

LOS ANGELES INSTITUTE FOR PSYCHOANALYSIS  
Education-Committee Meeting

Time: Thursday, April 7, 1966, 7:30 p.m.

Place: 344 North Bedford Drive, Beverly Hills

Minutes of the Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 7:45 p.m. by Dr. Lihn, Chairman. Present were Drs. Brunswick, Evans, Fenichel, Fielding, Friedman, Greenson, McGuire, Rangell, Van der Heide, and Vatz. Drs. Atkins, Leavitt, and Rollman-Branch were present from the faculty.

1. Minutes of the Meeting of March 3, 1966:

The minutes of the meeting of March 3, 1966, were approved with the following correction by Dr. Rangell: Point 7 of the proposals for the selection of new training analysts should read as follows: 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.

2. Admissions Committee:

- a. Dr. Peter Hood was accepted for psychoanalytic training.
- b. Dr. William Holyoak was accepted for psychoanalytic training.
- c. There were some doubts about Dr. Peter Loewenberg, applicant for training for research; and therefore it was decided that he be interviewed by Drs. Greenson and Van der Heide before a final decision is made.

3. Candidates:

- a. Dr. Petrus started Normal Development of the Child.
- b. Dr. Ada Burris has started supervision with Dr. Fenichel.
- c. Dr. Ronald Mintz has started supervision with Dr. Ekstein.
- d. Dr. Ritvo started supervision with Dr. Fenichel.
- e. Dr. Arthur Burris's request for a second case was approved.
- f. Dr. Malcolm Hoff's request for a second case was approved.
- g. Dr. Kalman's request for a second case was approved.
- h. Dr. Lerner's request for a second case was approved.
- i. Dr. Horenstein's request for Colloquium II was approved. His examiners will be Dr. Friedman and Dr. Leavitt.
- j. Dr. Wonka, having fulfilled all the requirements of training, was graduated.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER  
OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE

LONDON: PRINTED BY RICHARD CLAY AND COMPANY, LTD., BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

1931.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The following statement is prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Land Registration Act, 1925, and the Land Registration Rules, 1925, and is intended to give a general account of the work of the Land Registration Office during the year 1931.

THE LAND REGISTRATION ACT, 1925

The Land Registration Act, 1925, was passed by the House of Commons on the 22nd July 1925, and received the Royal Assent on the 23rd July 1925. It is the principal Act of Parliament relating to the land registration system in this country, and it is intended to give a general account of the work of the Land Registration Office during the year 1931.

THE LAND REGISTRATION RULES, 1925

The Land Registration Rules, 1925, were made by the Board of Land Registration under the authority of the Land Registration Act, 1925, and are intended to give a general account of the work of the Land Registration Office during the year 1931.

THE LAND REGISTRATION OFFICE

The Land Registration Office is a department of the Home Office, and is situated at the Land Registration Office, 100, Strand, London, W.C.2. It is the principal office of the Land Registration Office, and is intended to give a general account of the work of the Land Registration Office during the year 1931.

The Land Registration Office is a department of the Home Office, and is situated at the Land Registration Office, 100, Strand, London, W.C.2. It is the principal office of the Land Registration Office, and is intended to give a general account of the work of the Land Registration Office during the year 1931.

The Land Registration Office is a department of the Home Office, and is situated at the Land Registration Office, 100, Strand, London, W.C.2. It is the principal office of the Land Registration Office, and is intended to give a general account of the work of the Land Registration Office during the year 1931.

4. Curriculum Committee:

Dr. McGuire, Chairman of the Curriculum Committee, presented the following recommendations for appointment and reappointment of instructors, assistant instructors, and auditors:

- a. Instructor (1966-1969): Drs. Brandchaft, Ourieff, and Rollman-Branch.
- b. Assistant Instructor (1966-1967): Drs. Abrams, Berenson, Bronstein, Call, Grotstein, Leventhal.
- c. Auditors: Dr. Shane.

Motion: Dr. Friedman moved, s/Dr. Fielding, m/c, that these recommendations be approved.

5. Training Analysts:a. Vote on Dr. Lewy - One-Year Term:

Dr. Lewy was re-elected a training analyst for a one-year term.

b. Vote on the Proposals for the Selection of New Training Analysts:

The proposals for the selection of new training analysts were not approved. (8-yes, 3-no, 1-abstain.)

c. Mrs. Deri - Retirement - April 11, 1966:

Motion: Dr. Friedman moved, s/Dr. Greenson, m/c, that, in appreciation of Mrs. Deri's long and outstanding service as a member of the Education Committee, she be appointed Training-Analyst Emeritus.

d. Term of Office of Chairman of Education Committee Expires - June, 1966:

Motion: Dr. Rangell moved, s/Dr. Greenson, m/c, that a nominating committee of three members be elected and that this nominating committee elect its own chairman from amongst its members.

