

The Confederation of Independent Psychoanalytic Societies: The Emergence and Consolidation of a Professional Community

Prepared on behalf of the Committee on CIPS History by Fredric Perlman (co-chair) in consultation with Harriet Basseches (co-chair), Steven Ellman, Norbert Freedman, Beth Kalish-Weiss, Ernest Lawrence, Terrence McBride, and James Gooch (consultants).

CIPS members are invited to send comments, edits, proposed revisions, and additional information to the Select Committee on CIPS History at history@cipsusa.org.

The Confederation of Independent Psychoanalytic Societies: The Emergence and Consolidation of a Professional Community

The Confederation of Independent Psychoanalytic Societies (CIPS) was founded in 1992 in response to the historic changes in the organization of American psychoanalysis that occurred in the late 1980's. These changes, which resulted from the settlement of a lawsuit brought by the Group for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy in Psychology (GAPPP) against the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsaA) and the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA), transformed the relationships among American psychoanalysts and between American psychoanalysts and the international psychoanalytic community. CIPS was formed to represent a newly emerging community of independent American psychoanalytic societies of the IPA.

The organizational history of American psychoanalysis prior to the GAPPP lawsuit was shaped, in large measure, by the policies of APsaA and by its unique status within the IPA. Through most of its history, the educational policies of all APsaA institutes restricted psychoanalytic training to physicians, excluding social workers, psychologists, and other mental health professionals from training at APsaA institutes and barring them from membership in the association. At the same time, APsaA held an "exclusive franchise" in relation to the IPA. Under arrangements established before the Second World War, APsaA was to be the sole American organization belonging to the IPA, a rule that permitted only APsaA members to become members of the IPA. American psychoanalysts barred from joining APsaA were thus also excluded from the IPA. At the same time, APsaA's exclusive franchise with the IPA prevented psychoanalytic institutes outside APsaA from applying directly to the IPA for accreditation and component status. This was a very damaging set of arrangements, because the IPA, founded by Sigmund Freud and his collaborators in 1908, is the largest and most important professional association of psychoanalysts in the world.

The settlement of the lawsuit necessitated the abandonment of these policies by both APsaA, which renounced its "exclusive franchise" and its restrictive admission policies, and by the IPA, which was freed by the settlement to admit new American psychoanalytic groups to the IPA. In 1989 and 1991, four psychoanalytic societies that had long modeled their training programs and membership criteria on the rigorous standards of the IPA, were accredited by the IPA and granted provisional component status within the international association. These groups were the Institute for Psychoanalytic Training and Research, the New York Freudian Society, the Los Angeles Institute and Society for Psychoanalytic Studies, and the Psychoanalytic Center of California. These four societies shared a common history of exclusion from APsaA and the IPA as well as a common commitment to the promotion of psychoanalysis as an interdisciplinary profession. As the first independent component societies of the IPA in the United States, these groups confronted the challenge of establishing themselves within the international association as well as within the professional community of IPA psychoanalysts in the United States. The Confederation of Independent Psychoanalytic Societies was formed to enable these "independent groups," to pursue their common goals in concert.

Psychoanalysis in Europe and The United States: The Question of "Lay Analysis"

The unique character and culture of CIPS and its component societies is a product of its history and its historic role in the evolution of psychoanalysis in the United States. This history has been characterized a long struggle between competing segments of the American psychoanalytic community to control the boundaries of psychoanalysis as a profession. This struggle, once characterized as the controversy over "lay analysis," first crystallized when Freud and his followers began organizing psychoanalysis as a profession with defined standards for training and certification. The impetus for this initiative was Freud's concern about the practices of physicians and other persons who purported to practice psychoanalysis without having been trained to do so. Freud recognized that such so-called "wild analysis" threatened the future of psychoanalysis as well as the welfare of the public. It was therefore necessary to professionalize psychoanalysis: to establish adequate standards and a program of certification to enable the public to differentiate trained psychoanalysts from untrained persons seeking to exploit the growing prestige of psychoanalysis by identifying themselves as psychoanalysts. The IPA was conceived in 1908, and then formally established in 1910, in order to promote these professional purposes (Freud, 1910, 1914; Jones, 1955).

While analysts on both sides of the Atlantic participated in the creation of the IPA, the organizational history of American psychoanalysis differed significantly from that of Europe. Although most psychoanalysts in Europe and the United States were physicians, membership in most European psychoanalytic societies was open to individuals from a broad spectrum of disciplines and professional backgrounds. Many of the early analysts in Freud's circle were non-physicians (Roazen, 1971; Wallerstein, 1998). Freud maintained that medical training should not be a prerequisite for psychoanalytic training

and practice, and actively supported the psychoanalytic careers of non-medical aspirants (Freud, 1926). From its outset, the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society was open to talented persons from all disciplines. Freud was particularly eager to encourage academics and scholars from the humanities who could "apply" psychoanalytic knowledge to their respective fields of endeavor. Otto Rank, Theodore Reik, and Hans Sachs were among the first of these "lay analysts" trained especially to work in the area of "applied psychoanalysis" (Schroter, 2004).

Freud formulated his most impassioned and comprehensive argument in favor of this position when a psychologist-psychoanalyst from the Vienna Society, Theodor Reik, was sued for practicing medicine without a license (Freud, 1926). In this monograph, *The Question of Lay Analysis*, Freud articulated his vision of psychoanalysis as an autonomous profession, independent of medicine, with full professional education for new analysts to be provided by free-standing psychoanalytic training institutes, then starting to be formed.

Not all European analysts shared Freud's views regarding the training of non-physicians in psychoanalysis. Some leading analysts, such as Karl Abraham, the leader of the Berlin Psychoanalytic Society, strongly preferred to restrict psychoanalytic training to physicians. Membership in the Berlin Institute, unlike that in Vienna, was restricted to physicians, with the exception of those "lay analysts" like Rank, Reik and Sachs whose work was limited to "applied psychoanalysis" rather than clinical treatment, and those whose clinical practices, like that of Melanie Klein, were restricted to child analysis (Schroter, 2004; Wallerstein, 1998). Some European analysts objected to the training of any non-physicians, even those specializing in "applied psychoanalysis," arguing that such analysts, including Rank, Reik, and Sachs, inevitably engaged in clinical work with patients. Among other motives, this position may have reflected a wish to restrict competition for the limited number of prospective patients (Shroter, 2004).

In 1927, following publication of Freud's monograph on lay analysis, Ernest Jones, then editor of the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, solicited the views of both European and American analysts with regard to the question of lay analysis. Ten of the twenty-two Europeans, four of whom were lay analysts themselves, strongly supported Freud's position. Seven European analysts articulated arguments in opposition to lay analysis. The Viennese and Berlin groups were split in their attitudes. All three British analysts included in the survey, including Jones, took compromise positions favoring lay analysis under special conditions, such as medical supervision (Jones et al, 1927; Wallerstein, 1998). Despite these differences, Freud's vision of psychoanalysis as an interdisciplinary enterprise, supported by the growing number of non-medical analysts, would come to shape the organization of European psychoanalysis. Many of the luminary figures in the early history of psychoanalysis, including Siegfried Bernfeld, Ernst Kris, Otto Rank, Theodor Reik, Anna Freud, Melanie Klein, Ella Freeman Sharpe, Robert Waelder, Erik Erikson and many others, were individuals whose backgrounds in the arts and sciences enabled them to make unique contributions to the evolving body of psychoanalytic ideas (Bergmann, 1988).

The development of psychoanalysis in the United States, however, was determined by contingencies that differed significantly from those obtaining in Europe. Before the establishment of formal training institutes in the United States in the 1930's, Americans who aspired to careers in psychoanalysis needed to go to Europe to train with Freud or with members of his small circle of followers. Psychoanalytic training was thus a far more difficult and expensive undertaking for Americans than it was for Europeans. With rare exceptions, the only Americans to travel to Europe to study psychoanalysis were physicians, many of whom were already accustomed to pursuing advanced medical training at the prestigious medical centers of Paris, Berlin, Zurich, and other European cities.

From its earliest days, then, the psychoanalytic community in the United States was composed predominantly of physicians who went on to shape the development of psychoanalysis on this side of the Atlantic. The fact that the American psychoanalytic community was composed of physicians entailed a second fateful contingency. While the profession of medicine was highly organized and securely established in England and in central Europe, American medicine had long been characterized by haphazard training and was unregulated by any medical establishment or by any governmental authority. The Flexner report of 1910 revealed the chaotic and uneven state of American medical schools, many of which were exposed as "diploma mills" graduating incompetent practitioners (Flexner, 1910; Wallerstein, 1998). Following the publication of the Flexner report, the American medical community devoted considerable resources to the cause of enhancing the professional status of medicine in the United States (Freidson, 1970; Starr, 1982). American psychoanalysts believed that the inclusion of non-physicians within their ranks would both endanger the status of psychoanalysis and, at the same time, thwart their efforts to elevate the status of medicine. They preferred to organize the American psychoanalytic profession as an exclusive domain within medicine, thus protecting both medicine and psychoanalysis from any possible taint of quackery or lack of professionalism (Wallerstein, 1998).

As a result, the first formal American professional associations of psychoanalysts were primarily medical associations. The New York Psychoanalytic Society, founded in 1911 as a professional membership society for New York analysts, the American Psychoanalytic Association, established the same year to serve as a professional society for American psychoanalysts living outside the New York area, and the Boston and Baltimore-Washington Psychoanalytic Societies, founded in 1914, were all closed to non-medical practitioners. The "medical orthodoxy" of American psychoanalysis became more entrenched in the ensuing years because the attachment of American psychoanalysts to medicine deepened as the status of American medicine was enhanced in the middle years of the century (Eissler, 1965; Wallerstein, 1998).

From the earliest days of psychoanalysis, then, American and European psychoanalysts diverged in their visions of psychoanalysis as an enterprise and in the boundaries they set for membership in the profession. These differences came to a head in the 1925, when the IPA created the International Training Commission to establish uniform policies for psychoanalytic education (Fine, 1978; Schroter, 2002). Through its early history,

psychoanalytic training had been informal, and consisted largely of participation in the scientific meetings of the psychoanalytic societies, and in some cases, of personal analysis for the aspirant. When aspirants were ready, they applied for membership in the society, a process that typically required the presentation of a paper. In the 1920's, however, European analysts began establishing formal training institutes, beginning with the Berlin Institute and Poliklinik in 1920, the Vienna Institute and Ambulatorium in 1922, and the London Institute in 1924 (Danto, 1998, 1999; Schroter, 2002). European analysts, eager to promote the social authority and internal cohesiveness of the emerging profession and its new training programs, sought to institutionalize uniform training standards through the IPA, setting up the International Training Commission to attain this end (Fine, 1978, Schroter, 2002).

The attempt to establish a uniform standard, however, quickly surfaced the tensions brewing among Europeans, and more importantly, between Europeans and American analysts, about lay analysis. American psychoanalysts, who then constituted only a small minority of IPA analysts, strongly opposed the European training model and were adamant in their insistence that psychoanalysis in the United States be limited to physicians. All four of the American respondents to Jones 1927 questionnaire were strenuously opposed to the training of lay persons. Not only did American analysts refuse to train non-medical applicants or admit non-medical analysts into their ranks, they pressed the European branch societies and the IPA to support this American policy by refusing to provide training to Americans unless they had been issued prior authorization by a local branch society in the United States (Fine, 1978; Menaker, 1989; Schroter, 2002; Wallerstein, 1998). Some leaders of the American psychoanalytic establishment, incensed by the interference of European analysts in American professional affairs, questioned the wisdom of their allegiance to the IPA, believing that their alliance with psychiatry was more important to their interests than their continued affiliation with the IPA (D'Amore, 1978). The conflict between the Europeans and the Americans simmered through the ensuing decade with no resolution (Wallerstein, 1998).

