Memorandum Pertaining to the Split, Based on Material Available in the Ernst Lewy Split File

Dictated by Albert Kandelin, M.D., May 15, 1962

This file is considerable in bulk, and is very interesting for its many pertinent documents, including correspondence, reports of committee meetings, and various memoranda.

The file extends from early 1949 to mid-1950, and of course spans the official public announcement of the split, which occurred on February 16, 1950.

The first item is dated January 5, 1949, and is a letter to Robert Knight, referring to tensions among the local members, and particularly to controversy on the issue of lay analysts. Reference is made by Doctor Lewy to tension dating back to the time of the society's organization, and the fact that Simmel made certain mistakes in judgement which led to subsequent difficulties.

Subsequently Doctor Lewy, as Chairman of the Education Committee, studied a plan which he later proposed with considerable vigor, as a possible solution to avoiding a split. This was based upon what he referred to as the London Plan. In the file is a report of the London Institute for the year ending June, 1947, which describes the alterations in their constitution to avoid a split. Briefly, a plan was devised whereby certain basic courses were common for all candidates, and then separate courses, especially in technique in child analysis, were given by each of the two dissident groups, one set of courses for the Anna Freud Group, and another set for Mrs. Klein's Group. Candidates elected one group or the other with which to be identified. Margarete Rubin wrote a letter from London, dated August 27, 1949, giving some of the details I refer to above.

Doctor Lewy corresponded with different people to get information about how controversial matters were handled by other groups. In a letter dated January 20, 1950, Doctor Katz, of Philadelphia, refers to the split which had occurred there. He enclosed a copy of a long and detailed letter from Doctor Biddle, in the nature of a detailed report to Doctor Edward Bibring, of Boston, about the Philadelphia situation, and the split. This letter by Doctor Biddle is excellent in its detail, and is five or six pages long, single-spaced, and it occurs to me in some ways serves as a model for reports on the split which we are concerned with here.

In considerable detail, Education Committee meetings of February 2, 1950 and February 13, 1950 are reported. At the first meeting Doctor Lewy

(continued)

proposed his favorite solution, namely, the London Plan, versus the split as had occurred in Philadelphia, to "avoid hardship to students". Essentially, he proposed organization of the two factions into two sub-committees, to operate in the manner of the London Institute, each sub-group to operate its own training program. Miller and Romm each felt this was not feasible, and expressed opinions favoring a definite split, which would result in organization of a second Institute.

In the meeting of February 13, 1950, discussion was directed to the details of how to form the second Institute. Many difficulties were encountered for training analysts' need to apply to the National organization; the matter was then referred to the Board on Professional Standards, and final approval would be voted by a mail vote of the membership at large.

To facilitate the formation of the second Institute, Doctor Norman Levy was appointed training analyst at this meeting, to bring the number of the dissident group up to the required four. Also at this meeting, Doctor Van der Heide was appointed training analyst. However, each of the two new appointees was without any power to vote until the new Institute was recognized.

Doctor Miller proposed the motion to form a second Institute, and this was carried, the members of the new group being Miller, Romm, and Grotjahn. The members of the Educational Committee of the existing Institute: Lewy, Brunswick, Deri, Greenson, and Tidd.

By a gentleman's agreement it was proposed to make the transitional period possible by maintaining the Educational Committee with its existing members and officers until a new Institute was officially recognized, but a separation into two Institutes would take place immediately de facto if not de jure.

A proposed statement to candidates reviewed some of the differences in opinion between the two groups. This was objected to by the withdrawing group, and a briefer and amended version was circulated by mail on February 16, 1950.

An interesting aftermath to this announcement was a candidates' meeting on March 3, 1950. At this meeting the old group presented a statement which was read summarizing the reasons for this split, and trying to describe the scientific differences, as well as mentioning the existence of emotional factors. At this meeting it is my recollection that Doctor Grotjahn spoke for the dissident or new group.

On May 11, 1950 Doctor Greenson prepared a memorandum addressed to Doctor Lewy, summarizing the situation as of that date. He stated that three members had applied to the Board of Professional Standards for

(continued)

recognition as a new Institute, and had been instructed to commence operation as a separate organization, but without official independent autonomy until they had been investigated and approved. Meanwhile, the official authority would continue with the Executive Committee of the Los Angeles Institute during the transitional period of organizing and obtaining official recognition by the new and separate Institute. The terms of the temporary operational agreement recognized the formation of a second Society, and a proposed second Institute. This proposal recognized the privilege of the new Society's members on the Educational Committee to appoint teachers and conduct courses, the aim being on the part of all to continue the undisturbed execution of the training program.

I have prepared this memorandum as a summary of the material in the split file supplied by Doctor Lewy, and feel that it might serve as a rough draft of a more complete and detailed version of this episode in the history of Los Angeles psychoanalysis. There is even more material to be gleaned from data in this file, but perhaps even more importantly, the story should include personal reminiscences from persons who were directly involved, such as the training analysts of the Educational Committee at that time.

Albert Kandelin, M.D.

AK/jh

To be inserted at bottom of p.2 of Dr.Kandelin's "Memorandum pertaining to the Split" :

The so-called old group declined to send a representative to this meeting because after due consideration they were convinced this would not be in the interest of the candidates.That it would hardly be possible with representatives of both groups present to remain objective and to avoid emotional controversies to judge from the nature of previous discussions.