

The History of Membership/Certification in the APsaA: Old Demons, New Debates

By Paul W. Mosher MD and Arnold Richards MD

"It is true that in all fields a person may repeat the same mistake for innumerable years and call it experience." (Oberndorf, C.P., A History of Psychoanalysis in America, p. 246)

Our aim in this presentation is to examine the history of membership /certification in the American Psychoanalytic Association [APsaA] a history that has been evolving over more than seven decades. We have two themes: The first is to describe the longstanding and ongoing conflicts between representatives of the training programs, on the one hand, and the overall Association membership, on the other. The second theme is to show that recent events within the Association represent a case example of the impact of new technology, email, list-serves, and Internet communication on organizational conflict resolution. Our thesis is that the egalitarian nature of the Internet has significantly altered the nature of the discourse within the Association and has opened up the decision-making processes in the organization.

We believe that an organization falls under the shadow of its founder. In the case of the APsaA, the founder was A.A. Brill -- if somewhat indirectly. Brill's issues about inclusion and exclusion have been related to his own history and dynamics (Fass): he was a poor boy from eastern Europe (Kanczuca, Galicia) who came to the United States at fourteen with two dollars in his pocket, determined to make his way to a station in society, He was educated in medicine at Columbia in New York, and trained as a psychiatrist for four years at New York's Central Islip State Hospital at the turn of the last century. Subsequently, he was exposed to, and captivated

by, the dynamic psychiatry of Freud who he visited in Vienna and during his additional training at the psychoanalytically informed Burgholzli in Switzerland.

Upon his return to the United States in 1908, Brill established a practice of psychoanalysis in New York, while simultaneously working at Columbia's Vanderbilt Clinic, and thus became the first American psychoanalyst. He had at that time been designated by Freud as the English translator of Freud's works. He joined exclusive organizations like the Harmony Club, and promoted the medical exclusivity of The New York Psychoanalytic Society, which he founded in February 1911 and whose practices in turn determined the earliest practices of what eventually became the APsaA, to Freud's chagrin. By contrast, an earlier version of an "American Psychoanalytic Association" was founded in Baltimore at the instigation of Ernest Jones with the blessings of Freud, who had wanted Brill to form such an "American Psychoanalytic Association" with James Jackson Putnam as its first President (consistent with his preference for a non-Jew as head of a psychoanalytic organization); Brill, who had collected a group of physicians developing active psychoanalytic practices in New York was invited to join the new organization with his group and serve as its Secretary. Resisting intense pressure from Jones and Freud, Brill became a member, but initially not an officer. Brill was profoundly committed to establishing the legitimacy in the United States of this exotic European import by making it a respectable medical sub-specialty within psychiatry. He started the New York Psychoanalytic Society with his medical colleagues at a meeting at his home on February 11, 1911; the short-lived first APsaA was founded in May of that same year. By 1912, Brill's new society in New York had 27 members – all physicians. However, most meetings were attended by only a handful of members, and the Society actually functioned more as an intimate study group.

The earlier “American Psychoanalytic Association,” whose founding members were a mixed group of psychiatrists, did not flourish, but Brill's collegial and cohesive New York Psychoanalytic Society did. Prominent members of the Baltimore Association, such as William Alanson White floated proposals intended to disband their American Psychoanalytic Association and to merge it into the American Psychopathological Association. This wish to make psychoanalysis part of psychiatry conflicted with the wish of the new profession to remain autonomous. Although the New York group was strongly medical in its orientation, it was at the same time resistant to the possibility of being absorbed into a larger group of psychiatrists, many of whom were actually hostile to psychoanalytic concepts. The conflicting wishes to be part of, yet separate from, American psychiatry made it impossible for medical analysts over the decades to agree on proposals to establish *board certification* within psychiatry for psychoanalysis.

Brill's medically oriented New York Society survived through two decades, and by the end of the 1920s somewhat similar analytic societies had been founded in Washington-Baltimore, Chicago, and Boston. In 1932, those three societies, along with Brill's New York Society, confederated to form a new American Psychoanalytic Association – the predecessor and forerunner of the APsaA we know today. Each of these societies had or was forming a training institute which was an integral part of, *not separate from*, the Society.

During the 1930s the young Association had to deal with unanticipated problems presented by the influx of European analysts escaping the Nazis' persecution of the Jews or their ban on psychoanalysis and Freud—sometimes both—and there was disagreement with the IPA around

the issue of lay analysis which was Brill's *bête noire*. Brill had succeeded in establishing the M.D. degree as a firm requirement for membership in the American Psychoanalytic Association and, earlier, in the New York Society as well. But this was not a position that met with universal agreement. When a group of the new San Francisco Psychoanalytic Society joined the APsaA in 1942, they were told by the Association that they could not retain as full members their distinguished lay analysts Anna Maenchen, Erik Erikson, and Siegfried Bernfeld.

The San Francisco Society capitulated reluctantly, but they did give their lay analysts affiliate membership status in the San Francisco Society. Even the New York Psychoanalytic Society had offered second-class membership status to such New York lay analysts as Theodore Reik, Eric Fromm and Ernst Kris. But Brill staunchly resisted the inclusion of psychologists as full members, and Brill's exclusionary views held sway in APsaA for decades. In fact, as late as 1954 the American Psychoanalytic Association, the American Psychiatric Association and the American Medical Association published a joint resolution holding that *all psychotherapy* was a medical procedure which should be practiced only by physicians.

Except for a few times and places in history, psychoanalysts have been more than aware of the limited demand for their services. Therefore the controversy over psychoanalytic practice by non-physicians has a long and troubled history going back at least to 1912 in Europe.

According to Schröter (IJP 85:161) Carl Jung wrote to Freud in 1912 complaining about a potential non-medical psychoanalyst saying "There are just enough patients for ourselves."

Schröter comments in a footnote: "It can be safely assumed that economic concerns, as

expressed by Jung in the above quotation, played a critical role most stages of the controversy over lay analysis. *Since, however, they were rarely admitted openly but rather tended to be veiled by statements of principle, their impact is difficult to assess.*" [emphasis added]

Medicine, Psychiatry, Psychoanalysis and Brill

Since the exclusion of non-physicians from psychoanalytic training and practice, and the use of a medical speciality-like certification process further to cull out certain graduate psychoanalysts, took root only in the United States, one might rightly ask what it was about the historical development of the profession in the United States which led to this unique situation. The limitation of entry into psychoanalysis only to psychiatric physicians in the United States was finally agreed to internationally in 1938 (the "1938 rule") (Wallerstein pp. 23-49). Following World War II, the reorganization of the APsaA laid the foundation for the elevation of membership in the Association in place of the unattainable further step of board certification of psychoanalysts as a sub-specialty of psychiatry.

Certainly there can be no simple explanation of this phenomenon. We have already referred to A.A. Brill's personal inclination toward exclusivity. Other writers have remarked on psychodynamic factors which might be important. Wallerstein thought that the issue of "identity" of the profession was an important determinant: is psychoanalysis a branch of general psychology, as Freud believed, or is psychoanalysis a part of medicine -- a subspecialty within the specialty of psychiatry as Brill believed it must be. Levine(JAPA, 51S:208) explored more specific possible dynamic determinants.

The exclusion of non-medical practitioners from psychoanalysis, and the employment of a medical speciality-like certification process within the all medical profession have intertwined historical roots. Although both of these important developments in the history of the Association can be traced in part to Brill's influence, Brill himself was strongly influenced by the times in which he lived – times in which the structure of medicine and psychiatry was changing dramatically in the United States.

We believe that a full understanding of this issue, often referred to as the problem of “lay analysis,” and which reached so extreme a degree of contention between the European and U.S. analysts that it threatened to fracture the international psychoanalytic movement - and was “resolved only through a “truce” rather than a compromise -- cannot be gained without an understanding of the social environment in the United States during the 1920's and 1930's, the two decades in which the U.S. position hardened. It was in the 1920's (the anything-goes “roaring 20's) that the American psychoanalysts took the first “official” steps to limit psychoanalytic practice to physicians. And it was during the difficult and dreary days of the late 1930's (the depth of the “great depression”) that the proposal to add “board certification” in psychoanalysis first surfaced.