During the 1930's, American psychoanalysis underwent a major reorganization. Like the European psychoanalytic societies in the previous decade, psychoanalytic societies in the United States began setting up their own training institutes, beginning with the establishment of the New York Psychoanalytic Institute in 1931, the Chicago Psychoanalytic Institute in 1932, and the Boston and Washington Psychoanalytic Institutes in 1933. In 1932, the American Psychoanalytic Association was restructured as a federation of societies and training institutes, an organizational move that facilitated the establishment of the American association as a national professional organization, with its own training standards and accreditation functions. In 1936, American analysts demanded the functional dissolution of the International Training Commission, arguing that the Commission should be reorganized as a scientific rather than a regulatory body. Two years later, in 1938, the association adopted a formal "Resolution Against the Future Training of Laymen for the Therapeutic Use of Psychoanalysis" (APsaA, 1938). At the IPA Congress that year, American delegates confronted the IPA with a demand that the American association be granted an "exclusive franchise" on IPA membership for American analysts, with full autonomy and regulatory authority with regard to training

policies and membership criteria for persons seeking to train or practice in the United States (Wallerstein, 1998).

The deepening conflict between the Americans and the IPA could not be resolved at the 1938 Congress, and the outbreak of World War II interrupted the ongoing organizational functioning of the IPA. The war decimated the population of European psychoanalysts, many of whom were Jews coming to the United States to escape Nazi persecution. At the same time, the APsaA, demographically strengthened by the large number of European analysts who immigrated to the U.S., assumed the prerogatives it had demanded in 1938 and proceeded to function independently as an autonomous association. When the IPA resumed functioning after the war in 1946, European leaders of the IPA had little choice but to accept the new reality. Although the new arrangements demanded by the Americans in 1938 had been in effect from the outbreak of the war, they were not formalized until 1963, when the IPA accorded APsaA the status of a "regional association" within the IPA, with an "exclusive franchise" on IPA membership for American psychoanalysts and full autonomy with regard to admission policies at its institutes (Wallerstein, 1998).

Seeds of Change: The Growth of Lay Analysis in The United States

Although APsaA maintained its policy of "medical orthodoxy," forbidding its members to provide "unauthorized" training to non-medical aspirants outside the aegis of its training institutes, its efforts to eradicate "lay analysis" would prove futile. Some Americans from outside medicine, like Esther and William Menaker, had already trained in Europe and had begun practicing and teaching in New York upon their return (Menaker 1989). Moreover, many of the European analysts who settled in the United States were not physicians and, like the Menakers, were forced to practice without APsaA authorization. The most important of these was Theodore Reik, whose later career as an independent educator of aspiring analysts would decisively transform the organization of psychoanalysis in the United States. In addition, a sizable number medically qualified European analysts opposed the restrictive training policies of the American Association, and were prepared to violate the strictures of the Association in order to teach psychoanalysis to would-be colleagues who were barred from formal training by the restrictive policies of the American association. Together, these analysts formed a pool of teachers and supervisors to whom non-medical aspirants could turn for help in mastering psychoanalytic ideas and techniques.

At the same time, the Second World War had spurred the development of clinical psychology and expanded the demand for psychiatric social work. With the close of the war, a growing number of professionals in both disciplines were eager to obtain psychoanalytic training. Some aspiring analysts, such as Martin and Maria Bergmann, arranged their own training by forming study groups with European émigré analysts such as Theodor Reik, Paul Federn and Robert Waelder, and obtaining their training analysis and supervision with analysts from both within and without the American association

(Perlman, 1999). Although the American association had strictly forbidden its members from participation in such "bootleg" training, many were instrumental in training the first generation of American social workers and psychologists to become psychoanalysts (Bergmann, 1988; Wallerstein, 1998).

By the close of the war decade, the first formal psychoanalytic training programs for non-medical analysts were established. Theodor Reik, the psychologist whose practice had occasioned Freud's defense of lay analysis in 1927, and who had been barred from full membership in the American association, became a popular teacher of psychoanalysis and, in 1941, established the Society for Psychoanalytic Psychology to provide a professional "home" for non-medical analysts and aspirants. In 1948, he founded the National Psychological Association for Psychoanalysis (NPAP) in New York, the first psychoanalytic training institute to provide psychoanalytic training in accordance with the interdisciplinary European training model. NPAP became the hub of an emerging community of "lay analysis" in New York. In the late 1950's, two groups of NPAP members split off to form their own institutes, the Institute for Psychoanalytic Training and Research, in 1958, and the New York Freudian Society, in 1959 (Menaker, 1988; Richards, 1996; Sherman, 1988). Both groups were determined to provide training at a level commensurate with IPA standards.

The growth of "lay analysis" was also spurred by dissension over doctrinal issues within APsaA. In 1941, theoretical conflicts inspired Karen Horney and her followers to secede from APsaA to form their own institute. While Horney's American Institute for Psychoanalysis maintained the medical orthodoxy of the American Association, a subsequent split, two years later, gave rise to the William Alanson White Institute, which would offer psychoanalytic training to psychologists (Eckardt, 1978; Eisold, 1998; Fine, 1978). A few years later, Lewis Wolberg, a graduate of the Horney's American Institute, went on to found the Postgraduate Center for Mental Health, a training institute offering psychoanalytic training to social workers and psychologists as well as psychiatrists (Fine, 1978).

During the ensuing decades, graduates of all these programs themselves would go on to found other institutes. With the establishment of additional institutes in New York and elsewhere, the population of so-called "lay analysts" gradually expanded to approximate that of APsaA. Social workers and psychologists had not only formed their own institutes, they also came to form their own professional associations, including the National Committee for Psychoanalysis in Social Work, and Division 39, the Division of Psychoanalysis within the American Psychological Association. Still, there was no route to membership in the IPA, except through the American Psychoanalytic Association.

The GAPPP Lawsuit

This state of affairs was challenged by a civil lawsuit brought against APsaA and the IPA in 1985 by four psychologists claiming to represent an aggrieved class of several thousand psychologists. The lawsuit was funded by the "Group for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy in Psychology," or "GAPPP," an organization formed

in 1984 by members of the Division of Psychoanalysis (Division 39) to fund legal action challenging the exclusionary training policies of these organizations. GAPPP was spearheaded by a steering committee composed of three Division 39 leaders: Ernest Lawrence, President of Division 39 (and later president of CIPS), Nathan Stockhammer, chair of the Division 39 Qualifications Committee, and Bryant Welch, co-chair of the division's Professional Issues Committee, and also a practicing attorney. The lawsuit challenged APsaA's restrictive training policies as well as its "exclusive franchise" on IPA membership, charging both associations with restraint of trade, a violation of the Sherman antitrust law. In addition to filing the lawsuit, the GAPPP plaintiffs threatened to bring a complaint against APsaA to the Federal Trade Commission (Wallerstein, 1998; Simon, 2003).

The lawsuit posed a grave threat to APsaA and the IPA. The costs of conducting litigation were themselves substantial and the financial costs of damages and other penalties were potentially severe (Simon, 2003). The potential damage of the lawsuit was particularly disturbing insofar as APsaA had already been engaged in various organizational initiatives intended to relax its historic restrictions against formal training for non-medical practitioners. In 1956, APsaA amended its rules to permit its institutes to provide psychoanalytic training to a limited number of exceptional individuals from outside medicine. These trainees, however, sometimes referred to as "research psychoanalysts," were officially barred from practicing psychoanalysis, except in conjunction with their research activities. Subsequent proposals in the 1970's to bring the training policies of APsaA into closer alignment with IPA policies elsewhere in the world had been considered by a succession of four APsaA committees, but these efforts had each been brought to a halt by persistent divisions within APsaA (Wallerstein, 1998; Simon, 2003). The GAPPP lawsuit, however, had a galvanizing impact on APsaA, pressing the organization to settle its internal dissensions and transform its policies to avoid litigation. In 1984, as the threat of the lawsuit loomed, APsaA convened a new committee, chaired by Herbert Gaskill, to once again reassess APsaA's exclusionary policies. In 1986, APsaA instituted the so-called "Gaskill agreement" according to which APsaA agreed to provide full psychoanalytic training to a limited number of non-medical candidates. The GAPPP plaintiffs, however, were not satisfied with such a limited concession, and persisted in their efforts to seek a fuller accommodation (Wallerstein, 1998).

The lawsuit was filed on March 1, 1985. After a difficult series of tense negotiations, the lawsuit was finally settled in 1987, initiating two radical changes in the organization of psychoanalysis in the United States. APsaA agreed to open its training to non-medical applicants, and at the same time, the IPA dissolved the "exclusive franchise" arrangement demanded by the Americans in 1938. Although APsaA continued to be a "regional association" of the IPA, its authority after 1987 was restricted to the regulation of its own affiliated institutes and societies. The settlement thus permitted psychoanalytic training institutes in the United States to seek accreditation through the IPA rather than APsaA, and to become "independent" component societies of the IPA.

The settlement brought the divisive issue of "lay analysis" to a final close and ushered in a new and more hopeful era for psychoanalysis. The lawsuit benefited the lay analysts who had long been excluded from APsaA and the IPA, but at the same time, it strengthened APsaA by opening its doors to a wide spectrum of new candidates and members, many of whom are now making significant contributions to the organization. Richard Simon, president of APsaA during the years of the lawsuit, would note in retrospect that "the lawsuit saved APsaA" (Simon, 2003). At the same time, the lawsuit produced a wholesome and invigorating transformation of the IPA. Once the "exclusive franchise" of APsaA was dissolved, it became possible for a hitherto excluded population of American psychoanalysts to join the IPA, infusing it with fresh energy and new ideas, and significantly enhancing its importance and prominence in the United States.

A New Psychoanalytic Community Emerges: "The Independents"

The settlement of the lawsuit required action by the IPA to accommodate applications for accreditation by American groups seeking to affiliate with the IPA. Under the leadership of IPA President Robert Wallerstein, the IPA initiated the development of new accreditation procedures and appointed Charles Hanly of the Canadian Psychoanalytic Society to serve as the Chair of New Groups Committee for the United States. Four American institutes, all following the European training model of interdisciplinary psychoanalysis, elected to apply for IPA accreditation: The Institute for Psychoanalytic Training and Research (IPTAR), the Los Angeles Institute and Society for Psychoanalytic Studies (LAISPS), New York Freudian Society (NYFS), and the Psychoanalytic Center of California (PCC). Site visits were conducted at IPTAR, NYFS, and PCC in 1988, and at LAISPS in 1989. By the time of the IPA congress of 1989, the accreditation procedures IPTAR, NYFS and PCC were completed, and all three societies were unanimously voted into membership at the Rome Congress.

"The Rome Congress in 1989 was a historic and moving occasion," wrote Norbert Freedman and Jean Sanville some years later. During the vote, they wrote, representatives of the three societies "were asked to wait outside the hall until the vote had been completed. Then, to a standing ovation lasting for five minutes, they were ushered in, received, and asked to take their seats. It was a cornerstone in the history of the IPA and anyone who was in Rome then can hardly forget it" (Freedman and Sanville, 1999, p. 47). The emotional impact of the reception was similarly noted by IPA president Robert Wallerstein several years earlier: "Of any business meeting that I've attended in the IPA—and I have been attending them for twenty or thirty years now—the most moving was the time when that vote was announced, and the new members came into the room to take part for the rest of the day in the proceedings" (Wallerstein, 1993, p. 21).

LAISPS was voted in to the IPA as a provisional society two years later in Buenos Aires Congress in 1991. The LAISPS approval required a good deal of effort since LAISPS had accepted two Mexican analysts who were members of a psychoanalytic society in Mexico that was not affiliated with the IPA. The Mexican IPA societies, construing this as action

as a potentially dangerous precedent that could damage their authority over the practice of psychoanalysis in Mexico, responded by strenuously opposing the admission of LAISPS into the IPA. The acceptance of LAISPS was in serious jeopardy, and a great deal of negotiation was necessary to pacify the Mexican IPA societies and secure the support that was needed to ensure the approval of LAISPS as a full component society (Terrence McBride, personal communication).

