

I am grateful to the organizers of this conference for inviting me to participate. After accepting the invitation, I learned that at the conference David Andelman would also present, so I read David Andelman's book *A Shattered Place*, which focuses on the far reaching effects of Versailles 1919. I learned that at Versailles, the Great Powers, victorious after WWI, carved up Europe, the Middle East, and parts of the Far East. The victors, with a view to assuring their own hegemony, created unnatural geographic boundaries. Andelman's thesis is that what the Great Powers did at Versailles had profoundly negative consequences. It played a large part in the discord leading up to WWII, in the onset of the war, and in many of the conflicts after the war right through the second half of the twentieth century, especially in Central and Eastern Europe and the Middle East.

Now I would like you to make a grand leap with me. I am proposing that we consider the establishment of the Board of Professional Standards as the Versailles of APsaA and psychoanalysis in the United States. In 1946, the BOPS replaced the Committee on Psychoanalysis Training. The Committee had essentially been a consulting body. It could not issue binding training decrees without the unanimous consent of all the APsaA institutes. BOPS, in contrast, could act without the unanimous support of the institutes; it could promulgate training standards if a simple majority of the institutes agreed to them. BOPS was also empowered to set the admission criteria for membership in the American.

In 1946 Dr. William Menninger was President of APsaA. Menninger probably did more for the advance of psychoanalysis in America than any other individual by recruiting a legion of physicians to work as psychiatrists

in World War II. Hundreds of these physicians, after discharge, applied for psychiatric residency all over the country and then for analytic training at the institutes of APsaA--in New York, Boston, Chicago, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles. Topeka had more than 100 psychiatrists in their first post WWII class. Menninger made a strong plea to consider admitting scholars and psychotherapists to APsaA as well as graduates of APsaA analytic. His proposal was rejected emphatically. APsaA had to maintain its "pure" analytic identity by limiting membership to graduates of APsaA analytic institutes. Graduates, and not everyone who trained did in fact graduate, then had to apply to APsaA and provide examples of their clinic work and be passed (certified) by a committee of BOPS.

As a result of the BOPS “standards” during the next several decades as many as fourteen hundred graduates did not become members of APsaA, including psychoanalysts who went on to achieve important academic psychiatric positions. At the time training and membership could have been continued to be open to nonphysicians (lay analysts), but this possibility was never even discussed. In fact, APsaA specifically excluded from the general IPA members who came to the US before and after the war who were not physicians. There were efforts made to abrogate this rule, particularly on the West Coast, and especially in regard to psychoanalysts of considerable stature. These efforts went nowhere except in Topeka, where Karl Menninger was able to get special treatment for his cadre of psychologist psychoanalysts like Roy Schafer and Herb Schlessinger. The exclusion of lay analysts—particularly the exclusion of one lay analyst from the New York Society in the 1940s—had a profound impact of the trajectory of psychoanalysis in NYC. That lay analyst is Theodore Reik, whose situation

in regard to practice in Vienna was the occasion for Freud writing his polemic for lay analysis.

While Freud was making a case for the continuation of “lay” psychoanalysis in Europe, Americans, especially A.A. Brill, were fighting to medicalize the field. Of course, we all would agree that if Reik had found a welcome place at the NYPS he probably would not have founded NPAP. If he and other lay analysts were admitted for training at NYPI they would have become part of the APsaA psychoanalytic establishment. Instead the NPAP was formed, beginning the "Balkanization" of American psychoanalysis.

Exclusion from the NYPS&I was not just a matter of discipline it was also a matter of ideology. The process of ideological exclusion began with Karen Horney and several other psychoanalysts, all physicians, who walked out of the NYPS meeting after Horney was denied training status. The story, perhaps apocryphal, is that Horney and her supporters left the hall and marched down 82nd street, toward the local tavern, singing "We Shall Overcome." Horney and her group then established the AIP, with which Horney with Erich Fromm and his colleagues later split over the issue of lay analysis. Of course, he then went on to found William Alanson White. As you well know there were many similar breaks that led to the forming of new societies, many of which are now a part of the non-APsaA psychoanalytic landscape in New York. The Great Powers at Versailles created the Balkans by carving up the territory of the defeated Austro-Hungarian Empire. The "Balkanization" of psychoanalysis in New York involved a similar splintering, resulting directly from the exclusionary stance

and actions of APsaA and the New York Psychoanalysis Institute.

