

-1/29/76

H: Well, here we are back again for a second time. You have read over the transcript of the first interview?

F: Very superficially. I trusted you that it would be the way I would like it.

H: Well, I think it was quite understandable, no problem about that, and very interesting, and I think there are many things we could talk further about. For instance, one of the things I became aware of in reading over the interview was that we had very shortly gotten sidetracked away from your own history. I wonder if you would care to tell us about how you came into psychoanalysis in the first place?

F: It was a very broken up kind of treatment. I started ~~my~~ first treatment, then training, in Berlin, and when Hitler came I was in the beginning of it -- I had only one or two seminars at the Institute, and because there was no possibility to finish it at the time, and the threat of Hitler was too imminent to stay, I had to fall back on my previous training as a chemist~~x~~ and try to find a position to earn my living. So I left very early~~x~~ in 1933, in fact in March, because of the conviction that things would not only not get better~~x~~ but worse; and went first to Holland, stayed there for a little while, and then went to Paris and worked there, as I said, in my old profession as a chemist in a factory, which was a marvelous experience~~x~~ because I got to know the French working class, which was quite impressive. I don't know whether you're interested to know something about that.

H: By all means, yes.

F: I had worked for a little while, at the time I started my training,

Q: Well, have we any back again for a second time. You have read over

the transcript of the first interview.

A: Very superficially. I trusted you that it would be the way I would

like it.

Q: Well, I think it was quite understandable, no problem about that,

and very interesting, and I think there are many things we could talk

further about. For instance, one of the things I became aware of in

reading over the interview was that we had very shortly gotten sidetracked

away from your own history. I wonder if you would care to tell us about

how you came into psychology in the first place.

A: It was a very broken up kind of treatment. I started as first

treatment, then training, in Berlin, and when Hitler came I was in

the beginning of it -- I had only one or two seminars at the Institute,

and because there was no possibility to finish it at the time, and

the threat of Hitler was too imminent to stay, I had to fall back on

my previous training as a chemist, and try to find a position to earn

my living. So I left very early in 1933, in fact in March, because

of the conviction that things would not only not get better, but

worse; and went first to Holland, stayed there for a little while,

and then went to Paris and worked there, as I said, in my old profession

as a chemist in a factory, which was a marvelous experience because

I got to know the French working class, which was quite impressive.

I don't know whether you're interested to know something about that.

A: By all means, yes.

Q: I had worked for a little while, at the time I started my training,

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637

in Berlin, in a factory for chemistry outside of Berlin, and I got to know some of the workers there, and I was very much aware of the fact -- how they were subdued, submissive to any authoritarian figure, and I was surprised and pleased to see that the French workers were nothing of that sort. I remember I had to improve some process there which didn't work. I remember that when I was working there~~x~~ among the workers, when the boss came he first of all addressed the girls -- they were all girls working there -- always by ["]Ladies["], which you would not have found in Germany, and second, it wouldn't have occurred to any of them to get up when the boss came in. Rather they waited that he would ~~greet~~ ^{greet} them, which he did. He was as polite as can be, never issued any orders, but when he wanted anything done he'd ask them very politely would they please see to this or to this. ^P That was quite an experience, and a revelation for me, because this at the time was quite, quite different in Germany. They were very good and nice to me; they pitied my situation, and they were appalled about Hitler's tyrannical and cruel attitudes, and I really had a delightful time with them. Now that went on for some time, and couldn't go on forever~~x~~ because I didn't intend to stay in chemistry, but I always had planned to become an analyst. At the time Mrs. Deri had taken over the group in Prague, and fortunately and for my great, great benefit she wrote to me, "Why don't you come here and finish your training? You can stay with us. You don't have to continue the way you don't want to." Well, it didn't take long~~x~~ and I appeared in Prague~~x~~ and there I finished my training, and it was a delightful, more than that, a most impressive

in Berlin, in a factory for chemistry outside of Berlin, and I got to know some of the workers there, and I was very much aware of the fact -- how they were subjected, and I was very much aware of the fact -- I was surprised and pleased to see that the French workers were working on that point. I remember I had to improve some process there which didn't work. I remember that when I was working there among the workers, when the boss came he first of all addressed the girls -- they were all girls working there -- always by "Ladies", which you would not have found in Germany, and second, he wouldn't have occurred to any of them to get up when the boss came in. Rather they waited that he would greet them, which he did. He was as polite as can be, never issued any orders, but when he wanted anything done he'd get them very politely would they please see to this or to that. That was quite an experience, and a revelation for me, because this at the time was quite, quite different in Germany. They were very good and nice to me; they picked my situation, and they were apalled about Hitler's psychological and moral attitudes, and I really had a delightful time with them. Now that went on for some time, and couldn't go on forever because I didn't intend to stay in chemistry, but I always had planned to become an analyst. At the time the best had taken over the group in Prague, and fortunately and for my great, great benefit she wrote to me, "Why don't you come here and finish your training? You can stay with us. You don't have to continue the way you don't want to." Well, it didn't take long and I appeared in Prague and there I finished my training, and it was a delightful, more than that, a most impressive