The "New IPA Groups of North America"

The formal settlement of the lawsuit did not, however, bring the historic struggle of American non-medical analysts to a peaceful conclusion. Influential opponents of the settlement continued maneuvering to press APsaA and the IPA to implement measures to counteract the impact of the settlement. As a result, APsaA instituted special requirements for non-medical candidates at APsaA institutes while the IPA introduced new requirements that would slow down the accreditation of new applicant groups seeking component status. The situation was sufficiently grave that the American Psychological Association, in support of the GAPPP plaintiffs, appointed a watchdog committee to monitor compliance with the settlement (Karon, 1994).

Recognizing the opposition to their integration within the IPA, the newly admitted "independents" determined to form a single organizational entity to promote their common interests, both within the IPA as well as in the wider psychoanalytic community of North America. Norbert Freedman and Steven Ellman of IPTAR, Albert Mason of PCC, Abby-Adams Silvan of NYFS, and Jean Sanville of LAISPS took the lead in articulating the need for a new organization to represent the interests of the "independents." Norbert Freedman, then president of IPTAR, contacted Abby-Adams Silvan, Albert Mason, Ernest Lawrence, presidents of NYFS, PCC, and LAISPS, respectively, to organize a meeting of the four society presidents to take place at the Buenos Aires Congress in 1991. Although Freedman could not attend the conference, the meeting took place as planned, and was attended by many representatives of the four groups (Freedman and Sanville, 1999). The meeting was not official and no formal decisions were taken at the meeting. However, the participants had the opportunity to get to know each other and learn about each other's societies. Following their Buenos Aires meeting, the leaders of the four new groups began to communicate on a regular basis, and the first informal structures of an emerging organization began to take shape (Basseches, 1994).

Important events within the IPA would soon inspire the four groups to forge a more formal organization. The governance structure of the IPA had long been highly centralized and component societies around the world were mobilizing for a change. The need to democratize the governance of the IPA was a major topic at the Buenos Aires Congress of 1991. Joseph Sandler, then president of the IPA, called for a President's Meeting to be attended by all presidents of component societies of the IPA to discuss IPA governance and its reform. The meeting, held in London on July 24 1992, was to be a galvanizing event for the new groups. Sandler led a movement to promote the creation of a new IPA organizational body, the House of Delegates, to share governance of the IPA

with the existing bodies, the Executive Board and the Executive Council. The plan called for the creation of a working group to prepare organizational plans for the new House of Delegates and to draft new IPA Bylaws. The working group was to be formed by representatives of the three IPA regions: Europe, Latin America, and North America. And herein lay an organizational dilemma. In the past, APsaA would have represented North America in conjunction with its North American neighbor, the much smaller Canadian Psychoanalytic Society (CPS). With the addition of four new groups in the United States, this was no longer an adequate arrangement.

Anticipating the need to protect their common interests at the Presidents' Meeting, leaders of the four independent groups met in London to develop a common agenda for the upcoming meeting. Abby Adams-Silvan, Norbert Freedman, Albert Mason, and Jean Sanville – then presidents of the four independent societies – agreed that the four independent societies should present a united front to the assembled presidents and, most importantly, should work together to ensure that the independent groups would be full participants in the formation of any organizational body representing the North American IPA groups in the planning of the new House of Delegates.

Immediately following the 1992 Presidents meeting in London, the leaders of the four societies met in New York to discuss the formation of a formal coalition. This meeting, which would be a defining moment in the history of the emerging CIPS community, was held in Carolyn Ellman's office, and was attended by Norbert Freedman and Steven Ellman from IPTAR, Abby Adams-Silvan and Mark Silvan from the NYFS, Albert Mason from PCC and Jean Sanville from LAISPS. The four society leaders laid out a plan to form an official coalition, to be called the "New IPA Groups of North America." The conferees agreed that the new coalition would be governed by a steering committee comprised of the four society presidents and a second representative from each society. The steering committee would be co-chaired by one representative from an East Coast society and one representative from a West Coast society.

The plan for the new organization was enthusiastically approved by each of the four societies. The first steering committee, comprised of Steven Ellman and Norbert Freedman from IPTAR, Jean Sanville and Peter Wolson from LAISPS, Abby Adams-Silvan and Mark Silvan from NYFS, and Albert Mason and Fred Vaquer from PCC, began meeting later that year under the co-chairmanship of Norbert Freedman and Jean Sanville (Freedman and Sanville, 1993). The steering committee, which met monthly via conference calls, considered a wide range of issues. The most critical project on their agenda, however, was the formation of a new organizational entity to represent the North American region to the IPA. The steering committee was determined to organize a regional association for all the IPA groups of North America. The leaders of the new groups were convinced that it was necessary to create a new regional organization to ensure their full participation in the future governance of the North American region and, of course, to secure their representation in deliberations regarding the organization and composition of the new House of Delegates (Basseches, 1993, 2000; Freedman and Sanville, 1999).

The New Groups and the North American IPA Groups (NAIPAG)

The steering committee took the initiative by engaging APsaA and the Canadian Psychoanalytic Society (CPS) in a dialogue to explore the possibility of establishing a North American entity analogous to the regional associations in Europe and Latin America. A meeting of representatives of APsaA, the CPS, and the "New IPA Groups" was held in NY on October 24, 1992. Each group was represented by two delegates, with Steven Ellman and Mark Silvan representing the "New IPA Groups." Participants at the meeting, which was chaired by Bernard Pacella, the president of APsaA, agreed that North American psychoanalytic groups of the IPA needed to form a regional association, but they confronted a very difficult set of challenges.

The sizes of the North American groups differed dramatically. The IPS and the Canadian group each included about 400 analysts, while APsaA was constituted an organization of nearly 3,000 analysts. This made it very difficult to create a workable system of representation. The Canadians and the IPS wanted to ensure that they had some meaningful influence in the new organization, while the American association wanted to ensure that its prerogatives would not be curtailed by two relatively small groups. This situation was further complicated by the historic role of the American association in relation to the IPA. APsaA had represented North American psychoanalysts in the governance structures of IPA, and many APsaA leaders were naturally reluctant to surrender this institutional power. While the IPA plan to create the House of Delegates necessitated the creation of a regional organization, the psychoanalysts of North America, who had little history of cooperation and a long history of conflict, now had to put such an organization together.

To their great credit, the conferees arrived at a tentative agreement to establish a regional organization, to be composed of all three North American groups, and to be governed by a board composed of five representatives from APsaA, two representatives from the Canadian Psychoanalytic Society, and two representatives from the "New IPA Group." The group also agreed to establish a rotating chairmanship to ensure that each group has equal leadership opportunities (Basseches, 1993, 1994).

The same representatives reconvened at a second meeting called by Bernard Pacella in March of 1993. In the intervening months, the governing bodies of each of the three organizations had ratified the plan to form the North American organizational entity, and agreed to the governance structure negotiated at the October meeting. The new organization, to be called the "North American IPA Groups" would soon become known by its acronym, NAIPAG. At the March meeting, a NAIPAG Liaison Committee was appointed to develop arrangements for the selection of a North American delegation to the new House of Delegates of the IPA. The Liaison Committee was composed of two representatives from each of the component organizations: Helen Meyers and Owen Renik from APsaA, Carlos Featherstone and Brian Robertson from the Canadian Society, and Steven Ellman and Mark Silvan from the "New IPA Groups" (Basseches, 1993, 1994).

The Liaison Committee, which met in Montreal in May, later that year, succeeded in working out a proportional arrangement for representation to the new House of Delegates, according to which APsaA would appoint five delegates and the Canadian Society and the IPS would each appoint two representatives to the House of Delegates. In addition, the Liaison Committee also had to develop a formula for appointments to the Executive Council, the central governance body of the IPA, now to be composed of the IPA officers along with one representative from each of the three regional delegations to the House of Delegates. Addressing this dilemma, the Liaison committee agreed to a rotation system for the appointment of the North American delegate to the Executive Council, thus ensuring that each group had an opportunity to participate at the highest level of IPA governance.

The creation of NAIPAG, spearheaded by the "New IPA Groups," was a critical milestone in the reorganization of North American psychoanalysis, ushering in a period of regular contact between the three major North American IPA organizations. When the House of Delegates began meeting in 1994, Norbert Freedman and Jean Sanville were appointed to represent the "New Groups," later to be followed by Steve Ellman, Albert Mason, Beth Kalish-Weiss, Ann Rudovsky, and Nancy Hollander. Steve Ellman would go on to represent the North American delegation on the IPA Executive Council (Ellman, 1999; Kalish-Weiss, 2003; Steve Ellman, personal communication; Beth Kalish Weiss, personal communication). The House of Delegates would continue meeting until 2001, when the governance structure of the IPA was again transformed to promote further democratization (Rudovsky, 2001). The success of the Liaison Committee in working out the arrangements for the North American delegation to the House of Delegates was demonstrated by the collegial cooperation and coordination of the nine-member delegation that represented the North American region at the House of Delegates throughout the seven years of its existence (Basseches, 1995b; Freedman and Sanville, 1999).

The Coalition of Independent Psychoanalytic Societies

As the "New IPA Groups of the United States" participated in the creation of NAIPAG, the leaders of the New IPA Groups decided that their organization needed a name that conveyed the growing unity of the new groups. In the spring of 1993, the New Groups adopted a new name: the Coalition of Independent Psychoanalytic Societies, or the "IPS", for short. In May 1993, Norbert Freedman and Jean Sanville, co-chairs of the emerging organization, wrote to both Joseph Sandler and Horacio Etchegoyen, then President and President-elect of the IPA, to inform them that the "New IPA Groups in North America" had been renamed the "Coalition of Independent Psychoanalytic Societies." Sandler and Etchegoyen each responded with a congratulatory letter of recognition (Basseches, 1995).

On July 28, 1993, at the Amsterdam Congress, IPTAR, NYFS, and PCC were awarded full component status by acclamation at the IPA business meeting. (LAISPS, which had become a Provisional society at the 1991 congress, would become a full component society the following Congress in 1995.) Their "graduation" to full component status was celebrated later in the day at a gala event, hosted by the IPS. Invited guests included

members of the Executive Committee of the IPA, Robert Wallerstein, Joseph Sandler, Horatio Etchegoyen, and Valerie Tuffnell, the new Vice Presidents, Otto Kernberg and Harold Blum, Ethel Person, then editor of the IPA Newsmagazine, along with the site visitors who had shepherded the three groups through the accreditation process. These included Charles Hanly of Canada, Chairman of the IPA New Groups Committee, David Sachs, who succeeded Hanly in this position, and Owen Renik, who had served as the committee's North American co-chair. Also present were Bernard Pacella, then President of the APsaA, and Donald Meyers of APsaA. Norbert Freedman, whose vision and organizational efforts had inspired the first meetings leading to the formation of the coalition, gave a toast, here quoted almost in its entirety:

"This is a homecoming for members of the Coalition of Independent Psychoanalytic Societies, who have been guests in a house which they considered to be home for many decades. This situation was corrected, for since the memorable Rome and Buenos Aires Meetings, we have been guests no longer. Today we are completely home.

"This homecoming is attributable in no small measure to the architect of our house, Robert Wallerstein, and the effectiveness of his leadership. The homecoming may also be traced, and I hope to be allowed this change of metaphor, to the leadership of our Captain, Charles Hanly... Most important, he was instrumental in preventing another potential and disastrous lawsuit which could have scuttled us and the IPA. We are appreciative of Joe Sandler for not only his support of new groups as President of the IPA but also in protecting IPA standards, the cohesiveness of the IPA, and perhaps more importantly, lending... a learned edge to IPA affairs. To Horacio Etchegoyen whom we only know recently... [who] has made us aware of the vitality of psychoanalysis both in Latin America and in North America...

