

The Creation of CPPNJ

by Dennis J. Krumholz*

The Center for Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy of New Jersey (CPPNJ) resulted from the consolidation of two predecessor institutes, the Institute for Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy of New Jersey (IPPNJ) and The Contemporary Center for Advanced Psychoanalytic Studies (CCAPS). CCAPS was established in 1992; IPPNJ had been founded as an independent organization three years earlier, although it had originated at least a decade before then as a Division of the New York Center for Psychoanalytic Training (NYCPT).

What follows is an informal history of these predecessor organizations based on interviews conducted with past and present faculty and documents in the files of the Institute. This history is incomplete for several reasons. First, many individuals with knowledge of the past are either deceased or unavailable, and in several instances were unwilling to participate in this project. As well, only a limited number of documents from the early years of IPPNJ survive, as many were destroyed in the 2012 flood resulting from Hurricane Sandy. Recollections of different interviewees were sometimes inconsistent and some memories differed from what the documents reflect.

* The author has been practicing environmental law for more than 40 years.

The author is neither therapist nor psychoanalyst so this recounting is bound to gloss over issues of analytic theory and omit detailed discussion of the training and analytic attributes of psychoanalytic institutes and of psychotherapy more broadly.

This history concludes with the creation of CPPNJ in 2009. This is because activities since that time may be characterized more accurately as current events rather than history, and because so many present members have participated in the Institute in the years since consolidation that recitation of events since then would be largely unnecessary.

Perhaps faculty associated with CPPNJ or its predecessor institutes will take up the mantle to deepen and broaden this work and correct any errors that appear. Warm appreciation is due those current and former institute members and faculty who graciously lent their time and effort to this endeavor as interviewees, reviewers of drafts and fact-checkers.

The roots of IPPNJ were established in the late 1970s when Albert Shire and Peter Richman, New Jersey psychologists, met at the Maplewood home of

Samuel Kutash, also a New Jersey psychologist, to discuss the formation of a New Jersey branch of NYCPT. All three men were trained psychoanalysts and were members of the Board of NYCPT. They believed there was great interest — one interviewee described it as “pent-up demand” — among New Jersey psychotherapists who wanted psychoanalytic training but who were unable or unwilling to travel into New York City or Philadelphia and so were eager for local facilities to be developed.

Dr. Kutash was an established New Jersey practitioner who had undergone two different personal psychoanalyses by analysts who themselves had been analyzed by Sigmund Freud (although it was reported that neither analyst was rigidly “Freudian” in either technique or theory). He also was one of the psychologists responsible for the 1966 enactment of the New Jersey Psychology Licensing Act which allowed psychologists to practice psychotherapy. In fact, Kutash is thought to have been issued the very first license under this law. In light of this background — one interviewee referred to him as ‘renowned’ — Kutash had been welcomed onto the NYCPT faculty, where one interviewee referred to him as ‘a big deal.’ Undoubtedly, the involvement of Kutash, along with Drs. Shire and Richman, also well-established New Jersey clinicians, encouraged Reuben Fine, founder and Director of NYCPT, to allow establishment of a New Jersey satellite.

At the initial meeting, Kutash expressed his full support for the New Jersey branch but felt he was overcommitted and so was unwilling to formally participate. Kutash died of cancer in 1979, not long after these initial discussions took place. Shortly after this meeting, Shire and Richman discussed their proposal with Fine, who agreed to the establishment of a New Jersey Division of NYCPT. Fine offered no financial assistance, but Shire and Richman believed that the administrative and educational structure of the New York institute would provide the newly formed branch with a base of support.

NYCPT

According to an undated brochure, NYCPT was established by Fine in 1963, although one interviewee recalls it as having been formed in 1971. NYCPT was one of many New York-based psychoanalytic institutes active during that period. According to the brochure, the institute formerly had been known as the Metropolitan Institute for Psychoanalytic Studies (MIPS), although one commentator believes NYCPT was not the successor to MIPS but, rather, was created as a new institute when Fine and Stanley Graham, who had been co-founders, dissolved MIPS and went their separate ways. Dr. Graham also had served as Dean of MIPS and as Director of the Fifth Avenue Center for Psychotherapy, a clinic that was part of that institute. Fine also had been Director of the Center for Creative Living, a second clinic that was part of MIPS and which affiliated with NYCPT following dissolution of MIPS and the formation

of NYCPT. Dr. Graham went off to found the Greenwich Institute for Psychoanalytic Studies (GIPS) and some years later was elected President of the American Psychological Association, while Fine established NYCPT when MIPS dissolved.

Prior to founding MIPS, in 1948, Fine and Theodore Reik, a protege of Freud and the first psychologist to write a psychoanalytic doctoral dissertation, had formed the first non-medical psychoanalytic institute in this country, the National Psychological Association for Psychoanalysis (NPAP). Often with colleagues, Fine also would go on to establish the New York Society of Freudian Psychologists, now known as the Contemporary Freudian Society, followed by the Institute for Psychoanalytic Training and Research (IPTAR), before establishing MIPS and ultimately NYCPT. One interviewee thinks Fine believed that other psychoanalytic institutes were less dedicated to Freud than he was, and so he wanted to maintain control over how psychoanalysis was taught. One former NYCPT faculty member recalled that Fine had established this most recent institute so that he “could run it his own way with his own people.” Another commentator put it more directly: NYCPT was “a one man operation” that was “Reuben’s baby.”

Fine had been a highly acclaimed chess grandmaster early in this career. After retiring from chess, he reportedly worked at the Office of Strategic Services, precursor to the Central Intelligence Agency, where he was analyzed

by Benjamin Weininger, M.D., who had worked with Harry Stack Sullivan. Fine became a psychologist and then trained as a psychoanalyst. (As referenced above, few psychologists were able to become psychoanalysts at that time, as in the United States, the mainstream, medically oriented psychoanalytic institutes limited candidacy to medical professionals, more about which below.)

One humorous anecdote, perhaps apocryphal, is that it was suggested to the teen-aged Bobby Fischer, the irascible chess prodigy and later champion, that he get together with Fine who, after all, had been a chess champion himself, in the hope that Fine could eventually engage him in psychotherapy, which did not interest Fischer. After playing chess together for a while, Fine asked Fischer, “so, how are you?”, at which point Fischer abruptly stood up and ended the relationship.

More could be included about Fine than the current project warrants. By all accounts he became a senior and well-regarded figure in the New York analytic world. Fine authored a number of books on psychoanalytic topics for a general readership. As is relevant to this project, he was generally viewed as “brilliant, but with an authoritarian leadership style,” a quality that later would have an impact on IPPNJ. One interviewee acknowledged that Fine “was smarter than most people,” and believed he found it difficult to hide his “arrogance and impatience” as a result. One commentator sympathetic to Fine reported that he both taught classes and was “always writing,” and observed that he was able to express difficult analytic concepts in ways that both professionals and laymen

could understand. Another observer believed Fine “was honest about being an autocrat when it came to running his institute, and about aspects of theory and practice.” A less sympathetic commentator noted Fine’s ‘theoretical rigidity’ and tartly observed that “those who were part of his coterie of analysands and supervisees often were referred to as ‘Reubenites’ by those not part of the invisible inner circle.”

One observer who knew Fine in multiple capacities denied he was ‘tyrannical,’ but acknowledged he was “strict and direct,” and further noted he was “very kind [and] respectful, and emotionally honest and flexible” with a sense of humor. It also was mentioned that “Fine enjoyed the power and control that came with running NYCPT.” Time magazine wryly noted that “[w]hen Fine switched his major interest from chess to psychoanalysis, the result was a loss for chess — and a draw, at best, for psychoanalysis.”

NYCPT (or perhaps a predecessor institute) began operations in Fine’s apartment on West 86th Street in Manhattan. At some point, the institute relocated to a brownstone Fine had purchased at 9 East 89th Street, and it quickly grew to include 25 - 30 associated professionals. The brochure observed that the institute was Freudian in its orientation — it began with a 1914 quote from Freud emphasizing transference and resistance as the starting points of psychoanalytic work — but it also acknowledged that “analysis today

has expanded in many directions, some of which were unknown in Freud's day."

According to the brochure,

"[i]n addition to providing competent professionals in the fields of mental health with the highest level of instruction in the theory, techniques and practice of psychoanalysis, NYCPT sponsors a variety of research projects and engages in extensive educational programs for the lay public."

The brochure lists the organization's address as 490 West End Avenue; the East Side brownstone had been sold by then. A retired member of NYCPT recalled attending meetings at Fine's apartment on West 86th Street between Broadway and Amsterdam Avenue. Another interviewee recalled NYCPT offices at 1780 Broadway.

