

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

SPECIAL MEETING

February 13, 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.

Dr. Lewy stated this special meeting had been called for the purpose of discussing how to proceed with the split-up of the Institute in the most amiable way, so as not to jeopardize the status of the students. Dr. Lewy thought we should vote on the split first.

Miller: thinks vote on split up should be reserved until after the memo to candidates is discussed. Re Greenson's memo, from the standpoint of the candidates, the implication is that those who form another Institute belong to another school, are neo-Freudians; this is not going to help candidates but will only increase their difficulties. Further, to announce to them that hostilities are rife seems unwise ~~and from the standpoint~~. He has prepared a statement which ~~xxxx~~ he considers preferable.

Lewy: sees no expression about neo-Freudian school in Greenson's memo.

Miller: This is implied. He considers his group psychoanalysts.

Tidd: Greenson sent this around for everyone to see; if you consider this unacceptable, please let us have a copy of your statement, concerning the formation of ~~an~~ another psychoanalytic Institute.

Lewy: You feel that some aspersion is cast against one group in Greenson's statement.

Romm: Does not accept the controversial issues and this statement immediately stamps us as belonging to the Alexander group, by implication.

Miller: Let me state the situation briefly, as I think it exists and why this terminology is unacceptable to us. Not only for this group but a country-wide movement: those who feel that the more closely one adheres to Freud's theories and findings the better, another group who follow Freud's basic concepts very well but are stimulated to question many parts of his theories which he left controversial, even in the technique of therapy. Would remind you of Freud's own attitude in the original investigations, pointed ^{out} clearly

in many of his writings that psychoanalysis primarily was a research investigation, this occupied ~~his~~ the first years of his scientific endeavors, etc. I personally feel my attitude ~~is~~ scientifically is just as close to Freud as one can possibly get and do not feel it should be labeled as part of a school of thought.

Greenson: would agree that we delete all reference to Kardiner, French and Alexander. Also to strike all reference to suspicions and ~~hostile~~ hostility.

Lewy: Our group has been characterized as rigid. I do not question experiments, but want to teach first of all something which is commonly accepted as a body of scientifically accepted tenets and not jump at every so-called recent advance which to our minds does not represent any advance at all. I grant you the attitude to express doubts and wanting to find the answers in an experimental way -- both groups have that.

Tidd: If all are agreed to have a split first point is to get a statement to the candidates.

Lewy: Thinks Miller's heading is better because it is the formation of a second institute. Does not reflect on any individual.

Tidd: Would Dr. Miller object ~~to~~ to any student knowing these differences exist?

Miller: The candidate starting his training is in no position to decide for himself what is Freud's goal. ~~His~~ The average candidate relies very ~~hard~~ heavily on his analyst, his transference and only when he has reached an equilibrium can he begin to think for himself. I am thinking of the candidates primarily. Some senior candidates, for instance, are ready to think and begin to question hypotheses, to that group I would have no hesitation in discussing but would not use statement "I cannot get along" but would explain and encourage them to think for themselves. If a candidate would say to me, "I don't know but will know in a year or two," I would respect that. Extremely difficult for candidates and E.C. should agree on a platform.

Lewy: Controversies will have to be explained to candidates.

~~His~~ Greenson: My feeling is that Dr. Miller's statement is shorter. ~~Must~~ Must think of how ~~ju~~ junior candidates will react to each point. Would agree that a beginning candidate should not have all these details. What should they be told about libido statement? Amplifying smaller statement as befits the need of each candidate.

Romm: Why this second institute is being formed. ~~We~~ Do not say why this second institute is formed in reaction to the first institute.

Miller: Obviously no detailed statement printed, particularly in this fashion, ~~which is unsatisfactory~~ is going to be possible; will depend largely on the candidate — to try to condense this statement is avoiding the real issue. Why don't you explain your position scientifically and the new institute will do the same. Need not have the slightest feeling that I will resort to such expressions as suspicion and hostility. ~~This will have~~ The explanation to candidates will have to be done individually.

Greenson: Objects to "The E.C. announces a ~~new~~ tentative plan." Wouldn't want the candidates to feel it was ~~arbitrary~~ arbitrarily done.

Lewy: What about Greenson's first ~~page~~ paragraph? What will be the reaction on the part of the candidates? What are the differences? Especially what about those candidates who are not in analysis any more.

Romm: ~~Not another institute~~ Not a new institute ~~but~~ but "another" institute.

Miller: Those who wish to do so are free to question any training analyst.

Greenson: Make a general statement, ~~and in the same time that members are notified in a blank letter~~ ~~which is unhelpful~~ The rest should be left to the individual training analyst. Those who are no longer in analysis will have enough judgment to go to a training analyst for more information.

Grotjahn: Should this be sent now or attached when the separate ~~curriculum is made~~ curriculum is made.