"However the significance of these events... has had profound repercussions within our own land. We are appreciative of the new working relationship that has been established with our colleagues from the American Psychoanalytic Association. [We] have come to work collaboratively and cooperatively to deal with the many problems which beset psychoanalysis in our own land... We have [also] become aware of the importance of our colleagues from north of the border... [with whom] we have developed a close relationship" (quoted in Basseches, 1993).

Integration and Consolidation

From its inception, the primary goals of the IPS were chiefly political in nature. The impetus for the creation of the IPS was the IPA plan to form a House of Delegates, which in turn, required creation of a North American governance structure to work out the composition of the North American delegation to the House of Delegates. The IPS played a key role in forming NAIPAG and in negotiating representation of the IPS to the House

of Delegates. The IPS constituted a single political unit in this governance system, with two representatives on NAIPAG board and two representatives on the House of Delegates. At the same time, the IPS was charged by its component societies with a larger mission of protecting and promoting the interests of its members in the IPA and the North American psychoanalytic community and, in particular, to ensure the integration of its members in the IPA by lobbying for inclusion of IPS members on the committees and task forces of the IPA.

While the IPS worked at an organizational level to promote the integration of its members within the IPA, individual analysts from all four independent groups energetically sought opportunities for active participation in the activities of the IPA. Many presented papers and participated in panels. As a group, the newly admitted independents had become involved in the programming for the upcoming Amsterdam Congress, scheduled for 1993. As the new groups became progressively invested in the activities of the IPA, plans were made for the IPS and APsaA to co-host the 1995 San Francisco Congress. At the same time, Ethel Person, then editor of the IPA Newsmagazine, appointed Abby Adams-Silvan to serve as a Contributing Editor for news from the independent societies.

During these first years of its existence, the IPS slowly took steps to solidify its governance structure and expand its activities. In April 1994, it held its first membership meeting in Washington DC. Efforts were initiated to develop bylaws for more formal governance as well as plans for incorporation. At the same time, in November 1994, arrangements were undertaken to hold the first IPS conference in Los Angeles. Planned to follow immediately after the 1995 San Francisco Congress of the IPA, and billed as a "Post Congress Congress," the conference focused on the unique contribution of film to American culture. The two east coast IPS groups held a fund-raising gala to raise money to help create "scholarships" to help east coast members attend the Los Angeles conference. The consolidation of the coalition as a political entity was thus paralleled by activities that promoted an emerging sense of community and common identity among members from across the country.

The NAAP challenge

Although the original mission of the IPS was oriented toward securing our integration within the IPA community, the scope of its political activities would soon widen, as the threat of NAAP appeared on the horizon. While the GAPPP lawsuit had produced momentous changes in the organization of American psychoanalysis, the activities of another group, the National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis (NAAP), would soon produce a second round of changes in the American psychoanalytic scene. NAAP was founded in 1972 by twenty psychoanalytic groups to serve as their common professional association for the purpose of promoting their interests as 'psychoanalysts'. The founding institutes constituted a heterogeneous group of mostly 'non-traditional' institutes. None were affiliated with the IPA or with APsaA and, with the exception of the National Psychological Association for Psychoanalysis (NPAP), most were regarded as marginal to the psychoanalytic community by "mainstream" or "traditional"

psychoanalytic groups. A large proportion of NAAP members were not licensed mental health professionals, and many had no credentials in psychotherapy except for their institute training. Accordingly, NAAP pursued a twofold agenda: to secure its acceptance and recognition as a legitimate psychoanalytic association, and to secure licensing laws for its otherwise unlicensed members.

NAAP pursued a vigorous and effective strategy aimed at establishing psychoanalysis as a separate profession, with its own professional credentials and license to practice. It established minimum standards for training and certification, and created the American Board for Accreditation in Psychoanalysis (ABAP) to accredit training institutes and to certify practitioners meeting their criteria as 'psychoanalysts'. Unfortunately, NAAP'S educational standards and certification criteria were very lax compared to those of more traditional psychoanalytic groups. Mainstream groups were disturbed by the dramatic disparity between NAAP standards and those of mainstream groups with regard to the frequency rules for training analysis (the candidate's personal analysis) and control cases (supervised analysis conducted in fulfillment of training requirements). While formal training at mainstream institutes includes training analysis and control cases to be conducted at a high frequency (three to five sessions per week) in order to ensure the intensity and depth of the analytic work, NAAP standards permit training and control analyses to be conducted on a weekly basis (NAAP, 2002). Many analysts in regard such standards as appropriate for training in psychotherapy, not psychoanalysis.

Mainstream analytic groups, however, paid little attention to NAAP until the middle of the 1980's, when NAAP attempted to establish itself as the sole accrediting organization for psychoanalysis in the US, applying for this status to the Federal Education Department as well as to the quasi-governmental Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA), and its successor organization, the Commission on the Recognition of Postsecondary Accreditation (CORPA). This initiative elicited the growing concern of mainstream groups. The IPS, the Council of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapists (CCP), the American Academy of Psychoanalysts and Dynamic Psychotherapists (AAPDP), Division 39, and the National Membership Committee for Psychoanalysis in Clinical Social Work (NMCOP) all engaged in concerted lobbying efforts to oppose the NAAP initiative. Sheldon Bach and Harriet Basseches, then serving as co-chairs of the newly formed IPS Committee on Accreditation, joined with Alan Rosenblatt, chair of the APsaA Committee on Accreditation, to work together in these efforts. These groups mounted a vigorous and increasingly coordinated opposition to NAAP's efforts to become the sole accrediting organization for psychoanalysis. NAAP's applications were denied, and NAAP finally abandoned this effort in 1995 (Basseches, 1995; McBride, 1998).

From Coalition to Confederation

In 1996, efforts to consolidate the organizational structure of the coalition led to the replacement of the steering committee by a new Board of Directors, constituted by two representatives from each of the constituent groups. The board continued its earlier practice of electing East Coast and West Coast co-chairs to serve as leaders and

spokespersons for the organization. During the same year, the Coalition changed its name once again, replacing the term "Coalition" with the designation "Confederation" and incorporated as the not-for-profit "Confederation of Independent Psychoanalytic Societies of the United States" (McBride, 1998).

Although the confederation was still referred to as the "IPS," the new name was chosen to reflect the organization's growing sense of permanence and strength. The success of the IPS in advancing its integration within the IPA and its role as political unit within the governance structures of the IPA and NAIPAG demanded a structure that is more permanent and cohesive than a mere "coalition." The successful political efforts of the IPS, working in close alliance with APsaA, to repel the NAAP threat of the early 1990's inspired feelings of political power and organizational pride. At the same time, the collegial networks taking root in the context of collective IPS activities were maturing into bonds, not only of collegueship, but of friendship and partnership in academic and clinical pursuits.

In 1998, the Confederation initiated the IPS Newsletter, which would go on to publish annual or bi-annual issues every year until 2006 (when it was replaced by an email version, the CIPS ENewsletter). The Newsletter, initially edited by Maggie Magee (LAISPS) and Dianna Miller (LAISPS) and later by Susan Mulliken (IPTAR), proved to be an invaluable tool in promoting a sense of community among IPS members, expanding awareness of the IPS and its activities, and bringing the four IPS societies and their members into closer connection with each other.Â

During the same year, the IPS hosted its first Clinical Conferences, in Palm Springs, California, on "The Frame: Making it an Breaking It." The conference, planned by a bi-coastal committee, chaired by Nancy Goodman of the Washington D.C. branch of NYFS, was the first occasion for analysts of all four societies to meet each other and engage in exchanges about their theoretical orientations and clinical work. Norbert Freedman, speaking at the opening of the conference, observed that the conference was an opportunity to discover how our confederation, formed by four scattered groups with very different orientations, can cohere as a professional community. The experience of the conference proved to be exhausting and exhilarating. Harriet Wrye, reporting on the conference in the first issue of the new IPS Newsletter, wrote:

"The principal feeling is one of warmth, exhilaration and the satisfaction of an extraordinary psychoanalytic gathering. At the close, all participants marveled about the extraordinary ambience, power and success of the gathering... The IPS culture is now defined by true safety, mutuality, cutting edge generativity and collegial respect mixed with a great sense of playfulness..." (Wrye, 1998)

The conference, Wrye noted, which was devoted to the analytic frame, itself constituted a frame for the emergence of an exciting feeling of community. The unique conference format, featuring small group discussion of clinical material chosen to represent a particular theme, would be adopted as the model for all future IPS Clinical Conferences.

Subsequent "Biennial CIPS Clinical Conferences" were held at the Mohonk Mountain House in New York State in 1999 (Nussenbaum, 2001), at the La Mancha Resort, in Palm Springs, California in 2002 (Kelly, 2003), in Rye, New York in 2004, and in Los Angeles in 2006 (Hall, 2006; Perlman, 2006c). (Pictures from the Los Angeles conference are on the CIPS website).

In 2000, the IPS accepted a fifth organizational member, the Northwestern Psychoanalytic Society (NPS), then an IPA study group. In 2001, NPS became a provisional component society of the IPA and a full organizational member of the IPS. The addition to the NPS marked a major milestone in the history of the confederation. It was the first society to join the IPS since its founding nine years earlier and demonstrated the continued vitality of the IPS. The NPS had not been subject to the exclusionary policies of the IPA and APsaA, and sought membership in the IPS because of its leaders valued the expanded community and vibrant intellectual environment of the IPS.

The IPS and the Psychoanalytic Consortium

As the NAAP threat of the early 1990's (described above) illuminated the vulnerability of the established psychoanalytic groups, analysts opposed to NAAP became increasingly aware of their common interests in protecting psychoanalysis. Analysts in the major psychoanalytic organizations of the United States, including the IPS, APsaA, the American Academy of Psychoanalysts and Dynamic Psychotherapists (AAPDP), Division 39 of the American Psychological Association, and the National Membership Committee for Psychoanalysis in Clinical Social Work (NMCOP), all agreed that it was necessary to establish a national coalition to protect psychoanalysis from future NAAP efforts to control the profession, and to promulgate national standards for psychoanalytic training to which all mainstream analysts could subscribe (McBride, 1998).

Efforts to form the proposed coalition, however, were complicated by the conflicting interests and underlying divisions that had historically divided these groups. The IPS and APsaA represented constituencies committed to the IPA and to IPA training standards, which include four-session per week frequency standards for training and control analysis, while the AAPDP recognized a three-session per week frequency standard. Other differences also contributed to the challenge of establishing a national coalition. IPS, APsaA, and the AAPDP were composed entirely of trained psychoanalysts, Division 39 and NMCOP included many analytically oriented practitioners who were not themselves trained in psychoanalysis. The IPS and, to a much lesser degree, APsaA were interdisciplinary groups whose only common commitment was to psychoanalysis, while Division 39 and NMCOP were each composed of practitioners of a single discipline, whose common commitment was their discipline. The formation of a formal coalition thus required compromises necessitating a great deal of negotiation.

After years of hard bargaining, four groups joined together to form the new Psychoanalytic Consortium: APsaA, AAPDP, Division 39, and NMCOP. Although the IPS had participated with the other four groups in planning the formation of the Consortium, the IPS was excluded from the Consortium (McBride, 1998). Some

Consortium leaders subsequently explained that the IPS was excluded because its members were already represented by NMCOP and Division 39, an argument based on false premises since the IPS includes practitioners from other disciplines who are not members of other psychoanalytic groups (see Basseches and Perlman, 2005). Others, however, report in confidence that IPS membership was opposed by the AAPDP, NMCOP, and Division 39, all of whom favored a three session per week frequency standard and feared that CIPS and APsaA would form a strong alliance to promote a four session per week standard.

