

**PRELUDE AND COMMENTARY  
BY KEN FUCHSMAN**

# *The Politics of Exclusion in the American Psychoanalytic Association and Its Relevance to Psychohistory*

**PRELUDE**

Psychohistory has many strands, and psychoanalysis remains a prominent one. The triumphs and travails of being a member of American psychoanalytic organizations can highlight important concerns for psychohistory. What follows are two personal accounts and a commentary. The first is by the eminent Harvard psychological anthropologist, Robert LeVine, and the second by psychoanalyst, Arnold Richards, former editor of *The Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*.

## *Expelled from the American Psychoanalytic Association?*

Robert A. LeVine

On May 11<sup>th</sup>, 1977 I received a letter apparently terminating my membership in the American Psychoanalytic Association. I found it inconceivable. True, I was not a clinical psychoanalyst but a professor of anthropology (first at the University of Chicago, then at Harvard), but I had graduated from the Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis in 1971, participated in several of the spring meetings of the APA, and taught courses at

the Chicago Institute and later at the Boston Psychoanalytic Society and Institute, where I had recently been elected to an Affiliate Membership.

Furthermore, on May 9<sup>th</sup>, Arnold Cooper, Chairman of the APA Program Committee (later President of APA), had sent me a letter thanking me for my “excellent contribution” to the scientific contribution in the APA’s 1977 meeting in Quebec City and hoping that I would continue to contribute my “scientific efforts” to the APA and that “we may call on you for future contributions to our meetings.” Yet I was terminated two days later. What happened?

After a flurry of correspondence in which the director of the Chicago Institute had to defend me at length, it became clear that, as the APA Secretary, Rebecca Z. Solomon, said, in a letter of May, 31, 1977, “The standards and procedures of the American Psychoanalytic Association require the completion of full training before a candidate is graduated. While an Institute can ‘graduate’ a partially trained student, such graduation is not equivalent to graduation with full training.” In a later letter (June 30, 1977), she explained, “We never had a provision in our By-laws for membership for persons with partial training.” Yet my diploma from the Chicago Institute said I had “satisfactorily completed the prescribed course of training in the theory of psychoanalysis.” It did not certify me to practice psychoanalysis, nor did I want to. When Arnold Cooper became President of APA in 1980, he and others conducted a review of membership categories. Whatever the final disposition of that review, it was more than clear that many in the world of psychoanalysis had no interest in connecting with other disciplines like history, anthropology and sociology; I had noticed at the Quebec meeting of 1977 that many were more interested in “third party payments” from health insurance than in Freudian theory and its applications. In that sense they were behaving like other American physicians of the time.

Later, as we know, the world of psychoanalysis was opened up to non-medical candidates and has changed radically. When I was back in Chicago in the spring of 2008, I found that a former Ph.D. student of mine, Jim Anderson, was not only practicing analysis but was Program Chairman of the Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis—something impossible when I was there in the 1960s.

My training there between 1962 and 1971 was a significant episode in my scholarly career as well as my life. I had a six-year training analysis with Gerhart Piers, then Director of the Institute. I took five years of courses that acquainted me with psychoanalysis as diagnosis, theory and therapy in depth. I was the only research candidate during most of my

years at the Chicago Institute. (Before my training I thought I already knew most of what psychoanalysis had to offer the social sciences; that was laughable naiveté on my part.) I tried to share my new understanding of psychoanalysis as clinical process with other anthropologists in my 1973 book *Culture, Behavior and Personality*. But perhaps because of my primary commitment to social research, my approach in that book was not accepted by some psychoanalytic anthropologists who leaned toward a more orthodox Freudian position. That included my own (Chicago) student, the late Waud Kracke, who later became a Lacanian analyst.

I remain convinced that a Freudian social science is a valuable, indeed indispensable, objective. Without it, there is no dynamic unconscious, and it is individuals are assumed either to know their own motives or to have motives that can be characterized in simplistic terms. Such impoverished approaches are common in the social sciences, particularly economics and its offshoot, *rational choice theory*, in political science and sociology. These are grossly inadequate social theories compared with a Freudian perspective. I have long argued that every generation of social scientists re-discovers the power of Freudian ideas, and in anthropology, that continues into the present day: The latest issue of *Ethos: The Journal of Psychological Anthropology* (December, 2016) is devoted entirely to Anthropology and Psychoanalysis, and the contributors are all from the University of Copenhagen in Denmark.

