The Organizational Structure of the American Psychoanalytic Association: The Politics of Exclusion

When I agreed to give this presentation, I was not aware of how timely my topic would be. First, a personal note: This month is the 50th anniversary of my starting as an analytic candidate at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. 1964 was of course a halcyon time for APsaA and the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. There were 35 applicants and only 13 were accepted. Membership in APsaA was growing. Most of the departments of psychiatry had chairs who were psychoanalysts. Psychoanalysis had a lot of prestige and psychoanalysts commanded high fees for their services. It was the time of psychoanalysis of plenty, plenty of candidates and plenty of patients. In regard to training this promoted conformity and compliance to rules and practices set by those in charge because the candidates were aware if they did not comply there were many other interested candidates applicants waiting in the ways to take their place. It was also a time of a burgeoning psychoanalytic literature, important contributors within the perhaps too narrow classical Freudian clinical approach. It was a medical profession, Brill rather than Freud had prevailed but there were important research efforts by psychologists who were not allured by clinical training, for example the NYU Research Center for Mental Health—George Klein, Bob Holt, Leo Goldberger, Fred Pine, Shelly Bach, David Wolitsky, who was a CORST candidate, the only non-physician in my candidate class at NYPI. We thought those days would never end, but they did. I am sure all of you are aware that for many reasons, such as alternative treatments, psychopharmacology, limited
insurance reimbursement, and a charge in prevailing cultural and societal attitudes

psychoanalysis’s place in the mental health universe has dramatically changed. I don’t
know of a single chair of a psychiatry department who is a psychoanalyst now.
And psychiatry also is in trouble. There was not a single graduating medical student
from Albert Einstein Medical School who opted for psychiatry.

Institutional psychoanalysis has always had at best an ambivalent relationship
with democracy. It was conceived and informed by an autocratic genius who did not
willingly relinquish authority. Yet this same genius welcomed anyone into his tent -- as
long as they followed his rules. Psychoanalysis in America has been less ambivalent
toward democracy -- but, at least in the foremost psychoanalytic organization in the
country, democracy has sometimes been given short shrift. I would like now to consider
some of implications of the (still unconsummated) struggle to establish democratic
structure and inclusive procedure in the American Psychoanalytic Association for our
past and for our future.

An organizing metaphor may be useful here, and I've chosen the powerful image
advanced by David Andelman in his study of interwar Europe, *A Shattered Peace*. After
WWI, the victorious Great Powers carved up Europe, the Middle East, and parts of the
Far East. With a view to protecting their own hegemonies, they established unnatural
boundaries that proved costly -- and often impossible -- to enforce. Andelman delineates
the far-reaching and long-lasting effects of these manipulations and what he sees as their
profoundly negative consequences. In his view, the decisions made at Versailles in 1919
played a large part in the discord leading up to WWII, in the onset of the war, and in many of the post-war conflicts -- notably in Central and Eastern Europe and the Middle East -- that have persisted through the second half of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first. In other words I see the establishment of the Board on Professional Standards during the 1946 reorganization of APsaA as the Versailles of American psychoanalysis, the entanglements of which they are still mired in today. Like that ill-fated treaty, the BoPS was an effort to establish peace among uneasy factions, but it did so by enforcing unnatural, undemocratic, and ultimately untenable barriers. The very success of these exclusionary structures -- long protected by vested interests in APsaA as necessary for the organizations strength -- now threaten its very survival. It is time to revise the psychoanalytic continent, and re-think our treaties.

Here's where we are now. APsaA members as a whole are in their early sixties, on average; training analysts are mostly in their seventies. A financial crisis looms as more and more members age into the dues-free retirement years and few new members take their place. Candidate enrollment continues to fall, partly because of our unwelcoming caste system, and partly because the certification process is seen as arbitrary and unfair. And even if we attracted more candidates, we would likely not have enough patients to go around. APsaA several years ago hired a marketing consultant -- an extraordinary development, and not a cheerful one -- who found that while psychoanalysis as a theory was widely appreciated, the APsaA analysts who offer it were perceived as aloof, distant,
and wedded to a rigid and outdated model. (Although 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 Freud himself suggested for certain cases.) We are not seen as offering within our theory or our practice the other modalities informed by traditional psychoanalysis -- less frequent sessions, family therapy, etc.

