

Dr. Martin Grotjahn, Beverly Hills: 'Present Trends in Psycho-analytic Training.'

Dr. S. H. Foulkes, London: 'Group Analytic Observation as Indicator for Psycho-Analytic Treatment.'

*Business Meeting*

Thursday, 30 July, 9.30 a.m. Chairman: Dr. Heinz Hartmann, New York

*President's Report.* Dr. Heinz Hartmann:

The reports of the business meeting held at the Amsterdam Congress were edited through the kindness of Dr. Grete Bibring and have been printed in the 103rd Bulletin of the International Psycho-Analytical Association, and I should like to have any comments you may wish to make upon them.

Since there are no comments I assume that you approve the reports as published in the Bulletin. (*Approved.*)

I will now read to you the names given to us by the Component Societies of the International Psycho-Analytical Association of members lost through death during the last two years:

From the American Psychoanalytic Association:

Helen Arthur.  
N. Lionel Blitzsten.  
Henry A. Bunker.  
E. Van Norman Emery.  
Alan D. Finlayson.  
G. Leonard Harrington.  
Bela Heksh.  
Clinton P. McCord.  
Lillian D. Powers.  
Carl Tillman.  
Fanny von Hann-Kende.  
Herbert A. Wiggers.

From the Indian Society:

G. Bose, President.  
Pars Ram.

From the Israel Society:

Ilja Schalit, Secretary.

From the Paris Society:

John Leuba.

Member at Large:

Jacob Hoffmann.

I also want to report to you the death in the last two years of some analysts who had previously been members of the International Psycho-Analytical Association, but who, for one reason or another, were no longer members at the time of their death:

Siegfried Bernfeld.  
Karen Horney.  
Géza Róheim.  
Harold Schultz-Hencke.

May I ask you to rise in memory of those we have lost.

*Dr. Hartmann (continuing):* The membership of the International Psycho-Analytical Association is now close to 1,000, half of them belonging to one Component Society, the American Psychoanalytic Association. A certain number of analysts work in various areas of the globe—among others Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, South Africa, Venezuela, Yugoslavia—without the support of a Society or Institute. Eleven members of the International are direct members, one in Brazil, one in Yugoslavia, and nine in the United States, the latter being lay analysts who have been reinstated to membership in the International Psycho-Analytical Association on the recommendation of the Joint Screening Committee of the American Psychoanalytic Association and the International Psycho-Analytical Association (see Appendix 1 (d)).

I shall now give you some figures for the present Congress. A total of 575 persons have registered, which is considerably more than at any previous Congress. Of these 575, 220 are regular members and 80 are associate members of the different Component Societies; in addition 143 students and 132 guests attended the meetings of this Congress.

Recent Bulletins of the International Psycho-Analytical Association have informed you of the activities of our Component Societies, organizational changes and other facts and figures. In my report I will limit myself to some selected aspects rather than give you the total picture of analytic development in the last two years.

The *American Psychoanalytic Association* recognized the Western New England Society as a new Affiliate Society. In 1952, the American Association founded a new Journal, *The Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, to be published quarterly, and we wish the new publication good luck. The status of the American Psychoanalytic Association as a Component Society of the International Psycho-Analytical Association was reaffirmed at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association in Los Angeles, 1953. It was also decided at these meetings that for the years 1953 and 1954 each active member of the American Association is entitled, by virtue of his annual dues, to a subscription to the *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*. A Committee on Institutes and the Board on Professional Standards of the American Association ensure the establishment and maintenance of minimum training standards and help with training problems as they arise. The Board passed a resolution that a minimum of four hours a week, and an optimum of five, should be required for the student's own analysis and for his cases under supervision. I may mention at this point that the Central Executive of the International Psycho-Analytical Association has suggested the establishment of an analogous board for the European countries.

In South America three Component Societies—the *Argentine*, the *São Paulo*, and the *Chile Psycho-*

*analytic Societies*—are recognized by our organization and are expanding their scientific and training activities. About the group in Rio de Janeiro I shall talk to you later.

In Europe, the *Association of Belgian Analysts*, recognized at the Congress in Zurich, reports healthy growth and development, but no radical organizational or other changes that would ask for any action by this Congress.

The same is true of the *British Psycho-Analytical Society*, which is second among the Component Societies as to number of members. This Society added to its membership in the past three years more members than in any other comparable period of time in the past. An *Australian Society of Psycho-Analysts* was founded in 1952. It is not an independent Component Society of the International, but a subgroup of the British Society, its members being regular or associate members of the British Society.

The *Dutch Society* is divided into two subgroups, Amsterdam and The Hague, each having a direction and organization of its own, but working intimately together as part of the Dutch Society.

In France, the *Paris Psycho-Analytical Society*, owing to the intense energy of some of its members, has made an important step forward in re-establishing, after an interval of many years, an Institute in 1953. As to its organization, this Institute is partly independent of the Society. We wish to congratulate our French colleagues on their achievement. Unfortunately I have to inform you that even more recently a division has come about in this Society. A few weeks ago five members resigned. This event will be discussed later.

You remember that at the Congress in Amsterdam the *German Psycho-Analytical Association* (*Deutsche Psychoanalytische Vereinigung*) was recognized; while provisional recognition was withdrawn from the *German Psycho-Analytical Society* (*Deutsche Psychoanalytische Gesellschaft*). Objections that the President of the Gesellschaft, Dr. Felix Boehm, raised against your decision in Amsterdam were examined and considered unfounded by the Central Executive.