The Consortium proceeding without the IPS, developed a national set of minimum standards for training in psychoanalysis, featuring a three to five session per week frequency standard for training and control analysis, as well as minimum criteria for coursework and supervised casework. The Consortium would go on to create an independent accrediting body for psychoanalytic training institutes, the Accreditation Council for Psychoanalytic Education (ACPE). Despite the painful exclusion of the IPS from the Consortium, IPS leaders persisted in seeking admission to the new national organization. In 2000, after it succeeded in promulgating the national training standards described above, the Consortium agreed to consider the IPS for membership. A prerequisite of admission however, was the reorganization of the IPS into a "membership organization" with a president elected by the members.

Still intent on joining the Consortium, the IPS began a major reorganization to conform to Consortium requirements, undertaking a comprehensive overhaul of the organization's bylaws, and arranging for the election of a president and a secretary by the membership (IPS Board of Directors, 2001). In the spring of 2001, Steven J. Ellman (IPTAR) was elected the first president of the IPS, along with James Gooch (PCC) who was elected first Secretary. Following the election, the IPS renewed its efforts to join the Consortium but was informed that the IPS could only be admitted to membership as a provisional member with eligibility for full membership after two years. The IPS board, frustrated and offended by the Consortium's repeated rebuffs, responded with a unanimous vote to abandon its efforts to join the Consortium.

NAPsaC and the painful separation from the New York Freudian Society

As the IPS was consolidating, NAIPAG, which had never lived up to the hopes of its founders, was falling into a progressive state of disunity. Steven Ellman (IPTAR) and Norbert Freedman (IPTAR), the two delegates to the NAIPAG board from the "New IPA Groups" worked energetically to promote innovative NAIPAG initiatives, only to have their proposals stalled by the disinterest of the other groups. Crippled by conflicts with regard to the organizational role that component groups wanted NAIPAG to play, NAIPAG was progressively paralyzed and weakened by waning interest, especially on the part of the Canadians (Steve Ellman, personal communication; Ernie Lawrence personal communication; Harriet Basseches, personal communication).

By the end of the millennium, NAIPAG had ceased to function, leaving a gap in the administrative structure of the IPA in North America. Neither the North American IPA

groups nor their representatives to the House of Delegates had a context to discuss or coordinate their positions on IPA affairs and no unified organization existed to promote the unity and cohesiveness of the IPA groups in North America. The IPA, which was intent on promoting development of a regional organization for North America analogous to the European Psychoanalytic Federation (EPF) and the Federation of Latin American Psychoanalytic Societies (FEPAL), provided a ten thousand dollar grant to support the reestablishment of a regional North American group. Arthur Leonoff of the CPS was chosen by the North American groups to spearhead organization of the new confederation, to be called the North American Psychoanalytic Confederation (NAPsaC), and to serve as its founding chair (Arthur Leonoff, personal communication). The CIPS board appointed Steven Ellman and Ernest Lawrence to serve as its representatives on the NAPsaC board.

Unfortunately, the creation of NAPsaC occasioned a major conflict within the IPS regarding representation on NAPsaC's governing body that culminated in the separation of the New York Freudian Society from the IPS. The IPS had lobbied hard to arrive at the formula by which the IPS was represented on the governing board of NAIPAG. According to that arrangement, five seats were allocated to APsaA, two seats to Canadian Psychoanalytic Society, and two seats to the IPS. An identical arrangement had been negotiated for NAPsaC. As NAPsaC was taking shape, however, representatives of the NYFS took issue with these arrangements, arguing that the IPS community would be better served if each society appointed its own representative to the NAPsaC board. The other IPS groups, however, held that collective representation through a unified organization would strengthen our position in NAPsaC, especially in view of the favorable arrangements for representation on the NAPsaC board. Many IPS leaders feared that the arrangements advocated by the NYFS would make NAPsaC governance impossible. The growing crisis was brought to a painful conclusion in the winter of 2001, when the IPS and NYFS formally separated from each other.

The separation would challenge both the IPS as well as the fledgling North American confederation. Planning for NAPsaC was complicated by the NYFS wish to represent itself on the NAPsaC board, a development that undermined the governance arrangements that had already been negotiated. NAPsaC chair Arthur Leonoff supported the NYFS request for a seat on the NAPsaC board, creating a situation in which the allocation of either seats or votes on a reasonably proportional basis would pose an insurmountable problem. The situation was settled by default, as the board could only act on the basis of a complete consensus. This would go on to weaken the organization as a force, but enable it to serve as a forum and safeguard its potential for further development, to be described below.

The separation of NYFS and the IPS would also influence future developments within the IPS. The IPS, which had become a "membership organization" in order to fulfill requirements for admission into the Consortium, was fortuitously prepared to adapt to this new situation. Seeing an opportunity to mitigate the loss, Steve Ellman, then IPS president, promptly called for the creation of a new membership category to enable NYFS members to remain in the IPS as "Direct Members." Many NYFS members

rejoined the IPS as direct members, while others were already members as a result of their concomitant membership in IPTAR. As a result, nearly half the NYFS members would remain in the IPS, some of them taking on important leadership roles in the organization. In years to come, the new membership category would enable many talented individuals, from the NYFS and elsewhere, to contribute to the IPS community.

The separation from NYFS was a painful and wrenching episode, remembered with sadness and confusion by those who had enjoyed the years of intimate collaboration preceding the crisis. Looking back, virtually all leaders of the IPS, from that time to the present, have regretted the crisis that divided us from our friends and colleagues in the NYFS. In the years that followed the separation, the IPS endeavored to maintain close ties to NYFS, and, following an initial period of readjustment, has worked in concert with the NYFS to promote common organizational goals while looking for opportunities to repair injured feelings, resolve differences, and reunite our organizations.

Two new challenges for the IPS

While the separation from the NYFS entailed a painful loss, it brought a major internal struggle to an end, challenged the organization to clarify its identity and mission, and freed the CIPS board to respond rapidly and robustly to new challenges. Two major issues dominated attention during the latter part of Steve Ellman's presidency: the first national election to the new IPA Board of Representatives, and the looming threat of a NAAP licensing law in New York.

From 1999 to 2001, the IPA Task Force on Structure and Mission began formulating plans to transform the IPA's system of governance. The new plan, adopted by the IPA Executive Council, called for the replacement of the Executive Council and the House of Delegates by a single governing body, the Board of Representatives, to be composed of representatives elected by the membership in each of the three IPA regions (North America, Europe, and Latin America). correctly anticipating a contested election, the IPS Board voted to endorse the candidacy of James Gooch (PCC), mounting an energetic and successful campaign to secure his election to the new IPA Board of Directors. Jim Gooch would go on to serve two terms on the board, serving from 2003 to 2007. His election would prove to be critical when the IPS began confronting the crisis prompted by the NAAP licensing agenda.

A second challenge was presented by the imminent enactment of a NAAP-sponsored licensing law in New York. NAAP, which had abandoned its efforts to become the national accrediting body for psychoanalysis in 1995, had quietly mounted an aggressive campaign to enact licensing legislation for psychoanalysis, based on NAAP training criteria, and permitting training and control cases to be conducted at frequencies of one session per week or less. In 1993 the state of Vermont enacted NAAP-sponsored legislation establishing the first state certification for psychoanalysts. In July 2000, a second law for psychoanalysts was enacted in the more populous state of New Jersey, and in December 2002, a full licensing law was enacted in New York (Perlman, 2004a). NAAP's legislative agenda had attracted little attention from psychoanalysts or

psychoanalytic organizations. Surprisingly, the Psychoanalytic Consortium, established to protect psychoanalysis from such threats, took no measures to alert local groups or to mobilize opposition to the NAAP agenda in New York. The imminent passage of the licensing law, however, would prove to be galvanizing for the IPS.

The IPS board, which became aware of the bill some months before its passage, had just begun to consider its implications when the bill was enacted. Disturbed about the implications of the new law and the intentions of NAAP, CIPS President Steven Ellman invited Dr. Pearl Appel, then president of NAAP, to a face-to-face meeting of the CIPS board. The meeting, held in Steve's apartment in the summer of 2003, left the IPS board stunned. Dr. Appel's presentation made it clear that NAAP was intent on remaking the profession of psychoanalysis in its own image, promoting the idea of psychoanalysis as a weekly procedure to be performed by practitioners trained according to NAAP training criteria, and committed to lobbying for NAAP licensing legislation in States across the nation. The board, considering the meaning of Dr. Appel's presentation, unanimously agreed that NAAP's agenda, if left unchecked, would ultimately threaten the viability of our profession.

New Challenges and An Expanding Agenda

Ernest Lawrence (LAISPS) and Harriet Basseches (DMS), who had been elected to the offices of IPS president and secretary in Spring 2003, took office at the face-to-face board meeting held on the day after the board's meeting with Pearl Appel. Together, Ernie and Harriet began laying the foundation for the progressive expansion of CIPS functions. Ernie called on the organization to create a national roster to represent our organization to the public, to draft a more vigorous mission statement, and to cultivate of a spirit of political activism within the organization.

He urged the board to act immediately to create a standing Public Policy Committee to address the NAAP challenge, and appointed Fredric Perlman (IPTAR) and Beth Kalish Weiss (LAISPS) as Chair and Co-chair of the new committee. The committee, which was structured to include West Coast and East Coast branches, was charged with development of a strategy to address the adverse consequences of the licensing law in New York, and to prevent any NAAP legislative action in California (Perlman, 2004b). James Gooch (PCC), outgoing Secretary of the IPS, counseled the board and the new Public Policy Committee to take a "proactive" approach to our political initiatives, and to avoid a "reactive" stand that would allow the agendas of others curtail our creativity.

In the winter of 2003, some months after assuming office, Ernie resigned for personal reasons (Lawrence, 2004). The board appointed Harriet Basseches to replace him, and then appointed Ernie to the office of Secretary, a move that kept the leadership team in place for the duration of their terms. As the Public Policy Committee began considering responses to the NAAP threat, Harriet began addressing the organizational concerns and aspirations that Ernie had begun articulating that summer. One important initiative was the creation of a Mission and Structure Committee to reevaluate organizational objectives and working procedures. The committee, which included Jim Gooch (PCC), Beth Kalish Weiss (LAISPS), Ernie Lawrence (LAISPS), Terrence McBride (LAISPS), Fredric

Perlman (IPTAR) and herself met monthly, while a second group, including Harriet and Ernie, as well as Robert Wood, a candidate at IPTAR, worked in parallel to draft new bylaws to reflect the emerging recommendations of the Mission and Structure Committee. At the same time, a committee, chaired by Pete Wolson (LAISPS), was set up to construct the first CIPS website and established a CIPS Board listserv to enable board members to communicate with each other.

In 2004, the San Francisco Institute for Psychoanalytic Studies (SFIPS), which had become a provisional component society of the IPA at the New Orleans Congress in March of that year, became the fifth CIPS component society. Still smarting from the loss of the NYFS, CIPS welcomed the new group with enthusiasm.

A new acronym: Rebranding the confederation as "CIPS"

A major hurdle facing the IPS after the separation from the NYFS was widespread confusion regarding the name of the organization. Many psychoanalysts in the IPA often referred to the IPS as "the independent groups" or "the independent societies," phrases that linguistically negated the IPS as an organized political unit. Habitual references to "the independent groups" became even more problematic after the separation of the NYFS from the IPS. Prior to the separation, the terms "independent societies" and "IPS" were synonymous. Following the separation, this was no longer the case. The NYFS was still an "independent group" but it was no longer a component of the "IPS." Leaders of other groups, as well as their representatives on the NAPsaC and IPA boards, continued to think of the "independent groups" as a single entity with a single delegation to NAPsaC or to conferences of IPA groups. This persistent "lumping" of NYFS with the IPS undermined the capacity of the IPS to identify itself within the IPA and NAPsaC. In the summer of 2004, the IPS board addressed this problem by voting to change our acronym to include the letter "C" to represent the term "Confederation," the first word in our formal organizational name, and thus to better communicate our separate identity as a single, unified confederation. Thereafter, the "IPS" would come to be known as "CIPS."