Not training psychologists and social workers is what I call external exclusion.

But there also has been and continues to be internal exclusion. That has to do with an organizational structure which does not allow full participation of all the graduates of APsaA institutes in the educational enterprises at both the local and national levels.

When APsaA was reorganized in 1946, a Board of Professional Standards was set up which through its membership (later certification) committee determined who could become a member, who could run for office, who could vote for bylaws and who could become a training analyst. The first three strictures have been removed after considerable effort because of a recognition that APsaA would not survive otherwise, but the last stricture remains in place. Certification is a mandatory requirement for training analyst appointment by the local institute, and only analysands of training analysts can become candidates, and only candidates can become graduates and members. Although the leaders of BoPS assert that educational and membership functions are separate, in this regard they are inextricably connected. They insist that APsaA certification is an examination for psychoanalytic competence on which the professional standing of psychoanalysis depends. I will argue here, however that this is an example of APsaA
hubris -- a refusal to see that the world of psychoanalysis is larger than that one organization to which certification is particular. BoPS's preoccupation with certification and exams is an investment not in professionalism, but in the defense of its old hegemonies -- the most dangerous remnant still with us of our 1946 Versailles.

This system contributes to the self-perpetuating leadership situation in BoPS. Only certified members can become training analysts, only certified training analysts can become fellows (this was changed in a bylaw vote recently) and fellows nominate and vote for the board chair. The reorganization in 1946 set up APsaA as a bicameral body, a Board of Directors and a Board of Professional Standards with absolute authority in regard to educational matters. Many in the Board of Directors side and the Executive Committee felt they needed to find a way to reduce the stranglehold of BoPS had on membership and training analyst appointment. One year ago in January three individuals, the President, Robert Pyles, a former President, Warren Procci and Rich Pearlman who did not train at an APsaA Institute introduced what was called the PPP Proposal which asked BoPS to define objective and verifiable criteria for training analyst appointment. Members who met these criteria would be designated national training analysts and could be appointed training analysts by local institutes. The proposal passed the BOD by 23 to 14 and it created a fire storm in APsaA. BoPS did not respond to the request to define objective and varifiable criteria. The fact is they considered it for only fifteen minutes at a BoPS meeting. Their contention was that this proposal is in violation of the APsaA
bylaws passed in 1946, which as I indicated earlier, enshrined the principle that gave
BoPS absolute, final authority in regard to educational matters. Seven leaders of BoPS
got to court last year to file an injunction to prevent the Board of Directors of APsaA
from implementing PPP. The seven filed a brief (it is estimated that the legal costs were
in excess of $250,000) paid for by their own personal funds. The judge who heard the
case ruled in favor of the BoPS seven. APsaA appealed the ruling and the next court
upheld the first judge. The court’s recommendation was that APsaA needed to rewrite
the 1946 bylaws to end the bicameral structure. A committee has been appointed for this
task and is proceeding. The plaintiffs were invited to recommend members for this
committee but the offer was first accepted and then refused.

The essential position of the seven is that ordinary members of APsaA have no
standing in regard to educational matters. The organization is at an impasse because
passing bylaw amendments require a super majority and it is not clear that this can be
obtained given the position of the BoPS leaders. In an attempt at resolution, a joint
meeting is being held between the Board of Directors and BoPS at the annual APsaA
meeting in Chicago this week. In fact the first meeting was today. The second will be
tomorrow.

It would appear that all is lost because the BoPS leaders side is adamant. They
could have satisfied the members and retained their own educational authority and
autonomy by supporting what we call institute choice, allowing each institute to decide
themselves whether or not to require certification, five years post graduation. But they
did not get to do this. I have referred to their stance as an illustration of what Robert Michels has called the iron law (tendency) of oligarchy, where the group at the top in power maintains their hegemony in the organization.

Let's revisit the history.

American psychoanalysis established the first boundary that would distinguish it sharply from the way psychoanalysis developed elsewhere with the exclusion of non-physicians from psychoanalytic training and practice in 1938. Suffice it to say here that when the further step of board certification of psychoanalysts as a sub-specialty of psychiatry proved unattainable, the reorganization of the APsaA following WWII laid the foundation for a new machinery to accomplish a similar exclusionary end: the offering and withholding of membership in the Association. In the 1946 reorganization, the Board on Professional Standards was given jurisdiction over the vetting and admission of individual applicants for membership, and this membership process soon became an imitation of the process of Board Certification in the medical and surgical 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.

