MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION COMMITTEE

March 25, 1968

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Dr. Mandel, at the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society/Institute on Monday, March 25, 1968, at 8:00 p.m. Members present were Drs. Dorn, Sarlin, Beckwitt, Edelman, Motto, Malin, Mandel, and Grotstein.

The minutes of January 16 were discussed, and Dr. Dorn requested the following addition on page 1, line 45: "On Thursday, October 12, 1967, the Board of Directors of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society/Institute discussed a proposal I made and passed the following resolution: '.... that the CEC and the CAC be encouraged, as they see fit, to meet jointly or in liason with the equivalent committee of the other Institute with the aim of joining forces to pursue ideas.'" He also wishes line 49 and 50, which constitutes Dr. Mandel's response to his inquiry to be addended as follows: Dr. Dorn asks, "No. 1 - do we have a desire to meet with our counterparts (jointly or in liason), yes or no? No. 2 - if yes, how and when? No. 3 - if the answer is no, do we not have an obligation to so state to the Board of Directors?" The minutes were accepted with the amendments.

Dr. Mandel asked Dr. Grotstein to give a report on his meeting with Dr. Bronstein about the future of the special seminar. Dr. Grotstein replied that he had met with Dr. Bronstein and had submitted a written report to Dr. Mandel, the upshot of which was that the seminar had run into many snags and difficulties in its trial run, such as lack of directed purpose, choice of participants, direction towards sensitivity training or group therapy, and the attrition of Dr. Bronstein's position in the group by virtue of the guest lecturers. Dr. Grotstein went on to say that he and Dr. Bronstein were in agreement that the seminar should continue but with a more careful selection of participants, perhaps people with a unified background who could discuss things such as creativity, for instance, and also they both felt that round-table discussions could be held on a broader scale with people from many disciplines speaking on a panel. Dr. Sarlin stated that seminars such as these could best be handled by devoting ourselves to cleaning up the misconceptions that lay people have about psychoanalysis. He encouraged us to seek ways in which we could effectively implement the proper dissemination of psychoanalytic views. He felt that Dr. Bronstein's group was not a total failure. Dr. Mandel then asked the committee whether or not we should pursue this project. He emphasized that, should it be continued, there would have to be a more specific form in its makeup. He then asked whether or not we should delay it for this year and start it again next year after we canvass members of the Society who might be interested in such a project, especially those with special interest. Dr. Malin stated that he felt that Drs. Bronstein and Grotstein should come in with a definitive proposal, and he reinforced Dr. Mandel's idea about

9

0

1 2

recruiting members of our own group with special interests. He also felt that the Post-Graduate Committee should be contacted.

Dr. Grotstein then replied that such a special interest seminar would be fruitful only if it eventuated in a paper or research project.

Dr. Sarlin then stated that there was a lot to be accomplished by getting together with local people in the field of anthropology and sociology.

Dr. Mandel then stated that he had taken some of the ideas of the last CEC meeting to the point of an establishment of a CEC Faculty to the meeting of the Board of Directors. He stated that they reinforced his proposal and suggested that the Community Activities Committee should publicize to the academic community the availability of analysts for consultation in their fields in an effort to promote an exchange of ideas.

Dr. Dorn then suggested the concept of an inter-disciplinary study group where people, from the full-time Faculty of the universities, could take some time off and affiliate more actively with the Institute. He felt that this project could be supported by N.I.M.H. funds. He also discussed his collaboration, along with other analysts in our Society, with people at the Rand Corporation on projects in the field of psycho-biography.

Dr. Motto emphasized that we cannot approach these lay people as experts. Our approach to them must be from the point of interchange.

Dr. Malin then stated that we need a different format for our projects with the lay community, but he felt this was not our function, but rather the function of the CAC and the Post-Graduate Education Committee.

Dr. Dorn then stated that we have much to offer interested lay people in terms of how to approach interviews, how to understand patients, etc. Dr. Motto then replied that if a member of the Institute is invited privately to take part in one of these discussions with the lay group, he should make it known to the Institute formally for their information. Dr. Dorn replied that he was waiting for an opportunity to introduce the people from the behavioral sciences with whom he has been collaborating to meet with our committee with the idea in mind of establishing a definite curriculum of courses for them.

Dr. Mandel then replied that we should have a meeting with them and invite some of these people to discuss their ideas with us.

Dr. Sarlin also suggested local authors who have a wide

knowledge and interest in psychoanalysis should also be contacted.

Dr. Mandel then recounted his experiences with fascinating people in brain research at U.C.L.A. who have newer concepts of learning which have many applications to psychoanalysis.

Dr. Dorn then commented on the lack of integration and coordination in the police program, commenting to the point that so many psychiatrists and analysts seem to be involved who do not know about the work of other colleagues in this program.