Greenson: It should be discussed by Society.

Lewy: What objection is there to notifying candidates now?

Grotjahn: Isn't it possible that we have an unchanged next three months.

Brunswick: Thinks new plan wouldn't start before next September.

Romm: Thinks ~~we can~~ the second Institute can apply to the A.P.A. for recognition in May.

Grotjahn: If we sent such a letter now what does it mean, but if it is combined with a new schedule then we have a basis to discuss it.

Tidd: thinks this should be mailed right after Society meeting on Thursday.

Miller: Last paragraph. Won't be possible unless approved by APA. The only possible plan of procedure is to announce it formation in time to be acted on by the APA Council and Board on Professional Standards. If approved it must be voted on by mail by the membership at large and it will probably be December before it is finally decided.

Lewy: Think you can proceed under the auspices of the old Institute.

Miller: Continue until we get approval.

Lewy: Shall we sent statement now? First notify Society members.

Greenson: Want only to present it to the Society for information. And anyone who wishes to discuss it may do so.

Grotjahn: Shall we in sending it indicate the grouping?

Lewy: Should be grouped. Names to be typed.

Miller: Second point. Would like to propose that Norman Levy be appointed as a training analyst. Requirements are four training analysts, will have to have four if we are going to apply to APA.

Tidd: Isn't it true that when a new Institute applies for recognition that those persons who satisfy all the requirements can appoint such a person?

Greenson: Thinks we should first officially vote on a split.

Miller: Comments questions linked together so closely, officially must have four training analysts. Possible that three training analysts can constitute themselves another body and appoint one. For the purpose of facilitating this separation it seems to me that it's simpler and "nicer" and more official to do it in this way, if it's agreed to do it.

Lewy: Is the present EC going to be retained as such or from this point on will two ECs exist?

Greenson: ~~Thinks~~ If it would facilitate the formation of another institute would be in favor of Norman Levy, otherwise would vote against him to be a member of E.C.

Miller: This would in no way ~~interfere~~ interfere in the slightest with any subsequent appointments, but constitutes a tacit separation until it becomes formal. Suppose next week you wish to appoint X, that's agreeable with me. But we will have to agree that these people can't vote until the next election.

Greenson: Retain the status quo. For instance, postpone the elections until the official separation.

Lewy: ~~Kix~~ Kix thinks this EC will exist until probably December.

Greenson: Tacit understanding that all elections to this EC will ~~not~~ mean the new training analysts will have no vote.

Romm: These training analysts will not have a vote as members of the EC.

Greenson: One complication -- if Norman Levy appointed, will he be able to do training analysis. Can attend EC meetings but not vote on them.

Tidd: How about accepting new candidates for training?

Miller: We ~~cannot~~ can't do anything official until we are accredited by APA in December.

Brunswick: How many training analysts in Philadelphia withdrew to form a new institute? (The distribution was five and five).

Miller: In order to get recognition as an institute must have four training analysts. A new training analyst would accept candidates and do whatever else is required if he has the time. He can attend meetings but not vote until we get the official approval of the APA.

Romm: Why not postpone decision?

Greenson: Agree to vote for Norman Levy only to help this group out but otherwise would not vote for him.

Grotjahn: This would not apply to more than four on your side.

Lewy: No training analyst is a member of the EC until he is elected to it. We must know that we can appoint training analysts too.

Greenson: This question of helping out to form a new institute, could have repercussions on the people of our group. Our position too should be considered. This is

again a political business.

Tidd: Since this is the case and some of us would not vote for Norman Levy if there were not going to be a split wouldn't it be possible for the other group to elect another training analyst. Is there any objection to that?

Miller: No. I think my own assumption is that this is done.

Greenson: How would you feel if we said that we expect to appoint two new people when the separation is official?

Lewy: We assume that the APA will ~~accept~~ recognize the other institute, but if not then what do we have. We want to appoint two training analysts, Hanna Fenichel and Dr. Van der Heide.

Romm: Objects to Van der Heide, not to Hanna Fenichel.

Tidd: If we have all agreed there is to be a split let us vote on the split.

Greenson: moves we decide to form another training institute.....

Tidd: ~~motion~~ motion should come from Dr. Miller:

Miller: would be willing to make motion except he is impressed by the eagerness, etc.

Grotjahn: especially since the motion for a split came from Dr. Lewy.

Lewy: did not propose a split but proposed the London plan and a counter-proposition was made by Dr. Miller to split.

Grotjahn: says that the discussion of the splitting of the Institute started with the suggestion of Dr. Ernst Lewy to reorganize according to the London plan.

Miller: moves that another psychoanalytic institute be formed.

Greenson seconds the motion and it is carried unanimously.

Declaration who forms the other institute and who does not join it. Another institute: Grotjahn, Miller and Romm. The present institute: Brunswick, Deri, Greenson, Lewy and Tidd.