You will be gratified to hear that the *Italian Psycho-Analytical Society* has succeeded in establishing its own Institute. We wish them luck in their enterprise.

The *Swedish Psycho-Analytical Society*, besides successfully working in its own country, has now two of its training analysts conducting training analyses in Copenhagen, who are contributing towards the organization of psycho-analysis in Denmark.

Dr. Sarasin, who has been a member of the Central Executive for many years, is, you will regret to hear, incapable of attending this Congress, because the state of his health does not permit him to travel. However, he sent us a report on the activities of the *Swiss Psycho-Analytical Society*

and emphasized that for the first time an official collaboration could be established between the Swiss Society and the Cantonal authorities.

The *Vienna Psycho-Analytical Society*, though working under serious and well-known handicaps, was able to raise its membership to 16 and has 17 students in training.

Of the three recognized Component Societies in Asia, the *Indian Psycho-Analytical Society* particularly informs us of their extended and successful outside clinical activities. The *Israel Psycho-Analytical Society* reports that training is being done in three cities; they regret that it is not yet possible to form a Central Training Institute and to offer their training candidates more systematic training.

In Japan, the centre of the *Sendai Psycho-Analytical Society* is in Hirosaki, but psycho-analytic lectures are also held at Hiroshima Medical College and in Tokyo.

After these brief reports about the activities of Component Societies, I now turn to the applications we received for recognition by the International Psycho-Analytical Association, for Component Society or Study Group status.

You remember that the so-called *Brazilian Psychoanalytic Institute* was, at the time of the last Congress, under the direction of Dr. Burke and Dr. Kemper. It had a stormy history, and after years of uncomfortable truce between the two leaders, it came to an open break in 1951, which led to Dr. Kemper's exclusion. Dr. Kemper was followed by his candidates. Dr. Burke, now the sole training analyst, applied for recognition of this Institute by the International Psycho-Analytical Association, which, however, the Central Executive did not see fit to grant. Students of Dr. Burke will in the future have the possibility of working under the supervision of, and having contacts with, the recognized Society at São Paulo. In the meantime, some Brazilian analysts who completed training in Argentina have returned to Rio de Janeiro and started working there. We offered them the opportunity of a closer affiliation to São Paulo. Dr. Kemper has continued his work as training analyst, supervisor and lecturer in Rio on an independent basis. Two of his students took it upon themselves to make the long trip to São Paulo in order to get additional supervision by members of the São Paulo Society. Dr. Kemper has applied for recognition of his group as a Study Group under the sponsorship of the Society in São Paulo. The Central Executive recommends to you that you accept them as a Study Group under the sponsorship of the São Paulo Society. May I have your opinion on this? (*Motion carried by a large majority, one vote against.*)

*Mrs. Melanie Klein* speaks on behalf of the small group of Brazilian analysts trained in Argentina who recently returned to Rio de Janeiro. She objects to their being 'forced' into co-operation with the recognized São Paulo Society and proposes

instead of  
Argentin

Dr. I  
Society in  
new Stud  
of the na

Dr. A  
of a natio  
regional  
Rio, Dr.  
For the t  
accept sp  
Dr. Per  
Buenos A  
Dr. Pere  
impressi  
Dr. Koc  
that no i  
Society v

Dr. Pe  
sponsors  
cannot b  
Analytic

Dr. i  
impossib  
agrees t  
Society.

Mrs.  
Perestrel  
Paulo Sc  
native.  
recogniz  
split in t  
record t  
porary c  
has incr  
right to  
forced o

Dr. H  
the main  
solution  
is not pe  
Brazil, th

Dr. H  
in the M

Dr. H  
served i  
will be  
be kept

Dr. Z  
whole d  
to make  
before a  
that the  
tion, reg  
the past,  
psycho-a  
not go c  
very esse

Dr. B

instead the status of an Affiliate Society of the Argentine Society.

*Dr. Hartmann:* Since we have one recognized Society in Brazil, the natural thing would be for the new Study Group to come under the sponsorship of the national organization.

*Dr. Adelheid Koch* outlines a plan for the future of a national association in Brazil comprising several regional societies: one in São Paulo and two in Rio, Dr. Kemper's and Dr. Perestrello's groups. For the time being she advocates that the latter two accept sponsorship of the São Paulo Society. For Dr. Perestrello's group to be associated with Buenos Aires rather than with São Paulo would, as Dr. Perestrello confirmed, create an unfavourable impression in the eyes of the Brazilian public. Dr. Koch reassured Dr. Perestrello and his group that no interference in their work by the São Paulo Society would occur.

*Dr. Perestrello* expresses his willingness to accept sponsorship of the São Paulo Society if his group cannot be sponsored by the International Psycho-Analytical Association directly.

*Dr. Hartmann:* The alternative is actually impossible and so I understand that Dr. Perestrello agrees to accept sponsorship of the São Paulo Society.

*Mrs. Klein* expresses her impression that Dr. Perestrello agreed to accept sponsorship of the São Paulo Society only because there is no other alternative. However, she wishes the Congress to recognize this fact and also that there might be a split in the future. She requests to have it put on record that the present solution is only a temporary one and that after Dr. Perestrello's group has increased in numbers, they should have the right to dissolve an affiliation that might have been forced on them.