The brochure identified Shire as Director of the New Jersey Division (indicating it was prepared in the early- to mid-1980s), and named him and Natalie Brown, who became an early member of IPPNJ, as members of the NYCPT Training Committee. It listed 52 faculty members, a number of whom were, or would go on to become, faculty at the New Jersey Division of NYCPT and subsequently at IPPNJ.

NYCPT held periodic meetings, usually once or twice per month and often on Friday evenings (except in July and August), where faculty would deliver papers.

The institute was an “exciting” place to be in the 1970s, with faculty who were “hard-working and dedicated.” One sympathetic interviewee commented that NYCPT welcomed candidates from both academic and creative backgrounds, and that it was “an accepting place” and invested in those who were creative themselves, as was Fine. Annual symposia were presented in the 1970s and 1980s, which candidates volunteered to help organize and manage, and which became more robustly attended in the 1970s and 1980s. The Society for Psychoanalytic Training was the membership organization of NYCPT.

The New Jersey Division of NYCPT

Before the Institute for Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy, Inc., was incorporated in New Jersey, an unincorporated entity was established in the late 1970s, apparently without formal documentation, as the New Jersey Division of NYCPT. On behalf of this nascent organization, Richman and Shire entered into an agreement with the New York institute to establish a New Jersey branch. Richman and his attorney prepared a carefully considered agreement to which Fine agreed, but only orally. The agreement provided that the New York office of NYCPT would perform the administrative functions relating to the new Division, including registration, printing and distribution of the brochure, mailings, secretarial services and so on. For its part, the New Jersey Division was obligated to conform its activities with the educational structure and standards of NYCPT.

A subsequent recounting of this early history stated that, shortly following its creation, the Division consisted of approximately ten faculty “and a similarly small student body.” The New Jersey Division of NYCPT appears to have operated informally in the several years following its establishment.

Several years later, in an effort to give greater formality to the organization, Richman, who had trained and had worked as an engineer in the corporate world before doing his psychoanalytic training at NYCPT, sought to ascertain whether the Division was obligated to form a corporation or otherwise register with New Jersey authorities in order to form a training institute. One early participant noted years later that the Division could have remained unincorporated since it was not granting any formal degree or certification but merely taught courses in New Jersey and allowed NYCPT to grant certification. Richman was similarly advised by the New Jersey Board of Higher Education that such registration was optional but, with Shire’s acquiescence, he decided nonetheless to establish an educational corporation, including a Board of Directors, by-laws and other formalities. Creation of the corporation would turn out to be prescient in light of future developments.

A subsequent recounting of this period noted that the organization’s original by-laws provided that the Division could rescind its association with NYCPT at any time, and “IPPNJ thus freely chose to operate as an affiliate of NYCPT while

remaining legally autonomous,” but there is no record of these by-laws. A similar assertion was made some years later to the effect that establishing a separate legal entity was intended to help “avoid the fracturing and power grabs that often characterized training institutes at that time.”

It seems evident that the decision by Richman and Shire to establish a separate legal entity was intended to promote greater independence and autonomy for the New Jersey Division, notwithstanding that it remained deeply connected with, and in significant respects dependent upon, NYCPT. It was observed years later that

[t]he feeling that an analytic institute in New Jersey would be more attractive to potential New Jersey students if it had its own identity associated with New Jersey evolved into the formation of [IPPNJ].

In contrast with New Jersey’s efforts to establish an identity that was partially separate from its parent institute, including use of the name IPPNJ, NYCPT seemed to view the organization simply as its New Jersey outpost. For example, New Jersey candidates who took classes in New Jersey registered in New York as NYCPT students.

Either the initial agreement between Fine and Shire and Richman, or more likely a subsequent agreement between NYCPT and its New Jersey Division, also

provided that one-third of tuition payments made to NYCPT by New Jersey candidates would be returned to NYCPT-NJ, as the New Jersey Division was sometimes known. This provision would prove highly significant in the years that followed. These returned funds were of great importance to the New Jersey branch since they were to be used to create, among other things, an in-state office and library.

The first available documentation relating to this New Jersey psychoanalytic entity is dated May 1, 1983. At that time, initial fully paid shares of the corporation were issued in equal amounts to Shire and Richman, who each contributed financially “in order to seed the project.” The Institute for Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy, Inc. — “New Jersey” was not included in the legal name of the organization — was formally established as a non-profit New Jersey corporation on December 31, 1984 with the filing of the Certificate of Incorporation with the Secretary of State. Its principal office was identified as 120 Madison Avenue in Madison; its trustees were Shire, Richman and Judith Felton (now Logue). A special meeting took place that day among the three trustees, who elected David Maclsaac, Ruth Karr, Louis Brandzel, Irwin Kutash, and Malcolm Marks as additional trustees. The expanded Board then adopted by-laws.

There is no evidence that incorporation of the New Jersey Division was discussed with NYCPT. Several years later, in May 1986, the attorney who

handled the registration of the corporation provided its Certificate of Incorporation and related documents to Herbert Strean, who by then had become Director of NYCPT. There is no record of a response from Dr. Strean.

The next Board meeting for which documentation was located took place in June 1985, at which the foregoing members participated. The significance of the meeting was expressed in the following adopted resolutions:

RESOLVED, that the Institute of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy of New Jersey, is and shall be affiliated with the New York Center for Psychoanalytic Training and agrees to operate as if it were a division of the New York Center for Psychoanalytic Training under the aegis of the New York Center for Psychoanalytic Training Board of Directors, and all operations, standards and policies shall conform to those of New York Center for Psychoanalytic Training.

RESOLVED, that to the extent permitted by the by-laws of and in accordance with the Board of the New York Center for Psychoanalytic Training and the by-laws of and in accordance with the Board of the Institute for Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy, Inc., the Institute of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy shall operate under the standards and policies of the New York Center for Psychoanalytic Training because of the common goal and shared ideas of the two corporations.

The first resolution, above, is where 'New Jersey' is included for the first time in the name of the organization. At different subsequent points, Joseph Braun, Laura Feuerstein, Muriel Fox, Susan Herman, Carole Heydt, Nancy McWilliams and Harvey Schrier also became Board members of the New Jersey corporation.

Psychotherapy Center, Inc. also was formed in 1983. Shire and Richman were the sole shareholders and Directors, and they were elected President and Vice-President, respectively. This organization, which served as the clinic of IPP, was formally dissolved in 1991.

A Candidates Organization was formed shortly after NYCPT-NJ began operations. Candidates were described by interviewees as "adult learners" who typically were eager to express themselves and capable of doing so, yet at the same time, as analysands, they also were, according to one interviewee, "regressing" and "feeling like children." The Candidates Organization petitioned NYCPT to allow its members to sit on the Board of Directors and on its committees, a request the institute granted. As a result, candidates attended Board and committee meetings. The candidates' experience of participating in NYCPT meetings was reported as largely but not entirely positive. While they were permitted to raise issues during committee and Board meetings, one candidate recalled suggesting a change to institute practice and being chastised by a New York analyst that candidates "should know their place."

The Candidates Organization was responsible for preparing and circulating a newsletter, organizing Sunday seminars, and preparing the Directory of faculty and candidates. The Organization also organized the annual fall 'welcome back brunch,' which in the early days was 'pot luck' and typically took place at the home of a candidate or faculty member. In the early days of the New Jersey Division, these activities were "New York-centered" as NYCPT-NJ was just one component of NYCPT, which also had Divisions on Long Island and in Rockland County. Over time, the number of New Jersey candidates grew, and NYCPT-NJ itself ultimately assumed responsibility for the brunch, at which point it was moved to the Maplewood Community Center.

One activity the Candidates Organization performed was the publication of a directory of New Jersey faculty and candidates. The 1988 Directory noted that IPPNJ offers "advanced training in psychoanalysis and psychotherapy in conjunction with the New York Center for Psychoanalytic Training." The Directory also observed that it "...is the first effort by the Candidates Organization of IPPNJ to organize candidates and faculty in one source." It was deemed noteworthy by one interviewee that the Directory presented the names of the faculty and candidates together, since NYCPT practiced a more strict demarcation between the two groups. For one observer, this illustrated the more progressive nature of the New Jersey Division when compared with its affiliated institute.

Some interviewees observed that NYCPT-NJ practitioners generally were more eclectic in their approach to psychoanalysis than were their colleagues at NYCPT. Several observed that New Jersey faculty were more open than their New York counterparts to using multiple therapeutic approaches. One former faculty member quipped that NYCPT analysts searched for ‘the perfect analytic patient with the perfect motivation who would fit the perfect technique,’ whereas analysts at the New Jersey Division were more likely to meet their patients ‘where they were,’ and to approach psychoanalytic treatment more flexibly. This difference in approach was not verbalized but nonetheless was understood to be a notable philosophical difference between the two branches. Yet, one practitioner recalls a ‘hue and cry’ arising in opposition to the proposal by one New Jersey faculty member to teach a course on the theories of Sullivan, as this was viewed as an unacceptable deviation from the Freudian orientation of the organization.

