

Dear AGAP Members,

What follows is a communication that was sent by the ExCo to all IAAP society presidents on November 11, 2009. We encourage your discussion of the matters either among yourselves and/or via the online forum that will be activated from January 4 to February 4, 2010. By January 4<sup>th</sup>, the link to this forum will be posted at AGAP's website, <[www.agap.info](http://www.agap.info)>.

Best regards,  
Your ExCo

---

Society President,

The next IAAP Congress will take place in less than a year in Montreal. At that time the Delegates Meeting is of major importance because members of the IAAP, through their delegates, can hear about what is happening in the Executive Committee and can voice the concerns of all IAAP members. If we, the members, know and understand how the IAAP functions, particularly how all the elections work, we will make more informed decisions and be better prepared to understand and evaluate the priorities that the IAAP Executive Committee sets for us all.

In the attached document [below], we explain the election procedures (as we understand them) and their implications. It is our hope that this document can be shared and discussed with all members of your society, especially in view of the up-coming Council of Societies in February. We would of course be interested in any responses to the attached document. But most of all, we hope that all members will reflect on this information, contribute with more awareness and speak out for their interests and concerns at the Council of Societies meeting to be held in Zurich on Friday, February 5, 2010 and at the Delegates Meeting, Wednesday afternoon, 25th August, 2010 during the Montreal Congress.

Sincerely,

Craig Stephenson, Jacqueline Wright, Jutta von Buchholtz, Ursula Ulmer  
For the AGAP Executive Committee  
Sent by Deborah Egger, President, AGAP

#### 1. Election of the Executive Committee (EC) of the IAAP:

The EC is composed of two sections. One section consists of five officers: the President, President-Elect, two Vice-Presidents and an Honorary Secretary. The other section consists of nine Society Representatives. On one level the election process is straightforward and obvious; on another level there are activities that are not visible and not necessarily understood by the IAAP members.

The nine Society Representatives are elected from the fifty-two member Societies. There are terms of rotation so that no Society can serve more than two consecutive three-year terms. This system was initiated by IAAP past president Verena Kast and is working well.

With regard to the five IAAP officers, the situation is different. The President-Elect has

always become President, confirmed by a vote. The Honorary Secretary is appointed by the President, not elected. The positions open for election are the President-Elect and the two Vice Presidents. For the President-Elect the choice is between the two current Vice-Presidents. Although nominations from the floor are allowed, this doesn't really happen, meaning that no one new comes into the group of Officers. This creates a self-perpetuating system with only a shift of positions. It becomes clear that the same persons are usually in these offices of the Executive Committee for many years.

The only effectively open and genuine contests are for the two Vice-President positions. Do we understand and accept that, for the leadership of an association with over 3000 members, effectively two positions among the five officers are the only openly elected ones? Also, do we find it healthy for our organization that the two Vice-Presidents, after working along side each other for years, are then pitted against each other for such a contested position as President-Elect?

## 2. Voting Procedures

Voting for open positions on the Executive Committee takes place every three years at the Congress Delegates Meeting. Each society has a certain number of votes, depending upon its size. If a large society is unable to fill its number of designated delegate seats, then a few delegates may be authorized to carry a significant number of proxy votes. This process may result in fewer people representing the diversity of the membership. It also makes it easier for large groups to lobby and obtain many votes for one candidate.

Though it is not openly acknowledged, lobbying and trading of votes between societies takes place before and even during the Delegates meeting. An agreement may be reached between one or two large societies that may result in a significant number of block votes directed toward certain candidates in exchange for reciprocal support for other candidates or issues. If two or three of the largest societies agree among themselves whom they would like to have serving as an officer in the Executive Committee, it is relatively easy to press smaller societies into trading votes in return for a post as a society representative in the actual or in future elections. The consequences of this procedure are that the outcomes of the elections become predictable and the election procedures at the Delegates' meeting become a mere formality. Since the larger societies have historically occupied the positions of the Executive Committee Officers, there is little chance for any significant leadership change.

Would it not serve the spirit of openness and transparency if the voting procedures, which include lobbying and trading votes, were made clearer to everyone? Does the current procedure strengthen IAAP as a whole or does it tend to undermine the quality of the democratic process and limit the participation of minority views? Do we need to explore new policies in relation to trading votes that might support a more open system and greater representation among the membership?

## 3. Good Governance

As outlined earlier, the Executive Committee is made up of five Officers and nine Society Representatives. With regard to these nine Society Representatives, no society can keep a Representative on the Executive Committee for more than two consecutive terms. This rule of rotation ensures that societies can stay on the Executive Committee only for a maximum of six years.

Unfortunately, the Executive Committee as a whole meets altogether only once a year. The five Officers meet, but the nine Society Representatives mainly do commit-

tee work and send their recommendations to the Officers who make the on-going decisions. As a result, even though the Society Representatives rotate, their role in the Executive Committee is much weaker than the role of the self-perpetuating Officers.

The recently established Council of Societies meets usually in Zurich in February of the same year as the IAAP Congress. At this meeting, Societies should learn about positions on the Executive Committee that will need to be filled and items that will be on the agenda at the Delegates Meeting at the Congress in August. Unfortunately, small societies and those far from Zurich cannot attend the Council of Societies because of the expense. As a result, many delegates arrive at the Delegates Meeting at the Congress and do not know which persons are to be voted on or which issues are to be debated.

Introducing a rotational system for Society Representatives and establishing a Council of Societies were two ways of promoting the principle of good governance into our system. However, their importance in our government has decreased. How effectively can Society Representatives contribute to governing if they are not present at all the Executive Committee meetings? What organizational or budgetary changes would make it possible for Society Representatives to be present at all Executive Committee meetings? And how effectively can the Council of Societies communicate information if none of their members can attend the February Council meeting? How can the Council of Societies better prepare all Delegates of all Societies to prepare for the Congress and to maximize the democratic process?

4. The Router Program: Could it be seen as an example of how the present election procedures, lack of transparency and governance issues can create problems?

At the IAAP International Congresses in Barcelona and Cape Town, large numbers of Router Program graduates received from the IAAP diplomas as Jungian analysts. But the IAAP website states under Individual Training through IAAP: "It should be noted that the IAAP does not conduct formal training as a part of its regular business. Formal training is a function of Member Groups with training privileges."

[http://iaap.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=98:individual-training-through-iaap&catid=221:individual-membership&Itemid=117](http://iaap.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=98:individual-training-through-iaap&catid=221:individual-membership&Itemid=117)

This contradiction raises difficult questions. Is the IAAP now functioning as a training organization or not? Are the IAAP EC expected to select trainers and define curriculum for a globalized Jungian training? Is the IAAP competing against and even undermining its member groups with training programs (to which these candidates could potentially apply for subsidized training)? How much of the IAAP budget contributed by member societies goes to the Router program? Are the member societies being well-served by their IAAP EC in this regard?

We encourage you to discuss these issues among your membership and think it important for democratic transparency that member societies know what is happening and voice their concerns at the Council of Societies in February as well as at the Delegates Meeting in Montreal.