*Dr. Hartmann:* Thank you. I think we agree on the main point, though Mrs. Klein considers this solution a minor evil only, as I understood it. It is not possible for us to legislate for a further split in Brazil, though it may occur.

*Dr. Heimann* wishes this discussion to be recorded in the Minutes for future reference.

*Dr. Hartmann:* Everything you say will be preserved in the Minutes. Though not everything will be published in the *Bulletin*, the Minutes will be kept on file.

*Dr. Zilboorg* points to the importance of this whole discussion as the suggestion has been made to make provision for a 'split' in principle even before a split has occurred. He introduces a motion that the International Psycho-Analytical Association, regardless of the individual decisions made in the past, or to be made in the future, considers the psycho-analytic movement a united one and does not go on record in advance that splits are of the very essence of scientific freedom.

*Dr. Bartemeier* seconds the motion.

*Dr. Hartmann* asks for a precise formulation of the motion.

*Dr. Zilboorg:* The 18th International Congress of Psycho-Analysis, having heard various arguments in favour of or against the organization of various groups, considers the International Psycho-Analytical Association an organization of unity and does not in any way recognize, particularly not in advance, the formation of any kind of split, as if splits produced scientific freedom.

*Dr. Hartmann:* The motion has been seconded by Dr. Bartemeier and I want to take a vote on it. Who is in favour of Dr. Zilboorg's motion?

*Dr. Loewenstein* suggests putting into the motion the word 'automatic'. If the Association does not 'automatically' accept future splits, he would agree with that motion, which otherwise would imply an implicit condemnation of necessary or desirable splits which might occur.

*Dr. Zilboorg* would prefer to omit the word 'automatically' and merely to recognize the fact that splits are to be considered when they occur and not in advance.

*Dr. Hartmann (continuing):* I would suggest that if Dr. Zilboorg and Dr. Loewenstein agree, we postpone discussion, because the Central Executive has a suggestion on the question of splits and the present discussion would fit in very well at that point. You will hear it in a few minutes.

*Dr. Jones* suggests that the wording be left to a small committee.

*Miss Anna Freud* points out that the International Psycho-Analytical Association was organized on a national basis according to countries, and what Mrs. Klein has suggested really amounts to revising the organization according to scientific points of view. That would be an alternative principle, but we would have to agree on it in principle. If we do so, there is no doubt that in a very short time we would have two or more International Associations. Therefore, the present question should be considered in that light.

*Dr. Heimann* is in full agreement with Dr. Loewenstein's idea, which he conveyed by introducing the word 'automatic', but she would have no objection to another formulation provided it becomes clear that the International Psycho-Analytical Association feels strong enough to incorporate the principle for which this country stands so firmly, that unity is possible on the basis of agreeing to disagree.

*Dr. Waelder* states that, living in the United States, he has a great deal of experience with splits, and that the opinion regarding splits was very largely determined by which side split off; i.e. at a time when an unorthodox group split off in New York, the Freudian analysts felt there should not be two Institutes in one place; and in another place where non-Freudians had a majority, the Freudians felt exactly the opposite. He thinks that those who wish to preserve the International

Psycho-Analytical Association must be in favour of elasticity; the more elasticity the International or any other organization grants to its members, the longer it will live. The more it insists on forcing unity, the earlier it will break.

*Dr. Glover* wishes to move that if in the wording of the resolution, indication is given on the subject of splits—even if it were a motion that splits should not occur—the question of splits will still be left on record. The Association would be biasing itself. The International Association has certain constitutional rules and aims and it should stick to the rules and aims. He would like to remove both resolutions to avoid any commitment.

*Dr. Hartmann*: May I introduce what the Central Executive suggested on the points of splits. 'The Central Executive recommends that no secession from a recognized Society or Association should be effected prior to consultations with the Central Executive of the International Psycho-Analytical Association, and before the Central Executive has had the possibility of fully investigating the reasons for dissension.' This is the recommendation of the Central Executive, which *Dr. Zilboorg* could not know. Do you want to vote on this motion? And we will also have to vote on *Dr. Zilboorg's* motion.

*Dr. Zilboorg* claims that his motion was voted on already in principle and that *Dr. Hartmann* introduced a different question: namely, that if a split in a Society is threatening, the Central Executive ought to pass judgement. His motion was based on the principle that from now on small groups who are not yet members of a Society and the International Association could train in advance for splits, which naturally means the end of the International Psycho-Analytical Association. If, however, a large group comes to a point of split, that is a totally different story. There are two different things involved.

*Dr. Hartmann*: I regret to disagree as to one point. We could not yet decide on *Dr. Zilboorg's* motion, because some discussion interfered. Who is in favour of *Dr. Zilboorg's* motion? (47 in favour; 14 against. *Dr. Zilboorg's* motion carried.)

(From the audience): What about the amendment?

*Dr. Loewenstein* withdraws it.

*Dr. Hartmann (continues)*: As this question is settled, I will come back to the suggestion of the Central Executive. I will read again the suggestion which we wanted to express on the split of societies: 'No secession from a recognized Society or Association should be effected prior to consultations with the Central Executive of the International Psycho-Analytical Association, and before the Central Executive has had the possibility of fully investigating the reasons for dissension.'