The New Jersey Division organized a series of psychoanalytic conferences in its early years that were very well attended, and interest in the organization quickly “grew exponentially.” Soon, teaching sections were established in Highland Park/Princeton, Madison and Teaneck. Shire and especially Richman were largely responsible for running the institute in the early years. One commentator emphasized that Richman deserved a great deal of credit for all he did for the institute, which largely involved the ‘nuts and bolts’ of building and running the

organization, including enlisting faculty and organizing conferences. Another observed that Shire was the more academic of the two, while Richman was more entrepreneurial and was the “operational guy.” As noted, an office was established, with Ann Schneiderman as the “lovely and hard-working” non-professional administrator; indeed, one interviewee credited Schneiderman’s presence as having had a salutary effect on the candidates. One interviewee also credited the use of up-to-date computer software as having had a positive impact on the development of the organization. Many faculty taught year-long courses. At its peak, NYCPT-NJ counted approximately 80 candidates.

One source of professionals who trained and were analyzed at NYCPT-NJ was the Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology (GSAPP) of Rutgers University. This program was founded in 1976 by several psychoanalytic practitioners including, for example, Shire, Muriel Fox and Stanley Moldawsky, who later became members of the IPPNJ faculty. In contrast to the research focus of most university graduate programs in psychology, the primary purpose of GSAPP, which offered the PsyD doctoral degree rather than the research-oriented PhD in clinical psychology, was to train psychotherapists. Many New Jersey psychoanalysts welcomed this orientation as it was conducive to psychoanalytic training, as analysts typically were clinicians. In 1981, Nancy McWilliams joined the GSAPP faculty and was invited by Dr. Shire to join the New Jersey Division, where eventually she served as

recording secretary (and was replaced in this position years later by Helene Schwartzbach).

Another source of therapists who came to participate in the New Jersey Division of NYCPT was the Department of Psychiatry Adult Outpatient Clinic of the Rutgers School of Medicine. During the 1970s, Rutgers was developing a Community Health Center that was considered progressive and even avant garde. It was staffed by psychoanalytic psychiatrists, many of whom were from Yale and Johns Hopkins, who wanted to develop community mental health programs and expand psychological services. These initiatives were created as part of the Great Society programs of President Lyndon Johnson. They reflected the availability of new psychotropic medications that allowed formerly hospitalized patients to receive care in their local communities. These physicians were relatively early in their careers and were eager to educate and train non-medical students in psychology, social work and allied mental health fields. At the time, Rutgers was expanding its medical education from a two-year to a four-year MD training program, and so it sought out researchers and practitioners to help widen its reach and elevate its status. Journal clubs, training sessions and weekend retreats were initiated. As one observer noted, “this was an exciting and hopeful time” for mental health in New Jersey.

Candidates in the early years of the New Jersey Division remember the experience fondly. One recalled the excitement of being part of a “wonderful

cohort of practitioners...who were smart, motivated and interested in the curriculum.” One recalled joining the organization in order to become part of a “wonderful and strong” cohort of similarly minded people. Classes in the Princeton Division were often held at a Chinese restaurant on Route 27 in Kendall Park, located between New Brunswick and Princeton. Training at NJCPT-NJ made one therapist’s work with patients “more grounded and hopeful,” and candidates formed friendships and often referred patients to one another. “It was the heyday of psychoanalysis,” recalled one interviewee; another remembers that “things were rolling” in the early years of the organization. Yet another candidate recalled it as “a real swingin’ time, very busy.”

At least one faculty member of NYCPT taught students in the New Jersey satellite and travelled once a week from New York to the Princeton area to do so. This teacher recalls being ‘treated royally’ by the local candidates, who were eager to learn and to develop the institute, and that the experience was “cool and delightful.” This teacher and these students often met at the home of one of the students, and then went out for dinner. This faculty member remarked that Fine recognized the building interest in New Jersey for psychoanalytic training and education and was pleased to support it.

Al Shire, Director of the New Jersey Division of NYCPT during these years and beyond, was recalled affectionately by many interviewees. Shire received his

psychoanalytic training at the NYU Post-Doctoral Program. He was described by one as “friendly, very smart, thoughtful, intelligent and non-dogmatic,” and as ‘avuncular’ and a “conciliator.” As a “beloved” teacher at GSAPP, Shire served his students milk and cookies when meeting at his home, and as Director of IPPNJ he often hosted “fun” Sunday morning Board meetings at which bagels and a “huge breakfast spread” were served. Indeed, during his years teaching at GSAPP, and for many years after he retired, the psychoanalytic theory class that Shire had taught remained known informally as “Al Shire’s class.” Shire was able to attract faculty to IPPNJ, and he “combined warmth and intelligence, and was perceptive and quite knowledgeable.”

Another interviewee recalled Shire as having provided a “consistent professional environment” as Director of NYCPT-NJ and subsequently IPPNJ. He was viewed as having had considerable strength of character and was recalled as a “loving, problem-solving gentle man.” It was noted that some misunderstood Shire’s warmth and generosity for weakness, a characterization several commentators emphatically rejected. One observer recalled that he was a “treasure...not just smart, but wise and loving. No way was he weak.” Yet another interviewee characterized Shire as having had “an incredible number of talents” and as a “warm and caring man” who was “the gold standard” among therapists. One former faculty member recalled being attracted to the organization by Shire’s “flexibility,” that he was “important to the enduring nature of IPPNJ,” and that ‘he and the organization cannot be pulled apart.’”

One example of Shire's openness to non-psychoanalytic ideas is that he developed an interest in hypnosis.

One former candidate described faculty and candidates at NYCPT-NJ and then at IPPNJ as "warm, welcoming and accepting" in contrast to a different New York institute where this candidate's analyst was on the faculty and where faculty were "overly impressed with themselves" and candidates were made to "feel stupid." New Jersey faculty supported candidates' efforts to understand the materials, and were "energizing, open and sharing." This interviewee emphasized that candidates at the New Jersey Division were studying the same Freudian readings as were required by this New York institute, thus negating any claim that training at NYCPT-NJ was less rigorous. Another interviewee observed that candidates in New Jersey, which included clinicians from throughout the state, were a more diverse group than those at NYCPT. One former candidate pointed out that the New Jersey Division exhibited greater kindness to candidates by informing them promptly of the results of the exam given at the end of one's third year in training, in contrast with certain New York institutes where communicating exam results was purposely delayed, resulting in greater anxiety for the candidates.

As the New Jersey Division flourished in the 1980s, NYCPT, in contrast, started "to limp along." One possible explanation for this decline may have been NYCPT's need to compete with the many New York City psychoanalytic

institutes that were then opening training and membership to non-physicians as a result of the settlement of litigation brought by several psychologists who had been denied opportunities by mainstream medical psychoanalytic institutes to train as analysts. Welch et al. v. American Psychoanalytic Association et al. As a result of this settlement, which was formalized in 1988 but whose contours were known before then, the psychoanalytic institutes of the American Psychoanalytic Association and the International Psychoanalytical Association became obligated to admit qualified non-physicians, and so social workers and psychologists who heretofore had sought membership in the few institutes such as NYCPT that already admitted non-physicians now had become eligible for admission to these formerly physician-only organizations.

Another reason offered for the decline and ultimate closure of NYCPT was that it was run “like a mom and pop operation,” rather than as a *bona fide* business, although one commentator made it a point to observe that Fine himself had run NYCPT in a business-like manner. For example, following Fine’s death in 1993, NYCPT considered but ultimately decided against buying its own building, as other institutes had done, despite the fact that owning real estate in New York would have provided equity that could have been used to support the activities of the institute. One member of the NYCPT Board recalled that he had stepped down in frustration after a single term in part because “the Board spent too much time discussing money and not enough time addressing psychoanalysis and the work of the institute.”

Yet another reason offered for the decline of NYCPT was the rise of 'self-help' psychology literature. While some readers sought out psychoanalysis as a result of reading these books, most did not, and instead preferred more "instant gratification." The limitations of insurance coverage and the rise of behavioral treatment modalities also were cited as factors that likely contributed to the decline of NYCPT and, ultimately, to difficulties encountered by psychoanalytic institutes generally. NYCPT itself ceased to exist in the early 2000s.