kind of group/^{of}people, and I think about ~~that~~ ^{what} I have told you -- that they were really renowned analysts who were there at the time. The exchange was so lively. I learned a great amount, and I worked about ten hours a day when I started to see patients. We had meetings, I think at least as many as here, or more, but the enthusiasm was so great, and the closeness of the group was so satisfying that nobody complained about too much work -- we worked so hard, we shouldn't work so hard, and so on -- as we do here now. Besides, of course, it was 25 years ago, and that makes a difference.

H: Could you tell us what the analytic cases were like then, were they different from now?

F: Yes, that's an interesting question, and I think, looking back, that there was quite a difference. You know, ever since I started to work here I have very rarely if at all had a patient who represented a real symptom neurosis, without all the character deformities that you see now so very much. I remember that I had a classic compulsive in analysis -- that was my second case, or the first -- no I think it was the second -- really a classic obsessive-compulsive patient, who functioned very well, and about whom you couldn't say that his character was much impaired except for those limitations and constrictions that every compulsive character shows. That's not the way you find it here. The other one -- the first one -- was I think a perversion, a pervert masochist, and that one I lost. It mostly had to do with my lack of experience, but thinking back, I would also have to say that, as everybody knows, a real perversion is not an easy case to handle. And then

kind of people, and I think about ~~that~~ I have told you -- that
 they were really renowned analysts who were there at the time. This
 exchange was so lively. I learned a great amount, and I worked about
 ten hours a day when I started to see patients. He had messages, I
 think at least as many as here, or more, but the enthusiasm was so
 great, and the closeness of the group was so satisfying that nobody
 complained about too much work -- we worked so hard, we shouldn't
 work so hard, and so on -- as we do here now. Besides, of course, it
 was 20 years ago, and that makes a difference.

H: Could you tell us what the analytic cases were like then, were
 they different from now?

F: Yes, that's an interesting question, and I think, looking back,
 that there was quite a difference. You know, ever since I started to
 work here I have very rarely if at all had a patient who represented
 a real psychotic neurosis, without all the character deformities that you
 see now so very much. I remember that I had a classic compulsive in
 analysis -- that was my second case, or the first -- no I think it
 was the second -- really a classic obsessive-compulsive patient, who
 functioned very well, and about whom you couldn't say that his character
 was much impaired except for those limitations and restrictions that
 every compulsive character shows. That's not the way you find it here.
 The other one -- the first one -- was I think a perversion, a perversity
 masochistic, and that one I lost. It really had to do with my lack of
 experience, but thinking back, I would also have to say that, as every-
 body knows, a real perversion is not an easy case to handle. And then

the case after that had very much the earmarks of an hysteria, maybe ~~developed back~~, when I look back now, that was also somewhat a character difficulty, but not in the sense that you find here, and whether it is because at the time I was not so well experienced or trained, and today I might find the cases much closer to all the unclassical or the -- non-classical is a better word -- closer to character neuroses. I may now find it more that way, but at the time it didn't seem to be in the foreground. It was much less of an analysis of the character than really of a classical symptom neurosis.

H: I don't think, but that again certainly has a lot to do with the development of psychoanalysis since, that the question of whether a patient is a borderline case, whether he would be analyzable, whether another kind of treatment might not be more advisable -- that certainly never came up that often, as it does now, and as I said, partly I think because we know more, and we are now much more apt to look out for possibilities of borderline patients. But also I think they were different, in particular I think their object relationships were much more reliable, as I remember my first cases, much more stable. They were no less ambivalent, but they were much more stable and reliable, which certainly indicates that it was somewhat of a different type of pathology. I remember that my husband too made remarks like that when he started to work here after 30 years, that he thought that probably -- this was his hypothesis -- this was for sociological reasons, socio-economic reasons. The picture of the pathology had changed. And his idea was because of the very great uncertainties that people had gone

of treatment. *H:* Would it be fair to say that at that time you felt that psychoanalysis was the only effective way to procedure in an almost all cases? *H:* I wouldn't say it was, but I was much more inclined to think that psychoanalysis was applicable much more often, in many more of the cases than one thinks about now, and then I think we analysts had more the idea analysis will be the better way, and we were not so uncertain whether a patient would be analyzable or not, except of course for frank psychotic behavior. But in general one had much more the feeling that the patients were analyzable, and were by no means as doubtful about the possible outcome of psychoanalytic treatment, and not so ready to suggest maybe alternate kinds of treatment.