The BoPS leadership's control over certification is what has given it its power and its endurance: ultimately it determined who would be an APsaA member, who would vote in Association elections, who would be a training analyst, who would be a Fellow,
and who would select the chair of BOPS. All of this authority was held to be in the
service of protecting the professional stature of psychoanalysis in its own right and in the
eyes of the world. Yet given APsaA's decline in the public view, among physicians,
hospitals, and the insurance companies that pay them, academia, and even other
psychoanalysts, it is time to ask, in whose service has BoPS really used its clout? To what
extent has its protection of its own hegemony gotten in the way of its avowed wish to
safeguard psychoanalysis as a profession? To what extent has it inflicted upon us a
Byzantine network of gerrymandered boundaries that we are now struggling either to free
ourselves from or to maintain (at great cost to ourselves)? And to what end was that
network established, back in 1946?

Before 1946, the Committee on Psychoanalysis Training was the advisory organ
on educational issues in American psychoanalysis. It essentially functioned as a
consulting body. It could not issue binding decrees on matters of training without the
unanimous consent of all the APsaA institutes. BoPS, however, which replaced it in
1946, could act without the unanimous support of the institutes; it could promulgate
whatever training standards it chose as long as a simple majority of the institutes agreed
to them. It was also empowered to set the admission criteria for membership in the
American.

And there, from the very beginning, the handwriting was on the wall. BoPS was
more interested in narrowing the boundaries of psychoanalysis than expanding them. In
1946, the year of the reorganization, William Menninger was President of APsaA. He had
recruited a legion of physicians to work as psychiatrists in World War II, and in so doing had probably done more for the advance of psychoanalysis in America than any other individual before or since. After discharge, hundreds of these physicians applied for psychiatric residencies all over the country, and then for analytic training at the institutes of the APsaA--in New York, Boston, Chicago, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles. Topeka had more than 100 psychiatrists in its first post-WWII class. Menninger made a strong plea to APsaA to admit non-APsaA-trained scholars and psychotherapists, that doing so would enrich psychoanalysis, but his proposal was rejected by the "loyalists" that included many of the émigrés. Not only did APsaA feel that it had to limit membership to graduates of APsaA analytic institutes in order to maintain its "pure" analytic identity, it looked askance at its own. Even APsaA-trained graduates -- and not everyone who trained did in fact graduate -- had to provide examples of their clinical work and be passed (certified) by a BoPS committee before applying for membership.

The result of BoPS' guardianship of psychoanalytic education was that over the next several decades, as many as seven hundred APsaA-trained graduates did not become members of APsaA; among these were eminent psychoanalysts who went on to achieve important academic psychiatric positions - one Herb Pardes comes to mind. What does that say about BoPS's much vaunted educational standards? There were other things going on. One of them, in my view, was that the so-called question of lay analysis became a burning issue. Once training and membership had been open to non-physicians, but after 1946 this possibility was never even discussed. In fact, APsaA specifically
excluded IPA members who came to the US before and after the war who were not physicians. Attempts were made to abrogate this rule, particularly on the West Coast, and especially in regard to lay psychoanalysts of considerable stature. But these efforts went nowhere except in Topeka, where Karl Menninger was able to get special treatment for his cadre of psychologist/psychoanalysts, some of whom, like Roy Schafer and Herb Schlessinger, became members of the APM in subsequent decades. Exclusion from the NYPSI was not just a matter of the degree one happened to hold. It was also a matter of ideology. The process of ideological exclusion had begun with Karen Horney and the several other analysts, all physicians, who walked out of the NYPS meeting in 1941 after she had been denied training status because of her neo Freudian ideology. The story, perhaps apocryphal, is that Horney and her supporters left the hall and marched toward the local tavern, singing "Let My People Go." They drank to their solidarity in a local bar, and then went on to establish the American Institute for Psychoanalysis.