*Miss Anna Freud* states that it seems distressing under present circumstances of splitting that members of the International Association, by leaving a recognized Component Society, lose their membership in

the International Association without any possibility of knowing beforehand whether they will regain it; e.g., whether the secession will be recognized by the next Congress or by some other means. Before a Society splits, they should notify the International Psycho-Analytical Association of their intentions, so that it will be possible to inform both sides fully of their future standing with the International. It also gives splitting Societies a few weeks or months to consider the whole matter. This is the spirit in which the suggestion was made.

*Dr. Jones* supports *Miss Freud's* resolution, but wishes to add a comment on *Dr. Waelder's* proposition that the Freudian Association, if it is to survive, must be elastic. We all agree we should not be meeting in Congress if everyone were of the same opinion and there was nothing to discuss. However, there are limits to elasticity. If a group, e.g. states that everything hitherto published on psycho-analysis is wrong, in his opinion no strenuous effort should be made to retain them in the Association. This Congress has gone on record as regretting splits unless they are absolutely essential. There is room within the Association for very considerable divergencies of opinion so long as certain principles remain in common, and they should be tolerated and allowed, as they have been.

*Dr. Menninger* seconds the motion presented by *Dr. Hartmann*.

*Dr. Zilboorg* declares himself in favour of the motion proposed by the Central Executive, but inquires whether it will affect the Paris situation.

*Dr. Hartmann*: No, that is for the future. There is a motion on the floor. Will all those in favour of it please raise their hands. (*Motion of the Central Executive was carried; none against.*)

*Dr. Hartmann (continuing)*: I will bring up a question connected with what we just discussed, namely, the procedure concerning new Study Groups. The recommendation of the Central Executive reads as follows: 'The Central Executive recommends a decision by Congress that before reaching an agreement on sponsorship, the sponsored as well as the sponsoring group should consult the Central Executive.' In countries in which a recognized Society exists, this Society would presumably be the sponsor for any new Society or Study Group. In other cases, various reasons, geographical as well as of actual relatedness, may make sponsorship by one Component Society more promising than sponsorship by another one. This recommendation would not apply to the addition of subgroups to existing Societies (e.g. the Australian Society is a subgroup of the British Society; or if the American adds a new Affiliate Society), but only to groups asking for sponsorship in order to become, in due course, independent Component Societies of the International Psycho-Analytical Association. In the past there have been difficulties because this has not been done. I will explain what happened: Canada, e.g. had double

sponsors  
the Brit  
Canada  
later.—A  
study pr  
to the  
Groups.

*Miss*

Group?

*Dr. H*  
have ha  
to practi  
the back  
national  
to set de  
to canall

*Miss*  
standing  
to the Sp  
Study G  
group.

three ful  
can then  
in time p  
Society a

*Dr. Z*  
motion  
view of t

*Dr. H*  
excellent  
feels abo

*Dr. L*  
cil's rec  
Study G

*Dr. S*

*Dr. C*

last Cor  
Constitu  
discusse

appointe  
the next  
sight of.

Associat  
the sense  
a society  
ing a so  
their Co

ferently  
the Unit  
whereas  
for their

be meml  
itself, bu  
associate  
American

own cou

*Dr. Jo*  
amend t  
the cust  
wonder

included

sponsorship; both the American Association and the British Society sponsored the same group. Canada has tried a solution of which I will speak later.—Also, a Committee will be nominated to study problems of principles and standards related to the acceptance of New Societies and Study Groups.

*Miss H. Schwarz* asks for a definition of 'Study Group'.

*Dr. Hartmann:* Usually a group of analysts who have had some training elsewhere and who decide to practise in a new city or country and want to have the backing of a Component Society of the International Association. We have so far no regulation to set down procedure, so we feel the best thing is to canalize it through the International.

*Miss Anna Freud* points to a frequent misunderstanding regarding a Study Group and its relation to the Sponsoring Society. Not all members of the Study Group need to be members of the sponsoring group. Usually a Study Group has one, two, or three full members of the Sponsoring Society and can then add members to the Study Group who will in time present membership papers to the Sponsoring Society and become full members there.

*Dr. Zilboorg* suggests that the acceptance of this motion be postponed until the next Congress in view of the difficulties inherent in its application.

*Dr. Hartmann:* I think *Dr. Zilboorg's* point is excellent. But I want to hear how the Congress feels about it.

*Dr. Loewenstein* moves that the Executive Council's recommendations regarding sponsorship of Study Groups be accepted.

*Dr. Sterba* seconds this.

*Dr. Clifford Scott* points to the fact that at the last Congress before the war the Articles of the Constitution of the American Association were discussed in this Association and a Sub-committee appointed to consider them and bring them up at the next Congress; but in the interval it was lost sight of. In the Constitution of the American Association 'country' means North America in the sense that many Americans feel that sponsoring a society in Canada would be technically sponsoring a society in their own country, according to their Constitution, but some Canadians feel differently about that. Many Canadians will go to the United States, study there, and not return; whereas some Canadians will go to another country for their training. They may go back and wish to be members of the Society of the Canada group itself, but in the meantime might much rather be associated with the British Society than with the American Association, both being outside their own country.