IPPNJ Becomes Independent

As noted, the 1980s was a time of significant growth and development at the New Jersey Division, but was a period during which its parent institute fared less well. At some point, likely between 1986 and 1988, NYCPT stopped returning the one-third of the tuition monies tendered to it by New Jersey candidates as was required by the agreement between NYCPT and its New Jersey Division. Undated handwritten notes, almost certainly prepared in the late 1980s by Shire, state that

“[i]n 1986, I think, an oral agreement was reached with Reuben Fine, then Director of NYCPT, that would refund to us 1/3 of tuition coming from New Jersey registration. This agreement has been stated, orally, publicly frequently enough that I believe it has contract status. I mention this because a substantial part of the

motivation to split off from NYCPT comes from the fact that NYCPT is trying to alter the terms of this agreement, and if its Board votes to do it, since they handle registration and have the money, they will do it.”

As one commentator observed in this context, “Al Shire was a man of his word, and would have expected a handshake agreement to be binding.”

From the perspective of members of the New Jersey Division, tension with NYCPT increased largely as a result of this financial dispute. One faculty member recalls that New Jersey “was getting all the work, but none of the money.” Another remembers that the situation was one of “taxation without representation,” and that NYCPT viewed its New Jersey satellite as merely a “feeder” for candidates to take advanced level courses in New York. New Jersey became “resentful” as it became increasingly “hamstrung” by the lack of funds. Another analyst described the situation as “the tail wagging the dog,” that is, by this time NYCPT-NJ was contributing the majority of NYCPT’s candidates and therefore much of the institute’s operating funds. One commentator estimated that one half of the candidates at NYCPT were from the New Jersey Division. As one interviewee put it, “New York needed New Jersey more than New Jersey needed New York.”

The issue of membership in the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA) was cited by multiple interviewees as also having contributed to the rising

tension between NYCPT and NYCPT-NJ, although most commentators believe this issue came to the fore only once the dispute over money became acute. During this period, NYCPT was eager to become a member of the IPA, a status that was made possible by settlement of the lawsuit that allowed psychologists to participate in psychoanalytic institutes, noted above. A requirement for American members of the IPA was that candidates be in analysis at least four times per week. NYCPT promptly modified its requirements accordingly, despite the fact that until that time its candidates had been required to undergo analysis only three times per week. It also increased the number of supervision hours (“control analysis”) required of candidates in order to conform with IPA requirements.

In contrast, the majority of New Jersey Division analysts were less determined to join the IPA. This was due to the logistical difficulties for New Jersey residents in seeing an analyst an extra day per week, and because of the problematic effects of changing the rules so suddenly when candidates had come to NYCPT-NJ expecting a three-times-weekly obligation. As one interviewee recalled, increasing the number of analytic hours per week “would have made recruitment and retention of students impossible in an environment very different from New York City.” Another expressed it more directly: membership in the IPA for Streaun and NYCPT “was the ultimate in prestige,” whereas most of the “grassroots [New Jersey] practitioners could [have] care[d] less.”

As withholding of the tuition continued, the Board of the New Jersey Division began considering disassociating from NYCPT. All those interviewed ascribed the refusal to return funds as the primary, if not the sole, reason the New Jersey branch considered severing its relationship with New York. Yet, as noted below, other differences between NYCPT-NJ and NYCPT also played a role in causing the New Jersey Division to consider independence.

The situation had deteriorated by late 1989. A meeting of a Structure Committee of the New Jersey Division took place in early November of that year in order to address "...issues of the structure of an autonomous IPPNJ." The Structure Committee was a subcommittee of the Board of NYCPT-NJ that was created to "think through how to proceed IF the relationship with NYCPT [were to become] untenable as a result of their withholding funds." Several members of the Board had been members of other psychoanalytic societies where splits had occurred and so were aware that "pre-split rumblings and rumors created terrible ... conflicts of loyalty and contributed to an overall paranoid atmosphere." Among the issues considered were the type of leadership bodies appropriate for an independent institute, and the nature and length of training, personal analysis and control analysis that would be required of candidates. Other concerns discussed in this context included "the changing climate of psychotherapy, the impact of political and economic forces like insurance plans on the field, and the resulting changing needs of our trainees."

A meeting of the Board of NYCPT-NJ took place one week later. In a pre-meeting, the issue of “how IPPNJ will differ from NYCPT, and how this will be communicated to faculty and students,” was briefly discussed. Among the differences with NYCPT that emerged from the conversation were that an independent IPPNJ “will not have a small elite of IPA-qualified training analysts...would not have a two track system to becoming a psychoanalyst...” and would be able to offer “innovative new certificate programs.”

The Structure Committee met again two weeks later, at the beginning of December, to further consider the possibility of having NYCPT-NJ separate from NYCPT. Some members expressed the view that even if NYCPT were to provide the withheld funds, the New Jersey organization still would be better off as an independent entity since other concerns would remain. One New Jersey analyst recalls being told by those who participated in the disaffiliation that “breaking away would allow IPPNJ to have better control over their activities and to be kinder to the candidates.”

In addition to the choice of remaining or separating, a third option — staying within NYCPT but “carving out areas of greater autonomy” — was presented, but the Committee recognized a number of difficulties inherent in such a posture. Because the need for the withheld funds was considered to be “desperate,” it was agreed that December 15th — a date that apparently had been communicated previously to NYCPT — was a reasonable deadline by

which the New Jersey Division needed to receive the monies if it was going to remain affiliated with New York. The minutes of this meeting also make clear that members of the Board had taken great pains not to communicate to NYCPT the possibility of separation.

One week later, representatives of the Board of the New Jersey Division met with NYCPT leadership in its New York office to seek to persuade them to resume supplying the withheld tuition. (It is likely that other meetings and discussions also took place between representatives of NYCPT and IPPNJ to address this issue.) Shire and McWilliams and possibly others attended this meeting on behalf of the New Jersey Division. Fine, now Director Emeritus of NYCPT, participated, along with Ronald Sunshine, chair of the NYCPT Training Committee. Dr. Strean, a “lovely man” and a “charismatic, dynamic analyst” “with a strong personality” who had become Director of NYCPT several years earlier — and who also served on the faculty of the New Jersey Division and was a well-established teacher at the Rutgers School of Social Work — also likely participated. A few others also were in attendance representing the New York institute.

One of those present recalled the meeting as follows: Shire asked Fine to resume sending the money; Fine responded that the issue was not really about money and claimed that the “real source of tension” between the New York and New Jersey groups was that New Jersey had deviated from a classical Freudian

approach to psychoanalysis in favor of an Object Relations orientation. When Shire replied that NYCPT-NJ simply needed the money, Fine claimed that the Division was acting as the Oedipal child rebelling against its parent organization. Finally, Shire warned that, if NYCPT continued to refuse to return the tuition, the New Jersey Board would have to decide what to do. One observer noted that Fine “framed the dispute in terms of psychodynamics and theoretical heresy” but failed to understand New Jersey’s need for the money and for NYCPT to keep its word. Another person recalls that Fine and Streaan offered to provide the New Jersey Division with a fax machine in lieu of returning the tuition, an offer which New Jersey found “clearly unacceptable.” The meeting was unsuccessful in persuading NYCPT to resume sending the funds.

One faculty member recalled Shire commenting shortly following this meeting that “[n]o one would call me a weakling anymore” since the resolute style he had adopted at the meeting was a departure from his more typical conciliatory stance. New Jersey Board members generally did not wish to secede but felt it was the only possible response to NYCPT’s refusal to return the monies. Not long after this meeting, the NYCPT-NJ Board concluded that it had no choice but to have the organization disassociate from NYCPT. One participant recalls it as being “a painful decision.”

In addition to the toxicity that rumors of a split easily could create, as noted above, the New Jersey Board recognized that separation would be especially

difficult for candidates, who might feel conflict between, for example, their supervisors and their analysts, depending upon their respective loyalties. As a result, the Board decided to undertake the split as quietly as possible by keeping their intentions confidential until they were ready to make an announcement fully explaining what was transpiring and providing the organization's plans for the future. The Board also agreed to avoid attacking NYCPT in its notice to New Jersey faculty and candidates announcing its decision.