But the post-reorganization APsaA and BoPS learned little from this debacle. They clearly learned nothing about how costly to the strength of an organization the enforcement of unnatural boundaries can be. The exclusion of lay analysts—the exclusion of one lay analyst in particular, from the New York Society in the 1940s -- had a profound impact of the trajectory of psychoanalysis in New York City, and anticipated the erosion of APsaA's consequence with which we struggle today. That lay analyst was Theodor Reik. Reik's prosecution for non-medical practice in Vienna had provided the occasion for Freud's 1926 polemic in favor of lay analysis. But since the days while
Freud was making his case in Europe, Americans, especially A.A. Brill, had been fighting to medicalize the field, and -- with the exception of the incorporation of psychoanalysis as a subspecialty of psychiatry -- they had largely succeeded. If Reik had found a welcome at the NYPI he probably would not have founded the National Psychological Association for Psychoanalysis. If he and other non-physicians had been admitted for training at NYPI, they would have become part of the APsaA psychoanalytic establishment. But they were not, and they did not. Excluded from the big tent, in 1948 they formed a tent of their own. The foundation of NPAP was the beginning of the "Balkanization" of American psychoanalysis. As you well know, similar breaks led to the forming of other new societies, many of which are still part of the non-APsaA psychoanalytic landscape in New York. At Versailles, the Great Powers 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 Psychoanalytic Institute. And it seems to have been catching. Horney herself split from Erich Fromm over the issue of lay analysis, and Fromm then went on to found the William Alanson White Institute. This is Andelman's vision in action. Even so, however rigid APsaA was with regard to medical exclusivity, for a while after 1946 it seemed to be open to a certain amount of ideological diversity. After all, the Sullivanian/Interpersonal analysts of the William Alanson White Institute were members of APsaA by virtue of WAW's complicated relationship with the Baltimore Washington
Institute (see Mosher/Richards for more on this). But when that relationship ended -- another complicated story -- so did the hope for diversity within APsaA. The WAW analysts who were members of APsaA sought independent affiliate status for WAW in the Association, and a committee was formed at BoPS to consider their application. The deliberations dragged on for years. Finally Merton Gill, who was a member of the BoPS committee, told the William Alanson White members that it would never happen, and they withdrew their application. Gill made clear that the issue was more their ideology than the other old bone of contention, analytic frequency. This decision had fateful consequences for the American Psychoanalytic Association. It more or less, closed the door on the possibility of amicable ideological differences, and doomed analysts who diverged from BoPS's view of orthodoxy to the status of dissidents at best, and heretics at worst.

So APsaA's status became more and more anomalous. First of all, it was autonomous. In the 1920s and 1930s it had managed to establish its independence from the IPA International Training Council, an independence codified in the 1938 agreement; the IPA could no longer tell them who they should train. After 1946, it established itself ever more anomalously as an organization of physicians; the franchise for psychoanalysts in the United State was medical. APsaA also maintained its identity as the "real" or "pure" psychoanalysis, and enforced ideological exclusivity to that end. Other institutes were forming outside of that franchise, but APsaA felt itself both secure in and obligated to its role as the standard-bearer of orthodox psychoanalysis.
For some APsaA members, objection to the handling of the certification issue -- or the concept of certification itself -- was a matter of principle. For others it was a practical issue. They foresaw the financial implications for an Association whose members were aging but which raised unwelcoming bars against the young blood it needed to keep itself vital and solvent. There was also the fact that non-APsaA institutes were proliferating, and that notwithstanding BoPS's view of APsaA as the chosen people of psychoanalysis, the field was more and more being left in the hands of the gentiles. 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. When the write-ups were not forthcoming this was extended to three years, and eventually the requirement was dropped and noncertified graduates could remain as nonvoting, dues-paying members indefinitely. This situation was a problem for the organization because it was still losing members who didn’t want to pay dues and still be second class citizens. This was a topic for discussion at each twice-yearly national meeting. But the Training Analysts -- who were the powers-that-be in APsaA, who ran BOPS and held the elective offices as well -- were committed to the principle established in the 1946 reorganization that graduates of institutes had to be vetted by a committee of BoPS before they could become members of the Association. The institutes themselves were site visited every five years by a site-visit committee of the BoPS, but this wasn't enough for the group that trumpeted its role as the guardian of “standards.” BoPS was concerned about the phenomena of "compassionate graduation," it said—that is, the
passing of unqualified candidates by their institutes -- and maintained that they had an obligation to protect the public by assuring that Training Analysts were competent—that only certified analysts would be allowed to analyze candidates. The hope was that the public would seek analysis only from certified members of APsaA. Essentially BoPS did not trust its own training analysts to graduate competent analysts, of whom APsaA was producing fewer and fewer. 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. Expelling an institute required a majority of all the voting members of ApsaA and a two-thirds vote of the Executive Council and BOPS -- clearly impossible to achieve. The only leverage BOPS had on noncompliant institutes was its power to withhold certification from their members. (Both Martin Stein and Stanley Goodman, who served as chairs of BOPS, acknowledged this to be the case in the special issue of TAP that came to be known as the "white issue." I was the editor of TAP at the time and invited 20 members pro certification and 20 members con to argue for their position.)

