LOS ANGELES INSTITUTE FOR PSYCHOANALYSIS
Annual Board of Trustees/Membership Meeting

Time: Thursday, June 9, 1966, 7:30 p.m.

Place: 344 North Bedford Drive, Beverly Hills

Minutes of the Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m. by the Director of the Institute, Dr. Jack Vatz, at the direction of the President. Forty-seven members attended.

1. Minutes of the Meeting of March 10, 1966:

The minutes of the meeting of March 10, 1966, were accepted as distributed.

2. Report of the Treasurer - Fiscal Year, June 1, 1965, to May 31, 1966:

Dr. Pastron's report is on file in the Institute office. He noted that the sum for the Christmas Party covered the last three years.

3. Report of Divisions:

a. Psychoanalytic Clinic - Dr. Ourieff:

Dr. Ourieff's report is on file. The Psychoanalytic Clinic was active this year although it was inactive financially so far as the Institute was concerned. As detailed in the report, the number of applicants processed compares favorably with past years and a substantial number of patients are presently in treatment. There are 21 accepted applicants on the waiting list, and the potentiality of the Clinic is great. There are many problems and changes which will warrent detailed consideration in the next year and probable decisions by the members.

b. Training School - Dr. Lihn:

Dr. Lihn's report has been distributed to the membership and is on file.

c. Extension Division - Dr. Rollman-Branch:

Dr. Rollman-Branch's report has been distributed to the membership and is on file. Dr. Rollman-Branch offered her thanks to all the members who have helped to foster and develop the programs of the Extension Division. She took special note that Dr. Walsh had established a firm foundation by instituting an active and broad program prior to the time she became Director. Particular thanks were also offered Dr. Malin for his work with the social workers' program which was most successful.

d. Research Division - Dr. Goldberg:

The Research Division has been very inactive this past year for several reasons. The Research Advisory Committee has been approached by very few members requesting assistance in the past several years, and this probably reflects the limited numbers involved in research and the lack of need for assistance of those doing so. If the Committee is to truly catalyze research, it would mean the Committee being actively involved in doing research itself; and apparently at this time few individuals are prepared to so commit themselves. The following suggestions were offered:

1) Reconsideration of whether there should be a Research Division or will it exist in name only.

2) Consideration of what would be needed to activate such a Division if this were so desired. Dr. Goldberg felt that this would probably not be accomplished entirely among ourselves, but rather would involve the introduction of one or more persons actively involved in research who would give time and stimulus to research by others.

To a question from Dr. Leavitt, Dr. Goldberg noted that one year ago a proposal for engaging such a research individual had been informally presented to the Professional Committee but no further action was authorized. Dr. Futterman inquired regarding research candidates who had been accepted, and Dr. Vatz replied that individuals in the field of political science and history had been accepted. Dr. Rangell offered some comments regarding the problem of research, questioning why it is that we have the greatest research tool available to the behavioral sciences, and yet there is a lack of dynamic application of this research instrument. We must seriously reflect upon this situation and try to identify the problems. He questioned whether it is necessary to bring in outside persons or those in related fields to solve this problem without, however, gainsaying their contributions. He indicated the various studies on the subject currently pursued by The American and hoped that with the resolution of some of the more general problems there would be a revitalization of research activity locally.

4. Report of Committees:

a. Finance - Dr. Pastron:

See report on file.

Motion: Dr. Fenichel moved, s/Dr. Crutcher, m/c, that the budget for the year 1966 - 1967 be accepted.

Motion: Dr. Evans moved, s/ Dr. Rangell, m/c, to appropriate $3,000 for the library index and $300 yearly for a maintenance index.

Motion: Dr. Van der Heide moved, s/ Dr. Rangell, m/c, that the membership approve the salary increase of $50 a month for the Administrative Assistant.

b. Library - Dr. Barnard:

See report on file.

c. Housing Committee - Dr. Pastron:

See report on file.

d. Joint Committee on Mutual Problems - Dr. Leavitt:

A portion of the By-Laws proposed by the Committee pertaining to the Training School and its functions was submitted to the Board of Trustees. Dr. Leavitt abstracted the principal provisions of these By-Laws, presenting a brief summary. The remainder of the By-Laws, pertaining to the over-all organization should be completed and available by August.

Motion: Dr. Crutcher moved, s/ Dr. Pastron, m/c, that these proposed By-Laws be distributed to the membership for their study.

