

LOS ANGELES PSYCHOANALYTIC SOCIETY

ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING

Time: Thursday, June 18, 1964, 8 p.m.

Place: 344 North Bedford Drive, Beverly Hills

Minutes of the Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 8:15 p.m. by Dr. Sperling, President. There were fifty-eight members present.

1. The minutes of the meeting of May 21, 1964, were accepted as distributed.
2. Report of the Dean of the Training School - Dr. Friedman:

Since the membership had received the report of the Dean and had also heard his summary at the Annual Meeting of the Los Angeles Institute for Psychoanalysis, his report was very brief. He announced that Dr. Henry Lihn had been made the Assistant Dean of the Training School. He informed us that he had received a report of a panel on Training Analysis, which had taken place on November 10, 1953, under the auspices of the State University of New York, Downstate Medical Center. The meeting had been chaired by Joan Fleming. In this seminar Anna Freud's "Problems of the Training Analysis" was taken up in detail. This paper was considered of sufficient interest that a copy is on file in the office.

3. Membership Committee - Dr. Tausend:

Dr. Tausend announced that Dr. Allan Rosenblatt has applied for the transfer of his membership from the Association for Psychoanalytic Medicine of New York to this Society. His credentials were approved by the Education Committee and the Membership Committee, and he is eligible for Guest Membership in the Society.

Drs. Justin D. Call, Richard Edelman, and Mark F. Orfirer were elected to Active Membership.

4. Announcements:

The next Society meeting, which will discuss the report of the Committee for the Study of Psychoanalytic Practice for the second time, will be held on Thursday, June 25, 1964, at 8 p.m.

5. Report of the Treasurer - Dr. Fine:

A complete audit was not available because of the injury sustained by our Administrative Assistant, Mrs. Ermalene Yerkes. The report will be completed later on in the year. It was stated however that there are adequate funds available to carry on the Society's functions from June 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964.

6. Report of the Auditing Committee:

The report of the Auditing Committee, for the above-mentioned reasons, was not given.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Washington, D. C. 20535

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DIRECTOR

DATE: 10/15/54

RE: [Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

7. Report of Committees:a. History Committee - Dr. Kandelin:

In his annual report Dr. Kandelin stated that this Committee is now completing its second year. It has completed one part of the project--that of recording the reminiscences of fourteen pioneer members. The Committee is making every effort to preserve the history of our Society. Some efforts to collect and preserve historical data consist of accumulating into an archive the papers and records of our members. Letters, photographs, programs, and important documents will be preserved. In addition the Committee has considered the writing and publication of an historical narrative. An outline of potential chapters has been proposed as follows: 1) Evolution of Constitution and By-Laws; 2) Biographies of Simmel and Fenichel; 3) History of the Study Group; 4) Psychoanalytic Education; 5) The Psychiatric Scene in Los Angeles; 6) Changes in Psychoanalytic Identity and Psychoanalytic Practice; 7) Evolution of the Broadening Scope: Postgraduate Education, Public Information, Mental Health, Social Problems.

Dr. Rangell spoke of the importance and widespread interest nationally in such historical surveys and told of the publication of a monograph by the New York Society on the occasion of its 50th Anniversary.

b. Committee on Social Problems - Dr. Dorn:

Dr. Rocco Motto gave the report in Dr. Dorn's absence. Dr. Dorn was being inaugurated as the President of the Beverly Hills District of the Los Angeles County Medical Association.

The local Committee and guests met on October 29, 1963, to hear Dr. Michael Rosow present a five-year follow-up report of work with the State Department of Correction's probationers. Dr. Dorn, as Chairman, met informally with Dr. Ellis Toney to discuss methods of collecting data on the Negro, his identity problems and ideals, and contributions the analyst can make locally to the solution of such issues. This work is still in a preliminary stage.

The Committee on Social Problems of The American Psychoanalytic Association has met four times in the past year. They are directing their interests to group tensions, homosexuality, prevention of mental illness, prejudice and race relations, war, etc. An effort is now underway to collect psychoanalytic contributions to the literature on these subjects.