The formal decision to separate from NYCPT was taken by the New Jersey Board shortly thereafter, although no minutes of this decision are in the files of the Institute. In a four-page letter to candidates dated December 13th signed by Shire and nine other Board members, the Board announced its decision to disaffiliate. Three reasons were offered:

1. Financial exigencies. The letter observed that NYCPT was in "serious financial difficulty" and lamented that its solution was to rescind the 'distribution-of-funds agreement' that returned one third of New Jersey tuition to IPPNJ in favor of a single centralized budget for all of NYCPT, including its activities in New York City, Long Island, Rockland County, as well as New Jersey. The New Jersey Board feared this arrangement would destroy IPPNJ's "freedom to function with relative autonomy" and would make certain New Jersey projects impossible. That is, New Jersey needed money for

“more administrative help, better recordkeeping, better communications and public relations...for a library, a place to have professional meetings, and funds to have them more frequently...for local projects such as workshops, scientific meetings and programs geared to specific contemporary needs...for possible future development of training programs in group analysis, child analysis and psychoanalytically oriented family therapy....”

2. NYCPT’s efforts to join the IPA. The letter characterized this as “a less compelling but still serious influence on our decision to disaffiliate.” It cited in particular the IPA membership requirement to establish

a separate status of Training Analyst, thus setting up a hierarchical system among faculty members that most of us in New Jersey feel would do more harm than good.

IPPNJ’s letter observed that “the wish to join seems very strong among New York members, while New Jersey people seem to us predominantly indifferent, skeptical or negative about the implications of this pursuit.”

3. Incidental Considerations. Several instances of “administrative lapses, miscommunications and/or insensitive dealings with candidates and faculty by the central NYCPT office” led the IPPNJ Board to conclude that “we should try

to do better...as a local institute. We cannot promise to run an administratively superior ship from New Jersey, but we are hereby promising to try.”

Although not expressed in the letter, one additional underlying reason for separation was that some New Jersey faculty were unhappy with what they perceived to be a “one man operation” at NYCPT and instead favored a more egalitarian and democratic organization.

The Board’s letter to the New Jersey candidates emphasized that the determination to disaffiliate “does not reflect any serious philosophical or theoretical differences between New York and New Jersey analysts:

IPPNJ will continue to be a mainstream Freudian institute, in which all psychoanalytic points of view will be welcome, but which will require of its students a thorough grounding in Freud and in traditional drive theory and ego psychology.

Candidates were given the option of continuing their psychoanalytic training at either IPPNJ or NYCPT, “wherever they are most comfortable.”

The letter acknowledged in conclusion that disaffiliation “will doubtless cause stress, strain and misunderstanding among many of us.” It noted that New Jersey’s ties to NYCPT were based on “respect for its Freudian tradition, its accomplishments in psychoanalytic education, its dedicated faculty, and the

personal ties many of us have there[,]” and it mourned “the loss of a valuable connection.”

NYCPT responded several days later in a scathing five-page “Dear Colleague” letter written to faculty and candidates (presumably of both institutes) and signed by Streaan. The letter began by noting that its author

was experiencing a profound feeling of loss and disappointment as well as shock at what I feel is probably the most unethical betrayal I have observed in close to four decades of professional life.

The NYCPT position was that IPPNJ had been seeking “financial autonomy” during the prior two years and had threatened to “take the money and run” if it did not receive *all* of the monies that derived from the New Jersey Division. Streaan pointed out that NYCPT had been advised by its accountant five months earlier that if each division of the institute — presumably referring to Long Island and Rockland County, as well as to New Jersey — were to continue to receive one third of its candidates’ tuition, the institute would “go broke.” He then referenced a decision taken by a close vote of the Board of NYCPT ten days earlier that provided as follows:

In lieu of the one-third allotment, for one year and one year only, each division would submit a budget to the Finance Committee who

will recommend to the Board, what each division will receive.
The NYCPT Board will be the final arbiter.

Strean criticized the IPPNJ Board for “[having made] active plans to disaffiliate if the vote [of the NYCPT Board] did not go the way they wanted it to go” even while “negotiations and deliberations were taking place regarding the...financial situation.” The letter caustically observed,

Many of us on the NYCPT Board are still smarting from this very deceptive activity by individuals whom we regarded as colleagues and friends.

NYCPT’s letter acknowledged the “strain” that had existed between itself and IPPNJ “for some time.” Whereas for IPPNJ the grounds for disassociation were primarily financial, as noted, Strean’s letter attributed the split more broadly to “financial, political, interpersonal, ideological and educational tensions.” With regards to membership in the IPA, Strean stated it was likely that NYCPT, along with most of its members, would become part of the IPA, and, in sharp contrast to IPPNJ’s view, asserted that

the hierarchies, caste and class systems and divisiveness are envisioned by those on the New Jersey Board who have traditionally provoked them and are trying to sustain them.

As noted, the earlier letter of the IPPNJ Board had neutrally suggested that candidates continue their training at the institute where they felt most comfortable, but Streaun ended the letter by pointedly urging candidates to maintain their affiliation with New York:

If you are interested in continued training in Freudian Analysis with master teachers who are highly regarded psychoanalytic scholars, clinicians and supervisors, you will want to remain with NYCPT...For those students in New Jersey who are more interested in training in eclectic psychotherapy and who do not wish intensive training in Freudian analysis, we believe that you will not be happy staying with NYCPT. Many of the faculty, but not all, who will remain with IPPNJ do not see themselves primarily as Freudian analysts, and are not considered expert clinicians, theorists or teachers in Freudian theory and in Freudian practice.

The IPPNJ Board answered the NYCPT letter ten days later. It denied Streaun's claim that New Jersey had been "unethical and duplicitous" in not publicly disclosing the possibility of disaffiliation and explained the harm that would have resulted to candidates and to the overall relationship between the two groups had IPPNJ made the possibility of disaffiliation known before the December vote of the NYCPT Board. The reply "categorically rejected" Streaun's claim that IPPNJ had insisted upon retaining all New Jersey tuition payments, but it acknowledged that in earlier discussions the New Jersey Division had pointed

out that if the relationship were to be truly equitable, New Jersey would be entitled to receive more than one-third of its payments “considering our respective numbers of students in New Jersey and New York.”

Perhaps most significantly, the IPPNJ reply “emphatically den[ied] that our disaffiliation has anything to do with orthodoxy vs. heresy, or Freudian discipline vs. eclectic muddle-headedness.” It took sharp issue with Strean’s “demeaning tone towards our faculty” and stated that “Dr. Strean’s depiction of us as only dubiously esteemed as analysts is an insult to our members, who were trained at reputable and rigorous institutes.”

The separation strained relations among colleagues and many warm and friendly relationships of long standing did not survive. One interviewee recalled, in an understatement, that this period “was not a fun time” and that the separation between IPPNJ and NYCPT caused a “split in my heart” since this analyst had “great feelings” for both organizations and that “it was better when we all were friends.” Another recalled being “disappointed and bereft” about the split because of strong attachments to faculty in both institutes. Years later, one observer remarked that, ultimately, the fallout from this separation was less painful than the consequences of some New York institute splits and also less distressing to candidates and faculty than divisions that later arose at other psychoanalytic institutes, such as those in Denver and Minneapolis/St. Paul. This was partly due to the fact that “the IPPNJ Board members loved and

trusted AI, whose leadership style was respectful and egalitarian and who was sensitive to individual feelings about the split.”

IPPNJ Following Independence

Written records were largely unavailable for the period that followed IPPNJ’s independence. There is reference to a letter having been sent to candidates nearly one year later, in October 1990, that outlined the requirements for progressing through the psychoanalytic training program. It was noted in a letter to candidates circulated the following year that the training requirements for both the three-year psychotherapy program and the six-year psychoanalytic program “[are] the same NYCPT requirements we have been operating with since disaffiliation.” Among other requirements, personal analysis was required with a recognized psychoanalyst three times per week, but twice-per-week analysis was permitted at the beginning of the analysis. Shire remained Director, Richman remained Associate Director, and Ruth Karr was IPPNJ’s Director of Training. McWilliams served as Secretary for five years following IPPNJ’s disaffiliation from NYCPT, and was succeeded by Helene Schwartzbach for another five years. Linda Meyers served as Treasure for four years.

Draft By-laws were proposed in 1992 and adopted early the next year, although no adopted version was located. Interestingly, Article I, Section 1 harkens back to the very early days of the institute:

The organization was incorporated on December 1 [stet], 1984 under the laws of the State of New Jersey as a non-profit corporation, having the name The Institute of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy, Inc. and operating as The Institute for Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy of New Jersey.

The Director of the institute was to be elected by the general membership for a five-year term commencing in 1995 and every five years thereafter. While the positions of Associate Director and Director of Training were “to be appointed by and hold office at the pleasure of the Director,” the By-laws provided that the positions of Treasurer and Dean of Students were to be elected by the general membership for initial two-year terms, to be followed by five-year terms. As had been stated in the minutes of an IPPNJ Board meeting that took place shortly before the decision to disassociate from NYCPT was taken, “[t]his dichotomous structure was decided upon to ensure democratic representation without losing the Directors’ ability to guide the institute effectively and get things done.” Three geographical areas of the Institute were identified — Bergen, Essex-Morris-Hudson and New Brunswick/Princeton — and coordinators for each area were to be appointed by the Director. Various standing committees were formed; these included Training, Curriculum, Ethics and Standards, Faculty

Appointments and Assignments and Membership and Admissions. Membership in IPPNJ did not automatically confer faculty status, which required appointment by the Faculty Appointments and Assignment Committee.