5. Report of the Director - Dr. Vatz:

See report on file.

6. Vote on Proposed By-Laws Changes - (by Trustees):

Dr. Vatz presented the following proposal from the Education Committee, to implement which a motion was proposed amending the By-Laws in concordance with paragraphs 5 and 6.

Any member of the Institute who desires to become a training analyst may apply and become one upon meeting the following requirements:

1. Graduated at least five years.

2. Teaching experience is preferable but not required.

3. Member of The American Psychoanalytic Association.

4. Applicant to be required to present a case currently undergoing analysis by him before a committee comprised of two to four training analysts plus a like number of faculty members selected by the Chairmen of the Education Committee and the Faculty Committee. Within three months this committee will make its report and recommendations to the Education Committee.

5. Ratification would be by a 2/3 majority of training analysts eligible to vote and by a 2/3 majority of the full instructors, by mail ballot, mailed simultaneously to training analysts and senior instructors.

6. The original appointment is for five years and re-election every five years would be by a majority vote of training analysts and a majority of the full instructors.

7. After the Education Committee arrives at an intention to appoint as a training analyst someone who does not meet all the above-listed requirements, then the Education Committee must present this application to the Board on Professional Standards for its approval.

In response to a request from Dr. Walsh, Dr. Vatz ruled that discussion would be open to all the members although action must be taken by the Trustees only and also ruled on the appropriateness of the matter on the agenda. Dr. Rangell noted that an additional By-Laws proposal to provide that the Director need not be a training analyst had also been recommended by the Education Committee, and that this should be placed on the agenda together with the present matter. It was agreed that this matter would be taken up later in the meeting.

Several members questioned the appropriateness of this present proposal for By-Laws change and felt that since it was such an important matter and bore so directly upon the report of the Joint Committee, the Trustees should not immediately take action. Dr. Leavitt offered the following comments on this proposed By-Laws change:

"We can all understand and concur in the need and desire, expressed in the action of the Education Committee and in this By-Laws proposal, to increase the number of training analysts and broaden the basis of selection and election, so as to enable the Training School and the Education Committee to function effectively and to enable the Faculty to participate in some larger measure in the administration of the School. That changes are needed and long over-due has been obvious for some time, for it is two years since the Committee on Institutes recommended even such interim measures. I am profoundly aware that to raise any questions therefore about this proposal, is likely to be understood and categorized as quixotic, regressive, obstructionist or worse. This is all the

more reason why the questions must be raised and discussed openly and respectfully, so that differing viewpoints may be clarified, honored and, hopefully, reconciled. I see developing here another instance where circumstances, including communications problems, are leading to unwanted and unnecessary polarizations.

This proposal, while seeking to fulfill the laudable aims noted above, falls far short of achieving them I fear. Perhaps caused in part by the exigencies of the constant need to make the School function, a too narrow conceptualization reduces this effort to a gesture, which alters form but leaves substance unchanged. As I see it, the proposed change essentially embodies these points:

1. Selection of train analysts by a committee of training analysts and faculty,

2. Ratification of appointment to training analyst status by a 2/3 vote of the Education Committee rather than the present 3/4,

3. Simultaneous ratification of appointment by the senior faculty, and

4. The term of appointment for five years rather than three as at present.

The second and fourth points require By-Laws change at this time.

Regarding point 1., selection, this is a significant first step toward giving the faculty some voice in selecting training analysts, but it does not otherwise enhance their participation in the School and the choice of such selection committee rests entirely with the Education Committee. Regarding point 2., the change from 3/4 to 2/3, we must assume that this is proposed so as to require less unanimity and because of past difficulty in obtaining the 3/4 vote so as to appoint new training analysts. If this is indeed so, such difficulty reflects something of the underlying inadequacy in the whole of the present arrangement and the weakness of the proposed change. The presently required affirmative vote of 3/4 is 11 votes, the proposed 2/3 is 10. This implies the hope that the Education Committee, having for several years not appointed training analysts, will now through the change of just one vote, be enabled to remedy this problem with all its consequent difficulties.

Point 3, ratification of appointment by the faculty, is also a step in the right direction, in that it affords the faculty a voice and a veto, but still the essential matter of selection remains with the Education Committee, which continues to control the School and selection of its faculty and training analysts. The purpose of point 4, the five year term, is unclear, but I must assume it reflects the effort toward trusting to the administrative selection

processes and reducing the heirarchical differentiations even within the Education Committee itself.