H: I see. You mentioned that your own training was interrupted, and

the case after that had very much the character of an hysterical, maybe
 hysterical, when I look back now, that was also somewhat a
 characteristically, but not in the sense that you find here, and
 whether it is because at the time I was not so well experienced or
 trained, and today I might find the cases much closer to all the un-
 classical or the -- non-classical as a better word -- closer to
 character neuroses. I may now find it more that way, but at the time
 it didn't seem to be in the foreground. It was much less of an
 analysis of the character than really of a classical symptom neurosis.
 I don't think, but that again certainly has a lot to do with the
 development of psychoanalytic ideas, that the question of whether a
 patient is a borderline case, whether he would be analysable, whether
 another kind of treatment might not be more advisable -- that certainly
 never came up that often, as it does now, and as I said, partly I think
 because we know more, and we are now much more apt to look out for

through, because of the very uncertain political situations, the need
 for much more regressive behavior, no, not the need for regressive
 behavior, the appearance of much more regressive behavior, the lack of
 security, he thought had a lot to do with that, but he definitely
 remained on the greater predominance of unstable, of regressive character

glitches than he had seen in Europe.
 You mentioned that you rarely saw in those days alternative methods
 of treatment. Would it be fair to say that at that time you felt that
 psychoanalysis was the only effective way to intervene in an ailment
 such as this?

No, I wouldn't say it that way, but one was much more inclined to
 think that psychoanalysis was applicable much more often, in many more
 of the cases than one thinks about now, and then I think the analysis
 and more the idea analysis will be the better way, and we were not so
 uncertain whether a patient would be analysable or not, except of course
 for frank psychotic behavior. But in general one had much more the
 feeling that the patients were analysable, and were by no means as
 doubtful about the possible outcome of psychoanalytic treatment, and
 not so ready to suggest maybe alternate kinds of treatment.
 You mentioned that your own training was interrupted, and

~~Insert for page 7~~

+44 (ADDENDUM):

It occurs to me now that there was a forerunner to this situationⁱⁿ which, in the same way, I had the feeling that things were not necessarily the way they seemed to be on the surface. When I was about 15, my father's sister, who was in the terminal phases of a malignancy and was already quite disoriented, stayed, together with her husband, with us. I remember that one morning, at the time when she was already quite weak, she was jumping out of bed and shouting furiously how her husband had been unfaithful to her; how, at the ranch where they lived, several illegitimate children were running around, which, by way of gossip ~~and~~ by malicious people, was told her. She had a terrible outburst of rage and accused him^x in the most insulting and degrading way. Her husband, who heard that, was pulling his hair, desperate about the terrible changes in her -- how the illness had turned a gentle and loving woman into a fury who was capable of such horrifying lies. I remember distinctly how I thought ^{to} myself: " I am quite sure she tells the truth. As long as she wasⁱⁿ her right mind, she would never have dared to say anything about that, but now that she is no more in control of her thoughts, all of what she kept as a secret is coming out. " I also remember that the affection between the two of them always disgusted me because I had the feeling that so much was put on and for show.

At least I had started in Berlin, and it was only a short time that I had been in training there. Maybe it was too short for me to get any other impression, but I don't think so. I don't think there was any kind of basic or essential difference.

H: Do you recall how your interest in psychoanalysis was aroused in the first place?

F: I have one recollection. I don't know whether I remember the book. I think when I was sixteen I read a book by Blueher. I can't even tell you at the moment into what category to put it. Someone else, I would think Doctor Lewy~~x~~ with his great amount of scholarliness~~x~~ and being informed, he might know if you ask him -- a book by him, I don't know, it had something to do with youth development, and he talked there about the sexual meaning of certain behavior. For the first time I had heard about something that was non-sexual on the surface, but had a sexual meaning if you understood it, which impressed me so that I had the feeling, this is the way to look at the superficial appearance of ~~of certain~~ behaviors and attitudes, and things are not the way they look on the surface necessarily. This struck me so forcefully that from then on I was looking for more of the kind of insight and way of understanding psychological matters. * INSERT HERE NEXT PAGE

H: You say you were sixteen when you read this book. At that time in your life and in your schooling was psychology taught, was Freud known about?