The Subcommittee on the Prevention of Mental Illness has been the most active, collecting data on what psychoanalysis can contribute and recommend for the prevention of mental illness and to encourage mental health. In May, 1963, fifteen to twenty child analysts met with the Committee as consultants to aid in clarifying a psychoanalytic framework for normal development. Forty-five individuals and groups are contributing a series of basic statements about developmental and preventive measures in psychoanalytic terms. It is the Committee's hope that the collation and syntheses of such data will result in an organized body of psychoanalytic principles that can be integrated as such into mental-health programs. Drs. Ekstein and Motto have made contributions from their work on psychoanalysis and education. Two stages of work lie ahead for this Committee: the first will be the establishment of such principles and the second will be the methods of application. In addition to this, the Committee is proposing workshops and panels

as part of the programs of The American. The "Anonymity of the Psychoanalyst" and "Psychoanalysis and the Community" are two possible topics. The West-Coast Psychoanalytic Societies' fall meeting will include a panel on "The Psychoanalyst and His Contribution to Community Mental Health."

c. Women's Auxiliary - Dr. Pastron:

Dr. Pastron told us that thirty women attended the first invitational meeting. At that meeting discussion relating to its purpose and plan of operation was dealt with. An organizing committee was established consisting of Mrs. Betty Fielding, Rene Lomas, Martha Pastron, Ginny Rubin, Anita Rangell, Beatrice Sperling, and Flora Vatz. A second meeting explored the advisability of continuing the task of organization. Other committees have been established. A By-Laws Committee met and included in its Constitution that a member of the Society shall sit on the Board of Trustees of the Women's Auxiliary. It is the responsibility of the Society to select this Board member. Dr. Pastron stated that the Women's Auxiliary looked to the Society for guidance and leadership.

d. Housing Committee - Dr. Pastron:

The report of this Committee is on file.

e. Program Committee - Dr. Rollman-Branch:

As the Chairman of this Committee Dr. Branch illustrated some of the problems her Committee faced and made some recommendations. Upon taking office, her Committee found that some speakers had already been committed to address the Society in the future. She finds, on leaving the Chairmanship, that her Committee has committed speakers for the future. She was of the opinion that some form of overlap between the two Program Chairmen, or a cut-off date following the new elections, might be desirable. In such a situation the out-going Chairman would be responsible for planning ahead; for example, to the September or October meetings.

Furthermore, Dr. Branch thought that it would be a good idea if future Program-Committee Chairmen would be at least members of any Program Committee for regional or other meetings. This was done for the 1961 West-Coast meetings but not for the 1964 meetings.

One member of the Program Committee was appointed Arrangements-Committee Chairman, and that seems to have been an excellent idea. It encouraged the co-operation in this case between Dr. Mandel and Dr. Rollman-Branch.

8. Report of the President - Dr. Sperling:

Dr. Sperling's address was accorded an enthusiastic response. A motion was made by Dr. Sarlin, S/Dr. Van der Heide, M/C, that his Annual Report be distributed to the membership.

In his report he appraised those experiences and developments which had occurred during the tenure of his office which he considered of most significance. He highlighted some of the main problems confronting our Society and suggested that we look hard and critically at some of the solutions and explanations offered. Through the significant findings of the Committee on the Study of Psychoanalytic Practice the widespread dissatisfaction among our members with their practice, training, and the

"image of the psychoanalyst" has been brought into sharper focus. It was his hope that on the findings and subsequent evaluation of this Committee "the Society would move towards a rectification of the causes of the prevailing dissatisfaction."

Among the many issues dealt with in his report, one worthy of being singled out for special emphasis was the relationship existing between the Society, the Institute, and the Education Committee. The problem of this relationship is now under serious study by the combined Committee of the Society and Institute.