The restriction of access to professional practice in the healing arts was deeply imbedded in the *weltanschauung* of this entire era.

Earlier writers on this subject have attributed the exclusion of non-physicians to an attempt to root out “quacks” from the medical profession, but this is only part of the story and was mainly of importance in the 1920's -- considerably before the exclusion of non-psychiatric physicians from psychoanalysis was established nationally in APsaA. (The New York Society passed a resolution excluding all but the medically trained in 1926.)

The Flexner Report, published in 1910 (just two years after Brill established his practice) had begun a process of eliminating all means of training physicians outside the university based program. Prior to that time, physicians were “trained” in proprietary medical schools (some of which were known as “diploma mills”) and by being apprenticed to practicing physicians.

The prolonged process of implementation of the Flexner Report, the closing down of the proprietary medical schools, was occurring throughout the 1920's and into the 1930's when the last of these schools was closed. And while the Flexner Report signaled the beginning of closer regulation of the healing professions, it addressed mainly institutions claiming to train “physicians.” Other practitioner were addressed through legislative methods..

Accreditation of medical colleges by a federation of State Boards began in 1912 (JAMA 291:2139) but it was not until 1926, however, that the “Webb-Lomis” bill was passed by the New York Legislature to become the New York “Medical Practice Act” which required the *licensing* of physicians by the state. The intent of this law was to eliminate practitioners who were either outright frauds or who had been trained in the earlier inadequate programs, all loosely referred to as “quacks.” The principle targets of this bill were chiropractors. (According to Wallerstein, p.

29, it was somehow believed in Europe that this law had been instigated by Brill, and that its intention was to declare lay analysis to be illegal. We have found no factual basis, so far, for either assertion.)

It is almost forgotten today that in the very earliest part of the twentieth century, the practice of “psychiatry” was almost completely limited to hospital practice. The American Psychiatric Association had been founded in 1844 by 13 superintendents of “asylums.” Outpatient treatment of patients with non-psychotic disorders such as hysteria was carried out mostly by “neurologists” some of whom used elementary psychotherapeutic approaches such as persuasion combined with physical approaches.¹

It was largely the coming of psychoanalysis to the United States in the period after Brill established his practice *that began the transformation of American Psychiatry from a purely inpatient discipline to one in which outpatient treatment was feasible.* During the decade of the 20's (actually the ten years ending in 1932) membership in the American Psychiatric Association increased by 40%. From an organization in which all but “a negligible proportion were engaged in exclusively hospital practice,” by 1932 only 54% of the Association’s members fit this description! (Russell, AJP 12:(1):3) Much of the new growth² during the “roaring

¹Wallerstein has this wrong in his book in stating that *psychiatrists* were the major group of psychotherapists in the early part of the 20th century.

²The APA’s membership was almost 500 in 1910, doubled to 1000 during the next decade. (Rogow, p. 32.) Of 17,000 members of APA in 1970, 4000 lived in New York State, 3,000 in New York City!

twenties” had come from practitioners who were practicing psychoanalysis or other outpatient therapy based on the ideas that psychoanalysis had brought to this country. This transformation in the APA, related to the influx of psychoanalysts and other psychiatrist-psychotherapists appears to have created something of a “culture shock” from the point of view of the “old guard” of hospital superintendents who became concerned that (a) the definition of what a psychiatrist was changing and (b) there was an unwelcome “invasion” of the psychiatric field taking place.

There was, however, no formal definition of what a “psychiatrist” was. Although there had been a movement to define “special qualifications” for practice in certain sub-fields of medicine (“specialties”) starting in 1917, there was no certification or other special qualification in psychiatry.³ In 1928, Adolph Meyer, in his Presidential Address to the APA urged the creation of a diploma in psychiatry. “The fate of progress depends on minimal standards,” he said.

In 1929 an APA Committee endorsed the creation of a “definition, qualifications, limitations, and experience necessary before a practitioner deserves to be seriously regarded as a psychiatrist.” (AJP 86:417) The movement for “special qualifications” gained momentum in 1933 when the existing four certifying boards formed the “Advisory Board on Medical Specialties” (Starr, p. 357). The movement to limit the practice of “specialties” through

³ophthalmology (1916) and otolaryngology (1924), and boards in obstetrics and gynecology (1930) and dermatology (1932)

See: (<http://pn.psychiatryonline.org/cgi/content/full/37/15/16-b>)

“certification” of specialists was intensified by the severe competitive practice environment of the depression. (Starr, p. 356).

Psychiatry had resisted such certification for the prior two decades, partly because the old line psychiatrists thought of themselves not as specialists, but rather as experts in the complete medical care of chronically hospitalized patients with mental disorders. However, the situation had changed drastically by the 1930's as the “new guard” psychiatrists, largely analytically influenced outpatient practitioners, came to comprise half the organization. In 1933, James B. May, in his presidential address to the APA urged the creation of a board certification in psychiatry. (AJP, 90:1) In his address, May spoke of the “invasion” of the field of psychiatry, at first by “neurologists” and then blamed the second “invasion” (by psychologists) on the advent of psychoanalysis. He wrote:

“The next great invasion of the field of psychiatry was directly attributable to the psychologists. This was probably due to the productivity of Freud and other well-known exponents of the psychoanalytical school. The astonishing activity of these writers finally attracted the attention of psychologists who had never been aware of psychiatry up to that time. It was not very long before they began publication of articles, magazines, books, contributions of all sorts, on the subject of ‘abnormal psychiatry, which is psychiatry pure and simple, and does not belong within the domain of psychology...”

The psychologists soon invaded the clinical field and are now laying down rules intended to guide those who are interested in the actual treatment of the abnormal... ”(p. 4).

In that same year, 1933, a special section on psychoanalysis was established within the American Psychiatric Association with A. A. Brill as its chairman. Brill, clearly saw himself as the “father” of American psychoanalysis. In 1938 Brill wrote:

“Psychoanalysis was unknown in this country until I introduced it in 1908. [Psychoanalytic terminology] some of which I was the first to coin into English expressions, can now be found in all standard English dictionaries. Words like *abreaction, transference, repression, displacement, unconscious*, which I introduced as Freudian concepts, have been adopted and used to give new meanings, new values to our knowledge of normal and abnormal behavior. (Introduction, Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud, A.A. Brill, trans., Modern Library, 1938) p. 3.

Brill was unalterably committed to the limitation of clinical psychoanalysis to physicians and a dogged proponent of a close tie between the APA and psychoanalysis. He wrote:

“The American Psychiatric Association, which is the largest psychiatric organization in the world, has always been fair-minded and kindly disposed toward psychoanalysis; although some of the members were naturally critical, I

always found there a sympathetic forum. Since 1926 I had worked hard to establish a Section on Psychoanalysis in this organization and ... the council of this association finally recommended that a Section on Psychoanalysis be formed..." Id. p. 30.

Brill was unbending on the issue of "lay analysis:"

"I have always felt that psychoanalysis as a therapy belonged to the medical profession, to psychiatry, and what I have learned during all these years has not changed my opinion." Id. p. 29.

Three years later, summing up his career, Brill wrote (note here his echoing of May's use of the concept of being "invaded"):

"This leads me to the non-medical practitioners, to the so-called "lay-analysts" who began to invade this field of psychotherapy about twenty years ago. Despite the fact that I have known some highly educated lay-analysts, conscientious men and women, whose theoretical knowledge of psychoanalysis leaves nothing to be desired, I feel that as the problem now stands they should not be allowed to practice psychoanalysis or for that matter, any other form of psychotherapy..."

The American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology was established in the following year and immediately a movement, certainly promoted by Brill, began to establish a sub specialty board for psychoanalysis within that new board. In 1942 Brill's New York Society passed a resolution urging the APsaA to press for the establishment of such a board, but this proposal was not acceptable to other societies who evidently were concerned about losing control to a board composed of mostly non-psychoanalysts. Instead the officers of APsaA declared that "for the time being, a membership card issued by the American Psychoanalytic Association constitutes official 'certification.'" Finally, in the reorganization of the Association in 1946, the Board on Professional Standards was given jurisdiction over the admission of individual applicants for membership and this membership process soon became an aping of the Board Certification in medical specialties. Those who would or could not negotiate this final hurdle were forever denied membership in the "profession," despite their years of medical and psychoanalytic training.