As intended, the introduction of the new acronym interrupted habitual references to the "independent groups" and fortified our identity as a confederation of allied groups. In a relatively short period of time, CIPS emerged as a distinctive regional group, formally identified as such in the IPA roster, and informally recognized by members of regional and international work groups and committees. Although the change of acronym caused some initial confusion among our members, prompting some to wonder if yet another organization had been created, this initial reaction was followed by increased interest in CIPS and its activities.

The Public Policy Committee and the NAAP challenge

The Public Policy committee, which then included Helen Gediman, Fredric Perlman, Phyllis Sloate, Steve Ellman, and Allan Frosch on the East coast, as well as Diane Garcia, Jim Gooch, Ernie Lawrence, Beth Kalish-Weiss, and Terrence McBride on the West coast, began its work immediately. Analyzing the situation produced by the NAAP

licensing law, the committee agreed that the NAAP law threatened to undermine the traditional meaning of the title we use to identify ourselves to the public, creating a confusion of identities that could cripple our capacity to maintain and promote our relationship with the public.

To address this challenge, the committee developed a two-track strategy, featuring a credentialing track and a legislative track. In accordance with this strategy, the committee recommended creation of a national credential to enable the public to identify analysts trained in accordance with prevailing educational standards, and to differentiate those analysts from other practitioners trained according to the minimum standards set forth in the three state licensing laws. In addition, a "state-level" legislative strategy was also developed, aimed at influencing the legislative and regulatory process (Perlman and Kalish-Weiss, 2005).

With the approval of the board, the Public Policy Committee pursued both tracks simultaneously. Preliminary discussions with leaders of national and local groups outside the IPA revealed substantial conflicts regarding criteria for a national credential, especially in regard to psychoanalytic training standards and licensure in a mental health discipline. When it became clear that any effort to create a national credential in collaboration with a large coalition would entail years of effort with no probability of success, the committee decided to pursue creation of a credential through the IPA. CIPS invited APsaA to form a Joint Committee on Licensing and Credentialing to consider our credentialing proposal, as well as other aspects of our two-track strategy. The committee included the East coast members of the Public Policy Committee, as well as members of a similar committee that had been set up within APsaA. Extensive deliberations about the credential culminated in agreement to pursue creation of a "Fellow of the IPA" credential, or "FIPA," to be awarded to all members of the IPA.

With the approval of the full Public Policy Committee, Fredric Perlman arranged a meeting in London with Don Campbell, Secretary General of the IPA, and Ronald Britton, president of the British Psychoanalytic Society, to describe the crisis in American psychoanalysis and discuss the FIPA proposal. The meeting revealed the presence of similar problems in the United Kingdom and elsewhere in the world, and concluded with a general agreement that the FIPA plan should be proposed to the IPA board, with suitable provisions to accommodate regional differences in terminology. The committee proceeded to draft a formal proposal for creation of the FIPA credential, along with supporting documentation, which was distributed to IPA board members in the weeks prior to the March 2004 meeting of the IPA board in New Orleans.

The proposal, formally introduced at the IPA board by James Gooch generated initial opposition, especially among Latin American and European representatives who saw little advantage in such a credential. A presentation by Fredric Perlman on the crisis in New York, an impassioned argument on behalf of the proposal by Jim Gooch, and strong supporting arguments by APsaA representative Robert Pyles, however, occasioned a more thoughtful review of the proposal. With only one abstention and no opposition, the board voted to create the new credential for use in North America, with the understanding

that similar credentials could be created for other regions upon their request. A committee, chaired by Robert Pyles and co-chaired by Fredric Perlman, was set up to plan implementation of the FIPA credential, and In 2005, following protracted efforts to resolve some thorny organizational complications created by the new credential, the "Fellow of the IPA" credential was officially implemented.

While promoting the FIPA credential at the IPA, CIPS simultaneously pursued the legislative track of its two-track strategy. In New York, where the NAAP licensing law had passed, the plan was to create an alliance with other psychoanalytic groups to promote regulations that would raise the criteria for licensure set forth in the law. The CIPS-APsaA Joint Committee on Licensing and Credentialing produced a position paper on Licensing and Regulations to educate state administrators about psychoanalysis as a practice and a profession, and to spell out a series of specific recommendations. At the same time, the Joint Committee recruited other groups to join in these lobbying efforts. This resulted in the composition of a series of short lobbying letters, submitted to the state NY State Education Department by a growing coalition of organizations which eventually included every major psychoanalytic group in the state as well as NAPsaC, Division 39, the National Membership Committee for Psychoanalysis in Clinical Social Work, and the American Academy of Psychoanalysts and Dynamic Psychotherapists.

These efforts succeeded in causing the state reject NAAP efforts to ensure that regulations would require candidates seeking licensure to be supervised by practitioners licensed under the statute, a provision that would have prohibited psychoanalysts in the tripartite disciplines from engaging in supervision unless they obtained a second license. When a first set of weak regulations was published for public comment, the lobbying efforts of the coalition prompted the state to withdraw them for revision (Perlman, 2004b), but a second set of regulations, published some months later, was only marginally better than the first. With only minor modifications, this second set of regulations was approved by the State.

The Public Policy Committee encouraged further action. Steven Ellman, then president of IPTAR, and Fredric Perlman, CIPS Public Policy Chair, invited the presidents of major local psychoanalytic societies to a series of meetings to plan a response to the new regulations and the imminent implementation of the law. These meetings culminated in the formation of the New York State Psychoanalytic Confederation (NYSPAC), the first state professional association for psychoanalysts in the United States. NYSPAC joined with the New York State Psychiatric Association (NYSPA) to file suit against the State Education Department, charging the department with promulgating regulations that were more lax than the law it was designed to implement. The State challenged the "standing" of the plaintiffs, claiming that neither NYSPAC nor NYSPA were parties affected by the law. When the district judge ruled for the State, NYSPAC and NYSPA appealed the ruling. Unfortunately, the Appellate Court sustained the conclusions of the local court, and, following an appeal, the Court of Appeals refused to hear the case. No further litigation was possible at the time, and the NYSPAC board elected to wait for the emergence of a prospective client with clear standing before taking further action.

The Public Policy Committee adopted a different strategy in California, where there was no immediate threat of a NAAP type licensing law, in part, because state laws prohibit unlicensed practitioners from performing any work of a psychological nature. Current California laws do, however, permit university professors and other academics to undergo psychoanalytic training to advance their academic pursuits and allow for their "registration" as "research psychoanalysts," a status that permits the private practice of psychoanalysis. Reasoning that the existing research psychoanalyst law could serve as a precedent for a full licensing law, the Public Policy Committee developed model licensing legislation that, if passed, would restrict use of the title "psychoanalyst" to practitioners meeting Consortium-level training requirements. The proposed law, developed in collaboration with a Sacramento lobbyist, includes multiple pathways to licensure in psychoanalysis, and can serve as model legislation for any state where psychoanalytic practice is otherwise unregulated. In the summer of 2005, the committee began circulating the proposed legislation among other psychoanalytic groups in the state. Although there was widespread disagreement with regard to the CIPS licensing proposal, most California psychoanalytic societies recognized the importance of forming a state confederation to protect their interests in California.

Early in 2006, these groups formed the California State Psychoanalytic Confederation (CAPSAC), under the chairmanship of Beth Kalish-Weiss. CAPSAC quickly mobilized for action in the face of threat by a coalition of counselor groups seeking licensure in California. The proposed counselor licensing law included a scope of practice provision that would entitle a wide assortment of counselors to practice psychotherapy. When consultations with the legislative counsel in Sacramento revealed that this provision would, in all likelihood, also permit their practice as "psychoanalysts," CAPSAC joined other groups in lobbying against the bill, and helped bring about its defeat.

The efforts of the Public Policy committee, which had engaged CIPS and APsaA in a close alliance in lobbying the New York State Education Department, an experience that gave rise to a new sense of collaboration and collegiality between organizational leaders. In the period following the New York effort, CIPS and APsaA entered a period of ongoing dialogue to address NAAP threats and have engaged together in negotiations with NAAP intended to promote a change in NAAP policies. The CIPS model licensing law was adopted by APsaA's committee on state licensing initiatives for possible use in a legislative action in Massachusetts, and was specifically cited by both APsaA and CIPS reps in efforts to discourage NAAP from pursuing a licensing law in that state. This close collaboration would extend to other political issues of concern to both groups, especially the campaign to ensure patient privacy rights.

CIPS and the development of NAPsaC

CIPS leaders continued to view the development of NAPsaC as a major policy goal of the organization, believing that a strong regional organization would enable CIPS and the Canadian society to participate on a more equal footing with APsaA in the IPA governance and activities. CIPS leaders were therefore frustrated by NAPsaC's consensus governance arrangements. This arrangement, however, appeared to suit the American

association, whose leaders at the time preferred that NAPsaC remain a "light organization." These conflicting orientations to NAPsaC, along with the plan for governance by consensus, would significantly influence the evolving development of NAPsaC.

Steve Ellman and Ernie Lawrence, the CIPS representatives on the NAPsaC board, persisted in efforts to promote the organization's growth. CIPS actively supported a NAPsaC plan to hold a major conference on psychoanalytic education, but sadly, the endeavor had to be abandoned after the untimely death of the conference chair, Larry Chalfin. At the same time, the NAPsaC board responded with interest to the licensing crisis in New York, creating a NAPsaC Committee on Licensing and Credentialing, and joining CIPS and APsaA in lobbying the New York State Education Department in support of strong regulations to implement the new licensing law in. NAPsaC also supported the creation of the "Fellow of the IPA" or "FIPA" credential, originally proposed by CIPS and APsaA (described below).

In 2005, Harriet Basseches, just completing her term as CIPS president, assumed the office of NAPsaC chair. She and Fredric Perlman, the newly elected CIPS president who would join Harriet in representing CIPS on the NAPsaC board, adopted a "go slow" strategy for NAPsaC, seeking to nurture NAPsaC's development by introducing initiatives to which all component groups would agree. During Harriet's two-term tenure as NAPsaC chair (2005-2009), the NAPsaC board would go on to initiate three important new projects: two websites, proposed by Fredric Perlman, and a new initiative, proposed to the board by Harriet, to establish a program of ongoing NAPsaC "Working Parties."

Harriet Basseches thoughtfully shepherded each of these projects through the board's deliberations and the bureaucratic challenges entailed in their creation. The NAPsaC-sponsored "Find-an-analyst" website," now operational and located at www.findananalyst.org, is the first national website designed to enable prospective patients to locate IPA analysts near them. A second website, also proposed by Perlman of CIPS and still in development, is designed to serve as an on-line bulletin board and national events calendar for NAPsaC members. This site, which will evolve to suit NAPsaC's emerging needs, can be accessed at www.napsac.info.

During her tenure as NAPsaC chair, Basseches had been seeking ways to enhance the recognition and identity of NAPsaC as a North American regional presence. She saw the opportunity to advance this goal by introducing the most ambitious of the new projects, the "Working Parties" program, modeled on the innovative European Psychoanalytic Federation (EPF) "Working Parties" program. The EPF Working Parties project is designed to advance the study of psychoanalytic treatment by examining critical aspects of psychoanalysis, such as the analyst's implicit theory of treatment (Canestri, 2006) and the comparison of psychoanalytic approaches (Tuckett, 2008), to cite but two of the Working Parties groups' focuses. Lynne Moritz, then president of APsaA, was influential in encouraging the NAPsaC board to take on this ambitious program. She had been in one of the Working Parties at the EPF and was convinced of the value and importance for psychoanalysis of developing such groups.