9. Nominating Committee - Dr. Leventhal:

In introducing the slate of nominees for the various offices of the Society, Dr. Leventhal singled out for special comment the nomination of Dr. Leo Rangell as an unopposed candidate for President. Referring to the obvious and severe problems which we are presently facing, Dr. Leventhal stated that our Society felt fortunate to have a member of our Society with the distinction of international and national status as well as direct experience with our local problems. Dr. Rangell is not only a past President of The American Psychoanalytic Association but is a past President of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society as well. The Nominating Committee therefore felt most gratified to have prevailed upon Dr. Rangell to accept this nomination.

10. Election of Officers:

President:	Leo Rangell, M. D.
Vice-President:	Maimon Leavitt, M. D.
Secretary:	Maurice N. Walsh, M. D.
Treasurer:	Norman B. Atkins, M. D.
Membership-Committee Member	Kenneth Rubin, M. D.
Executive Councilor:	Samuel Futterman, M. D.
Alternate Councilor:	Samuel J. Sperling, M. D.

Following the elections, Dr. Rangell took the podium and gave us a stirring and thoughtful acceptance address. Acknowledging first the action which had just been taken placing him at this moment at the leadership of our Society, Dr. Rangell observed that the mood is obviously not the same now as it was when he stood here as President for the first time almost ten years ago. It was much more simply then in the nature of honor given and gratitude returned. He saw today's event as a more extraordinary one, obviously not one of a routine "moving up," but one "which we know bespeaks troubled times."

He said, "While I appreciate the trust which your action connotes, and while I was prevailed upon and accepted this responsibility and even mission in spite of many more personal interests, I wish to underscore my lack of claims--and to emphasize that what we can accomplish is only what we will all do together in good faith."

He then proceeded to highlight a few central and salient issues which he considered at the "core of the complicated web which envelops us." With regard to the problems which face us, in his assessment these are "not spurious or exaggerated but a piece of the reality around us, which it would be well to face and solve. You have heard them referred to in all three of the Annual Reports, by the President, Director, and Dean. They vary from benign and technical problems to some which could be more

ominous in their consequences." Dr. Rangell stressed the fact that we would be dealing with the sequelae of these problems over a long-range period, perhaps through most of this coming year's administration. He recalled to us that he had also acceded to the position of President of The American at a time when that Association was facing serious problems.

With regard to the handling of these problems, Dr. Rangell stated that he would resist several trends. For one, he did not intend to permit them to be passed of either as personal controversy or to be attributed to externals. He did not feel that the problems were due to "the other group," nor to the influence of universities or residency programs, nor to community factors. The problems which we face, he felt, are internal. He intended to resist two opposite pulls. One is the tendency to sweep the problems under the carpet again. He said the pull towards secondary repression has not been overrated, and he was aware of such an urge even in himself. But he equally intended to resist the demand from some quarters to "put up or shut up," that is, to be specific, to confront, to name names, etc., with the idea that, "If you can't go the whole way, then say nothing."

Dr. Rangell strongly emphasized the fact that any of these approaches could be chaotic for the Society, and he intended to oppose them all. He said, "We are dealing with phenomena both delicate and subtle, which defy such drastic action, and yet cannot on that score be denied. As psychoanalysts we know the wide area between action and repression. The greatest part of our accomplishments are within that band." He complimented the two Co-Chairmen of the Committee for the Study of Psychoanalytic Practice and our past President, Dr. Sperling, for their firmness and yet their admirable restraint. It is his aim to continue in this vein. "We wish solutions and not recriminations."

Dr. Rangell then stated that if he had to pick out some of the most relevant and nuclear elements within the content of these problems, he felt that while we shared the experiences and fates of all groups, as Freud has written about in "Group Psychology" and "Civilization and Its Discontents," there is something special about psychoanalytic groups. Referring to a statement of Anna Freud's about the sequelae of training analyses in a group which stays together, Dr. Rangell expressed his agreement about the central importance of states of unresolved transferences existing in such group situations. These exist more often than we would like and are often balanced by complementary countertransference mechanisms, thus emanating from both sides of the couch. In no other societies do you have to deal with "group post-analytic sequelae." The result is often a stratification and a hierarchy of social-professional levels, which for long periods of time may reach a static state. He quoted one wag who defined an institute as "a collection of unresolved transferences." He agreed, however, with Dr. Sperling about the dangers of oversimplification and of glib diagnoses of complex situations and stressed the importance of studying this vital subject.