*Dr. Jones* suggests that the American Association amend their constitution, defining 'country' in the customary sense, since otherwise one might wonder whether Mexico, Guatemala, etc., are also included in their definition of country.

*Dr. Waelder* points out an existing difference concerning the meaning of Study Group for the American Association and the International Association respectively: e.g. for the International Association and the British Society 'Study Group' merely implies moral support of a group of people interested in psycho-analysis; for the American Association, it means a group of analysts with limited training rights under sponsorship of a parent institute. This difference in definition might be responsible for the difficulties of the Canadian group.

*Dr. Gillespie* confirms on behalf of the British Society that a Study Group is not in any sense a training organization and that the British Society would never have recognized the Canadian group in that sense.

*Dr. Hartmann:* To speak about the present state of the Canadian group: analysts in Montreal have been in contact with the International Association, with the Detroit Society, with the British Society, and with the American Association, with the aim of securing sponsorship. The latest information the Central Executive of the International Association has received from them was that they now want to become an Affiliated Society of the American Psychoanalytic Association.

*Dr. Gillespie* states that his latest information is that there has been a difference of opinion among the five members of the Montreal group, three of whom have decided that they want to postpone application to the American Association until they have certain assurances in advance, the other two wish to join. Since the majority is in favour of postponement, they will not apply as a group.

*Dr. Hartmann:* My information is a few months old and yours, I understand, a few weeks.

*Dr. Bartemeier* confirms *Dr. Gillespie's* information and asks whether a future application of the Canadian group for Affiliate Society status in the American Association would be against regulations of the International Association.

*Dr. Hartmann:* It would not infringe on any accepted principle of the International Psychoanalytic organization.

*Dr. Loewenstein* states that there is a motion.

*Dr. Hartmann:* May I say that the Central Executive, as far as I can see, is in favour of accepting *Dr. Zilboorg's* suggestion to postpone decision on this question. Since even a clear formulation may apparently be misunderstood, we would like to bring this question up in two years after consultation with the American Association.

(From the audience): I second the motion to accept recommendation of Council.

*Dr. Koch* inquires whether groups having only one training analyst could be recognized as a study group.

*Dr. Hartmann:* We do not favour the development of a group out of such a situation. We are in favour of providing possibilities for the students

to get their teaching from several analysts. By the way, in America there is a difference between Study Group and Training Centre.—Is there any more discussion? There is the question whether we should decide now or after consultation with the American Association. I am in favour of discussing it with the American. I would be in favour of accepting Dr. Zilboorg's recommendation to refer the question back to the Central Executive and to consultation with the American.

*Mrs. Klein* asks for a clearer definition of Study Group in respect to the number of training analysts. Was Dr. Hartmann's statement concerning the undesirability of training by only one training analyst a ruling or a recommendation?

*Dr. Hartmann:* The Central Executive can only recommend; we have no possibility of enforcing regulations. We will nominate a committee to study problems of Study Groups and new Societies, so that we can arrive at a clearer understanding of the problems involved and at a definition of the term 'Study Group'.

*(From the audience):* I move a resolution that the suggestion of the Central Executive be accepted.

*Dr. Loewenstein* withdraws his motion.

*Dr. Zilboorg* moves that the proposed ruling remain for further consideration by the Executive Council until the next Congress.

*Dr. Atkin* seconds this motion.

*Miss Anna Freud* suggests that before voting the fact should be considered that the International Congress is held in Europe and that therefore the Americans are usually at a disadvantage. For this reason it would be only fair to postpone decision on sponsorship until the Central Executive could discuss this problem with the American Association.

*Dr. Hartmann:* Who is in favour of postponing the question of Study Groups until after discussion with the American, and to appoint a committee to investigate problems relating to Study Groups? *(Overwhelming majority; none against. Dr. Zilboorg's motion carried.)*

*Dr. Hartmann (continuing):* May I come back to the applications we have had. *Denmark:* two members of the Swedish group have settled in Denmark, Dr. Vangaard and Dr. Nielsen, and one Danish colleague, Dr. Hansen, trained in Vienna, has joined them. They have asked to be recognized as a Study Group under the sponsorship of the Swedish Psycho-analytic Society. The Central Executive recommends that this recognition be granted.

*Dr. Zilboorg* seconds the motion.

*Dr. Hartmann:* Let us vote on the Danish group under the sponsorship of Sweden. *(Overwhelming majority; one against.)*

*Dr. Hartmann (continuing):* In Copenhagen there is also the Society called 'Selskabet for Dynamisk Psykoanalyse' which has again asked to be accepted as a Component Society. We found it consisted mostly of persons not sufficiently trained

according to the present standards of the International Association. The Central Executive therefore cannot recommend recognition.

I mentioned before that in *France* five former members of the Paris Society resigned a few weeks ago. By this act they have also lost membership in the International Association. They are: Drs. Lagache, Lacan, Dolto, Favez-Boutonnier, and Reverchon-Jouve. This question has been widely discussed. The resignations occurred after a meeting of the Paris Society at which Dr. Lacan, then president, had received a vote of non-confidence in the Society. The doubts concerned serious deviations of training practices counter to the experiences and convictions of the majority. On the one hand, the members who resigned have now formed a new group and asked for recognition. They claim that it was rather incompatibilities of character that caused the difficulties and induced them to move. The Central Executive feels that before any decision can be reached the situation ought to be more thoroughly clarified than could be done at the Congress and it has nominated a committee to ascertain the facts and to report them. The committee consists of Dr. K. R. Eissler, Dr. Greenacre, Mrs. H. Hoffer, Dr. Lampl-de Groot, Dr. Winnicott.

