LOS ANGELES PSYCHOANALYTIC SOCIETY
Business Meeting

Time: Thursday, January 20, 1966, 8 p.m.

Place: 344 North Bedford Drive, Beverly Hills

Minutes of the Meeting

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Leavitt, President, at 8:04 p.m. There were 54 members present.

1. The minutes of the meeting of December 16, 1965, were accepted as distributed.

2. Membership Committee - Dr. Atkins:

   Sumner Shapiro, M.D. was elected to Active Membership in the Society.

3. Joint Committee Report and Discussion:

   This report and the discussion which followed constituted the remaining business of the meeting. The report was introduced by Dr. Leavitt, followed by Dr. Leonard Rosengarten who read a preamble to the report (previously circulated to the membership) reviewing the background and philosophy af the report, particularly as related to the Training School.

   Following Dr. Rosengarten's introduction, Dr. Atkins presented the overall reorganization plan for the Society and Institute. In his preamble he indicated some of the thinking that had gone into its composition. One object, he stated, has been to bring more members into direct activity in our Society and Institute. Most of the officers therefore are to be elected annually. The continuity of the organization is provided for by the composition of the sections or committees as well as by certain offices. Following this, Dr. Atkins presented the portion of the report entitled "The Preliminary Plan for the Reorganization of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society-Institute" (which has also been previously circulated) in connection with the organizational chart entitled "Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society-Institute."

   Dr. Ourieff presented that part of the plan for the reorganization of the Training School. In the preamble he presented the history of the development of the report, including the many criticisms made about the Training School, the committees that were organized, reports that had been read at prior meetings, including Dr. Greenacre's paper at the last meeting of the International. Dr. Ourieff stated that the objectives of the Committee were as follows: 1) to bring the members more into the decision-making structure of the Training School and 2) to attempt to resolve some of the questions regarding position and functions of the personal training analysts. In pursuit of answers to these questions, the Sub-Committee of which he was Chairman attempted to analyze the functions of the Training School, especially the Education Committee, by going over minutes, by evaluating decisions made by the Education Committee, and then by testing the significant question; namely, "which decisions made by the Education Committee required a training analyst to make such decisions." The Committee arrived at the conclusion that there were no such decisions made over the past years. They felt that all

decisions of the Education Committee could have been made by mature non-training analyst faculty members. This led the Committee to the decision to have a faculty (including training analysts) which would make necessary decisions for the Training School. The next question was "Do we need training analysts?" (other than as required and designated by The American Psychoanalytic Association). The conclusion was not in the usual sense. The Committee felt that the training analysis can be done by most senior members of the faculty but that this function would confer no other powers as such. The power to make decisions could rest independently within the faculty and particularly the senior faculty. Initial faculty membership (auditor) would be available upon application or by invitation after one year of membership in the Society-Institute; in other words, one year following graduation. The faculty, as envisioned by the Committee, would consist of teachers but would also include members who were administrators, researchers, writers, or made contributions in the various ways in which analysts can contribute to the profession and science. The appointment to training analyst, on recommendation by Faculty and Coordinating Committees, would finally be made by majority vote of the Board of Directors. Dr. Ourieff proceeded from this point to a detailed discussion of the report, which had also been circulated prior to this meeting.

Following Dr. Ourieff's presentation, Dr. Leavitt made note that the proposals presented were arrived at by vote, in most instances unanimous, of the Joint Committee but that some members of the Committee hold somewhat different viewpoints on several items and that they would present these to the Society. He added that the lay members of the Board of Trustees of the current Institute will be included in the plan as "lay consultants" to the Board of Directors.

At this point the discussion was opened from the floor.

Dr. Bird began the discussion by noting that there was no by-laws committee accounted for in the report. He felt one should be appointed. There was immediate agreement and a brief discussion about where it would fit into the organizational chart. Mr. Hilborn stated that he felt no attorney could possibly write by-laws for the Society based on the report delivered. He went on to suggest that the members of the Board should be elected without specified office and the Board should elect its own officers. He also advocated longer terms for some of the offices of the Society in order to allow for a greater continuity of service.

Dr. Malin requested that the training analysts present express their viewpoints about the reorganization plan.

Dr. Van der Heide spoke, without prior preparation, in response to an invitation from the President. He stated that he was in principle in full agreement with the report adding, "It does not spell out utopia but is an improvement." He questioned certain details because of their importance but did not go into them at this point, except for the question of how one is to begin to serve as a member of the faculty. He noted that some members of the present Education Committee are not in agreement with the plan but added that a reorganization plan does not require the specific approval of the Education Committee. If the

plan is acceptable to the membership of the Society and the Institute, it will be approved by them, even if the Education Committee is not in agreement. At this point Dr. Leavitt read a letter from Dr. Brunswick reflecting his general approval of the plan.