"MEMBERSHIP" AND "CERTIFICATION"

The terms "certification" and "membership" used throughout this article have taken on multiple intertwined meanings over the years. To avoid confusion, here is an overview of the twists and turns of these usages for the reader unfamiliar with this history. "Certification" has also been imagined to serve a succession of purposes shown in the following paragraphs in **bold print**.

In the 1920s, before standardized rules for training of psychoanalysts had been established in the United States, some individuals without medical degrees traveled to Europe to receive training as psychoanalysts with established psychoanalysts there. They would return to the United States with a “*certificate*” from their teacher stating that they were now trained as analysts and would **expect to be admitted** to the New York Society. In other words, the “certificate” attested to the *training*, not to a determination of post-graduation competence of these individuals. After at first agreeing to accept such people as members, the New York Society, as it became ever more strongly committed to limiting the practice of psychoanalysis to physicians, changed its position and in 1934 reached an agreement with the International Psychoanalytical Association such that “Now analysts who had been trained in Europe and were so *certified* but who in other respects did not meet the requirements of the Society to which they applied could be refused admission.” {Oberndorf, p. 196] [emphasis added]

“Certification” in Psychoanalysis in the United States initially referred to a hoped-for *Board Certification as a medical specialty*. Brill and his colleagues believed that achieving such *medical board certification* would **legitimize psychoanalysis** as a medical discipline. The New York Society accordingly passed a resolution in 1941 urging the national Association to advocate such a certification within the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology. The Association leadership rejected this proposal on the grounds that the Association would not have sufficient influence on the certifying board until the predominance of psychoanalysis within psychiatry had progressed. Instead, the leadership of the 1932-1946 APsA declared that, “For the time being, a membership card issued by the American Psychoanalytic Association

constitutes official 'certification'." [Knight, 1943] So while medical board certification attests to a post-graduate assessment of a professional, the certification referred to by Knight was initially nothing beyond an **affirmation of the fact of training** because *completion of training* was the only criterion for eligibility to join the APsaA at that time..

In the successor (present) 1946 organization, the Board on Professional Standards was required by the new bylaws to **"certify"** in writing that each individual applicant for membership met that board's "requirements as to character and ethical and professional standards." This "certifying" process thus became a **criterion for membership in the Association**, and was carried out by a membership committee of the Board on Professional Standards in an increasingly controversial and rigorous manner. The 1946 bylaws did not explain any further whether what was being certified to was the fact of training or the result of a post-training evaluation of the applicant by a body outside the applicant's institute. This became the crux of what was a 50 year long dispute in the Association. Until 1977, a prospective Active Member applied for *membership* in the Association; the new membership process was not formally referred to as "certification" until 1977.

In 1972, in the face of a Nixon era initiative for a national health plan, psychoanalysts came to believe that Board Certification for psychoanalysts would be the **key to obtaining third party payments** under the national plan. A committee was set up to consider the possibility of establishing a board outside APsaA to carry out such certification but opinion of the Societies was distinctly negative, as in the past. So, as an alternative, in 1977 the membership process

was renamed “certification,” the membership committee was renamed the “certification committee,” all current members of the Association were declared “certified,” and “*certification*” became **the lynchpin criterion for eligibility for membership in the Association.** After 1977, a prospective Active Member applied for “certification” and, once “certified” could then apply for active membership.

In the 1980's, new classes of non-voting membership were created which did not require “certification.” Certification then became a **criterion for voting membership in the Association, holding offices in the Association, being a member of committees of the Board on Professional Standards, and being appointed as a Training Analyst.**

In the early 1990s, any graduate of an Approved Institute, and certain graduates of IPA institutes, were admitted to (partial) voting membership; certification continued as a criterion for those functions which had existed before and, in addition, **was a criterion for voting on bylaw amendments which affected educational standards.**

In 2001, all voting distinctions were removed. At the present time, APsA certification is only a **criterion for appointment as a training analyst** (and thus to be a Fellow of the Board on Professional Standards), and eligibility to serve on a committee of the Board on Professional Standards. These remaining restriction are in the bylaws of the Association and cannot be changed without the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members who vote on such a proposal.

THE PRE-1946 APsaA

The Berlin Institute was founded in 1920, during the same year that a proposal to absorb the APsaA into the American Psychopathological Association was defeated by the members of the APsaA. The New York Psychoanalytic Society formed an educational Committee in 1923 and an institute in 1932 with Sander Rado as its first director of Training. Between 1932 and 1946 the APsaA was a confederation of member societies.

Each individual member of a member society was automatically accorded individual membership of APsaA as well. There was no additional central control over eligibility for individual membership in the Association.

The pre-1946 Association basically had two classes of members: Individual Members and Societies. Some issues were determined by votes of individual members but other issues were voted on by societies, i.e. each society member had one vote. The Council on Professional Training could make “recommendations” but no change in the “Official Recommendations of the Association” could be made without the *unanimous* approval of all the societies. The Pre-1946 Bylaws said very clearly the *“The Authority of the Council on Professional Training shall be limited to making recommendations.”*

During this period, as we have said, the Association was concerned about the absorption of the refugee psychoanalysts, the ongoing question of lay analysis, and the effort to establish a psychoanalytic credential with the American Psychiatric Association. There was serious

concern about a shortage of analytic patients in New York; it was feared that the influx of European analysts, some of whom were not physicians, would make the shortage worse. In 1938, the Association “set up new rules which stated that only physicians who had completed a psychiatric residency at an approved institution could become members” (Hale, p. 128). The aim of this effort, reflecting the aspiration of Brill and others to make psychoanalysis a medical discipline, took the form of proposals to create a *Board Certification* in psychoanalysis. Board certification in medicine is the traditional way legitimacy is achieved for practitioners of new specialties and sub-specialties, and to some extent limits the ability of non-certified physicians to compete with certified physicians in the practice of their specialty.

The fur began to fly in the early 40s as emotional disagreements heated up between those who advocated a Freudian orthodoxy, and those who advocated academic pluralism and the freedom to challenge basic Freudian tenets. In April, 1941, Karen Horney was demoted from “training analyst” to “lecturer” by a majority of those voting (but not a majority of those present because many abstained) at a meeting of the New York Psychoanalytic Society. After the vote was announced, Horney, Clara Thompson, and three younger members of the New York Society – Kellman Robbins and Efron – walked out and resigned (Hale, p. 143). The story, apocryphal perhaps, is that they stood outside the building on West 86 Street singing “Let My People Go” and then walked to the bar at the Tip Toe Inn on Broadway where they discussed founding a new Society. Later in 1941, Karen Horney and her associates founded the American Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis [AAAP], whose very title infuriated the New York Society. The AAAP itself evolved into several other groups (in part because of the lay-analyst/medical-

affiliation issue), among them the William Alanson White Institute and the New York Medical College group. The William Alanson White Institute was founded by Clara Thompson and Eric Fromm who was marginalized by Horney who did not assign them new candidates for analysis and supervision

Rado's position as education director of the New York Society was abolished in 1941. In 1942, Rado, David Levy (a former President of the APA), George Daniels, Abraham Kardiner, and Carl Binger left the New York Psychoanalytic Institute and started the Association for Psychoanalytic Medicine, a new psychoanalytic society in New York. They went on to found a new training institute in New York associated the College of Physicians & Surgeons of Columbia University. However, the bylaws of the APsaA, which limited each city to only one society, prohibited the affiliation of the new society with the Association.

These splits might not have had any impact on the American Psychoanalytic Association except that the William Alanson White group (Erich Fromm, Clara Thompson, et al.) was designated as the New York branch of the Washington School of Psychiatry, which was a part of the Baltimore-Washington Psychoanalytic Society and Institute which in turn was an affiliate of the American Psychoanalytic Association. Candidates trained at William Alanson White, therefore, were presumable eligible to become members of the American Psychoanalytic Association. That situation changed when the Baltimore Society ended its association with the Washington School, but eventually those William Alanson White analysts who were still members of APsaA sought independent affiliate status for William Alanson White in the Association. A committee was

formed to consider their application. The deliberations were drawn out, to say the least, and ended when the William Alanson White members realized that they never would be accepted because of their heretical interpersonal point of view. The situation also changed because after the Baltimore and Washington institutes split the Washington School of Psychiatry “divorced” from the Washington Psychoanalytic Institute so that it could maintain its Accreditation (Sheila Hafter Gray)..