We anthropologists have had a long and complicated relationship with psychoanalysis. Though the anthropologist Franz Boas was present at Freud's 1909 Clark University lectures, there is no evidence that he was convinced. In 1913 Freud published his anthropological treatise, *Totem and Taboo*, which drew heavily on 19<sup>th</sup> century British sources, including the cultural evolutionism that Boas (1911) had already examined, critiqued and rejected.

It was Bronislaw Malinowski, the Polish anthropologist at the London School of Economics who created a stir that would be fateful for the relationship between anthropology and psychoanalysis. Having already reinvented ethnographic fieldwork as "participant observation." Malinowski published an article in 1924 suggesting that Freud's Oedipus complex took a different form in a matrilineal society like that of the Trobriand Islanders where Malinowski had worked. This brought a swift rejoinder from Ernest Jones, Freud's disciple in London and a member of the secret committee to protect Freud. Malinowski considered his revised Oedipus complex a tribute to Freud, but Jones and the secret committee—as well as Freud—took it as an act of war. After Malinowski pub-

lished the book version in 1927 (*Sex and Agression in a Savage Society*), Freud suggested that his disciple Princess Marie Bonaparte fund a field expedition to Melanesia, Australia and Arizona (including matrilineal peoples) by the Hungarian folklorist Geza Roheim. Roheim set off in 1928, determined to prove Freud right and Malinowski wrong, and in a special issue of the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* in 1932, he presented his evidence for that idea. Now psychoanalysts could assume the Oedipus complex was universal and take no further notice of data on childhood from different cultures.

Among anthropologists, however, there was no unanimity on the Oedipus complex or other issues. For better or worse, each anthropologist seeks to make an original contribution to knowledge—no one wants to be termed an “orthodox” scholar, simply reflecting the consensus of others—and that has meant, in the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, a wide variety of psychoanalytic anthropologies fashioned by virtuosi in psychological anthropology. Some are convinced (as Malinowski was) that the culture they studied requires a culture-specific version of the family relationships, while others believe that beneath “superficial” cultural variations, there lay universal influences like the Oedipus complex.

I am one of these psychological anthropologists, convinced that my training at the Chicago Institute in the 1960s still enables me to contribute to the building of a Freudian social science. Having spent the last few decades in cross-cultural research on infancy and early childhood, I find little of value in Freud’s psychosexual stages, yet I am convinced as ever of the wisdom in the 23 volumes of the Standard Edition of Freud’s psychological writings. In *Totem and Taboo*, it is censorship that stands out for me as a central concept, for sociologists have also identified the ways in which we censor our motives and emotions in everyday life. I am constructing a model in which Freudian and social censorship can be combined to create a better account of human behavior in our own and other societies.

## ***From Favorite to Persona Non-Grata: A Psychoanalytic Journey***

Arnold Richards, M.D.

**T**his is a difficult report for me to write. In 1964, more than 50 years ago, I was admitted to the New York Psychoanalytic Institute and started my analysis with Dr. Henry Lowenfeld. I began classes and supervision of analytic cases in 1965 and graduated in 1969, completing the

program in fewer years than usual. Clearly, I was a highly-regarded candidate, and my education was excellent. My instructors included some the “great” analysts of that time—Edith Jacobson, Rudy Lowenstein, Charles Brenner, Margaret Mahler, Jacob Arlow, Martin Stein, Nick Young, Otto Isakower, Chuck Fisher *et al.* I was appointed to the faculty soon after graduation, elected Secretary of the Society, and served for many years as Chairman of its Program Committee. I was one of the prime movers in the development of the Extension Division and arranged for many well-received courses and many well-attended panel discussions. I was clearly in favor and could do no wrong.

This all changed significantly in the late eighties when a group from Division 39 of the American Psychological Association sued the New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute (NYPSI), as well as the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsaA), the Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research, and the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA), for restraint of trade because of the exclusion from training of non-physicians, *i.e.* psychologists. My wife was involved in the lawsuit from the beginning, and I am sure this was known to many members of the NYPSI. However, some of my friends in the Society told each other that I should not be blamed for supporting the lawsuit because of my wife; and that this did not mean that I as a physician and psychiatrist favored non-medical psychoanalytic training. In 1991, I was appointed editor of *The Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association (JAPA)*, a very prestigious position. I was the second editor of *JAPA* who was a member of NYPSI, thus clearly “a feather in our cap.”

That same year, I was invited to give the A.A. Brill Memorial lecture of the New York Psychoanalytic Society and eventually gave my talk in 1995. The title was “A.A. Brill and the Politics of Exclusion.” I contrasted the attitude of A.A. Brill against lay analysis with that of Sigmund Freud in its favor. I spoke about how the shadow of the founder (A.A. Brill) falls over an organization (APsaA and NYPSI) and faulted particularly NYPSI for what I called the “politics of exclusion,” in this case of non-medical psychoanalysts. This has been the theme of many of my scientific, political, and polemical contributions since.