F: At that time I hadn't heard the name Freud. I hadn't been anywhere where people talked about anything about psychoanalysis, where the name

Q: At least I had started in Berlin, and it was only a short time that I had been in training there. Maybe it was too short for me to get any other impression, but I don't think so. I don't think there was any kind of basic or essential difference.

A: Do you recall how your interest in psychoanalysis was aroused in the first place?

Q: I have one recollection. I don't know whether I read the book. I think when I read a book by Freud, I can't even tell you at the moment into what category to put it. Somewhere else, I would think Freud knew with his great amount of scholarship and being informed, he might know if you ask him -- a book by him, I don't know, it had something to do with youth development, and he talked there about the sexual meaning of certain behavior. For the first time I had heard about something that was non-sexual on the surface, but had a sexual meaning if you understood it, which impressed me so that I had the feeling, this is the way to look at the superficial appearance of certain behaviors and attitudes, and things are not the way they look on the surface necessarily. This struck me so forcefully that

from then on I was looking for more of the kind of insight and way of understanding psychological matters. * INSERT HERE NEXT PAGE

A: You say you were sixteen when you read this book. At that time in your life and in your schooling was psychology taught, was Freud known about?

Q: At that time I hadn't heard the name Freud. I hadn't been anywhere where people talked about psychoanalysis, where the name

of psychoanalysis was mentioned. I knew of course I had been interested in psychology up to a point. By the way later on in my university studies, psychology was one of my, how do you call that here?

H: Major?

F: Major. Yes, you know it isn't divided up the same way as here. It was one of the topics I studied. I got very much interested in it, and very dissatisfied because of the academic way I had to learn it, and I was dissatisfied because having read that book I was always after what is behind the appearance of things. It left me very unsatisfied, which brings to me a very amusing anecdote which might be interesting for the people to hear. It may be that Mrs. Deri will remember it *too*. There was a very famous psychologist at the time. Professor Max Wertheimer was his name. He had founded a kind of a study group called the "Gehirnrinde", which means "the rind of the brain" -- there must be an English --

H: The cortex.

F: The cortex, yes, that's what the German word was for -- in ~~which~~ *which* psychology people were talking, and students were listening, and once Bernfeld was invited to give a lecture *on* ~~of~~ psychoanalytic viewpoints.

H: This was at the university?

F: At the University of Berlin. It was a kind of study group. You could say it was like the Extension Division at our Institute, not quite, but this is the best way I could designate it. So Bernfeld was invited, and he talked about, as far as I know, parapraxis. Koehler, the very famous, as he was called, "Monkey Koehler", because he made the experiments

of psychoanalysis was mentioned. I knew of course I had been interested

in psychology up to a point. By the way later on in my university

studies, psychology was one of my, how do you call that later

Hi:

To: Yes, you know it isn't divided up the same way as here. It

was one of the topics I studied. I got very much interested in it

and very dissatisfied because of the academic way I had to learn it

and I was dissatisfied because having read that book I was always after

what is behind the appearance of things. It left me very unsatisfied

which brings to me a very amusing anecdote which might be interesting

for the people to hear. It may be that this, Bert will remember it too.

There was a very famous psychologist at the time. Professor Max

Wundt was his name. He had founded a kind of a study group called

the "Gehirnklub", which means "the club of the brain" -- there was no

an English --

Hi: The context.

Handwritten note: ~~which~~

To: The context, yes, that's what the German word was for -- in ~~the~~

psychology people were talking, and students were listening, and once

Wundt was invited to give a lecture ^{on} ~~in~~ psychoanalytic viewpoints.

Hi: This was at the university.

To: In the university of Berlin. It was a kind of study group. You

could say it was like the Extension Division at our Institute, not quite

but like in the best way I could describe it. So Wundt was invited

and he talked about as far as I know parapsychics. Kohler, the very

famous, as he was called, "Monkey Kohler", because he made the experiments

with anthropoids, was the chairman in that meeting, and Bernfeld brought a case of a patient who, getting up from the couch, had left some change on the couch, and he was using that example to explain parapragis, or a slip -- that this was not intentional; it had happened without the patient being aware of it, without the patient's deliberate intentions. The illustration is that unconsciously things are done. So Koehler ^{who} was quite sarcastic~~x~~ and extremely hostile toward analysis, ~~and~~ said to Bernfeld, "How do you think did the unconscious take the money out of the young man's pocket?"; whereupon Bernfeld, with his very quiet humor and superiority, smiling kindly, said, "With the fingers, Professor!" And of course you can imagine how much laughter that elicited, and Koehler I remember looked very embarrassed when Bernfeld retorted that way. Koehler was an extremely antagonistic and hostile person toward psychoanalysis -- a brilliant man, who had done most impressive, most valuable experiments with these anthropoids, but extremely hostile toward psychoanalysis. I don't know whether he's still alive. I think he came to Princeton, he may be there. Wertheimer I know died. Wertheimer was a very superior scientist and human being, a ^{great} ~~big~~ man.