The point is that none of these By-Laws changes are really necessary in themselves, and never have been, in order to attain the indicated purposes. If it has indeed been the desire and the capacity of the Education Committee to work harmoniously and effectively together, all the appointments which might be made under these changes could easily have been made, and even including participation by the faculty, in the past years. And if this is not the tenor of their unified desire and capacity, no matter how individually devoted each may be to such purpose, a proposal really involving a change of just one vote, even with the confirming power of the faculty, will hardly remedy the situation.

Despite these reservations I have noted above, these proposals should still have been eagerly and gratefully received and supported, at least as an earnest of constructive change, had they come in prior years. But at this time as badly as the Education Committee has needed such change in order to function and to restore the convictions and support of the faculty and membership, these proposals cannot be considered separately from basic, broad reorganization proposals presented to the Board of Trustees at this meeting by the Joint Committee. These two By-Laws proposals are too limited in conception and function, I feel, and can only be meaningfully dealt with in the broader framework of a complete By-Laws revision reflecting considered philosophical, educational, organizational and administrative constructs such as is in the reorganization plan. The proposals in the present motion may be the best, but if so should then be incorporated in a broader plan, either the one before you now or such as is your pleasure. This motion has some of the superficial mechanical elements of the Joint Committee plan, but does not at all come to grips with the basic problems, such as are attacked in the basic reorientation of the latter plan. Rather, the present motion retains essentially the same autonomous, conflictual and at times ineffectual present structure of the Education Committee and the impotent, disenfranchised roles of the faculty and institute membership. To the claims of urgency, two responses can be made; first the reorganization plan for the Training School is not a sometime thing; rather it is a present reality before you now for consideration and action. Secondly, since training analysts once appointed still do not vote until one year after appointment, a reorganization plan can be adopted and placed in effect a year before any effective change in the Education Committee made possible by this motion can occur.

Accordingly, I suggest this proposal not be effected immediately, but rather that it be included in the consideration of reorganization, where if deemed appropriate, it may come to have meaning and effect."

Dr. Lihn reported on the reactions of both the Education Committee and the Committee on Institutes to the present proposals for the reorganization of the Training School made by the Joint Committee. The majority of the Education Committee has many questions about these proposals. Dr. Astley and Dr. Keiser of the Committee on Institutes also raised many questions during discussion of it with Drs. Lihn and Van der Heide at the May meetings and indicated where further work needed to be done. They too felt that while the Joint Committee continued its work the Education Committee should carry on its functions and continue reorganization along the lines recommended by the Committee on Institutes.

The Education Committee recently passed by a two-thirds majority new proposals for qualifying training analysts. These proposals require By-Laws changes and therefore the approval of the Board of Trustees. The adoption of these proposals is felt to be appropriate and even urgent. Changes such as these, made now, need not interfere with the work of the Joint Committee on the total plan.

Dr. Van der Heide stated that Dr. Leavitt's survey covered his objections and also questioned why this proposal must come up now. Dr. Van der Heide regretfully expressed his disagreement with Dr. Lihn's review of the discussion with Drs. Astley and Keiser, indicating that Dr. Astley had received the report late and that it was a preliminary report. The Board on Professional Standards expressed satisfaction not specifically with the work of the Education Committee but rather of the Institute. Dr. Leavitt discussed his meeting with Drs. Astley and Keiser and reported that they were generally approving of the changes, but had certain substantial questions as to over-democratization and impermanence of committees with consequent loss of administrative effectiveness and some uncertainty about the plan which was not altogether clear to them particularly in regard to the proposed autonomy of the School, which they mistakenly understood to be placed directly under the control of the general membership. Mr. Freeman indicated that he would prefer not to see this motion brought to action and felt certain that if it were brought to a vote, it would be defeated. Rather than see that happen he would prefer that it be considered together with the Joint Committee proposals. This matter is not an emergency although the matter of the Director may be.

<u>Motion</u>: Mr. Freeman moved, s/Mr. Licht, that the motion to act on the Education Committee proposal be continued to the next regular meeting.

Dr. Goldberg spoke to this new motion urging it be defeated. There are undue fears that the work of the Joint Committee would be threatened. The Committee has been working for two years, and we do not yet know if their work will be put into effect for some time. Meanwhile the Joint Committee is preventing needed changes from being effected.