In 1946 it looked as though there still might be a chance APsaA would remain ideologically diverse, even if it was still quite rigid in regard to discipline. Members of the William Alanson White, with their Sullivanian Interpersonal orientation, were members of APsaA, by virtue of their membership in the Baltimore Washington Institute (through the Washington Branch of William Alanson White). There was also a committee formed at BOPS to consider having William Alanson White become an institute of APsaA. Their deliberations dragged on for several years. Finally a member of the committee, Merton Gill, let the William Alanson White members know that it would never happen, and they withdrew their application. Gill told them that it related to their ideology more than the analytic frequency (3 times per week) issue. That, more or less, closed the door on the possibility of ideological dissent.

So let me recapitulate. Where is APsaA in the aftermath of our Versailles? It had established itself as a group of medical psychoanalysis, secure in its identity as real or pure psychoanalysis. It was ideologically exclusive and the psychoanalytical franchise for psychoanalysts in the United States became medical. APsaA in the 1920s and 1930s had been able to establish its independence from the IPA International Training Council (the 1938 agreement) and not allow the IPA to tell them who they should train.

The two decades following our Versailles were considered the golden age of the American (APsaA) psychoanalysis. It was an age of plenty—

plenty of candidates and plenty of patients—many at high fees. In the 40s to the 50s there were more candidates than members of the APsaA. But the two decades of the golden age were followed by four decades of decline. This was in part determined by external factors—managed care, loss of deductibility for psychoanalysis, psychopharmacology; but there were also intrinsic factors and the changing view of psychoanalysis in academia, which have contributed to the decline of APsaA. My own trajectory is an example.

I began my analytic training at the end of the end of the last decade of the golden age of psychoanalysis. I was accepted for analytic training in 1964 at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. Thirty-five individuals applied that year and fourteen were accepted—thirteen men, one woman, thirteen physicians and one psychologist who was a “research” student. It is rare now that there are more than ten or fifteen applicants. I graduated in 1969, submitted my case reports to the Board of Professional Standards and became a member of APsaA in 1972 or 1973. This made me a “real analyst” unlike one third of the graduates of approved institutes who could not become members of APsaA because they would not participate in the BOPS certification procedure or because their application was rejected.

In 1976, APsaA had fourteen hundred active members but another eight hundred institute graduates remained as Paul Mosher put it, “out in the cold,” uncertified. This was a problem for some in APsaA on principle and for many because of the financial implications for an Association with an aging membership. The initial “solution” was to allow noncertified graduates to pay dues but not have the right to vote or hold office. They

could maintain that status as long as they agreed to write up their cases in two years. I think that this was extended to three years and then the requirement was dropped and they could remain as nonvoting dues paying members indefinitely. This situation was a problem for the organization and was a topic for discussion at each twice yearly national meeting. The Training Analyst powers that be, who ran BOPS and included the elected officers as well, were committed to the principle established in the 1946 reorganization that graduates of institutes had to be vetted before they could become members of the Association. This was the case even though the institutes themselves were vetted every five years by a site visit committee of the BOPS. BOPS trumpeted their role as the guardian of “standards.” They said they were concerned about the phenomena of compassionate graduation—the passing of unqualified candidates by their institutes and they said they had an obligation to protect the public by assuring Training Analysts were competent—only certified analysts would be allowed to analyze candidates and the hope was that the public would seek analysis from only certified members of APsaA.

Many found this set of propositions unconvincing. What was the latent purpose? I think the main issue was that even with the reorganization, BOPS could not enforce its will on individual institutes because expelling an institute required a majority of all the members (not just the voting members), a two-thirds vote of the Executive Council and BOPS – clearly impossible to achieve. The only leverage BOPS had on individual institutes was by not certifying their members. Both Martin Stein and Stanley Goodman, who had served as the chair of BOPS, acknowledge this was the case in a special issue of TAP published in the late eighties, the so-called

“white issue.” I was then the editor of TAP and invited 20 members pro and 20 members con to argue for their position.