I think that incident changed how I was viewed by the members of NYPSI, especially by those in charge, but also by ordinary members and many of my colleagues and friends. I think this was because its medical identity was a very important component of the Society and Institute. To this day, there are still some faculty there who hold the view that only psychiatrists can become psychoanalysts.

I played a role in the settlement of the lawsuit. After a lawyer from Paul Weiss, a firm that also represented NYPSI, filed a reply brief to a motion for summary judgment, Jack Arlow and I advised Richard Simons, President of APsA, to hire a new lawyer. This one, unlike the Paul Weiss lawyer, was for settling instead of fighting. The Division 39 plaintiffs indicated that they would file an antitrust complaint. At that time, APsA and the IPA were for settling the Columbia Center and NYPSI was opposed. The “smoking gun” was a comment by the chair of the Board of Professional Standards (BoPS) that it was a “pocketbook issue.” Dick Simons wrote in *JAPA* several years later that APsA was not guilty of anti-trust violation; instead, it was guilty of “arrogance.”

After the lawsuit was settled, the Institute did admit psychologists, but at this time there are only 2 or 3 candidates who are not psychiatrists. Although after the settlement other APsA institutes admitted social workers (MSWs), it took 15 years of efforts, both by me and Manny Furer, for the NYPSI requirement to change. The Institute first agreed to train social workers who had a PhD and then those with a MSW. I don’t think there are any MSWs currently in training, but I don’t know if that is because none applied, or whether some applied and were rejected.

Another important event happened around the same year that I gave the Brill Lecture. In an effort to show that APsA welcomed psychologists, I prevailed upon my wife to apply for Certification from BoPS. I thought it would be a “slam dunk.” She was a Training Analyst at two non-APsA IPA Institutes, and two of her candidates had become Training Analysts as well. We all were surprised when she was “continued.” She has written about her experience in a paper for a meeting in Paris (Estates General) about the politics of psychoanalytic groups. Arlene considered starting a suit because NYPSI and APsA were still under the jurisdiction of the judiciary that was set up as part of the lawsuit settlement. She agreed not to file a complaint if I would start a discussion about certification on the members’ listserv of the APsA.

I began a discussion with a quote from Bob Michels’ *JAPA* plenary address that said the purposes of the Certification Committee and the Committee on Scientific Activities were in conflict. My argument was that certification was an examination that had no reliability and validity. This discussion has continued for more than twenty years and has resulted in significant changes in the role of certification in the organizational structure of APsA. Certification had been a requirement for voting on bylaws and holding office, as well as for being a fellow of BoPS, but that is no longer the case. BoPS’s requirement of certification for Training

Analyst (TA) appointment will be “sunsetting” in June 2017, and institutes will thereafter be free to decide whether or not to require certification for TA appointment. It has been a long road; but I believe I have contributed to bringing about change in APsaA. The Training Analyst system, nevertheless, remains the basis of a two-tier system and a ruling oligarchy in some institutes such as NYPSI.

As one might expect, however, I am not celebrated for this accomplishment by the NYPSI oligarchy. I was told by more than one colleague in NYPSI (who had also been personal friends of mine) that they would never forgive me for what I did. Clearly, in their view, I had destroyed psychoanalytic education. By starting a discussion about certification on the members’ list, I was providing a platform for members with no standing to discuss educational matters—those who were not Training Analysts and could not become Training Analysts because they were not certified.

I am not sure “bullying” is the right term to describe how I am treated at my Institute. A better term would be *persona non grata*, which is what I have become there. Since the 90s, I have not been asked to teach, supervise, or analyze, although my contributions are celebrated by a small group of my friends I am a sought-after teacher, supervisor, and analyst in non-APsaA institutes, including Contemporary Freudian Society (CFS), American Institute of Psychoanalysis (AIP), and the Metropolitan Institute for Training in Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy (MITPP). Moreover, I have consistently received rave reviews from students in the courses that I have taught.

In NYPSI, politics evidently trumps pragmatism. Perhaps the concern is that I would “contaminate” their candidates by inculcating them with radical political views on organization. NYPSI is a body that does not welcome dissent; it is even able to discourage members from publicly disagreeing with it. My experience has been that there are candidates who agree with me; but their chief concern is with progression and graduation, faculty appointments, and referrals for members.