Dr. Mandel stated that he has discussed this matter with Mr. Fisk, the Assistant Chief of Police, and stated that the project is only in the pilot stage. Dr. Mandel then asked Dr. Beckwitt about the program for candidates' wives.

Dr. Beckwitt replied that several meetings have been held where members of our Society addressed the candidates wives at the Institute. He felt that the meetings were quite successful. Dr. Lawrence Friedman will be the next speaker, and following that, there will be a panel discussion in May.

Dr. Mandel then asked Dr. Grotstein about the status of the residency course.

Dr. Grotstein stated that as of this date, 34 residents from the various residencies have signed up for the course. (As of the dictation of these notes, there are 42 signed up.) The course will consist of a series of six lectures, discussions, and seminars on case material. Drs. Greenson, Atkins, and Malin will be guest lecturers. Dr. Rangell was invited, but was unable to attend because of other time commitments.

Dr. Dorn then brought up for discussion the addendum to the minutes he made at the beginning of this meeting.

Dr. Sarlin stated that any discussion about liason with the other Society should be taken up by the Board of Directors before we can act on it.

Dr. Mandel agreed with Dr. Sarlin's comments and went on to state that our committee is too involved already with our own business to tackle liason just at this time. However, there were projects afoot that involved collaboration with them, such as the training faculty for the San Diego Institute, following the suggestion of the American.

Dr. Dorn stated that the Board of Directors has encouraged our investigating a joint function where such can take place, for instance, as in the work with the police.

Dr. Malin stated his agreement with Dr. Dorn and also wondered

)

if we could not collaborate with them in courses for social workers.

Dr. Mandel said that he had no objection, but he felt that there should be a liason committee which should first decide on some of these issues beforehand.

Dr. Dorn asked to what effect this would be and what would they conclude.

Dr. Mandel stated that he felt it would be better if there were simultaneous agreement at a higher level than that of this committee. For instance, we do not have the permission of their Board.

Dr. Malin stated that we have an obligation to deal with these people.

Dr. Grotstein stated that the idea of cooperation and collaboration with the other Institute, even though desirable and progressive, comes possibly at a very great risk, which we have not yet fully discussed or realized. He felt, for instance, that the ideas about psychoanalytic practice and theory held by members of the other Society are so different in some cases from our own that we may possibly jeopardize ourselves in such a naive, sophomoric, well-intentioned attempts.

Dr. Motto then stated that we should ask Dr. Pomer, the President of the other Society, to designate a representative from their Extension Division to speak with us, so that we can discuss joint problems.

Dr. Sarlin affirmed Dr. Grotstein's position and stated that we don't know what we want to do. Maybe it would be better, he stated, to postpone and consider this problem at greater length. He went on to say that there are so many sub-groups within each Society, and there are so many considerations to be taken up. He stated that we should first have our own programs working smoothly before we undertake liason.

Dr. Beckwitt registered a personal reaction to the negative about the idea of collaboration because of the components of the other group.

Dr. Dorn then replied that would it not be possible to explore areas where we could collaborate.

Dr. Motto then asked if we could not discuss the idea of mutual problems and organization, not programs.

Dr. Sarlin again warned that we do not know how we would be received there and cautioned that we should be very careful.

Dr. Motto replied that we could handle these matters through specific questions, such as the enrollment of their social worker course, the evaluation and outcome of their work with them, what are the qualifications for the Faculty, etc.

Dr. Mandel stated that he had appointed a committee consisting of Drs. Edelman, Motto, and himself to contact Dr. Comess, the head of the Extension Division of their Society, to invite him and others to join with us in the discussion of joint problems.

Dr. Dorn then made mention of Mr. Alan Sieroty, a State Assemblyman, who had contacted him about legislation for a project on family life and sex education. Dr. Dorn felt that perhaps we should all offer ourselves for consultative help.

Dr. Mandel reinforced Dr. Dorn's suggestion and asked for volunteers or suggestions who in the Society would be best qualified to handle this.

Dr. Dorn stated that he raised the issue to point out the need for a political action committee but also was trying to point out the need for courses at the Institute for interested laymen who could be instrumental in such a program. He went on to state that he would like to see the Los Angeles Psychomanalytic Institute as a mecca for these people. This can only happen, in his opinion, when there is a school for them.

Dr. Malin then commented on how amazed he was at how little psychoanalysis was involved in sex education. Psychiatrists and psychologists usually take over this field.

Dr. Motto then requested to be dropped from the special ad-hoc committee on social workers because of possible prejudice emanating from considerations of the Reiss-Davis Clinic.

Dr. Mandel accepted his resignation and suggested that we reform a new sub-committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

James S. Grotstein, M.D.

JSG/ajb