The NAPsaC Board endorsed the proposal to initiate a pilot program and approved Harriet's choice of Abbot Bronstein to head the project. Bronstein, a member of both CIPS and APsaA, had been involved with the EPF Working Parties and was in contact with David Tuckett. Bronstein formed a NAPsaC committee representing the NAPsaC constituencies. Together with his committee, Bronstein worked on developing and implementing the NAPsaC Working Parties program in collaboration with EPF analysts. At the time of this writing, more than 100 North American analysts have participated in the pilot program, which concludes in 2009 (Basseches with Bronstein and Perlman, 2008). It will be up to the next NAPsaC board to determine further efforts in this direction, although the IPA board and officers are very hopeful that Working Parties will be continued in the North American Region.

CIPS and the Psychoanalytic Consortium: A relationship reconsidered

In 2005, the Psychoanalytic Consortium issued an invitation to CIPS to join as a full member, without further preconditions, and without undergoing any provisional membership period. The invitation sparked renewed discussion about the Consortium. Many board members and CIPS leaders recognized that much had changed in the psychoanalytic world since the formation of the Consortium. At the time the Consortium was first formed, CIPS was just taking shape as an organization and its leadership believed that membership in the Consortium would advance the organization's standing in the psychoanalytic community while affording CIPS the opportunity to participate in deliberations that would shape the profession and its policies in the United States. By 2005, however, CIPS had become a recognized and respected organization within the psychoanalytic community. At the same time, it was clear that CIPS could no longer play a significant role in shaping the Consortium or its policies. Negotiations regarding the promulgation of minimum national training standards psychoanalytic training in the United States had long since been concluded. The ACPE, the accrediting body set up by the Consortium was already set up and with an independent governing board to which membership in the Consortium provided no representation.

Most disturbing to the CIPS leadership, however, was the role the Consortium had played in New York. Despite its mission, the Consortium had not acted to protect psychoanalysis from the passage of the NAAP-inspired licensing law in New York. While the NAAP bill was working its way through the legislature, the social work and psychology groups in the state were very actively lobbying for legislation to secure passage of highly valued "scope of practice" provisions for their respective state licenses. During the legislative process, the social work and psychology bills were "bundled" with the NAAP bill, creating a situation in which the investment of psychologist and social workers in their respective licensing agendas came into conflict with their interests as psychoanalysts. The two state groups, which placed a higher priority on their own bills, requested that their national organizations refrain from opposing the NAAP bill which their bills were bundled. Division 39 and NMCOP acceded to these requests and, as a result, the Consortium did not act to oppose the NAAP bill (Wagner, 2006).

Many CIPS leaders agreed that the failure of the Consortium to act in defense of psychoanalysis in New York revealed a serious flaw in the composition of the Consortium. Two of its member organizations, Division 39 and NMCOP, were clearly divided in their commitments, each representing a primary discipline whose interests could be at variance with the interests of psychoanalysis. The reliability of both groups was also seen to be undermined by the fact that both Division 39 and NMCOP were "interest groups," composed of mental health professionals many of whom are not trained analysts. Some argued that only an interdisciplinary professional organization, composed exclusively of psychoanalysts, and whose common interest was the protection of psychoanalysis, could be trusted to safeguard the profession (Perlman, 2006a, 2006b).

Harriet Basseches and Fredric Perlman arranged to meet with the Consortium board in the spring of 2005 to discuss CIPS concerns. The meeting included frank discussions about the role of the Consortium in New York, as well as other Consortium policies and rules of membership. Although some members of the Consortium board offered assurances that the organization's failure in New York would never be repeated, this was not established as a formal provision of Consortium policy, and divisions of opinion on the board revealed that this assurance was far from guaranteed. At the same time, discussions of Consortium policies revealed that membership in the Consortium required financial contributions to the ACPE, from whose development CIPS had been excluded, as well as commitment to policies which were at variance with fundamental CIPS principles. Most important of these was a Consortium rule that restricted the number of candidates and members who could be admitted to Consortium groups from outside the traditional mental health disciplines.

In June 2005, after extensive discussion, the CIPS board voted to decline the invitation to join the Consortium (CIPS ENewsletter, September 2005). In a formal letter declining the invitation to join the Consortium, CIPS cited the existence of significant policy differences between the two organizations and, at the same time, offered to work together with the Consortium on issues and initiatives whenever our interests converge (Basseches and Perlman, 2005).

New Developments and Initiatives

Fredric Perlman (IPTAR) and Bonnie Engdahl (PCC) began the first of their two terms as President and Secretary at the face-to-face weekend meeting of the board in Seattle, 2005. Hoping to build on the foundations laid in the previous administration, including a new set of bylaws approved by the board at that meeting, Perlman submitted an ambitious development plan intended to initiate a synergistic cycle of organizational expansion by increasing activities, stimulating member participation, and enhancing the value of CIPS to its members (Perlman, 2005). The CIPS Board adopted most provisions of the plan immediately, beginning with a series of measures to improve operational efficiency, build needed organizational infrastructure, and recruit members to take on the various projects entailed in the expansion effort. In the first of a series of moves intended to increase CIPS membership, the board voted to create an "affiliate membership" category to include all candidates at CIPS institutes. Leigh Tobias, a candidate at PCC,

was appointed to serve as the Recording Secretary of the board.

It was clear that the future development of the organization would require adoption of new routines to enhance the efficiency of organizational functioning. The board voted to adopt new procedures for the conduct of board meetings, to begin work on a procedural manual to structure the performance of routine activities, and to expand the role of committees to enable multiple tasks to be carried out simultaneously by different work groups. Committees were set up to carry out a host of new objectives: to recruit members to positions within the organization, to develop the proposed procedural manual, to further develop the new CIPS website, to create programs of continuing education and educational exchange between societies, to write a new history of CIPS to orient new and prospective members, and to explore options for creation of a CIPS journal.

A critical challenge facing the board was the lack of needed infrastructure. The board, which had no roster of individual members, recognized the need to create a central membership database to track membership in the organization. Working through its committees, the board oversaw production of the needed database, creation of new listserves to enable the board to communicate directly with members, redesigned the website to suit the new organizational plan, and inaugurated publication of the E-Newsletter, under the editorship of Randi Wirth (IPTAR), to replace the CIPS Newsletter. The Newsletter was a hard copy publication published once or twice a year from 1998 to 2005 under the editorship of Susan Mulliken. While Newsletter had served to bring the organization together, it was too expensive to publish with the frequency necessary to serve organizational needs. The development of the database, the listserves, and the ENewsletter made it possible for the board to circulate and post minutes of board meetings, to announce open positions to the membership, and to provide members with real time updates on important organizational and political developments. These innovations enabled the organization to pursue each of the initiatives spelled out in the development plan.

The Committee on Public Policy successfully spearheaded the development of state psychoanalytic confederations in New York and California, developed model legislation for the licensing of psychoanalysis, and developed plans, approved by the board, for creation of a Standing Committee on Professional Credentialing to consider prospects for creating a coherent national credentialing system for psychoanalysts. On the recommendations of the Public Policy Subcommittee on Patient Privacy Rights, co-chaired by Jay Frankel and Susan Berger, CIPS join the Coalition for Patient Privacy (CPP), and organized a series of vigorous and successful CIPS lobbying effort, conducted in coordination with the CPP, to ensure that national health information technology legislation, recently enacted as part of the 2009 stimulus package, would include provisions for the protection of patient privacy rights.

The Committee on Intramural Education, under the chairmanship of Phyllis Sloate, organized a growing number of teleconference study groups, including seminars on the works of Wilfrid Bion, the clinical phenomenon of enactments, psychoanalytic supervision, and symbolization, with a new group addressing the problem of concreteness

scheduled for the fall. Plans for an educational exchange program to enable CIPS members to participate in the educational programs conducted by CIPS institutes outside their own home societies have faced successive obstacles, but are still being pursued.

The CIPS Publications Committee, having been dissolved after discovering that the inauguration of a CIPS journal or annual publication was not feasible, was reconstituted in 2006 as a Book Series Committee, following the board's adoption of a new plan, inspired by a proposal put forth by Norbert Freedman, to develop a CIPS book series to feature the work of the CIPS community and its members. The new committee, chaired by Meg Beaudoin, developed plans for a book series, titled "The Boundaries of Psychoanalysis." After negotiating with a number of publishers over the course of more than a year, the Committee concluded a very favorable agreement with Karnac Press in 2008. In 2009, the Board approved plans for creation of an Editorial Board for the new series, and appointed Meg Beaudoin to serve as the series editor. Within a remarkably short span of time, the new series has already inspired a growing number of collaborative projects within and across CIP Societies. At the time of this writing, eight volumes are already in preparation. The first volume, *When Theories Touch*, was generously offered to the series by its author, Steven Ellman. This book, to be published in 2009, will introduce readers to the diverse theoretical positions articulated in subsequent volumes.

During the course of these years, the board also spearheaded a succession of measures designed to increase membership and enhance member participation. In 2006, the Direct Member Committee, chaired by Kris MacGaffin, developed plans for the creation of a new "Direct Members Society" ("DMS") to serve as a "home society" for Direct Members of CIPS. The new plan called for the DMS to have its own governing body, to elect its own representatives to the CIPS board, and to be considered an autonomous component society of CIPS with a separate vote on all matters normally ratified by the component societies. The CIPS board enthusiastically approved the plan, which was seen as promoting the recruitment and participation of Direct Members. Bylaw amendments were drafted, approved, and ratified by all societies. The board later voted to expand the Direct Member Society by creating a new membership category to permit candidates at institutes outside CIPS to join as Direct Affiliate Members.

In 2006, CIPS adopted an additional measure to expand membership by voting to create a new membership category for honorary members. The plan called for the invitation of all Honorary Members of component societies to become Honorary Members of CIPS. This implementation of this new initiative, overseen by Diane Garcia, has expanded CIPS membership, enabled new members to contribute to CIPS activities, and significantly expanded the visibility of CIPS. The Honorary Membership of CIPS now includes Christopher Bollas, Ron Britton, Wilma Bucci, Michael Feldman, Jesse Geller, Betty Joseph, Thomas Ogden, Leo Rangell, Brian Robertson, MD, Hanna Segal, MD, Elizabeth Spillius, Ellen Handler Spitz, John Steiner, and Elizabeth Young-Bruehl.

CIPS today

CIPS today is a vibrant organization, with six component groups, including the Direct Member Society, and over 600 members. The CIPS community is multidisciplinary, with many members drawn from the arts and humanities as well as the traditional mental health professions, and theoretically pluralistic, including analysts representing a wide spectrum of psychoanalytic approaches and schools of thought. CIPS is committed to preserving both the multidisciplinary and theoretically diverse character of psychoanalysis, having learned through our own experience that a richly pluralistic community stimulates our curiosity and supports our creativity. From the first clinical conference at La Mancha until today, CIPS has nurtured a robust culture of academic freedom and pursued projects that ensure the productivity of our diversity by creating contexts that promote collegial dialogue and study across societies. Our unique clinical conferences, along with the expanding roster of teleconference study groups and book projects are expressions of this commitment.

With an expanding political and academic agenda, a growing number of members are participating in CIPS initiatives, engaging with each other in new patterns of collaboration within and across societies, and forging the relationships that knit our community together. Five study groups are currently underway and eight books are in preparation. With each new project, analysts from outside CIPS are drawn into our organization, attracted by one or more of our activities, projects, or political initiatives. As a result, CIPS now includes many members of the New York Freudian Society and APsaA, as well as analysts from elsewhere in the world. The Direct Member Society now has over fifty members and expands with each new initiative. More than eighty members registered for our 2009 Biennial Clinical Conference, and applications to attend the conference came from as far away as New Zealand and Australia!