Mr. Hilborn spoke again, declaring that there was too little power vested in the executives of the organization and too much in the membership. The officers he felt should be elected for more than one year, and also he would prefer a larger Board with some members who are not officers. He reiterated that there were too many elections for too many offices. Dr. Leavitt responded that the Committee has been very much aware of this problem of the balance of democratic responsibility versus administrative efficiency and pointed up some of the provisions and possible limitations. Dr. Atkins elucidated and invited Mr. Marvin Freeman to speak. Mr. Freeman seconded some of Mr. Hilborn's concern. He stated that in the effort to democratize it is possible to set up new cliques, which is what we are trying to avoid. He advocated electing a Board which would then choose its own officers rather than having each officer elected directly to his office by membership. Dr. Rosengarten responded to this by stating that the Society would perhaps prefer to sacrifice some efficiency in the interest of a broader participation and greater democracy. He felt also that it may be part of the maturation of analysts to find themselves serving and growing with their professional society. Dr. Barnard asked a question of the difference between the board of directors of a corporation and the executive committee of a scientific organization. Dr. Atkins responded that this question came to the nub of the matter and stated that in the view of the Committee and of the Society our organization much more closely resembles a fraternal and scientific and professional organization rather than a business corporation.

Dr. Walsh then stated that in his opinion we wanted to involve many members on a large scale. The details of the organization in which they are involved can vary but the democratic principle is important. Mr. Freeman replied that a complicated organization sometimes makes for less democracy and more confusion.

Dr. Gilman turned the discussion to two of the main issues; namely, (1) the fusion of the Society and Institute and (2) the change in the Training School. He declared that in his opinion this second point is the important issue; that if this issue is resolved satisfactorily, the rest of the complications which are involved in the organizational plan as presented might be unnecessary. Dr. Shiell stated he felt like Rip Van Winkle coming out of a long sleep. He wanted to ask no questions but only to thank all those who did the arduous work in preparation of this report. He declared "The fresh air in this room is marvellous." He felt we ought to try out the plan to see how it works and allow evolution to operate from such a beginning. Dr. Bird stated that he felt we are in many ways a unique organization, that we have no treasurers and no secretaries etc., but that almost any one of us can fit into almost any office position and do well. Dr. Vatz declared that the organization in this new plan is much simpler than our present organization; when one combines the committees of the Society and Institute, there are many more at present then would be found in this new combined

Institute and Society organization without any duplication of work. A second point was in the form of a question, which was the same question which Dr. Van der Heide had raised; namely, "how will auditors be selected?"(Following this there were other questions such as "how will they be promoted?") The third point referred to the selection of those who are to conduct the analysis of candidates. He declared that such appointees must fulfill the requirements of The American Psychoanalytic Association, and he was not sure that our plan provided for this.

Dr. Rangell, the last discussant of the evening, clarified the last point of Dr. Vatz; namely, that the appointment of training analysts is done at the local level and that The American Psychoanalytic Association simply receives the announcements and notifies the Board on Professional Standards. This is true in the case of all training analysts (other than exceptional instances, for example, if an Institute desires to appoint a training analyst who does not meet all the requirements of the American, or, if a training analyst is to be appointed on a geographical basis). Following this he noted a small but significant detail in Dr. Ourieff's note of the text of his paper in which he talked about the method of appointing training analysts who would be eligible by virtue of the rules and regulations of The American Psychoanalytic Association and added, "or those who are <u>not</u> eligible to be members of The American Psychoanalytic Association." Dr. Rangell felt that this would be the one thing that would get us into difficulty with The American and that it is the only point that they would question and would bring about an investigation of our plan. He felt that such a point should not be in the standard procedures and that this needs far more discussion than had been given to it up till now. (Dr. Ourieff thought that the "not" was in error in the report.) On the other hand Dr. Rangell lauded the fundamental plan, declared he was wholeheartedly for it; but concluded his statement with a word of caution in which he wondered whether this would not be a good time for us to stop and to consider more objectively the whole plan. Particularly he expressed a hope that matters in Los Angeles psychoanalytic circles had progressed far enough to where it would be possible to consider a merger of both Societies in an effort to reunite the groups separated in 1950 before we instituted our reorganization. He felt that such a move could truly electrify the psychoanalytic world. He noted that there are murmurings in various cities where such splits had taken place about efforts which might be made to reunify societies.

Dr. Leavitt requested the recommendation of the membership concerning the choice of continuing the meeting or recessing to resume at a date in the very near future. The members indicated a desire to recess.

The meeting was recessed at 10:35 p.m.

Melvin Mandel, M.D.
Secretary

MM:cc