We have taken note of this early history at some length because of our contention that the resolution of the William Alanson White situation had fateful consequences for the American Psychoanalytic Association.

1946—THE “NEW” APsaA

The new society that the Rado defectors had founded applied for recognition by the APsaA in 1942, and the members of that society many, of whom were members of the APsaA, threatened to resign from the Association if the new society were not recognized. A proposal to amend the Association bylaws to make such an affiliation possible was defeated, and a very contentious negotiation process unfolded, new accommodation society/one-city rule was relinquished, but this liberalization was paid for by a loss of autonomy for the individual societies. Determination of training standards was transferred into the hands of the central organization, and the old structure was doomed.

In 1946, partly as a result of the fall out over the Columbia Institute controversy, the 1932 American Psychoanalytic Association was disbanded, and a new American Psychoanalytic Association – the one we have today – was formed. The founding principles of the new Association represented a compromise between those who demanded diversity and those who insisted on “standards” and central control of those standards. Under the new organization, Societies and Institutes were no longer a single entity but were completely independent. The rule that only one society could exist in a given geographic area was abolished. These major changes favored those pressing for diversity, but represented a threat to those who feared that new competing institutes would deviate from the “standards.”

To satisfy those concerned about “standards” *changes were made in the control of individual membership procedures in the new Association.* Until the 1946 reorganization, eligibility for membership in the Association had been “automatic” for all graduates of APsaA-affiliated institutes. The 1946 reorganization had the following fateful consequences:

(1) The determination of who could become an individual member of the national organization was taken away from the societies and transferred to the central organization and...

(2) within that central organization the specific determination of who could become a member of the national organization was placed in the hands of the Training Analyst members of the Board of Professional Standards, an entity which

represents only the faculty members in the Approved Institutes, and which does not represent the overall Association membership through the Affiliate Societies!

Clara Thompson, one of the founding members of William Alanson White and a member of APsaA, maintained that the 1946 rule was implemented to screen out applications from the deviant Washington School/William Alanson White/Baltimore-Washington group. She wrote that after the rule was put into place one of her people (Ed Tauber), told her that he was given a hard time. But others contend (Charles Brenner, personal communication) that the reason for the new membership procedure was concern that Sandor Rado's new Columbia Center for Psychoanalytic Medicine would institute a three-times-per-week training requirement for training analysis and control cases; the APsaA authorities feared that Rado's graduates would automatically become members unless there was a membership procedure that specifically stipulated a four-times-per-week requirement. (Needless to say, Rado saw the handwriting on the wall and went along with the higher training frequency.)

Under the new arrangement, the Board on Professional Standards, the successor to the "advice-only" Council on Professional Training of the 1932-1946 organization, had to "certify in writing" the eligibility ("as to ethical and professional standards") of each individual applicant. The new bylaws, however, failed to state exactly what was being certified. Was the power to "certify" intended to be a simple review of the applicant's training in an "Approved Institute," as when in the analogous situation of a professional applying for membership in a professional organization, or was this "certification" intended to be a detailed separate post-graduate evaluation of the

applicant's "competence," corresponding to examination by a medical speciality board? Out of this ambiguity, this new power to "certify" eventually morphed into a rigorous oversight and credentialing which in the 1970s was actually renamed "certification". In fact, since 1941 it had been explicitly held by some in the leadership of APsaA that membership in the American Psychoanalytic Association was the functional equivalent of *board certification* in a medical speciality.

During this early period of the new APsaA, from 1946 through the 1950s the training function dominated the activities of the Association. But the small organization was growing at a breakneck pace and it wasn't apparent to many that the Board of Professional Standards, which represented only the Approved Institutes, would become less and less representative of the overall Association membership as the years went by. In 1932 the APsaA had 32 members. In 1940 it had 192 members in 1940, but by 1960 there were 1000. There were twice as many candidates in the training programs as there were actual members in the association!

But before five years had passed, the control of eligibility for individual membership had become a flash point. Enough applications were being held up by the new Membership Committee of the Board on Professional Standards that in 1951 an investigation committee, instigated by a motion floated by some of the earlier "dissidents," was formed to review the membership procedures. Although a majority favored a less controlling approach, the "Board", which consisted only of "Senior Analysts" [later called Training Analysts] of the Approved Institutes, moved toward the development of a more stringent membership procedure (*certification*),

requiring extensive case write-ups by the applicant. The 1951 investigating committee's recommendation of a mandatory "due process" review of any application for membership that was rejected or "deferred" was ignored.

We should also note at this point that in 1951/52, the Association was incorporated under the New York "Membership Corporation Law" and the Executive Council, which consists of the nationally elected Officers, elected society representatives, and nationally elected Councilors-at-Large, was designated as the Board of Directors; as the Board of Directors of the new corporation, the Executive Council had final authority over APsaA policies. In theory, this clarified the lines of power in the APsaA and intentionally placed the Association under some degree of state scrutiny (but a fact that went largely ignored until the late 1990's). Instead, a myth that the Association was governed by a bicameral legislature, with the Board on Professional Standards as a co-equal "body," persisted for forty years.

Over the next twenty years, as the membership process became more and more arduous, growing numbers of Approved Institute graduates chose not to apply for membership/certification. Many of these psychoanalysts, already senior board-certified psychiatrists, felt the entire membership procedure to be demeaning. So while most of these Approved Institute graduates joined their local Affiliate Societies, but it appeared increasingly to many that they would forever be denied membership in the national organization. It is difficult to overstate the bitterness and hostility that this engendered among the graduates (now a huge number) of the Association's own "Approved Institutes." Many of these analysts became negative ambassadors for the Association

among a much wider group of mental health professionals, and this fact served only to heighten the hostility toward the Association already felt by other mental health professionals toward its exclusionary policies. (It is a tribute to the wish for professionals to be part of a national organization of peers that a very large percentage of such approved institute graduates actually did join the Association when they were finally offered the opportunity, albeit with a kind of “second-class” status; but they still refused to subject themselves to any individual vetting, as we will see below. Many brought with them into the Association a residual bitterness stemming from their earlier exclusion.)

In 1976, in a paper devoted to this “membership problem,” Anton Kris wrote that “Some 800 eligible psychoanalysts, graduates of Association-approved institutes, have not applied for active membership, many explicitly because of the application requirements. This number is more than one-half the roughly 1400 active members of the Association (American Psychoanalytic Association 1971b, p. 2, fn.)]” This means that of 2200 graduates only 1400 (64%) applied for membership between the 1950's and the mid 70's.

The widespread antagonism toward the membership application procedure, and the consequent shunning of Association membership by large numbers of graduates, led to concern in many quarters about the moral and financial health of the APsaA, but those in control of the application procedure stoutly defended its methodology and rationale. They felt that certification was a valid post-graduate requirement for would-be members of the Association. They passionately believed that allowing graduates who had not been individually approved by the Board on Professional

Standards to join the Association would eventually lead to an “erosion” of the very standards themselves.

But others saw the membership application procedure as a way for the Board on Professional Standards to actualize its otherwise dubious control over training within the approved institutes. Indeed, Kris (1971) concluded that the Board on Professional Standards was using its control over the professional fate of individual graduates as a club over the Approved Institutes. Even though the Board conducted “quality control” site visits of all the “Approved Institutes,” it had no other practical mechanism for enforcing its recommendations within those institutes themselves. As Martin Stein wrote:

It is argued that the board can exert influence to improve the educational work of the various teaching organizations through its Committee on Institutes. Its impact is, however, severely limited since the only effective sanction the Board can recommend for an institute that is failing in its duty toward its candidates is tantamount to suspension. The Board is understandably reluctant to take such extreme action, which would affect adversely every member of the affected institute and all its candidates in training whatever their qualifications. It is inevitably a move of last resort. For all practical purposes the Board is left with only one way to exert effective influence on psychoanalytic education: by requiring graduates who apply for active membership to provide evidence of competence in the practice of

psychoanalysis -- that is certification (*TAP*, Fall 1990 Special Supplement).

