will happen if the APA raises objection to recognition of the other institute. The election of Norman Levy should be based on the premise that we have the right to keep the present EC in office. Dr. Miller stated that this election would in no way interfere with any subsequent appointments, but constitutes a tacit separation until it becomes formal, that we would have to agree that Drs. Van der Heide and Norman Levy could not vote until the next election. A new training analyst would not necessarily be a member of the EC and unless he were elected to the EC he could attend meeting but not have a vote.

Question was raised whether Drs. Levy and Van der Heide if elected would have the power to vote at the re-election of the EC members whose terms expire (Dr. Lewy, Drs. Miller and Romm) and Dr. Greenson felt that as a gentleman's agreement the present EC should continue in operation until official recognition of the new Institute is made by the APA.

Dr. Miller moved that another psychoanalytic institute be formed, Dr. Greenson seconded the motion and it was carried unanimously. Declaration was made as to who forms the second institute and who does not join it: Another institute: Grotjahn, Miller and Romm; the present institute: Brunswick, Deri, Greenson, Lewy and Tidd.

Dr. Miller asked about the institute funds; Dr. Tidd said his group was willing to make a fair and equal division, legally the Institute as such cannot transfer funds except to another non-profit organization. Dr. Tidd would put division of the funds on the basis of $3/7$ of the amount in the treasury when another institute has been officially recognized.

Dr. Miller then asked about the library and Dr. Romm suggested adding $3/7$ of the cost of the library to the amount the other institute will receive. Mrs. Deri pointed out that all students were free to use either library.

Dr. Brunswick reminded the members that only the legal members of the Institute, the incorporators were enabled to vote on institute policies; these members were Drs. Brunswick, Lewy, Romm and Tidd.

Draft of the Gentlemen's Agreement of Feb. 2nd and Feb. 13th, 1950
between the two groups in the Education Committee of the Los Angeles
Institute for Psychoanalysis.

- (1) At the regular meeting of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Institute, the unanimous decision was made, after considerable discussion, to follow the proposal of Dr. Miller and Dr. Romm to establish another psychoanalytic institute in L. A. In order to do this, the three members of the Education Committee, Dr. Milton Miller, Dr. Martin Grotjahn and Dr. Romm will resign from the Los Angeles Institute for Psychoanalysis and apply to the proper authorities for the authorization to found another psychoanalytic institute in Los Angeles.
- (2) It was agreed that this should be effected in an amicable way.
- (3) In order to preserve the continuity of the training of the students and to protect their rights and privileges, it was agreed that until the other ~~(new)~~ institute is recognized by the proper authorities the three withdrawing members officially remain members of the present Institute. The sense of this particular agreement was that a separation into two institutes now takes place de facto, if not de jure; and each of the two groups is free to develop its own curriculum and appoint its own lecturers.
- (4) Until the other ~~(new)~~ institute will be established, the students now in training will continue to receive endorsement and diplomas from the present Institute. Upon recognition and establishment of the other ~~(new)~~ Institute, any student may choose which Institute he will join.
- (5) For the purpose of enabling the dissenting group to have the four training analysts required by the American Psa. Assn., for the establishment of new institutes, Dr. Norman Levy was appointed a training analyst, with the understanding that he accept candidates for the new institute only.

(6) Dr. Carel Van der Heide was appointed a training analyst of the present Institute.

(7) It was agreed that the present Education Committee continue to meet until official recognition of the other Institute was made by the American Psa. Assn.

(8) It was agreed that no elections should be held and no changes made as to membership and offices held in the present Education Committee until the other Institute will be officially established.

(9) It was agreed that the other Institute receive $3/7$ of the amount of the treasury of the present Institute when the other Institute receives official recognition by the American Psa. Assn.

(10) It was agreed that $3/7$ of the cost of the library of the present Institute be added to the amount the other Institute will receive upon its official recognition by the American Psa. Assn.