CIPS continues to fulfill its primary political mission, protecting and promoting our interests as independent IPA groups, lobbying for the appointment of our members to the committees of the IPA, working to promote the advancement of NAPsaC to better distribute professional power among the North American IPA groups. Since the early years of the new millennium, however, CIPS has broadened the scope of its political activities, working with other groups to promote responsible licensing laws and to protect patient privacy rights. Our model law has been studied by allied professional associations and has been utilized to alert NAAP that CIPS and other mainstream groups were prepared to respond very forcefully to their legislative efforts in Massachusetts and other states. Our active participation with the national Coalition for Patient Privacy was instrumental in ensuring the inclusion of privacy provisions in the national health information technology legislation enacted by Congress in 2009.

CIPS today is increasingly committed to enhancing the experience of our candidate members. Since 2005, when candidates were formally admitted to CIPS as "affiliate members," a growing number of candidates are participating in CIPS governance and activities. In 2006, CIPS voted that affiliate members be invited to participate in all future CIPS clinical conferences without regard to their student status. That same year, the board voted to enroll all our affiliate members in the International Psychoanalytic Studies Organization (IPSO), the international candidate association for students at IPA institutes.

Affiliate members of CIPS are today more fully aware of the international psychoanalytic community, more widely engaged in thinking about psychoanalysis as a profession, and more prepared to assume leadership roles when they graduate training.Â

Honoring Our Founders

Although the CIPS of 2009 may appear to be a somewhat different organization than the "New IPA Groups of North America," established in 1992, we continue to be animated by the same spirit that inspired our founders and remain committed to the values of democracy, pluralism, creativity, and intellectual rigor that informed their judgment and conduct in establishing our organization. The years of our exclusion from the national and international bodies of psychoanalysis challenged our founders to cultivate attitudes of self-reliance, self-confidence, resourcefulness, imbued them with a fierce devotion to the ideal of fairness, and demanded the development of organizational skills and political savvy necessary for survival in a professional environment that was hostile to their interests and their identity as psychoanalysts. Our founders brought these attitudes and skills to the formation of the "New IPA Groups of North America," fostering an organizational culture that would support and fortify its members, and promote the steady advancement of our interests and our progressive evolution as a confederation.

In 2008, the CIPS Board of Directors, reflecting on the history and achievements of our organization, determined that CIPS should formally celebrate its origins and the signal contributions of our founders and leaders. Toward this end, voted to post and circulate this organizational history, and to take special measures to recognize and honor our founders and those distinguished members whose outstanding and sustained contributions have made CIPS possible.

In November 2008, the Board of Directors voted to honor the members of the first steering committee by naming them "Founders of CIPS." The Founders included the East-Coast and West-Coast co-chairs of the 1992 board, Norbert Freedman (IPTAR) and Jean Sanville (LAISPS), as well Abby Adams Silvan and Mark Silvan, representing NYFS, Steven J. Ellman representing IPTAR (along with Norbert Freedman), Peter Wolson, representing LAISPS (along with Jean Sanville), and Albert Mason and Fred Vaquer, representing PCC.

In addition, the board also voted to honor four individuals whose sustained contributions and visionary leadership were foundational to CIPS and its history. In November 2008, in accordance with bylaws established to make this action possible, the Board of Directors unanimously elected Steven Ellman (IPTAR), Norbert Freedman (IPTAR), James Gooch (PCC), and Ernest Lawrence (LAISPS) to the newly created membership category of "Distinguished Life Member."

The CIPS Board of Directors formally honored our Founders and Distinguished Life Members at the 2009 Clinical Conference, expressing to them our gratitude and the gratitude of our members for having laid the foundations for this confederation and

embodying it with the robust spirit and sustaining values that have enabled it to thrive and for providing the broad shoulders on which we stand today.

Bibliography

Adams-Silvan, A. (1993). In statu nascendi: The Coalition of Independent Psychoanalytic Societies in the U.S.A. *International Psychoanalysis (IPA Newsletter)*, Vol. 2, No. 2.

American Psychoanalytic Association (1938). Resolution against the future training of laymen for the therapeutic use of psychoanalysis. *Bulletin of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, Vol. 1.

Basseches, H. (1994). Development of the Confederation of Independent Psychoanalytic Societies of the United States. (Unpublished paper, privately circulated.)

Basseches, H. (1995a) CORPA decision: end of the road for ABAP. *The American Psychoanalyst*, Vol. 29, No. 1.

Basseches, H. (1995b). IPS, now three years old, spurs move toward regional IPA federation. *The American Psychoanalyst*, Vol. 29, No. 2.

Basseches, H. (2000). *IPS and the APsaA: A spirit of cooperation*. *The American Psychoanalyst*, Vol. 34, No. 1.

Basseches, H. (2005). Efforts focus on educational criteria for psychoanalysis in New York. *The American Psychoanalyst*, Vol. 39, No. 1.

Basseches, H., with A. Bronstein & F. Perlman (2008). Update on NAPsaC. *American Psychoanalyst*, Vol. 42, No. 4.

Basseches, H. and Perlman, F. (2005). *Report to the CIPS board on Meeting with the Consortium*. CIPS Archives. May 2005.

Bergmann, M. (1988). Who is a lay analyst? *Psychoanalytic Review*, 75: 361-372.

CIPS (1997). Introduction to the IPS. Public information statement. Issued by the IPS Board of Directors (privately circulated).

CIPS (2006). Annual President's Report (2006). Annual report of CIPS President to the membership, September 2006.

D'Amore, A. D.T. (1979). Historical reflections on the organizational history of psychoanalysis in the United States. In J.M. Quen & E. T. Carlson, (Eds.), *American Psychoanalysis: Origins and development* (pp. 127-140.) New York: Brunner/ Mazel.

Danto, E. A. (1998). The Ambulatorium: Freud's Free Clinic in Vienna. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 79: 287-300.

Danto, E. A. (1999) The Berlin Poliklinik. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 47:1269-1292.

Decker, H. (1979). Psychoanalysis and the Europeans. In J.M. Quen & E. T. Carlson, (Eds.), *American Psychoanalysis: Origins and development* (pp. 1-19.) New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Eckardt, M.H. (1979) Organizational schisms in American psychoanalysis. In J. Quen and E.T. Carlson (Eds.), *American Psychoanalysis: Origins and Development* (pp. 141-146). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Eisold, K. (1998) The splitting of the New York Psychoanalytic Society and the construction of psychoanalytic authority. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 79: 871-885.

Eissler, K. (1965). Medical orthodoxy and the future of psychoanalysis. New York: International Universities Press.

Ellman, S. (1999). Report from the House of Delegates. *IPS Newsletter*, Vol. 1, No. 2.

Fine, R. (1979). *A history of psychoanalysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Freedman and Sanville, 1993). Report to the Membership: The Coalition of Independent Psychoanalytic Societies. *CIPS Archives*.

Freedman, N. & Sanville, J. (1999). *International Psychoanalysis* (IPA Newsletter), Vol VIII, No. 2.

Freidson, E. (1970). *The Profession of Medicine: A study of the sociology of applied knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freud, S. (1910). Wild analysis. *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 11:219-227. London: Hogarth Press, 1957.

Freud, S. (1914). On the history of the psychoanalytic movement. *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 14:1-66. London: Hogarth Press, 1957.

Freud, S. (1926). On the question of lay analysis. *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, 20:177-258. London: Hogarth Press, 1959.

Hale, N. (1995) *The rise and crisis of psychoanalysis in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hall, J. (2006). Report on the CIPS Biennial Conference: Reflections. *CIPS Website*.
<http://www.cipsusa.org/events/2006ConferenceReport.cfm>

IPS Board of Directors (2001). National membership election. *IPS News, Vol. 3, Number 1*.

Jones, E. (1955). The life and work of Sigmund Freud, Vol. 2: Years of Maturity, 1901-1919. New York: Basic Books.

Jones, E. et al. (1927). Discussion of lay analysis. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 8*: 174-283, 392-401.

Kalish-Weiss, B. (2003). Report on the IPA House of Delegates. *IPS Newsletter, Vol. 4, No. 1*.

Karon, B. (1994). The future of psychoanalysis. In R. C. Lane & M. Meisels (Eds.), *A history of the Division of psychoanalysis of the American Psychological Association (pp. 351-365)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kelly, M. (2003) Third IPS clinical conference, *The IPS Newsletter, Vol. 4: No. 1*.

Lawrence, E. (2004). Retiring president's letter. *IPS Newsletter, Vol. 5, No. 1*.

McBride, T. (1998). The IPS and external accreditation. *The American Psychoanalyst, 32*: No. 1.

Menaker, E. (1988). Early struggles in lay psychoanalysis: New York in the thirties, forties, and fifties. *Psychoanalytic Review, 75*: 373-379.

Menaker, E. (1989). *Misplaced Loyalties*. New York: St. Martins Press.

NAAP (2002) *Registry of Psychoanalysts*. New York: National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis.

Nussenbaum, G. (2001). Mohonk weekend "October 1999. *IPS Newsletter, Volume 3, No. 1*.

Perlman, F. (1999). Love and its objects: On the contributions to psychoanalysis of Martin S. Bergman. *Psychoanalytic Review, Vol. 86, No. 6*.

Perlman, F. (2003). Notes on the structure and functions of professions, with special reference to psychoanalysis (Unpublished paper, privately circulated).

Perlman, F. (2004a). Psychoanalysis in the United States: A new challenge. *International Psychoanalysis, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Summer Supplement)*.

- Perlman, R. (2004b). The public policy committee. *IPS Newsletter, Vol. 5, No. 1.*
- Perlman, F. (2004c). Proposed regulations for New York State license withdrawn for revision. *The American Psychoanalyst, Vol 38, No. 4.*
- Perlman, F. (2005b). Eight Proposals: President's report to the board. *CIPS archives.*
- Perlman, F. (2006a). The NAAP challenge: The lessons of New York. Paper given at the APsaA Conference, January 2006, New York.
- Perlman, F. (2006b). Psychoanalysis as a Profession: Confronting the NAAP challenge to psychoanalysis. *The Round Robin: Newsletter of Section 1 (Psychologist-Psychoanalyst Practitioners), Division of Psychoanalysis (39), American Psychological Association, Vol 21, No. 2.*
- Perlman, F. (2006c). Report on the CIPS Biennial Conference: Reflections. [CIPS Website.](#)
- Perlman, F. & Kalish-Weiss. (2005). The CIPS public policy committee. *CIPS Newsletter, Vol 6, No. 1.*
- Richards, A. (1998). Politics and Paradigms. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 46:* 357-360
- Richards, A. (1999). A.A. Brill and the politics of exclusion. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 47:* 9-28.
- Rudovsky, A. (2001). Report on Governance. *IPS Newsletter, Vol. 3, No. 1.*
- Roazen, P. (1971). *Freud and his followers.* New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Sherman, (1988). Theodor Reik and lay analysis. *Psychoanalytic Review, 75:* 380-392.
- Schroter, M. (2002). Max Eitingon and the struggle to establish an international standard for psychoanalytic training (1925-1929). *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 83:* 875-894.
- Schroter, M. (2004). The early history of lay analysis, especially in Vienna, Berlin, and London: Aspects of an unfolding controversy (1906-1924). *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 85:* 159-178.
- Simon, B. (2003). The lawsuit revisited. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 51 (Supplement):* 247-271.
- Starr, P. (1982). *The social transformation of American medicine.* New York: Basic Books.

Wagner, L.B. (2006). The Psychoanalytic Consortium, ACPE, and the Profession of Psychoanalysis. *The Round Robin: Newsletter of Section 1 (Psychologist-Psychoanalyst Practitioners), Division of Psychoanalysis (39), American Psychological Association, Vol 21, No. 2.*

Wallerstein, R. (1993). The history of lay analysis in the United States. *International Psychoanalysis, 2: No. 2.*

Wallerstein, R. (1998) *Lay Analysis: Life Inside the Controversy*. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.

Wrye, H. (1998). The 1998 midwinter clinical conference, Palm Springs. *The IPS Newsletter, Vol 1: No. 1.*