That is my story. But I am hopeful that the situation will change. I certainly will continue my efforts. Moreover, there have been encouraging events at NYPSI since I wrote the first draft of this recollection. The election in June 2016 resulted in a less conservative majority on the NYPSI Educational Committee (EC); and this EC voted against NYPSI’s joining AAPE (American Association for Psychoanalytic Education), which is BoPS *redux*, but outside of APsaA member oversight. This was followed by two retreats in which organizational matters were discussed, but shunning of individual members was not on the agendas and as far as I know was not discussed.

Is there hope for the future? At the retreats, NYPSI has begun to consider some of the policies that I have advocated for decades. A member once said that the Institute needed me to be their Socrates: “We just don’t want you to drink hemlock!”

## *Commentary*

The American Psychoanalytic Association was established in 1911 by A. A. Brill. Given the controversial nature of Freud’s early findings, Brill was intent on making psychoanalysis respectable. To do so, along with several other reasons including concerns with “pocketbook” issues, the Association mandated that to be a member one needed to be a psychiatrist. Freud himself was unhappy with this American restriction. In 1925, he had defended the qualifications of psychoanalyst Theodore Reik, whose doctorate was in psychology. The next year, Freud published *The Question of Lay Analysis* where he stated that “psycho-analysis is not a specialized branch of medicine....Psycho-analysis is a part of psychology” (1926, SE XX, 252). His declarations did not deter American psychoanalysts from reaffirming their medical standard; though they did prevent a break with Freud by allowing lay analysts in New York to work with children (Gay, 1988, 500). Then in 1938, the American Psychoanalytic Association required all members to be board certified psychiatrists who had completed a training analysis at a recognized psychoanalytic institute. However, there were number of analysts without medical degrees, who were influential in this country, even before the 1980’s lawsuit which opened psychoanalytic training to non-MD’s. In addition to Reik, there were Otto Rank, Anna Freud, Erik Erikson, Erich Fromm, Ernst Kris and many others, some of whom received their psychoanalytic training at a variety of non-APA psychoanalytic institutes.

The experiences of both Dr. LeVine and Dr. Richards are products of the onetime insularity and exclusiveness of the American psychoanalytic establishment. Even though anthropologist Robert LeVine had trained and graduated from the Chicago Psychoanalytic Institute in 1971, in 1977 he was officially expelled from the American Psychoanalytic Association for not being a certified practicing analyst. Before his termination, LeVine had in 1973 already published his landmark book, *Culture, Behavior, and Personality*, in which he concludes that “psychoanalysis had no interest in connecting with other disciplines like history, anthropology and sociology (LeVine, 2017).



Similarly, psychologists Arnold Schneider and Helen Desmond say that by excluding non-medical analysts the American Psychoanalytic Association was "limiting psychoanalysis' scholarly tradition while elevating its practice function" (1994, 314). Freud's own notion of psychoanalytic training was much broader, he wanted analytic education to "include elements from the mental sciences, from psychology, the history of civilization and sociology, as well as from anatomy, biology, and the study of evolution" (1926, SE XX, 252).

At the time LeVine's membership in the American Psychoanalytic Association was withdrawn, the American Psychiatric Association was formulating DSM III. The DSM committee was highly critical of psychoanalysis because it had not produced empirical research evidence that they considered to be scientifically respectable. In 1980, when the third edition of this manual was published, much of the psychoanalytic had been excluded.

By concentrating more on therapeutic practice than in making connections with other disciplines in the biological and social sciences or with the humanities, the focus of much of American psychoanalysis had often been too narrow for its own development. More recently American psychoanalysis has incorporated approaches and findings from diverse scholarly fields, including neuroscience and psychological attachment research, and shows signs of returning to Freud's own broad perspective. Robert LeVine's exclusion in 1977 is the product of a time when the psychoanalytic establishment functioned more as a guild than a broad-minded research enterprise.

Arnold Richards later experience is also a product of the mentality of exclusiveness and exclusion. The divisiveness and rivalries within psychoanalysis begin with the founder. For all his virtues, Freud expelled and/or ostracized psychoanalytic dissenters. Before there was a psychoanalytic movement, Freud in *The Interpretation of Dreams* writes of needing "an intimate friend and a hated enemy...and not infrequently...that friend and enemy have come together in a single individual (1900-1901, SE V, 483). Later, there were a number of times when Freud had rancorous splits with men who had been his friends and followers. The first splitting of a psychoanalytic group was in the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society when Adler and his supporters broke away, followed several years later by the expulsion of Jung and his followers. The United States has not been free from controversies tearing psychoanalytic institutes apart. In Boston, a group of analysts seceded and formed a second psychoanalytic organization. The Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Institute was so

divided that the American Psychoanalytic Association considered expelling the Angelinos. The Chicago Psychoanalysts had downgraded their most renowned member, Heinz Kohut (Kirsner, 2000, 125).