It was originally thought to establish a separate Training Institute within IPPNJ in order to fulfill one of the primary purposes of the organization,

to train qualified and interested professionals in the principles and practice of psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychology and psychotherapy.

By-laws, Article I, Section 2 b. This structure would have created a second organization within IPPNJ, resulting in two officer structures, a separate Board of Administrators, separate meetings and the like, and prospective candidates would have applied for admission to the Training Institute rather than to IPPNJ. Instead, the adopted By-laws simplified the organization by eliminating this parallel institute in favor of having IPPNJ itself be responsible for all aspects of training, including establishing the standards for admission and the requirements, fees and procedures. One additional change made to the proposed By-laws was to eliminate the requirement that By-Law amendments be made initially by the Board of Trustees, to be followed by a vote of the members. The revised version allowed amendments to be made simply upon a two-thirds vote of the voting members of the Board.

One additional provision of the By-laws is noteworthy. Section 11 of Article V provided that

unless decided by at least a two-thirds vote of the voting members of the Board, all decisions by the Board shall not be implemented until confirmed by the Board at its next meeting.

The presumed purpose of this delay provision was to give the Board the opportunity to reconsider decisions which, as demonstrated by the close vote, it had not wholeheartedly supported.

IPPNJ largely continued the classical approach to psychoanalytic training that had been practiced at NYCPT and by IPPNJ when it was affiliated with the New York institute, although one interviewee made a point of characterizing NYCPT as “a very very classical institute” but IPPNJ as only “classically oriented.” Draft Proposed Standards for analysts wishing to join IPPNJ, which were circulated for consideration among the membership shortly following disassociation, set forth the outlook of the new institute:

IPPNJ is a Freudian institute in that its members emphatically share Sigmund Freud’s conviction about the importance of understanding unconscious processes, particularly as they appear in transferences and resistances, as the means to maximize human freedom to love, work and find pleasure. We also respect

the vast amount of disciplined and creative thinking that has enriched the field since the time of Freud, building on his discoveries....IPPNJ welcomes students who take the unconscious seriously and wish to immerse themselves in the most intensive, extensive exposure to their own unconscious lives and the subjective lives of their patients.

The Proposed Standards also noted more specifically that most Jungian, Adlerian, Rankian and Reichian practitioners would be excluded from admission, while analysts trained at more mainstream institutes including, among others, the White Institute and the New York University Post-Doctoral Program, and where a substantial part of the applicant's training was Freudian, likely would be admitted.

Several interviewees agreed that IPPNJ also followed a more "contemporary orientation" than NYCPT. That is, "[t]he institute maintained its basis in Freud, but also branched out into other theorists such as [Heinz] Kohut and [Stephen] Mitchell." One observer expressed it this way: "IPPNJ was steeped in a classical approach, but was informed by a contemporary outlook."

Meanwhile, as noted above, NYCPT had applied for membership in the IPA shortly following IPPNJ's disaffiliation. In furtherance of its application, as noted, the institute increased the number of analytic hours required of candidates and upgraded the standards required for control analysis. One

interviewee recalls that “members [of NYCPT] spent many hours in interviews eager for acceptance.” Ultimately, unlike, for example, the New York Society for Freudian Psychologists and the Institute for Psychoanalytic Studies, which were accepted into membership by IPA, NYCPT’s application was denied. One observer speculated that a possible reason for the rejection was an anonymous letter sent to the IPA evaluation committee that described the organizational functioning of NYCPT as “less than ethical.” Another reason for the denial could have been the recent turmoil with IPPNJ. This rejection was a “big blow” to Fine, Streaan and NYCPT itself — one commentator recalled that membership in the IPA was “Reuben’s dream” — and along with the other reasons noted above, likely contributed to the ultimate demise of the institute.

One interviewee pointedly observed that the IPPNJ By-law requirement to elect the Director periodically — one draft of the By-laws called for election of the Director every three years beginning in 1995, while the final version called for Director elections every five years — was honored in the breach, and that no elections took place once the institute began operating independently. This practice appears somewhat surprising in light of the fact that one feature of NYCPT that IPPNJ members reported being uncomfortable with during the period leading up to disassociation was the more authoritarian and centralized structure of NYCPT, that is, that it was a “one man operation.” Several interviewees commented that elections were proposed at IPPNJ more than once but were rejected. One reason offered as to why none were held was that “ [the

Board] could get AI to do whatever was needed for IPPNJ.” Another was that the effort to hold an election would have been burdensome and so there was “no strong support for creating the ‘tidal waves’ that would have been needed to start the [election] process.” The institute was doing well in the years following independence and, as noted, Shire was held in especially high regard by members of the institute. Some faculty were put off by the idea of an election and even thought it might be viewed as an affront to Shire. Notwithstanding, certain Board members were subject to term limits, and new Board members were selected by alternately choosing a senior faculty member followed by a junior faculty member.

Susan Herman served as Treasurer of IPPNJ for four years, during which time she helped the organization enhance its financial solvency. She also helped establish a community “clinic without walls.” Dr. Herman and Helene Goldschmidt directed the clinic, which provided patients with low-cost psychodynamic treatment, brought in revenue — a percentage of the patients’ fees were contributed to the institute — and introduced patients to candidates who were required to complete a certain number of analytic hours. Significant uncertainty had been expressed by the Board of Directors prior to disaffiliation from NYCPT as to how the clinic should be treated in the event disaffiliation were to take place. As the minutes of one Board meeting during that period put it,

The clinic. Ah! the clinic. This discussion concluded with ambivalence on the part of most members of the committee.

Everybody agreed that Dr. Herman has done an incredible job as the effective CEO of the clinic. However, aside from the money the clinic brings in, there was a real question of whether it should continue.

The creation of CCAPS

CCAPS was formed in 1992 and was formally incorporated in May of that year. The new institute originally was going to be named Center for Advanced Psychoanalytic Studies, but the acronym “CAPS” was already being used by another organization in an unrelated field, hence, the need to add “Contemporary” to the name. Irwin (Larry) Kutash and Steven Dranoff, colleagues and friends, founded the institute. Dr. Kutash had been a member of the Board of IPPNJ since the very early years of the organization. He served as Director of the Essex Division of the institute for a dozen years and had taught the Technique of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy course. Kutash had completed his psychoanalytic training at the Post Graduate Center for Mental Health in New York, and had published many books and numerous articles. He served as Dean of CCAPS — a more academic designation than the term “Director” that was used at NYCPT, IPPNJ and other psychoanalytic institutes — from its founding until 2001.

Dr. Dranoff also had been on the Board of IPPNJ and also had completed his analytic training at the Post Graduate Center. He drew on his organizational expertise to help manage the institute. Shortly following its formation, Stanley Teitelbaum joined CCAPS as Dean of Training, a position in which he served for about five years. Dr. Teitelbaum also had been on the faculty of IPPNJ and also did his psychoanalytic training at the Post Graduate Center, where he had known Kutash and Dranoff.

One interviewee recalled that a “brouhaha” had resulted when Kutash and Dranoff announced to the IPPNJ Board of Directors that they were leaving to found CCAPS. Some at IPPNJ wondered why another institute was needed since another New Jersey psychoanalytic institute already was operating in the Bergen County area — the New Jersey Institute for the Training of Psychoanalysis, located in Teaneck and founded by Joel Bernstein. IPPNJ was a growing institute at the time, and many on the faculty were disheartened when members departed to form a competitor. Some saw a process at work that was remarkably parallel to the disassociation of IPPNJ from NYCPT, only now it was IPPNJ’s turn to feel aggrieved by the departure of faculty for a new institute.

Kutash persuaded a number of “luminaries” to join CCAPS. For example, Thea Bry, a leading child analyst who had trained with Anna Freud and who was described as “a mentor to and revered by many,” and Alexander Wolf, the creator of group psychoanalysis, both joined the faculty of the new institute.