Other effects which may stem from some of the above formations and which we have unfortunately indeed seen to some extent, are a certain amount of infantilization and the existence of symbiotic relationships which--in some cases--may threaten to become permanent. Fixations in life may be superseded by fixations in analysis. Positive as well as negative transferences can be equally culpable. While some people are fatalistic about such outcomes and feel that they are inevitable, Dr. Rangell does not think that this is the case. He quoted from a paper of the Washington Society that one function which the Society can perform is the function of working through.

One other manifest and all too pervasive result of such processes, which has been commented upon by many sources, has been a pall on creativity. Dr. Rangell stated that he does not mean particularly original creations but the simple act of discussion and of the expression of ordinary and expectable opinions. An inarticulateness within large segments of the group has been clearly visible and is particularly striking in that it exists in people who are basically verbal and ideational in their characters and in the very heart of their profession. Moreover this trait is not existent in the same people in other situations.

"But to look at the other side of the coin, we can equally observe an enormous amount of energy, drive, and motivation among our membership. This unfortunately is especially seen in their activities outside of the Society's scientific life." He pointed to the reports by Drs. Vatz, Walsh, Rollman-Branch, Harrison, etc., to attest to such vital and interested activities. "The blockage in the Society is noteworthy," he said. "But just as we know as analysts that resistances must be dealt with before content, so do we plan to first work at removing our problems, after which we can hopefully expect the contents to improve." The proof of this, he felt, was that there had already been a discernible upsurge in the Society since these issues have come up for discussion.

Dr. Rangell asked for "a renaissance of the Society." As the number of candidates remains the same or even decreases and the Society constantly grows, he expressed the hope for a steady elevation of its place as an organizational entity and as a structure of psychoanalytic identification.

Dr. Rangell also at this point indicated in advance that he intended to propose a Postgraduate Seminar in the fall to be called something like "Exercises in Discussion." In form and structure this will be modelled after the Kris Study Group in New York but in content tailored to our own specific local needs. He planned to give details later. He concluded by extending his congratulations to the outgoing administration and in particular to Dr. Sperling, who has worked earnestly, honestly, and devotedly in the interests of the total Society.

Dr. Rangell's address was received with an enthusiastic burst of applause.

11. There was no new business. The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Sidney Fine, M. D., for
Maimon Leavitt, M. D.
Secretary

SF: jk

Dear Mr. [Name],
I have received your letter of the 10th inst. regarding the matter of [Subject]. I am sorry that I cannot give you a more definite answer at this time, but the matter is still under consideration.

I have discussed this matter with the relevant departments and we are working to resolve the outstanding issues as quickly as possible. Your patience is appreciated.

I will contact you again once a final decision has been reached. Thank you for your understanding.

Sincerely,
[Name]

Enclosed for you are the documents mentioned in your letter. Please review them at your convenience.

Very truly yours,
[Name]

cc: [Name]

Yours faithfully,
[Name]

[Name]

Dear Mr. [Name],
I have received your letter of the 10th inst. regarding the matter of [Subject]. I am sorry that I cannot give you a more definite answer at this time, but the matter is still under consideration.

I have discussed this matter with the relevant departments and we are working to resolve the outstanding issues as quickly as possible. Your patience is appreciated.

I will contact you again once a final decision has been reached. Thank you for your understanding.

Sincerely,
[Name]

Enclosed for you are the documents mentioned in your letter. Please review them at your convenience.

Very truly yours,
[Name]

cc: [Name]

Yours faithfully,
[Name]

[Name]