Dr. Vatz ruled that further discussion be limited to the Trustees. He stated that he would like to see the By-Laws changed as suggested, the vote for which in the Education Committee was 10 to 2. While the proposals are not perfect, the Education Committee should not be hampered by not permitting it to make what changes can be made. Others can be made later. If this is not effected now, the chance of new training-analyst appointments will be nil; this proposal does remedy the situtation to a considerable extent, and it is important to allow the Education Committee to function now. In response to questions, Dr. Lihn stated that he could not speak for the Education Committee, but that personally he was opposed to further postponement. Dr. Rangell noted that action by the Education Committee need not be predicated upon this proposal; and while the refinement asked for may be good, it would actually make appointments more complicated than at present. A negative vote would not stymie the Education Committee in its functions, for the bottleneck in appointments has been at the initiation of appointments not on the matter of voting for them.

At this point the question of proxy votes was raised and in response to a request for an opinion, Mr. Freeman and Mr. Licht stated proxies are not permitted by governing bodies in such instances, but suggested that if the presiding officer were in doubt, it should be put to a vote. The vote for proxies was defeated.

<u>Vote on motion</u>: The motion to postpone was passed.

Dr. Vatz returned to the matter of the motion by the Education Committee that the By-Laws be changed so that the Director of the Institute need not be a training analyst. Mr. Freeman and Mr. Licht indicated that even though the matter was not on the agenda, it would be proper to introduce it, and after Dr. Rangell stated that the omission was purely an administrative error, Dr. Vatz ruled consideration in order. Dr. Futterman, speaking for the Nominating Committee, pointed out that the Committee has been unable to obtain the consent of any of the training-analyst members of the Board of Trustees. The By-Laws do provide for an Assistant Director who need not be a training analyst, but if the Director is absent the Assistant cannot vote. Therefore a training analyst would have to be elected pro-tem in any case. Dr. Rosengarten did not feel that such a change should be arrived at hastily without prior notice of consideration and felt rather that there should be renewed effort by the Education Committee to obtain a candidate for the office. Dr. Rangell noted the disadvantages of making a change hastily, but underscored that if such a change is not made, it would require the forcing of a reluctant person to take the position without any real enthusiasm for it. There are many other available persons who perhaps should be utilized if the requirement can be changed.

Motion: Mr. Freeman moved, s/Dr. Brunswick, m/c, that the motion be amended to read that solely for the fiscal year beginning June 1, 1966, the present requirement, that the Director be selected from among the training-analyst members of the Board be waived, and a Director for that year may be any analyst member of the Institute, selected by the specified election procedure.

7. Election of Trustees - by Members:

Dr. Vatz opened nominations for election of a non-training analyst member of the Board to fill the expired term of Dr. Crutcher, and Dr. Sperling was elected unanimously. Mr. Pigott and Dr. Reynolds were elected non-analyst members of the Board by acclamation.

8. Election of Officers - by Trustees:

The Board elected Mr. Hilborn President; Dr. Pastron, Treasurer; and Dr. Leavitt, Secretary, by acclamation.

At this point Dr. Vatz read a letter of resignation then submitted by Dr. Lihn, as Dean of the Training School.

Motion: Dr. Tausend moved, s/Dr. Atkins, m/c by acclamation, that Dr. Lihn reconsider his resignation and expressed the confidence of the membership in him and his administration as Dean.

9. Election of Director:

In response to the request for nominations for Director, Dr. Rangell briefly reviewed the requirements of the position and the special qualifications of Dr. Samuel Sperling, whose name he placed in nomination. Dr. Sperling was unopposed and elected Director of the Institute.

Dr. Vatz then turned the meeting over to Dr. Sperling, who offered thanks to Dr. Vatz for the efforts and accomplishments of his administration. Dr. Sperling promised to work for harmony and unity of the organization and for that which is to the best welfare of the organization. There is an urgent need for harmony between and among everyone in the face of vital crises and then beyond to the time when we can devote our main energies to the principal tasks of our scientific and professional life.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

10. Election of Members:

Dr. Gerald Nemeth was elected a member of the Institute.

There being no further business the meeting was closed at 10:15 p.m.

Maimon Leavitt, M. D.
Secretary

ML:jk:
jw