By 1968, it was evident that the percentage of graduates applying for membership was dropping significantly. Only 40% of those graduating between 1960 and 1964 were applying for membership.

In 1974, one outside observer of the Association wrote:

“...it is not possible to do without rules and regulations in psychoanalytic education and certification, but the growth of them makes one wonder, "Why the fear?" For example, a recent issue of the *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* contains page upon page of rules, regulations, discussions of rules, ad hoc and post hoc committees, so that one wonders when these people have time for work, leisure, or the aesthetics of the process. It is as though the claim to complication were a way of arriving at absolute Truth and Perfection. ”

Lefer, J. (1974) Supervision—Anamnesis and Catamnesis. *Contemp. Psychoanal.*,
10:248-253

CONTINUING CONTROVERSY ABOUT “MEMBERSHIP,” AND GRADUAL LIBERALIZATION

It is not surprising that the membership issue continued to be a bone of contention in APsaA.

Those responsible for the overall financial health of the Association kept calling attention to the lack of membership growth and the aging of the membership into non-dues paying status. Others, who had concerns about developing more diversity and openness in the Association, joined them and gladly added their voices to those the urging changes in membership policies.

During the 1970s a series of modification of the Association's membership structure, essentially attempted compromises, were instituted to address this perceived “membership problem.” Each of these changes, while it helped the Association's coffers, only served to highlight further the problem caused by the continuing restrictive membership policy, and the second-class status experienced by the large group of non-certified graduates.

The first modification, effective in 1973, intended to entice non-certified graduates to apply for membership/certification, was the creation of a dues-paying, non-voting, time-limited “Associate Member” category open to all Approved Institute graduates. Two hundred twenty-five new members immediately joined the Association (40% of those invited), but as the three year limited time period dragged on, and was “extended” for some, it became clear that most would not apply for certification leading to active membership, and they would have to be dropped. However, by that time the Association had become dependent of the dues of these “Associate Members.” A

decision was made to send each of these members a letter asking for an expression of intent to apply for “certification.” Those so indicating would not be dropped, even though the time limit had passed.

By the early 1980's, however, few had actually applied, so another membership category, “Extended Associate Member,” with no voting rights or right to hold office, was proposed in a 1983 bylaw amendment, and was adopted by an overwhelming vote of 661 to 44. This new category was not time-limited, and was open only to those who were in the third year of their three year “Associate Member” sojourn. In addition, as an ingathering gesture through a one-time “waiver,” an application deadline of December 1984 was established for graduates who were not already “Associate Members.” Almost all of those initially accepting this new permanent membership (120 out of 1,200 invited) were already “Associate Members,” and only 10% of eligible non-members applied. By 1987, there were 1576 Active Members, but there were also 568 Extended Associate Members, and an additional 174 Associate Members as the previous Associate Members who did not apply for certification transitioned to Extended Associate member status. A financial crisis was still in the making if the post-1984 application rate of new graduates continued to be low.

THE FIRST “DELINKAGE”

In 1989, The Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society and Institute conducted a survey of the Association Active Membership on the link between certification and Active Membership. As

reported to the Board on Professional Standards, this survey resulted in a strong expression of preference for dropping the connection (77.5% vs. 22.5%, with a 50% response rate.)

Pressure was thus mounting to dispense with the membership-certification tie altogether, and to grant some kind of permanent Active Membership to non-certified institute graduates. At that time, Arnold Richards was editor of *The American Psychoanalyst*, the newsletter of APsaA. In 1990, Richards proposed that TAP put out a special issue in dealing with the possibility of separation of membership from certification, which was then called “delinkage,” and invited proponents of both sides, pro and con, to submit statements for publication.

Although many felt that the weight of logic and practicality was on the side of delinkage, a bylaw amendment did not muster the two-thirds vote of the certified members required for passage.

There remained a group strongly concerned that if non-certified graduates became voting members, the “standards” of the Association’s training programs would be in danger and that this group was large enough to prevent the necessary majority.” The non-certified members could not vote of course. But the vote of the certified voting members was close enough to warrant another attempt. This time a compromise proposal was put forth that conferred permanent membership on non-certified graduates including *limited* voting rights—voting for officers and for *non-educational by-law amendments*—but maintained the certification requirement for running for office, and, of course, for becoming training analyst and serving on the Board on Professional Standards or the Executive Committee. In retrospect, this was probably an illegal arrangement. It created “classes” of voting members with different voting rights, but without the necessary

formalities required under corporation law to assure the preservation of the rights of each class of members.

This compromise proposal did receive the two-thirds majority necessary for passage, and the by-laws were amended in 1992. As a result of the delinkage, the Associate and Extended Associate membership categories were abolished and all such members became second-class full members instead. (Tellingly, Richards recalls a very respected senior member who practically cried when the vote was announced, feeling that all he had worked for “was being destroyed.”) The newly created certification-based stratification of graduate analysts members was not resolved in the Association until 2001 (see below.)

While the admission of non-medical applicants (with the settlement of the lawsuit) and the delinkage of certification from membership saved the APsaA from fiscal and also substantive problems, those changes did not significantly affect the political or theoretical makeup of the organization. To wit: eliminating the certification requirement for “full” membership was a step in the direction of a real professional membership organization, but it remained a two-tiered Association. There was no evidence that the leadership was concerned; in fact, many among them brought themselves to vote for partial enfranchisement only because it increased the dues base of the Association while prohibiting voting rights on educational matters, prohibited serving as a Fellow of the Board on Professional Standards, and denied eligibility for Training Analyst appointments for these “second-class” “full members.”

It should be noted that throughout all these years psychoanalysis was going through some changes in the United States that would to affect APsaA from without. The first was the collapse of third party reimbursement of psychoanalysis which very sharply reduced the pool of potential private psychoanalytic patients during the 1980s and 1990s. The second was the development of training programs for psychoanalysts in institutes that were completely separate from the American Psychoanalytic Association; these training other mental health professionals such as psychologists and social workers as psychoanalysts. Many of these new professionals had little love for the Association because of its long history of exclusionary policies. Thirdly, the prestige of psychoanalysis in the U.S. was rapidly diminishing. The large number of psychiatry chairs in medical schools that had been held by psychoanalysts in the 1960s and 1970s were now being occupied by “medically” oriented psychiatrists. In the early 1990s the Association’s monopoly on training psychoanalysts eligible for IPA membership in the U.S. was lost as the IPA began directly to accredit Institutes outside APsaA’s “approved” institutes. (The APsaA agreed to make some graduates of such institutes eligible for APsaA membership, subject to individual scrutiny by the Board on Professional Standards.) Finally, in 2002, the State of New York enacted legislation creating a *profession of psychoanalysis* with statutory training requirements and professional licensure. The new profession will be a masters level mental health discipline similar to social work in the extent of the prerequisite mental health training.

Once non-physicians were eligible for training at institutes of the Association (after the lawsuit was settled in the early 1990s), they were eligible for membership upon graduation; so were the graduates of four non-APsaA institutes (IPTAR, The Freudian Society, PCC, and LAISP) that had

been admitted into the IPA by the agreement mentioned above. It turns out that the eligibility of American IPA members for membership in the APsaA would have a fateful impact on the organization's policies and governance.

One of the new IPA members of the Association was Arlene Kramer Richards, the wife of one of the authors (Arnold Richards). Kramer Richards was already a training and supervising analyst at IPTAR and the Freudian Society, had written widely in psychoanalysis, and was respected as a clinician, contributor, and teacher. A member of Division 39 and a past-president of its Section 1, Kramer Richards was also a member of the IPS, the affiliate group of the four American non-APsaA IPA institutes. Only a fraction of the IPS's membership of about 550 had joined the APsaA, and the leadership of the Association was interested in encouraging more to do so. While the leadership of the IPA Institutes IPTAR, The Freudian Society, CCP and LAISP may have discouraged members from joining the APsaA out of concern that membership in the American would draw energy and commitment away (and the \$600 annual dues might be an individually discouraging factor), Kramer Richards believed that an important reason for the small American IPA Institute presence in the Association was the perception that their members would have second-class citizenship compared with the first-class, certified APsaA citizens. She decided to apply for certification herself - even though she was already a training analyst at two IPA institutes - as part of the effort to recruit IPA members to join the Association, and to demonstrate that the members of the Board on Professional Standard's Committee on Certification intended to treat their new IPA colleagues respectfully and collegially.