The membership/certification controversy was pushed aside for a while in 1982, when four members of Division 39 sued APsaA, the Columbia Center, and the NYPI for restraint of trade in excluding non-physicians from training. The suit was settled in Division 39's favor -- that is, APsaA lost. Non-physicians were admitted for training and three non-APsaA institutes were admitted into the IPA. This settlement abrogated one of
the most cherished restrictions enshrined in the 1946 reorganization -- who could be trained. But the long and bitter battle over it, and the ugly nature of the resolution, was as much a consequence of our Versailles as WWII 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 the certification requirement for full voting membership. The task force proposed that the bylaws be changed to allow all graduates of APsaA institutes to become members with the right to vote for officers, but without the standing to run for office, to serve on BOPS, or to be appointed a Training Analyst. This second compromise received a two-thirds vote of the members on the second try. The process of democratization that far from taxation without representation to full voting rights, took about 45 years in total. But the remaining restrictions on participation still stood.

Note that the first two compromises about membership, steps towards democracy though they were, were accomplished by a top-down process motivated by, and aimed at, the need for the Great Powers of American psychoanalysis, APsaA and BoPS, to protect a self-perpetuating hegemony that depended on artificial borders and exclusions based on medical degrees, doctrinal purity, and submission to an arbitrary vetting process with no transparency whatever. Full enfranchisement and a truly democratic process would require attention to the concerns of the governed as well as the government, an attention that so far BoPS had shown itself unwilling to pay. How could the grass-roots voices in American psychoanalysis, for so long silenced or, worse, extruded, make themselves
heard in the interests of a more truly democratic system? The answer to that question is that a new technology -- specifically email listservs -- proved to be a potent force in organizational change, and the one that finally required the Treaty of 1946 and its guardians to pay attention to the realities of the new world that had developed over fifty years.

In 1995, Bob Galatzer Levy started the first APsaA email bulletin board. In 1996, Paul Mosher started a members' list and the "open line." And changes began to happen. They were slow at first -- glacially slow, it sometimes seems -- but less slow than they would have been, I contend, if the fundamentally democratic machinery of the Internet for member communication had not been put into place. For the first time the citizens of the territories occupied by BoPS and the APsaA governance could organize.

As email communication was becoming available twenty or so years ago, American psychoanalysis was still dealing with the fallout of the Division 39 lawsuit. As a result of that settlement, members of IPA institutes could become members of APsaA. One of the IPA members accepted into the APsaA was my wife, Arlene Kramer Richards. And here again I will offer a personal narrative to illustrate how the democratic process gained traction with the help of the new email technology, and how vital the new political landscape it enabled has proven to the threatened well-being of American psychoanalysis.

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 and that their APsaA colleagues looked down on
them. But join they slowly did, and in time there were many more uncertified APsaA members looking at the anomalies of APsaA governance with a jaundiced eye -- and there was an available medium for talking about them that was not constrained by matters of geography or time zone. There was also an opportunity to make the certification process public in a way that it had almost never been before. Successful applicants usually heaved a sigh of relief and went about their business. The unsuccessful -- either angry, frustrated, mystified, or ashamed -- were not inclined to share much of the experience. I suggested that Arlene apply for certification. She did. She was rejected. She was told by the committee that they would understand if she didn’t continue her application. But Arlene, whom I have dubbed the Rosa Parks of APsaA, persevered. She was passed by the second committee, and she recounted her experience in a paper written for the Psychoanalysis Estates General in Paris in 2000. Note that Arlene was already a Training Analyst at two IPA institutes, and that several of her former analysands were Training Analysts as well at IPA institutes. I felt that her initial rejection called into question both the reliability and validity of the certification process as a test of psychoanalytic competence, and I started a discussion on the open line about certification. I began my first post with a quote from Bob Michels’s APsaA plenary, in which he stated that the goals of the Certification Committee and the Committee on Scientific Activities were contradictory.