John Duryee, who was a member of the faculty of Fairleigh Dickinson University (FDU) at its Madison/Florham Park campus, helped CCAPS become a post-graduate program at the University. (Similar post-graduate programs in psychoanalysis had been based at New York University and Adelphi University.) Dr. Duryee had obtained his analytic training at the NYU Post-Doctoral Program in Psychology and Psychoanalysis; while at CCAPS he taught classes, served as a training analyst and senior supervisor, and held the title of Associate Dean of Training. Later, Alan Cooper, who had been Director of Training at the White Institute, also joined CCAPS as Director of Training. Geralynn Dranoff, a non-professional in the psychoanalytic field who was described as a “gem” and who “had a large amount of organizational information at her fingertips,” served as Secretary until shortly before the later merger with IPPNJ. Cathy van Voorhees was then hired as the part-time administrative secretary of the organization, and in more recent years was described as the “glue that [has] held [CPPNJ] together for so many years.”

One benefit from affiliating with FDU was that it allowed CCAPS’ candidates and faculty access to the university’s library and classroom space. In fact, for a period of time, CCAPS was known as “CCAPS at FDU,” and institute faculty became ‘adjunct faculty’ at the University. CCAPS was organized as “in but not of” FDU. That is, for example, none of the CCAPS faculty was compensated by the University. CCAPS had access to classrooms and received a discount from standard University rates when it leased space at, for example, Lenfell Hall,

and for other activities. It is not clear whether CCAPS candidates had access to FDU books although, as noted, they were able to use library facilities. One faculty member lamented that CCAPS' own books were located "in an uninviting windowless room" on the campus in a space that was not much used. Years later, James Garofallou, then the Dean of CCAPS, attempted to also affiliate the institute with the Teaneck campus of FDU but the psychology faculty at that location were skeptical of psychoanalysis and followed a behavioral approach and so the arrangement was not established.

Central to the philosophy that Kutash and Dranoff applied in developing CCAPS is that it would embrace different psychoanalytic approaches. Kutash believed that candidates should be exposed to varying analytic orientations so they could select which approach(es) worked best for them. One commentator referred to CCAPS as "open-minded" and without a particular psychoanalytic orientation. For example, *The Psychotherapy Casebook*, edited by Kutash and Wolf, contained 30 theories and techniques. Those former CCAPS faculty who were interviewed for this history confirmed that the institute exposed its candidates to a variety of psychoanalytic approaches and encouraged them to find their own. One commentator likened the diversity of faculty backgrounds to the different analytic backgrounds of the faculty at Westchester Center for the Study of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy.

This eclectic approach was expressed at the beginning of the 1993-94 CCAPS Faculty Directory, as follows:

Our programs are unique in concept and vision. For example, our Training Program in Adult Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy begins with a foundation in traditional classical theory and technique, including an ongoing series of courses in developmental theory. We proceed to training in Object Relations, Ego, Self, Interpersonal and the newest cutting edge approaches. We conclude with courses that integrate this learning and help candidates find their own style and philosophy.

CCAPS established a one-year program to enable candidates to assess at an early stage whether this was the path they wished to take. As noted, it established a child and adolescent program run by Dr. Bry; this program later was run by Nicholas Papouchis, who was Director of the Long Island University program in Clinical Psychology, and then by Martin Silverman, a child psychoanalyst who had been on the faculty of the NYU Post-Doctoral program. CCAPS also established a supervisory training program directed by Dr. Teitelbaum and a four-year program leading to a certificate in psychoanalysis. Another initiative was providing continuing education for clinicians in the area. The 1993-94 Faculty Directory listed 62 faculty members, about one half of whom had their office in New York.

One interviewee characterized CCAPS' curriculum as being "broad, and somewhat less in the traditional mode than some institutes, including perhaps IPPNJ, which was more traditional." Another noted that psychoanalytic training was "in vogue" when CCAPS was formed, and that the new institute, likened at the outset to a "baby needing nourishment," integrated Object Relations and Self-Psychology into its coursework. In contrast, institutes such as the NYU Post-Doctoral program offered courses in these subjects but on separate tracks from the more traditional Freudian approach. From the perspective of IPPNJ, "IPPNJ has historically been classically oriented while CCAPS has had a more organic flow."

One noteworthy difference between CCAPS and IPPNJ was that CCAPS required its candidates to complete their training in four consecutive years, while IPPNJ permitted candidates to complete training over a longer period of time. One benefit to the CCAPS approach that was commented upon was that it enabled candidates to form a cohort, something otherwise more difficult to achieve in New Jersey than in New York City because of the longer distances that need to be traveled.

Another difference between the two institutes was that IPPNJ had a "Ready for Control" examination at the end of the third year, whereas CCAPS did not believe this interim step was necessary. Nor did CCAPS require end-of-

semester exams or papers, as IPPNJ did. Notwithstanding their differences, by all accounts “cross-fertilization” between the institutes took place during the years they operated separately. The number of members at IPPNJ typically was two or three times greater than the membership of CCAPS.

One interviewee recalled the years at CCAPS as “robust and fun” and that the institute was “vibrant.” Others remembered that Kutash was “devoted to the institute, and made participants feel wanted,” and that he was a “great, funny and a smart teacher.” One commentator believed his ambition was to create an institute on par with those in New York; another recalled in a similar vein that Kutash had “swung for the fences.” One interviewee reflected that “Larry achieved his goal to create a wide and varied curriculum, as well as a beneficial connection with FDU.” Years later, when he retired and moved to California, CCAPS held a dinner at FDU in Kutash’s honor where he was declared “Dean Emeritus in Perpetuity.”

The 1990s and Beyond

As had been the case during the 1980s, as noted, interest in psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic training remained high in New Jersey during the following decade. At IPPNJ, Shire and Richman continued to serve as Director and Associate Director, respectively, and at CCAPS, Kutash and Dranoff served, respectively, as Dean and Assistant Dean. The leadership at IPPNJ changed

shortly before the end of the decade, and not long after that a similar transition took place at CCAPS.

In August 1999, Shire and his wife were strolling together one evening in downtown Maplewood when, as described by The New York Times, a “torrent of bricks” from a nearby building suddenly rained down on them, killing Shire’s wife instantly and injuring Shire. Shire resigned as Director of IPPNJ not long after this tragedy, and Richman’s resignation followed. Before leaving the institute, Shire appointed Irwin Badin to assume the Director position.

Dr. Badin had completed his psychoanalytic training at NPAP in 1988 and shortly thereafter was introduced to IPPNJ, where not long afterwards Shire asked him to teach a class whose instructor had become unavailable. Badin taught psychoanalysis and supervised candidates at IPPNJ for the next decade and also served on the psychology faculty of Montclair State University for many years prior to, during and after serving as IPPNJ Director. By all accounts, Badin was a “charismatic teacher” who also had “good organizational ability.” One interviewee noted that, like Shire, Badin was a “collaborative leader.” As Director, Badin appointed Veronica Bearison to serve as Associate Director, a position which she held until IPPNJ consolidated with CCAPS. Bearison had received her analytic training at IPPNJ when it was a Division of NYCPT and was one of the first graduates of the newly independent institute in 1990. Badin and Bearison continued to lead IPPNJ “as AI had run it.”

Just a short time later at CCAPS, in 2001, Kutash appointed Garofallou as Dean. Garofallou had received his psychoanalytic certificate from the William Alanson White Institute, which had had an interpersonal approach rather than a traditional Freudian orientation. Garofallou reported that the leadership transition took place as follows:

The hand-off was simple. Larry and I met for lunch during the summer at a diner near Larry's office in Livingston. Larry handed me an eight-inch stack of the institute's papers and wished me luck.

Garofallou went on summer vacation shortly thereafter and used the opportunity to gather ideas for the institute. He served as Dean until the consolidation with IPPNJ. No election took place for Dean, or for any other CCAPS office, during the years Garofallou led the institute.

While Dean, Garofallou established several new committees, such as a Program Committee and an Admissions/Recruiting Committee. What sometimes had had an "ad hoc quality" was given greater organization. Garofallou also tried to organize the faculty to provide greater outreach to the public.

One suggestion made during Garofallou's tenure as Dean was to include attorneys, accountants, real estate professionals and other non-psychoanalytic

professionals on the Board of Trustees, as had been the case at the White Institute. The idea behind this proposal was that non-psychoanalytic professionals would provide additional structure for the institute as well as access to additional funding, including from Board members themselves. This suggestion met with resistance among the CCAPS faculty. Many believed that including non-psychoanalytic professionals on the Board would cause the institute to lose direction since they feared that trustees who were not themselves psychoanalysts would then be in charge. Ultimately, several non-analytic professionals were appointed as advisors, but they lacked the authority that trustees are able to exert.