Kramer Richards has written a detailed account of her experience.⁴ In short, she submitted her case material to the Committee, was told that it was deficient. She decided to pursue her application rather than to withdraw from the process as many have done after a first or second rejection or “deferral”. Kramer Richards’s account documents vividly the procedural and individual problems with the certification exam . Many other members communicated with her describing similar experiences with the Certification Committee. Kramer Richards story is important to this paper because it is the springboard for our thesis about organizational change.

Kramer Richards’s experience alerted Arnold Richards to the undemocratic nature of a system in which voting and office-holding is based on a test without demonstrated validity or reliability. And, since her experience was clearly not unique yet none of her fellow deferred applicant for certification were willing to do anything to change it, Arnold Richards realized that the system depended on a climate of intimidation that discouraged complaint. He further realized that organizational change would require an expository platform from which the membership could be informed about what was at stake.

The traditional platforms in the American had been official publications like the newsletter and bulletins, and meetings if the official committees, and other administrative bodies—the membership and certification committees, the often scripted meetings of the Board of

⁴Richards, A.K.,(2001) “Discussion of the certification process at the American Psychoanalytic Association.”
Full text is available on-line at:
<http://www.etatsgeneraux-psychanalyse.net/archives/texte147.html>

Professional Standards and the Executive Council (where input was limited to “official” designees). There was also the yearly meeting of the rank and file, which might provide a broader forum for dissenting views but was notable mainly for its sparse attendance. The organs of communication in the association are largely controlled by its officers, and almost over an entire half-century all the officers have been training analysts, the group with a major stake in the maintaining control Board of Professional Standards over the entire Association. Dissenters views had few platforms for addressing to the membership at large any questions about this lopsided set up.

THE ADVENT OF THE INTERNET

What made the difference was the Association’s Internet email lists! APsaA e-mail communication was first established in 1996 by Mosher during the Presidency of Judith Schachter. The new unmoderated, (that is completely uncensored) lists, provided by the Association became a major force for change. For the first time, the Association gave its members venue in which ordinary members could make their voices heard by a wide audience of colleagues. The Internet avenues—the “members” list and the “open line” list—alone provided the means for broad participation in ongoing debates about controversial topics and the presentation of non-official positions, free of organizational oversight or permission.

The ability of new communications technologies to transform organizations or governments has been noted by others. For instance, in the book “Dismantling Utopia How Information Ended the

Soviet Union” Scott Shane describes how the wide spread use of fax machines led to the overthrow of the Soviet Union. A Rand Corporation publication has extended this analysis to number other situations in which hierarchical organizations have been liberalized and “flattened” by a variety of technological innovations leading to enhanced communications.

Arnold Richards began a conversation on the open line list about the certification on process with a reference to a comment in the Plenary Address by Robert Michels on the Case Study that the aims of the Committee of Scientific Activites and the aims of the Committee on Certification were incompatible. At its peak, this list engaged some 1,200 of the 3,400 Association members. Richards's 1998 posting began a lively two-year discussion that was eventually instrumental in enacting the second delinkage—total enfranchisement and voting rights. This development illustrated the profoundly destabilizing effect the Internet can have on organizations. Internet chat lines are functionally democratic, unlike other forums in an organization: the message matters as much as the messenger; you can be anybody and still have a voice.

Not so under the then-prevailing certification mandate. The fact is that 95% of those who persisted in the application process eventually passed, if somewhat the worse for wear. Some complained about their experience to their colleagues; others were just relieved to be over the hurdle and went about their business, although often with some sense of alienation from the organization. Still others, we think, have gone on to become members of the certification committee themselves, and in some cases to do unto others as they were done to. It is true that there are some, perhaps many, who having sailed through the exam are very positive about the

experience and trumpet the educational value of having been required to write up all their cases for scrutiny. The authors have not heard of anyone trained at an Institute of the APsaA and who had a negative experience with Certification going public, or trying in some way to change the system. It was becoming clear that the overall structure of the APsaA discouraged dissent, and that the members of The Board on Professional Standards, and its Certification Committee, were inextricably committed to the linkage between certification and to their view of “standards.”

The system itself mitigates against outspoken questioning. Candidates are concerned about graduating, graduates are concerned about becoming certified, certified members are concerned about becoming training analysts, training analysts are concerned about becoming fellows of the Board, and fellows of the Board are concerned about achieving (either in their own person or in that of their close associates) the chair of The Board on Professional Standards.

The stark and irrefutable fact of the almost complete domination of APsaA political offices for half a century by Training Analysts also raises questions about the effect of the “Training Analyst system” on the direction the Association has taken. The first training analyst, Hans Sachs, believed that a training analyst should withdraw from all offices in the Institute and Society. [Bernfeld]. How far in the exact opposite direction have we gone? Can the peculiar fact of the domination of APsaA elective offices by training analysts be related to unanalyzed and thus unresolved idealizations in the minds of all the voters in APsaA, all of whom, of course, have had an important analytic relationship with a “training analyst?” Is there, in fact, a false organizational self in APsaA, analogous to the false self that some have suggested are fostered in individual

members by our training system? [See Berman, E. (2000) The Utopian Fantasy of a New Person and the Danger of a False Analytic Self. *Psychoanal. Psychol.*, 17:38-60]

No one should minimize how important it is to bringing about movement in the direction of inclusion in an organization that has since its inception had an inordinate preoccupation with what Richards has called the politics of exclusion. To read the proceedings of the Board on Professional Standards, or the recorded farewell addresses of The Board on Professional Standards chairs yields the impression that the APsaA's main raison d'être has been gate-keeping. Has gate-keeping been carefully sheltered under the administrative euphemism "maintenance of standards." Unauthorized training, lay analysis, certification—in each case the thrust of the Board was on keeping some group out of the Association, rather than on fulfilling its mission as the Association's education and training arm. This spirit of exclusion has permeated APsaA since its inception. In fact, the section on membership of the 1946 bylaws of the Association, still on the books, begins with this unusual negative and exclusionary description of eligibility for Association membership "No person shall be eligible for election as an Active Member unless . . ."

Email lists (listserves), which allow any subscriber to express a point of view in a marketplace of ideas, are intrinsically inclusive. As the discussion of some of these membership and certification issues began to appear on the Association's lists, members favoring the status quo began to complain about the "tone" of messages sent to these lists, rather than addressing the substance of these writings. Certainly, a lack of familiarity with the newly developing styles of email

communication could account for some of this pique. We suspect that, in addition, much of the complaining resulted from dismay at the idea that matters which had previously been thought properly to be discussed only among the group of Training Analysts in the Board on Professional Standards were now being discussed by the voting membership at large. We believe that the “word was passed” that Board Fellows should refrain from entering the dialog, and for the most part they disappeared from the lists, except to surface occasionally to complain, once again, about the “tone” of the messages, which they apparently continued to read.

A THIRD DELINKAGE?

Certainly the APsaA system will never be the same, after a history of devotion to the exclusion of supposedly “deviant” institutes (William Alanson White) and analysts. The exclusion has always had a self-perpetuating aspect, whereby Training Analysts, who are the certifiers, certify the members who may become training analysts, and ultimately choose successor generations of training analysts.

An Internet email list discussion about yet a third delinkage—removing the certification requirement for appointment as a training analyst and service on The Board on Professional Standards—has developed over the past two years. A Task Force on Education and Membership had been convened in 1989 to try to resolve what has been seen as a “board/council” conflict in the Association. Typically, 17 of the 20 members of this Task Force were Training Analysts. The Task Force report suggested a compromise which it divided into two sections. The first was

a group of (mostly) liberalizing bylaw amendments that would extend full voting rights in the Association to all active members and to all trainee-members as well. (This proposal also, however, increased the number of signatures required to initiate a grass-roots bylaw amendment from ten to fifty.) The second section of the proposal advocated a “Procedural Code” for the Association that would insulate the Board on Professional Standards from the political oversight of the membership, thus partially negating the liberalizing changes in the proposal.