All agreed on a preliminary statement to Society members ~~and to candidates~~ and after that to send out statement to candidates. Procedure - to help them formulate letter to ABA.

Miller: Next item is to propose the appointment of Dr. Norman Levy to facilitate the formation of another psychoanalytic institute to be a recognized affiliate institute of the APA.

Lewy: would like to add "those whom we want to appoint"

Dr. Lewy's suggestion has nothing to do with Dr. Miller's proposal, it is decided.

Greenson: Future elections of the EC should be postponed until this proposal has been acted upon officially by the APA.

Miller: Thinks this hinders the formation of another institute. We would have to appoint ourselves the EC.

Brunswick: Re the first institute, the training analysts were ~~xxxxxx~~ Mrs. Deri, Dr. Lewy, ~~xxxxxx~~ Drs. Romm, Slutsky and Tidd. You have three training analysts and add one.

Lewy: Should find way to determine that Dr. Levy is a training analyst of the other institute. ~~xxx~~ Not sure what will happen in the APA if any objection is ~~raised~~ raised to recognition of the other institute, we'll be stuck. This should all be based on the premise that we have the right to keep this EC in office.

Greenson: What about each appointing one training analyst.

Lewy: No need to balance each other. Question of our needs. Not satisfied with just Hanna Fenichel. We need training analysts very badly.

Tidd: Why not elect Van der Heide along with Levy?

Miller: Objects to the election of three. ^{should continue} Lots of things to be discussed/ functioning as we have been. ~~Assuming~~ According to the constitution of the Institute a reelection of chairman ~~and~~ and members whose terms expire must be held. Suppose the three of us are not reappointed, we would have no voice in the remaining six months and if the APA did not pass on our application we are without any function whatever.

(The members of the E.C. whose terms expire in 1950 are Dr. Lewy, Chairman, and Drs. Miller and Romm).

Miller: The formation of another institute will require financial support. What about the institute funds.

Tidd: Willing to make a fair and equal division. There is a legal point, so that the Institute as such cannot transfer funds ~~except~~ to another non-profit organization.

Miller: We need to know amount, etc.

Tidd: Do you have suggestion as to what you think would be ~~fair~~ fair?

Miller: Would like to get half of the money.

Tidd: Would put it on the basis of 3/7, on the basis of the amount in the treasury when another institute has been officially recognized (approximately \$9,000. in the bank -- 3/7 is about \$3850.)

Greenson: Re Norman Levy. We felt that in order to safeguard ourselves we would like to propose Van der Heide.

Drs. Grotjahn, Miller and Romm feel this is a legitimate proposal. Question is raised whether Drs. Levy and Van der Heide if elected would have the power to vote at the re-election of the members whose terms expire.

Greenson: As a gentleman's agreement the present EC should continue in operation until the change is officially made.

Miller: What about the feelings of the two new people?

It is felt that during the transition the EC should continue as is.

Grotjahn: Shall this election be announced at the Society meeting on Thursday?

Dr. Miller moved that Dr. Norman Levy be appointed a training analyst, and ~~Dr. Tidd~~ this motion was carried. Dr. Tidd moved that Dr. Van der Heide be appointed a training analyst and this motion was carried.

Miller: raises question about the library.

Lewy: opposed to splitting up the Ernst Simmel Library.

Romm: suggests ~~paying the maintenance of the library~~ that 3/7 of the cost of the library be added to the ~~3/7~~ to the amount the other institute will receive.

Deri: points out that all students ~~and faculty~~ will be free to use either library.

Only the legal members of the Institute, the incorporators, are enabled to vote on institute policies; these members are Drs. Brunswick, Lewy, Romm and Tidd.

Lewy: Discussion of the report of By-Laws Committee which seems to be futile under the present circumstances. Agenda for Thursday Society meeting includes Anna

9
Freud's talk and necessity to change reservations. After that announcement is made, Dr. Tidd will call for the report of the EC.

Greenson: Oral examination. What about new members to the Society.

Deri: The constitution calls for an oral examination.

~~Deri:~~ *Miller:* It is to be expected that there will be a split in the Society.

Tidd: suggests that the statement to the candidates be typed the first thing on Tuesday, that it should be read to Doctors Greenson and Miller on the telephone for their o.k., reported to the Society on Thursday and mailed just after the Society meeting.

Greenson: What about new members to the Society?

Miller: Much more important whether they are to be members in the APA.

Tidd: Can recommend them for membership in the APA before membership in the local society.

Greenson: Thinks this should be discussed too.

Romm: We want to become another institute because we do not want to be a society without an institute.

Miller: Both are affiliates of the American Psychoanalytic Association.

Greenson: No confusion if application for institute is accompanied by application for affiliate society.