Michels wrote:
".. If one wanted to develop an operant conditioning paradigm to discourage the writing of case histories, it would indeed be difficult to improve on our certification procedure. Ironically the Committee on Certification may be the Committee on Scientific Activities worst enemy”  R Michels JAPA 2000 The Case History

A lively, informative, and spirited discussion followed, both pro and con certification. Suddenly members of APsaA who had had no place, up to then, to discuss their feelings on this matter could now be heard, by their colleagues if not yet by their overlords at BoPS. I don't have to tell you that this was not a development joyfully welcomed by the vested interests in APsaA. One of my colleagues at the NYPI told me he would never forgive me for what I had done. What did I do? I asked. "You let the members who were not educators to be part of a debate about educational matters," he said. Well, yes. I did. And the outcome was another task force: The Task Force on Education and Membership. This recommended a bylaw change in which noncertified members would be able to run for office and vote for by law amendments. This bylaw achieved a two-thirds majority, and became the law of APsaA-land. It was another step in the right direction, and now the only remaining restriction was that noncertified members could not be considered for Training Analyst appointment. That final hurdle—TA appointment--has been preoccupying APsaA, BOPS and the members list and open line for the past six years. A bylaw amendment called Institute Choice, which prohibits BOPS from requiring institutes to appoint only certified members as TAs, while
individual institutes would be allowed to make their own decisions as determined by their own voting members received 57% of the vote, just short of the necessary two-thirds majority. But the landscape is still changing, and the artificial boundaries established in 1946 and enforced since then by BoPS are slowly falling to a more democratic worldview. In the 2012 APsaA presidential election, Mark Smaller, running on a progressive platform against Eric Neutzel, a former BoPS Chair, received 60% of the vote. In a recent election, every member running on a platform that endorsed institute choice was elected. It has taken a long time and a creative use of new technology. And in the last election the less conservative candidate receive 70% of the vote. And there has been a very recent dramatic development - The Chicago Faculty organizational civil disobedience decision.

Three weeks ago, the Chicago Institute of Psychoanalysis voted unanimously (with one abstention) to allow non certified faculty to analyze candidates. This is in violation of the APsaA bylaws and in defiance of BoPS. Theoretically, the institute could be expelled for this violation, but according to the APsaA bylaws disaccreditation of an institute is effectively impossible because it requires a vote of two thirds of the Board of Directors and a majority of the members. I have proposed this action as an example of a violation/exception to the iron law tendency to hegemony. It is a bottom up and not a top down decision.
It came about in the following way. They began accepting candidates who were not in analysis with a training analyst even if they were not willing to switch. This infuriated BoPS. David Terman, the director at that time, made a presentation of the CoPE, the Committee on Psychoanalytic Education of BoPS. They said he was being hysterical when he said that his institute would die without that change. And he was attacked, met with rage, at the June 2013 BoPS Fellows meeting. They decided to go forward in any case. BoPS agreed to a one instance waver system that does not meet the situations of all the potential applicants. More exceptions were made which some conservatives saw as a slippery slope, which it was. Others thought the process was unnecessarily long and should be abolished. More change followed. They voted that the Director and the Dean did not need to be a training analyst. This led up to the faculty vote two weeks ago. Many of us suspect or hope that this rule will be adopted by other institutes. It remains to be seen what the push back from BoPS will be. The hope is that the meeting this week will show that BoPS is not monolithic and the institutes, in the interest of survival, will support more liberal policies. It should be noted that the legalization was taken unilaterally by the seven and who did not ask for approval from the entire BoPS.

APsaA has come a long way from the politics of exclusion enshrined in 1946 and defended since, at great cost to psychoanalysis as a profession. I hope APsaA is on its way to becoming a fully democratic and participatory organization. The decisions that the newly-vested members of the Association make in the next few days or months or
years will determine whether APsaA can be renewed as a vibrant and forward-looking professional organization, or whether it will wither away as new and more flexible organizations of younger psychoanalysts develop and come to dominate the profession.