The Executive Council of the Association overwhelmingly approved the proposals, and in 2001 the liberalizing bylaws proposals were adopted by the membership, thus removing the final limitation on the voting rights of non-certified members of the Association. The proposal to extend full voting rights to affiliate members (candidates) was adopted by a razor-thin margin.

However, it soon became evident that the other part of the proposal had been envisioned by some as a change in the organization’s structure having the force of bylaw amendments without the necessary membership vote needed actually to amend the bylaws. Ultimately, it was discovered that the entire concept of such a “procedural code” is not legal under New York law, and thus only the more liberalizing part of the report has found its way into the bylaws of the Association.

One of us (Paul Mosher) published a series of carefully researched “Civics Lessons” published on the APsaA Open Line list over a period of months in 2001 and 2002, clarified the reorganization of the APsaA in 1946, the 1951 incorporation, and the current status of the APsaA under the very pro-democracy New York State Not- for- Profit Corporation Law that governs the Association.

Although they were met at first with derision, the facts uncovered in these “Civics Lessons” were recently confirmed by a consultation with a leading attorney-expert on the New York Not-for-Profit Corporation Law. This consultation has triggered an internal struggle in which those previously in control of the Association’s membership policies now seek to “reorganize” the Association we believe to regain what they had previously claimed was their position of power, and to continue Brill’s policies of exclusion.

Richards thought that the major unresolved problem as to the deficiencies in the certification process, following the 2001 amendments was that certification, still determined a graduate member’s eligibility to become a training analyst. In the discussion that Richards began on the open line email list, what Richards called the “third delinkage,” the dropping of the requirement of certification for Training Analyst appointment, was vigorously opposed by The Board on Professional Standards. One concern appeared to be that no one would apply for certification if it was not a requirement for training analyst appointment, and that APsaA’s internal certification system would wither away.

The Internet medium created enough attention to the problem that the Board appointed a committee to study the problem and prepare a report. As a Committee of the Board on Professional Standards, it is no surprise that this new committee was not representative of the entire membership—all its members were training analysts and only one could be identified as opposing certification. Four “critics of the certification process” (including Mosher and Richards)

were invited to meet with the committee, but there was no evidence of their input in its final committee report, which begins with the axiomatic claim that the psychoanalysis needs a national test of competence to maintain its standing as a profession. The report acknowledges that the current test does not have demonstrated validity or reliability, and recommends that establishing a parallel committee be established to study the validity and reliability of the process.

In October, 2002, a group of about fifty members who were critics of the certification process, formed a private email discussion group, “delinkage” which made no use of any Association facilities. This group contributed to a small legal fund which was used to hire an attorney expert in the New York State Not-For-Profit Corporations Law, who confirmed Mosher’s assertion as to the illegal nature of the “Procedural Code” proposal which would not be voted by all the members or approved by the legally elected board of directors.. No agreement could be legal which deprived the Board of Directors of the Association of its ultimate authority over APsaA policy.

Ultimately, as a consequence of Mosher’s “Civics Lessons,” which suggested that the APsaA was not in compliance with the New York State Not-for-Profit Law, and which were verified by the “Delinkage” attorney, the President and President-Elect sought consultation with the renowned not-for-profit lawyer, Victoria Bjorklund. (The other Officers, the Directors, and the Chairman of The Board on Professional Standards were excluded from the meeting.) This noted attorney confirmed that the Association was operating illegally in several respects: the Board on

Professional Standards had no legal status which could give it the power to enact policies for the Association which the Board of Directors did not approve. Additionally, the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors was not legally constituted because such a committee must be designated by the Executive Council and comprised of councilors or elected officers.

These were seismic findings. In response, The Board on Professional Standards formed a committee to determine how the Association could be restructured to grant the “Board” the legal status it previously imagined it had. One alternative, floated by the President-elect Jon Meyer was to “reincorporate” the Association in Delaware as if the Delaware law would support a non-democratic structure illegal in New York. (This is not the case.) Many members saw that proposal as a way to circumvent democratic governance. An additional incidental finding of the attorney was that an anachronistic provision in the Certificate of Incorporation of the Association also meant that the Executive Council was larger than its stated maximum size. (This has been corrected.)

The independent “Delinkage” email list provides another route through which new communications technologies can affect the political process. The change in the Association bylaws in 2001, that raised the number of signatures for a grass roots bylaw amendment from ten to fifty, was clearly intended to restrict the ability of the rank-and-file members to influence the Association. However, the existence of the Delinkage list, which joined members holding relatively similar views on the issues under discussion, effectively negated this restrictive change by making it relatively much easier to obtain fifty signatures than would have been possible in the

old days, when members had no forum for communicating among themselves, other than mail or fax. After extended discussion on the independent list where the wording of the proposal could be hashed out in view of all potential signers, the group easily mobilized the fifty signatures needed for two bylaw amendments. One of those would have removed the bylaw requirement for certification for training analyst appointment. The other would have clarified and restated the lines of authority in the Association.

The Board on Professional Standards rightly perceived that the bylaws proposals would have restated in unambiguous terms what was in fact the case anyway, however it may have been denied for sixty years— that the democratically elected Executive Council has final authority over all APsaA policies. The certification delinkage amendment gave the Board of Professional Standards the right to waive the certification requirement if they or institutes saw fit. When we pointed out that would provide more options for the Board we were told “Don’t do us any favors”. We think that the fear was that enacting a by law amendment proposed by a group of individual members (an initiative from below) would establish a bad precedent .The amendments fell far short of reaching the two-thirds vote needed for adoption, but despite vigorous opposition by the Board on Professional Standards, the proposals did achieve a near-majority of the members’s votes.

Despite this defeat, which had been anticipated, the by-law vote was an occasion for focusing members’ attention on their own rights and responsibilities, and for pursuing a discussion about the effect of the political structure and relationships within the APsaA on the development of

psychoanalysis in the U.S. The vote also showed that there would be little chance to gain a 2/3 vote for any bylaws proposal that would *decrease* the democratic nature of the Association, as presently constituted under New York law.

There is, of course, another side to this story. It has to do with what many call “standards,” but which we prefer to call “quality”—quality education and quality treatment—that is a system of education and training that develops knowledgeable practitioners who help their patients, discharge their ethical responsibilities, and approach their tasks with an attitude of dedication and humility. Our sense is that despite the preoccupation with “standards” there still has been a fall-off in quality. On the other hand it may be that we have left what Jacob Arlow calls the “Apostolic Age”—which may be a good thing if it means creativity and advancing the field.

Richards's feeling is that the removal of some of the restrictive structures, such as certification, will be beneficial to all. There is no evidence that certification selects for better training analysts. Mosher does not believe that the real problem with certification is its lack of reliability and validity, even if such deficiencies exist. He sees it as a passage rite that is similar to analogous and equally unproven rites in other professions. Instead, Mosher sees the problem as the low application rate; that is, certification in APsaA is not selling because APsaA's certification process as currently administered has for years appeared to many as a star chamber proceeding that is arbitrary, unfair, and lacking in transparency as currently constituted. Application for certification hovers below 50% for recent graduates as compared with 90% application rate for Board Certification in Medicine. This leads to an APsaA with two large classes of members and

a divided structure. Mosher has made clear that one measure of the success of the certification process would be a substantial increase in the application rate which would demonstrate a true wide-spread confidence in the integrity of the process. This point was completely ignored by the Board committee studying certification, despite the evidence that members are now voting against APsaA certification with their feet.

Since the 2001 bylaws amendments removed all distinctions among APsaA Active Members with respect to their “certification” status, the matter of APsaA certification is in theory no longer a “membership” issue. However, in practice this is not the case. Because in APsaA’s traditional hierarchy, becoming a training analyst, or even being eligible for such an appointment—a status which currently requires that one be “certified” — has emotional meaning in the membership organization as well as a substantive and important career effect on those who work within the current “approved” APsaA training facilities. In addition, the requirement that all training analysts in “Approved Institutes” be certified hamstrings any efforts to extend “approved institute” status to independent institutes that have no tradition of “certification” as a prerequisite for their training analyst positions.