*Dr. Loewenstein* stresses the fact that, according to information received by him, the majority of students followed the split-off group. He points to the dangers inherent in such a split to students and patients, comparing it with the divorce of parents. He pleads for tolerance on both sides and for the safeguarding of the training of students and the analyses of their patients irrespective of the side to which the students adhere.

*Dr. Hartmann:* Thank you, Dr. Loewenstein, a very important suggestion.

*Mme. Bonaparte* is in favour of studying the situation carefully. She affirms that the split occurred because of divergence in technique. She considers the question of technique a fundamental one in analysis in general, and in the training of analysts in particular. Therefore, she thinks that a careful examination of the technique used by the members of the new group is required, particularly in view of the fact that one of these members two years ago promised to change his technique, but did not keep his promise.

*Dr. Nacht* corrects Dr. Loewenstein as to the number of students who left the Institute. Fifty per cent of the students are in analysis with members of the Paris Psycho-Analytical Society. In answer to Dr. Loewenstein's plea for tolerance towards students and their patients, he reads the following letter sent to Dr. Lagache on 18 June, 1953: ' . . . The Members of the Council, seeing that your collaboration should no longer be accepted, has to find someone else for the classes and courses you were going to direct, and in order to avoid hardship for both trainees and patients, the members of the

Council arrived a trainee a him from

*Dr. L* this letter that they after the; only an Nacht's not to 1 split and

*Miss I* often be the cons able to Dr. Nac students spirit.

impossit whose ti is incom grounds between visor.

tions w! recomm thrashed all poin consists matters

*Dr. 2* Society the Intu the mer should Associa

*Dr. ,* New Y bers of were n the An of the others their n becaus Society

*Dr. .* group and th nation: Centra applica Society invest: before

*Dr.* resolut that n careful Intern:

Council asked that an arrangement might be arrived at by which full freedom will be left to the trainee and that no pressure will be exercised on him from whatever side it may be. . . .

*Dr. Loewenstein* expresses his pleasure about this letter, but states that he heard from two students that their supervision had been cancelled the day after they left the Institute. He hopes that this was only an isolated incident and appreciates Dr. Nacht's and the Educational Committee's decision not to let students and patients suffer from the split among the 'parents'.

*Miss Freud* states that as a child analyst she has often been asked by parents to save children from the consequences of divorce, and has never been able to do so. The second point concerns what Dr. Nacht said about the gesture extended toward students of the other side being made in the right spirit. It is a well-known fact that it is nearly impossible to supervise the work of a candidate whose training analysis for some reason or another is incomplete, insufficient, or carried on on different grounds. There has to be some form of harmony between the work of training analyst and supervisor. It is exactly the complexity of these questions which has determined the Central Executive's recommendation that this matter should not be thrashed out here which would not give insight into all points, but to entrust it to a committee which consists of purely objective people well versed in the matters of psycho-analytical training.

*Dr. Zilboorg* refers to the splits of the New York Society where neither group lost membership in the International Association and advocates that the members who resigned from the Paris Society should retain membership in the International Association during the period of investigation.

*Dr. Hartmann:* In the case of the split of the New York Society, those who left remained members of the International Association because they were members of the American Association and the American Association is a Component Society of the International. When Dr. Lagache and the others left the Paris Society, they did not retain their membership in the International Association, because the Paris Society is the only Component Society of the International in France.

*Dr. Jones* reminds Dr. Zilboorg that the Rado group was recognized by the American Association and therefore retained membership in the International Association. He also points out that the Central Executive is the proper body to deal with applications for membership of people outside the Society and that it is proper that they should investigate this new Society coming from outside before accepting it.

*Dr. Aikin* emphasizes the importance of the resolutions just adopted by Congress, namely, that matters of groups splitting off should be very carefully studied by the Executive Council of the International Psycho-Analytical Association, and

secondly, the resolution of principle against the too ready fragmentation of various groups in the International. He states that in conversations with some of the members and students who resigned, the problem concerning training had not been mentioned at all, but the split had been explained by incompatibilities of personalities. He professes himself against splits for such reasons, although a number of members of the International Psycho-Analytical Association seemed to find it justified to split off because of personal disagreements. The function of the International Association should be to propound and maintain policy and even to exercise authority in such matters. The French group should be asked to reconsider and to postpone any action until after the investigation of the Committee. If a split is unavoidable, it should be undertaken in the course of several years so that, in accordance with Dr. Loewenstein's suggestion, it will not be too traumatic for students and patients.

*Miss Freud* thinks that the Congress should be informed that an unfortunate step has already been taken by the leaving members of the French group. They have informed the non-analytic professional environment of their step in a circular which carries the quarrel, without giving reasons for it, into the outer world. Therefore, pacifying comes too late.