The New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute (NYPSI) followed a somewhat different path. As Dr. Richards has documented in other writings (Richards, 2015), a small group of analysts dominated NYPSI and stifled dissent. Splits were prevented, but marginalizing psychoanalysts who were too independent occurred, as in Dr. Richards case. Arnold Richards had been such a loyal member of NYPSI, and yet his siding with his wife appears to have cost him his preferred place in the society and institute to which he has been dedicated.

Does what happened to Robert LeVine and Arnold Richards have implications for psychohistory? Psychohistory has not ever had an organization such as the American Psychoanalytic Association which has attempted to maintain jurisdiction over regional branches. In the U. S., psychohistory has been organizationally dispersed with the International Psychohistorical Association and *The Journal of Psychohistory* in New York, Wellfleet in Massachusetts, The Psychohistory Forum and *Clio's Psyche* housed in New Jersey, and the now discontinued *The Psychohistory Review* in Illinois.

As Arnold Richards went from a treasured insider to the margins at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute, within psychohistory there have also been individuals who were favored in some groups but not in others. Still, psychohistory does not have training institutes, an overseer organization, nor is it embedded in academic departments. There are no gatekeepers who are entitled to certify who is in the "guild" of psychohistory and who is not.

There is a parallel between psychoanalysis and psychohistory in another regard. Dr. LeVine observed that psychoanalysis was not much interested in scholarly work from other fields; its narrow focus on therapy more than academic investigation has caused it problems. The emphasis on treatment rather than experimental studies helped to diminish the reputation of psychoanalysis within psychiatry. In the broader culture, psychoanalysis was often criticized as not meeting scientific criteria.

Similarly, a continuing critique of psychohistory is that it does not meet scholarly standards of evidence and argument. While within psychohistory Lloyd DeMause and William McKinley Runyan, among others, have addressed these issues, these questions of evidence and argument remain the most persistent criticisms of psychohistory.

Recently, University of Cincinnati psychologist, William R. Meyers has written on how psychodynamic inquiry can productively use social sci-

ence methods (Meyers, 2015). There are additional ways psychohistory might meet these challenges of evidence and argument. Any psychohistorical inquiry should focus on what would count as legitimate evidence. There are challenges here as there are numerous competing psychologies with divergent evidentiary standards. Among historians, what should count as being history and what as being pre-history are matters of controversy. This leaves the question of what makes for good psychohistory, and what does not, an open question. As psychoanalysts are confronting the questions about their standards, so psychohistorians need to be as thorough as they can in their investigations. A lesson to be learned from the unfortunate experiences of Robert LeVine and Arnold Richards is that we all need to be more open minded, less exclusive, and more tolerant of the views of others while rigorously pursuing scholarly and clinical work.

*Ken Fuchsman retired from the University of Connecticut in 2016 after many years as faculty and administrator. He has written on Presidents Trump, Obama, Kennedy and Nixon. Dr. Fuchsman also writes on the nature of being human, trauma, war, Freud, and the nature and prospects of psychohistory. He is on the editorial boards of the Journal of Psychohistory and Clio's Psyche and currently serves as President of the International Psychohistorical Association.*

## REFERENCES

- Freud, S., 1900-1901, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works: Volume V, The Interpretation of Dreams*. London: The Hogarth Press.
- Freud, S., 1926, *The Standard Edition, Vol. XX*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Gay, P., 1988, *Freud: A Life for Our Time*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Kirsner, D., 2000, *Unfree Associations: Inside Psychoanalytic Institutes*. London: Process Press.
- LeVine, R., 2017, "Expelled from the American Psychoanalytic Association," *Journal of Psychohistory*, in press.
- Meyers, W. R., 2015, *Social Science Methods for Psychodynamic Inquiry*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Richards, A. D., 2015, *Psychoanalysis: Critical Conversations: Selected Papers by Arnold D. Richards, Volume 1*. New York: International Psychoanalytic Books.
- Schneider, A., and Desmond, H., 1994, "The Psychoanalytic Lawsuit: Expanding Opportunities for Psychoanalytic Training and Practice," in Lane, R. C. and Meisels, M. (editors), *A History of the Division of Psychoanalysis of the American Psychological Association*. Hillside NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.