Drs. Brunswick, Fenichel, and Fielding were elected to serve on the nominating committee.

e. Discussion of Joint Committee Proposals Regarding the Education Committee:

Dr. Vatz stated that he felt the idea of combining the Institute and Society had merit; however, the Training School should have autonomy. The Training School should not be run by the members; it should be run by those who do the teaching (faculty and members of the Education Committee).



April 7, 1966

Dr. Friedman suggested the following plan for the organization of the Training School:

"Training School  
:  
Dean  
:  
Education Committee  
:  
Faculty

The faculty consists of:

- |                           |   |                    |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|
| 1) Training analysts)     | } | voting members     |
| 2) Instructors            |   |                    |
| 3) Assistant instructors) | } | non-voting members |
| 4) Auditors               |   |                    |

The voting members of the faculty shall elect the Dean, who is also Chairman of the Education Committee.

The Dean shall be a training analyst. His term of office: initial election for two years; re-election: not more than two successive one-year terms.

The Education Committee shall consist of seven members:

Chairman  
3 training analysts                      3 instructors

The voting members of the faculty shall elect the six members of the Education Committee (three training analysts and three instructors) in addition to the Chairman. Terms of office: yearly alternating three years. At the first election one in each category shall be elected for one year, one in each category shall be elected for two years and one in each category shall be elected for three years. Thereafter one in each category shall be elected for a term of three years. They shall not succeed themselves.

The Chairman (Dean) shall appoint the Chairman of the Committees of the Education Committee from among the members of the Education Committee. Additional members of the Committees shall be appointed from members of the faculty.

All meetings of the Education Committee shall be open to the voting members of the faculty (training analysts and instructors).

It is imperative that the Training School is independent in all matters of training. It shall be represented on the governing body of the Institute-Society by the Dean."

Dr. Fielding felt that there should be some separation between the training program and the general organization such as exists in medical schools. Schools



are run by schools not by medical associations. The academicians and the research oriented should be the nucleus of the Training School with a large degree of autonomy. This is a projection of things to come in psychoanalysis (our organization), along with the possibility of university affiliation. There should be more autonomy for the Training School than is called for in the plan of the Joint Committee.

Dr. Greenson stated that the function of training and teaching has to be separated from other functions of our Society and Institute. Training needs specialized people. It should be relegated to people who have proven they can train--people who are willing to be scrutinized. All the other changes the Joint Committee wants to make are fine. Voting on who will do the training analysis should be by faculty and training analysts.

Dr. Leavitt stated that the Joint Committee wants to keep a viable training school. The plan wants to make the training school separate and autonomous. The faculty would run the school, not the membership as a whole. However, the membership influences the school in two ways: 1) Financial and 2) the faculty would select their own "trainers"; confirmation would be by the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors would have a confirming function only. This latter is a reflection of the feeling that while the school is supported and staffed by the professional society, the membership feels disenfranchised and is disenfranchised. This ultimate sense of responsibility to members reduces the school's autonomy.

f. Dr. Orr - Application for Geographical Rule Training Analyst:

The Chairman read letters of recommendation from Drs. Calef, Goodman, Reider, and Sutton in answer to his request for information regarding Dr. Orr.

Motion: Dr. Greenson moved, m/c, that the Education Committee, at its next meeting, vote on whether or not it wishes to accept Dr. Orr's application for geographical rule training analyst.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

Henry Lihn, M. D.  
Chairman

HL:jk

The first part of the document discusses the general principles of the system. It outlines the objectives and the scope of the project. The second part describes the methodology used in the study, including the data collection and analysis techniques. The third part presents the results of the study, and the fourth part discusses the conclusions and the implications of the findings.

The results of the study show that the system is effective in achieving its objectives. The data analysis indicates that there is a significant difference between the experimental and control groups. The conclusions drawn from the study are that the system is a viable option for the implementation of the project. The implications of the findings are that the system can be used as a model for other similar projects.

In conclusion, the study has shown that the system is effective in achieving its objectives. The data analysis indicates that there is a significant difference between the experimental and control groups. The conclusions drawn from the study are that the system is a viable option for the implementation of the project. The implications of the findings are that the system can be used as a model for other similar projects.