*Dr. de Saussure* expresses his pleasure at the adoption of the resolution concerning splits and thinks that this measure could have prevented the present situation in Paris. Since he used to be a member of the Paris Society, he feels most sympathetic with their recent troubles and hopes that, if no spirit of revenge prevails, a unity can be restored without sacrifice of standards. The objective Committee that has been appointed might be of help in unifying the two groups.

*Dr. Loewenstein* appeals again to the French colleagues to reduce damage as much as possible.

*Dr. Hartmann:* I am in favour of limiting this discussion because it involves a question that without intimate knowledge of facts cannot be decided and the Committee was appointed for this purpose.

*Dr. Clifford Scott* suggests provisional membership for the split-off group, since he assumes that they were not aware of the consequences of their action.

*Dr. Benassy* repudiates this assumption by referring to the public statement, which Miss Freud mentioned, in which they state that they do not see why the International should not recognize them; this means that when they resigned they knew that by that fact they were resigning from the International Association. He believes that the students might suffer from internal dissensions as much as or more than from a definite split.

*Dr. Balint* suggests several different procedures for keeping the members of the split-off group in

the International Association; e.g. membership at large; provisional recognition of the whole group; or individual membership in other Component Societies.

*Mme. Bonaparte* comes back to the problem of deviation in technique used by the dissenting members and emphasizes the necessity of the Committee's investigation of these problems, since the question of standards is of great importance for the development of psycho-analysis in France.

*Dr. Hartmann*: I am in favour of closing the discussion. I want your opinion. (*All were in favour of closing the discussion.*)

*Dr. Loewenstein* points to the fact that the members of the split-off group could not participate in this discussion, because they had lost membership in the International Association, which he considers as anomalous and unfair.

*Dr. Hartmann*: I feel we should leave all these questions to the Committee; its investigation will not take place until the next Congress. We shall ask this Committee to interview both sides and to report as soon as possible to the Central Executive. (*A motion was proposed and seconded to leave the discussion to an impartial Committee; they should hear both sides and report back to the Central Executive as soon as possible.*)

(*From the audience*): What is the status of the French colleagues pending investigation?

*Miss Freud*: The status is the one they created themselves by resignation.

(*Motion passed; two against.*)

*Dr. Hartmann (continuing)*: We come to the next point. A group of psycho-analysts in Norway has asked to be accepted as a Component Society. Among them are a few who do not practise analysis but something else, a new technique. This composition of the group made it impossible for the Central Executive to recommend it.—In Spain there is one group in Barcelona and one in Madrid. The leader in Madrid is a member of the German Psycho-Analytical Society and a training analyst. Both groups have applied for recognition. However, the situation did not seem clear enough to warrant a decision at this time. The Central Executive recommends that the group in Madrid seek closer contact with the Paris group regarding lecturing and supervision. As to the group in Barcelona, Dr. Jones, who will be spending his vacation not far from there, took it upon himself to investigate prevailing conditions on the spot during the coming year. We wish to express our gratitude.

*Dr. Braatoy* protests sharply against the decision of the Executive Council concerning the Norwegian group.

*Dr. Hartmann*: You are out of order, but if you want to give a brief explanation we will listen to you.

*Dr. Braatoy* presents the historical development of the Norwegian group; he stresses the difficulty of breaking off co-operation with certain members

for scientific reasons in peace-time, after having co-operated with them in times of extreme external danger during the war. He does not want to argue against the Executive Council's decision, but asks only for precise and definite formulation of the reasons in a letter to the group.

*Dr. Hartmann*: I am sure you will be grateful for Dr. Braatoy's information. The decision is merely postponed until the Norwegian group reaches proper standards for membership.

*Miss Steinbach* wishes to say that the Madrid group did not apply to be recognized. She only informed the Executive Council of the existence of the Madrid group and asked for help, which they gratefully received.

*Dr. Hartmann (continuing)*: The Central Executive welcomes an arrangement by which three officers of the Sigmund Freud Archives, Inc., would be chosen from among representatives of the International Psycho-Analytical Association. I now ask Dr. K. R. Eissler to report to you.

*Report on the Sigmund Freud Archives, Inc., by Dr. K. R. Eissler (see Appendix I (a)).*

*Dr. Hartmann (continuing)*: Thank you, Dr. Eissler.—I want to tell you that we have accepted a suggestion by Dr. Hans Hoff of Vienna that a bust of Freud be erected there. A bust of Freud exists which Dr. Jones has very kindly offered for this purpose and I want to convey to him the warmest thanks of all of us.—It was decided in Amsterdam that the Scientific Committee on Research be put on a more democratic basis. An appeal by the Central Executive was meant to achieve that delegates should meet during the Congress and prepare the ground for future work. This appeal was only partly successful. Only a few societies accepted the suggestion to send delegates. Some voiced doubt as to the fruitfulness of the whole venture, but some representatives of some groups were present. They are: Dr. Bastiaans, Dr. Hoffer, Dr. Kris, Dr. Loewenstein, Dr. Scott, Dr. van der Leeuw, and Dr. van der Waals, and I would like to ask Dr. van der Waals to give a brief resumé of their discussion.

*Report of the Scientific Committee on Research by Dr. H. G. van der Waals (see Appendix I (b)).*

*Dr. Hartmann (continuing)*: Thank you for your report. I cannot add anything except that I am glad to hear from Mme. Bonaparte that she would be interested in collaborating. I will now ask Dr. Gitelson to make a financial report.