The CCAPS Faculty/Candidate Directory of October 2008 listed 39 Faculty, 12 Candidates, three graduates of the three-year Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy Program and four graduates of the full Psychoanalysis Program. Thirteen New Jersey counties plus New York City were represented by the faculty and candidates who had connections with Managed Care Panels from ten different insurance companies. Illustrating the great variety of its program, 16 specialties were listed, including Addictions, Bereavement/Grief, Chronic/Terminal Illness, Creative Artists, Generations of the Holocaust, Hypnotherapy, Mind/body Connection and Trauma/Dissociation.

Consolidation of the Institutes

Interest in psychoanalysis began to wane during the first decade of the new century, a development that was not unique to these institutes nor New Jersey. One commentator referred to it as a “loss of momentum.” Various reasons have been cited for this decline, prominent among them was the advent of shorter treatment modalities such as different behavioral approaches, and the influence of insurance companies, especially managed care, in shortening the length of therapy for which coverage was made available.

One interviewee recalled that CCAPS had had good years but also poor ones, and that the same likely had held true for IPPNJ. One interviewee characterized each institute as “top-heavy,” that is, with many supervisors and faculty but few candidates. By the mid-to-late 1990s, the number of candidates at IPPNJ had dwindled to a handful, and one interviewee recalled that CCAPS had had a similarly small number. It was suggested by some that, in addition to the factors noted above, the weak enrollment each institute experienced was due to the competition between them. University graduate programs also had reduced teaching psychoanalysis in favor of approaches such as Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT). It also was observed that the symptom-focused approach to health care, including to both mental and physical health, had influenced the general public as illustrated, for example, by the liberal use of medication in treating depression and anxiety.

In light of the declining enrollment in each institute, interviewees observed that “the institutes needed to join together to survive” and that a reason for the decline was that the two institutes “split the pool of candidates.” Another commentator thought joining the two institutes would be “natural” and, as noted, a third commented on the cross-fertilization between the institutes that had taken place during the years they were both operating. Yet, consolidation of psychoanalytic institutes may have been unprecedented.

During the early- to mid-2000s, and with the approval of the Board of Directors of IPPNJ, Badin approach Garofallou to explore the possibility of consolidating the two institutes. A third institute, the New Jersey Institute for Analytic Training (NJAT), based in Bergen County, originally was considered as part of this concept. Accordingly, Badin, Garofallou and Cynthia Eisenberg of NJAT met at a diner on Route 4 to discuss combining the three institutes. NJAT was only “lukewarm” about the idea, however. Also, NJAT accepted non-licensed candidates, a policy which IPPNJ was willing to consider but CCAPS was not. Ultimately, IPPNJ agreed to restrict candidates only to licensed practitioners, but in any event NJAT dropped out of these conversations early in the process.

Garofallou and Badin continued their discussions via weekly meetings at Garofallou’s Montclair office on Friday afternoons. In all, Garofallou and Badin met for several years in an effort to work out the terms of the combination of the institutes. [The term ‘consolidation’ applies when two organizations combine to

form a third and the first two cease to exist, which is what took place here, notwithstanding that the combination of CCAPS and IPPNJ is universally referred to as a 'merger'.] Other representatives of each institute also met in an effort to develop a unified approach to many areas of mutual interest.

The most significant issue that was considered by representatives of the two institutes was the number of sessions per week that would be required to qualify for certification as a psychoanalyst. A related issue was the extent to which time 'on the couch' would be required, as some IPPNJ analysts at that time were moving away from using the couch with some psychoanalytic patients. Various differences between the institutes needed to be resolved in order to establish a single organization. To cite but two examples, CCAPS had both lay and professional Boards of Directors, whereas IPPNJ had only a professional Board; CCAPS employed a paid administrator, but IPPNJ did not.

Curriculum was a significant area of difference between the institutes. For example, as noted, CCAPS did not use IPPNJ's third-year "ready for control" test, but this practice was incorporated into the consolidated institute. Another difference was that IPPNJ organized its courses around analytic concepts, such as transference, resistance and the like, while CCAPS tended to organize its curriculum based on clinical conditions and schools of thought. In this regard, representatives of each institute's Training Committee met periodically in an effort to merge the training aspects of each.

Critical to negotiations was that Garofallou and Badin trusted each other, had a “rock steady” relationship and became “treasured friends.” Both men had joined together several years earlier, along with a representative of NJIAT, in an unsuccessful effort to forestall adoption of legislation establishing a licensing program for psychoanalysts. In fact, it was their collaboration on that effort that facilitated subsequent conversations about the possibility of merging their respective institutes. Coincidentally, it also happened that both Badin and Garofallou had had the same first analyst.

One element of the merger that proceeded as smoothly as any other was the formation and development of the Couples Division. Daniel Goldberg, who had completed his psychoanalytic training at IPPNJ and also had trained in Couples and Family Therapy at New York University and at the Center for Family Learning, spearheaded the effort to make the Couples Division a part of the consolidated institute that was then in the process of formation. Both Badin and Garofallou were in favor of including a couples program as part of regular training in the new institute, but ultimately it was determined to make it a separate division.

Dr. Goldberg reached out to Tom Johnson, who had trained at IPPNJ but completed his training on the Relational track of the NYU Post-Doctoral Program, to ascertain his interest in doing couples work in the context of a

psychoanalytic institute. Goldberg, Johnson and Rose Oosting from CCAPS worked together for several years leading up to and following consolidation to develop a two-year training program for faculty. The Couples Division faculty, ultimately comprising about 20 participants, met once or twice per month at Dr. Oosting's home to discuss basic texts in couples therapy in order to develop a teaching model. As one observer noted, as consolidation discussions among Badin, Garofallou and others from IPPNJ and CCAPS were taking place, the Couples Division already was "actually doing it," that is, working together to develop a joint program.

Ultimately, the Couples Division developed as a parallel program to the 'core program' of CPPNJ. It had its own curriculum and faculty, about ten candidates per year participated, and it issued its own certificate upon the completion of a two-year training program. This organizational structure proved to be problematic as time went by, however, as faculty who were not in the program began to view it as "taking energy away" from the central mission of the Institute. Another observer commented that the program began to be perceived as "wanting to do its own thing" and wishing to become separate from the other parts of the Institute. In this context, one faculty member recalled that the couples program needed its "mother and father," that is, CPPNJ, less and less as it grew. As well, some viewed the Couples Program as insufficiently psychoanalytic for an institute with a strong commitment to a psychoanalysis as the primary treatment approach.

Over time, there was “an insufficient infusion of new energy” into the program, a development that also impacted programs at family therapy institutes generally. Ultimately, years later, the Couples Division devolved into a continuing education model, similar to the Child and Adolescent Interest Group (“CAIG”) that developed years later within the Institute.

In order to avoid future conflicts, Badin and Garofallou strove to make sure each predecessor institute was equally represented on the Board of Directors of the consolidated organization. Their goal was to bring the best of their respective programs into the new Institute, and to provide coherence and clarity to the structure. As discussions continued, the general memberships of the institutes held one or more joint meetings.

As described in the minutes of an IPPNJ Board meeting held in October 2006, the two institutes “were now committed to the process of making the creation of a new institute happen rather than just exploring the idea.” Minutes of a slightly earlier IPPNJ Board meeting reflect that Badin and Garofallou by that time had worked out a tentative organizational chart in the event consolidation of the two institutes were to take place. The accounting firm that effected the consolidation submitted a proposal to CCAPS to perform this work in May 2007, indicating that enough progress had been made by that date to begin the lengthy consolidation process. CPPNJ was incorporated in January 2008, illustrating

that by that time the two institutes had formally agreed to come together and had selected the name of the successor institute. Actual consolidation did not take effect until 2009, however, since approval of the new organization's tax-exempt status was needed before formal consolidation could take place. A joint Board of Directors was established in late 2008 in which a representative of each institute filled each Board position. Initial By-laws were adopted unanimously by the joint Board in October 2008. The Certificate of Consolidation was filed in August 2009. Calendars for each institute for the 2008-2009 academic year indicate that, although they were continuing to operate separately, a spring conference was held jointly in April 2009. Each institute held its final independent graduation in June of that year.

The initial Board of Directors of CPPNJ was comprised of representatives of each predecessor institute, as noted, with co-Directors established for Executive Director and Treasurer positions and for Training, Admissions, By-laws and Candidates committees. One faculty member who was involved in the consolidation process expressed pride at his work in "bringing the two institutes together for a common goal." Badin and Garofallou served for two years as Interim Co-Directors of the new Institute, at which point they relinquished their positions. Seth Warren, who had completed his analytic training at the NYU Post-Doctoral Program, had been a member of the IPPNJ faculty and had served as a member of the Interim Board of Directors as the consolidation was

taking place, was elected Director of CPPNJ in the Spring of 2010.

Consolidation had been achieved and the new institute was fully underway.