The membership/certification issue was pushed somewhat to the side in 1982 when four members of Division 39 sued APsaA, the Columbia Center and NYPI for restraint of trade in excluding nonphysicians from training. The suit was settled, Division 39 won—nonphysicians were admitted for training and 3 nonAPsaA institutes were admitted into the IPA. This settlement abrogated one restriction enshrined in the 1946 reorganization. The battle about who could be trained was a consequence of our Versailles just as WWII, as Andelman argues, was a consequence of Versailles 1919.

After the settlement of the lawsuit, and after the discussion in TAP, a task force was formed in 1990 to resolve the membership issue. They proposed that the bylaws should be changed to allow all graduates APsaA institutes to become members with the rights to vote for offices, but not run for office, serve on BOPS or be appointed a Training Analyst. This was a compromise which received a two-thirds vote of the member on the second try. So this process took about 45 years in total.

Which brings me to the second part of my paper—the impact email list serves in organization change. Bob Gallatzer Levy started on an APsaA email bulletin board in 1995. And Paul Mosher started a member’s list and open line in 1996. The changes that have occurred during the last decade and a half, although still glacial, I contend happened quicker than they might if the internet medium for member communication had not been put

into place. And the changes in the certification system were in part a consequence of the settlement of the law suit. As a result of that settlement members of IPA institutes could become members of APsaA. One of the three members who were accepted was Arlene Kramer Richards. Both Arlene and I were working hard to get IPA members to join APsaA. It was not an easy task because the years of exclusion and the belief that many IPA members had that they were not considered real analysts. That they were looked down on by their APsaA colleagues. I suggested that Arlene apply for certification. She did and she was turned down. Keep in mind that Arlene was a Training Analyst at two IPA institutes and several of her former analysands were Training Analysts as well. Arlene has recounted her experience in a paper written for the Psychoanalysis Estates General in Paris in 2000. She was told by the committee that they would understand if she didn't continue her application. But Arlene, who I have dubbed the Rosa Parks of APsaA, insisted on persevering and was passed by the second committee. I felt that her rejection called into question the reliability and validity of the certification test of psychoanalytic competence. I then started a discussion on the open line about certification. I began my first post by quoting Bob Michel's APsaA plenary in which he stated that the goals of the Certification Committee and the Committee on Scientific Activities were contradictory.

The discussion which followed pro and con was lively, informative, and spirited. Of major importance was the fact that members of APsaA who up to then had no place at the decision making table now had a voice which would be heard. One of my colleagues at the NYPI told me he would never forgive me for what I did. What did I do, I asked? You empowered the

members who were not educators to be part of a debate about educational matters. But the outcome was another task force: The Task Force on Education and Membership which recommended a bylaw change in which noncertified members would be able to run for office and vote for bylaw amendments. The only restriction that remained was that non certified members could not be considered for Training Analyst appointment. This achieved a two-thirds majority and became the law of the APsaA land. The final change—TA appointment has been preoccupying APsaA, BOPS and the members list and open line for the past six years. We are now about to vote a third bylaw amendment (the first two didn't get two-thirds) called Institute Choice which prohibits BOPS from requiring all institutes to appoint only certified members as TAs. The vote is this December. Institute Choice then called “local option” two years ago received 57% of the vote, short of a two-thirds majority.

However, I should also mention that in a recent election all the members running on a platform endorsing institute choice were elected and the organization has officially recognized that APsaA is not a bicameral organization with an Executive Council and a Board of Professional Standards having equal standing, as the 1946 Reorganization tried to make so.

BOPS as is required by New York State Law is a “committee of the corporation” and the board has the ultimate power. So APsaA came a long way in moving from the 1946 politics of exclusion to becoming more democratic and participatory organization thanks to email member communication in this age of google.