*Report of the Treasurer of the International Psycho-Analytical Association, by Dr. Maxwell Gitelson (see Appendix I (c)).*

*Dr. Hartmann (continuing)*: Thank you, Dr. Gitelson.—I now have to tell you that some months ago we received an invitation from Dr. de Saussure, who has just returned to Geneva after twelve years in the United States, that the next Congress should take place in Geneva. He said that no Congress had ever been held in the French part of Switzer-

land, a  
Associa  
sent an  
there.

to repe

Dr. (

Swiss S

Analyti

Dr.

accepte

Dr. I

ask Dr.

(He wa

Dr. de

Dr. .

tenary

the nex

Dr. )

suggest

Dr. )

change

Dr. J

why so

Who is

(Great

(One.)

Geneva

Saussur

What a

Dr.

appoint

Dr.

that we

purpose

last poi

the Ho

Dr. J

I will ce

I wo

have ac

two act

which I

ments )

A total

have b

original

258 mi

Freud;

the det

want to

first edi

tried to



land, although many permanent members of the Association live there. Last night the Paris group sent an invitation asking that we should convene there. Let me ask whether Dr. de Saussure wants to repeat his invitation.

*Dr. de Saussure* extends the invitation by the Swiss Society for the 19th International Psycho-Analytical Congress to Geneva in 1955.

*Dr. Bartemeier* moves that this invitation be accepted.

*Dr. Hartmann*: Before we vote I think we should ask Dr. Parcheminey about the invitation to Paris. (*He was not present.*) Then we shall vote on Dr. de Saussure's suggestion. Who is in favour?

*Dr. Jones* brings up the question of the centenary of Freud's birthday in 1956, and whether the next Congress should be postponed to 1956.

*Dr. Hartmann*: Any discussion on Dr. Jones's suggestion?

*Dr. Hoffer* points out that it would involve a change from the usual dates.

*Dr. Hartmann*: And that is one of the reasons why some are in favour of not letting it coincide. Who is in favour of holding the Congress in 1955? (*Great show of hands.*) Who for postponement? (*One.*) Let us settle the place. Who is in favour of Geneva? (*All in favour.*) Thank you, Dr. de Saussure, for your invitation. Any other business? What about the centenary? We have some ideas too.

*Dr. K. Eissler* suggests that a Committee be appointed to prepare the centenary celebration.

*Dr. Hartmann*: I want to assure Dr. Eissler that we will nominate a Committee with that special purpose in mind. If there is no other business, the last point is nominations, and I would like to ask the Hon. President, Dr. Jones, to take the chair.

*Dr. Jones*: We are now without a President and I will call for nominations from the floor.

(*Dr. Hartmann was proposed by Dr. Atkin, seconded by several members, and accepted by acclamation.*)

*Dr. Hartmann*: Thank you, Dr. Jones. Thank you, all the members of the Congress, for your vote of confidence, and I will try my best in the following two years. I want to say thank you also to all those who have been helpful to me in the last two years, the members of the Executive Council, and especially to the Hon. Secretary, Dr. Ruth Eissler, without whom the work could not have been done. She has agreed to continue serving on a temporary basis as Hon. Secretary and we will try to keep a full-time secretary to facilitate her heavy task. Are there any nominations for Vice-President?

The following were nominated and unanimously elected:

Mme. Marie Bonaparte.

Miss Anna Freud.

Dr. W. H. Gillespie.

Dr. Jeanne Lampi-de Groot.

Dr. Maxwell Gitelson was re-elected as Hon. Treasurer.

*Dr. Hartmann*: In concluding, I wish to extend our appreciation to Dr. Phyllis Greenacre and Dr. Ernst Kris, chairmen of the Programme Committee, and all its members for their great efforts in organizing our scientific programme. I also want to thank the members of the British Society who made this Congress as pleasant as it could be for all of us. Particular thanks are due to the Administrative Committee headed by Dr. Balint; and Miss King, Mrs. Hill and Miss Drescher. I hope to see all of you again in two years in Geneva.

The meeting is adjourned.

## APPENDIX I

### REPORTS TO THE BUSINESS MEETING, EIGHTEENTH INTERNATIONAL PSYCHO-ANALYTICAL CONGRESS, LONDON, 1953

#### (a) Report on the Sigmund Freud Archives, Inc.

I would like to give a brief report on what we have achieved so far. The work has consisted of two activities: namely, one, to collect documents which have direct reference to Freud, and documents having direct reference to psycho-analysis. A total of 1,176 letters and cards written by Freud have been received, a small number of them in original, the majority in photostat or microfilm; 258 miscellaneous letters which refer indirectly to Freud; 231 letters which have direct reference to the development of psycho-analysis. I do not want to specify other items, such as photographs, first editions, etc. The second function: we have tried to arrange interviews with persons in direct

contact with Freud or who were close to people who were close to Freud. There are now 115 recorded interviews with 95 interviewed people.

The financial situation is rather favourable. At one point it looked as if we should not be able to continue our work because we had no money, but at the last minute the Bollingen Foundation in New York made a substantial contribution. I would be grateful to you if you should decide to send a letter or telegram of thanks to that Foundation, because they supported our work in such a generous way.

I heard recently that Freud published a review of a book by Coudenhove-Kalergi in English, but I