Will the certification system wither away? If it does, will the training analyst system wither away as well? And would that be good or bad? Will the lesser number of new training analysts bring the supply more in line with demand? Now, unlike the fifties or sixties when we had a psychoanalysis of plenty—plenty of candidates and plenty of patients—most training analysts have few candidates in analysis. Arnold Cooper, a past-President of APsaA, has estimated that

when psychoanalysis is stable, only about 10% of the APsaA members would be training analysts compared to the 25% or more needed during a period of rapid growth. At the present time, only 22% of the members of the Association are Training Analysts, but half of those are over 70 years of age. Since only Training Analysts are eligible to sit on the Board on Professional Standards, the diminishing importance (proportionally) of “training” as function of APsaA has resulted in the control of the overall well-being of the Association, and its place within American psychoanalysis, by a relative sliver of the APsaA membership.

Two years ago the APsaA hired a marketing consultant. Focus groups found that there was considerable appreciation of psychoanalytic theory among the public, patients and analyst and therapists outside the APsaA. There was less appreciation of psychoanalytic technique, however, and even a still less positive view of us, the analysts, the messengers of psychoanalysis who were described as aloof and distant. Newell Fisher, the APsaA president, set out on a country-wide journey, visiting every society in the U.S. Often he was told that the problem was not our PR but our product; that is, our rigid adherence to a 4/5 times per week intensive model of psychoanalysis. In fact, our practice surveys show that *fully half of the psychoanalyses now conducted by APsaA members are carried out at a frequency of three times per week* (as originally suggested by Freud for “light” or “established” cases.) We should incorporate within psychoanalytic theory and practice, and within the definition of the profession itself, other modalities informed by traditional psychoanalysis – less frequent sessions, family therapy, etc.

In any case, the Bjorklund opinion has dramatically altered the landscape of the American Psychoanalytic Association. Instead of a bicameral structure of equals or a structure in which one body is more equal than the other, we now have a situation in which the status and authority of the Board on Professional Standards, the educational arm of the APsaA, are in doubt.

The APsaA is still facing a situation of falling overall candidate enrollment. We are looking at fiscal shortfalls as expenses increase and revenues flatten or diminish. Members of the APsaA average 61.9, training analysts 70.2. Twenty-eight percent of members, according to one projection, will no longer be paying dues by 2006, and the same projection calculates that the percent will increase substantially in the next decade unless the APsaA attracts new candidates who will eventually become new members.

Newell Fischer, Immediate Past President of APsaA, was very aware of this situation. In 2003, he empowered a task force, chaired by Harriet Wolfe, to explore the possibility of inviting analysts who have trained at institutes outside the APsaA to join. Subsequently, in June 2004 he introduced a bylaw amendment which has the intent of relocating the membership function from the Board of Professional Standards to the democratically elected Executive Council. Under the current bylaws, the Board on Professional Standards (which represents only the "Approved Institutes" and on which only Training Analysts can serve) exercises control over membership eligibility of the organization as a whole. Members of BOPS are concerned about the impact of such a change on institutes applications and training standards. Dr. Fisher feels that membership issues impact upon all aspects of the functioning of APsaA, and should be considered in the

Executive Council, where all stake holders are represented. Under his original proposal, the Executive Council, acting as the APsaA Board of Directors, would have been empowered to change the criteria for membership in APsaA without an affirming vote of the present membership.

At the June, 2004 annual meeting of the Association, extremely strong opposition from the Board on Professional Standards to Dr. Fischer's original proposal led to intense negotiations and an eventual "compromise" bylaw proposal which, while transferring the membership function a Committee of the Executive Council, makes clear that the *Executive Council cannot on its own change the "criteria" for membership in the Association*. Instead, any initiative to modify the membership criteria will have to be submitted to the membership as a bylaw amendment. Such a vote requires a two-thirds (of those voting) vote in favor. The proposed bylaw was adopted unanimously by the Executive Council and went to the membership for the needed vote of approval with the endorsement of the Board on Professional Standards. Approval is a foregone conclusion. Some cynics have pointed out that it has always been the case that a two-thirds vote of the membership could change the membership criteria, have called the "compromise" nothing more than a cosmetic change, and believe that the compromise was a political maneuver intended to derail Dr. Fischer's initiative. And while there may be some truth to this assertion, there is one substantive change that the bylaw change will bring about. That change is a modification in the way in which graduates of IPA-approved training programs become eligible for membership. In the future, any psychoanalyst **who is a member** of the IPA is eligible to become a member of APsaA with the same no-vetting process as is used for graduates of APsaA Approve Institutes.

One way of seeing this is that APsaA has, in part, “outsourced” its membership eligibility determination to the IPA!

Other cynics feel that the Board on Professional Standards has responded to the current state of affairs by refusing to enter an open dialog with the Association membership. In fact, some supporters of the *status quo* paradoxically appear to be advocating an even more radical step: APsaA would be essentially disbanded as a professional membership organization and transformed into a sort of “interest” organization which any person with an individual interest in psychoanalysis could join. Presumably, this would avoid a liberalized definition of the profession while leaving the Approved Institutes intact to pursue their current training policies free of member oversight. They would be in a position to represent themselves as the exemplars of the “true” psychoanalysis. Finally it is by no means certain that a great many graduates of training programs other than the APsaA Approved Institutes would apply if offered the opportunity of “full membership” as long as we have the current certification-Board on Professional Standards caste system in existence within the Association.

In the meantime, a Task Force on Reorganization, which was been selected by the Executive Committee, and has been endorsed by an overwhelming referendum vote of the membership is now beginning its deliberations. This Task Force will issue a restructuring plan with the appropriate by law amendments which will require a two third vote of the membership. How long will this take? In the past no major change in the organization has taken less that five years.

Describing the events of the 1950's that led to the exclusionary and restrictive APsaA membership, certification, and training policies, historian Nathan G. Hale wrote "In time the new rules that required increasingly lengthy periods for compliance ensured that psychoanalytic organizations would be made up to a considerable extent of the middle aged and the aging." The day that Hale has predicted has arrived. The Association is now losing its position as the preeminent psychoanalytic professional organization in the United States. The decisions that the members of the Association make in the next few years will determine whether the Association can be renewed as a vibrant forward-looking professional organization, or whether it will wither away as new organizations of younger, more flexible, professional psychoanalysts develop and come to dominate the profession.

American Psychiatric Association (1929) Proceedings of Societies; Report of

the Committee on Medical Services, *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 86:417-422.

Beck, Andrew H. (2004) The Flexner Report and the Standardization of American Medical

Education, *JAMA* 291:2139.

Berman E. (2000). The utopian fantasy of a New Person and the danger of a false analytic self.

Psychoanalytic Psychology 17:38-60.

Bernfeld, Siegfried (1962) On Psychoanalytic Training. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 31:453-482, p.

481.

Fass, P. (1968). A.A. Brill: Pioneer and Prophet. Unpublished Master's Dissertation: Columbia

University.

Freud, S. (1938). The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud, ed. and transl. A.A. Brill. New York:

Modern Library.

Sheila Hafter Gray, Personal Communication, 14 Apr 2004.

Robert Knight (1953) .The Present Status of Organized Psychoanalysis in the United States.

Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association 1:197-221.

Kris, Anton O., (1976). The Problem of Membership in the American Psychoanalytic

Association. *Journal of the Philadelphia Association for Psychoanalysis* Volume III Nos.

1 & 2 1976, pp. 22-36.

Hale, N.G. (1995). *The Rise and Crisis of Psychoanalysis in the United States: Freud and the Americans, 1917-1985*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fred Levine (2003). The Forbidden Quest and the Slippery Slop: Roots of Authoritarianism in

Psychoanalysis *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 51 (Suppl.):203–245.

Langer, Walter C & Gifford, Sanford (1978). An American Analyst in Vienna during the

Anschluss, 1936-38. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 14:27–54.

Obendorf, Clarence (1953). *A History of Psychoanalysis in American*. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Russell, W. L. (1932) Presidential Address: The Place of the american psychiatric association in modern psychiatric organization and progress. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 12:1–18.

Schroter, M. (2004) The early history of lay analysis, especially in vienna, Berlin and London: aspects of an unfolding controversy (1906-24). *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 85:159–178.

Starr, Paul (1982) *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*, New York: Basic Books, p. 357

Martin Stein 1990 TAP.

Wallerstein, Robert (1998) Lay Analysis - Life Inside the Controversy, Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press

paul_mosher@compuserve.com

and

ArnieDR@aol.com