H: Well then, when you got your beginning training at the Berlin Institute it must have been newly organized at that time.

F: No, I think it had been already there for some time, and my husband was the Director of the Clinic at the time, and he was teaching very much. I remember H. Rado^{Dr. Rado}, who was one of the most brilliant teachers you could ever hear. His teachings were so clear, so succinct,

which was the chairman in that meeting, and Bernfeld brought

some of a patient who, getting up from the couch, had left some

change on the couch, and he was using that example to explain phenomena

on a slip -- that this was not intentional; it had happened without

the patient being aware of it, without the patient's deliberate

intentions. The illustration is that unconsciously things are done.

So Bernfeld was quite sympathetic and extremely hostile toward analysts,

and said to Bernfeld, "How do you think did the unconscious take the

money out of the young man's pocket?" Bernfeld said, "With this

very quiet humor and superiority, smiling kindly, said, "With this

ingenious, Bernfeld. And of course you can imagine how much laughter

that elicited, and Kohler I remember looked very surprised when

Bernfeld reported that way. Kohler was an extremely sympathetic and

hostile person toward psychoanalysis -- a brilliant man, who had done

most impressive, most valuable experiments with class experiments, but

extremely hostile toward psychoanalysis. I don't know whether he's

still alive. I think he came to Princeton, he may be there. Wertheimer

I know him. Wertheimer was a very superior scholar and human being.

a very man.

H: Well then when you got your beginning training at the Berlin Institute

it must have been newly organized at that time.

F: No, I think it had been already there for some time, and my husband

was the Director of the Clinic at the time, and he was teaching very

much. I remember one of the most brilliant who was one of the most brilliant

reactions you could ever hear. His teachings were so clear, so accurate,

and so impressive, I never forget what a marvelous teacher of classical psychoanalysis he was at the time. By the way there's another anecdote which I was told, I wasn't present -- it was at a seminar where I was not yet permitted to participate -- about a discussion to distinguish what is neurotic anxiety and what is fear. To give an illustration Rado said, "Let's think of the most simple imaginable case, the door opens and a lion enters this room. Now is that neurotic anxiety or is that fear?" This was amusing the whole crowd of people. ~~4~~ So what else could be of interest to "coming generations"?

H: At that time when you were taking your university training, and then your analytical training, before the situation arose that made you think about coming to America, what was the prevalent attitude toward America in general, and American science, and psychoanalysis.

F: Well, you know everybody was somewhat inclined to believe what Freud had said, and everybody knows what that was, that America is no place for psychoanalysis, and he was very much dismayed about the people who went to America, the psychoanalysts, because he thought that it would ruin their psychoanalytic capabilities. He couldn't foresee of course what has happened, but fortunately his prediction didn't come true. But he was very much opposed to the move of some people who went to the United States. There's lots in Jones', you know, to be found about his remarks in that respect.

H: And you and your colleagues tended to feel similarly?

F: Well, ^{we} suspected that he was right. It was what everybody suspected, that he was right about everything he said about psychoanalysis, and

and so progressive, I never forget what a marvelous teacher of classical
 psychology he was at the time. By the way there's another anecdote
 which I was told, I wasn't present -- it was at a seminar where I was
 not yet permitted to participate -- about a discussion on dissociation
 which he brought up and what he learned. To give an illustration
 of the kind of simple things that are possible, said, "I've thought of the most simple imaginable case,

the door opens and a lion enters this room. Now is that humorous anxiety
 or is that fear? This was amusing the whole crowd of people. So
 what else could be of interest to "coming generations"?

II: At that time when you were taking your university training, and
 then your analytical training, before the situation arose that made
 you think about coming to America, what was the prevalent attitude
 toward America in general, and American science, and psychoanalysis?
 I: Well, you know everybody was somewhat inclined to believe what
 Freud had said, and everybody knows what that was, that America is
 no place for psychoanalysis, and he was very much dismayed about the
 people who went to America, the psychoanalysts, because he thought
 that it would ruin their psychoanalytic capabilities. He couldn't
 foresee of course what has happened, but fortunately his prediction
 didn't come true. But he was very much opposed to the move of some
 people who went to the United States. There's lots in there, you know,
 to be found about his remarks in that respect.

II: And you and your colleagues tended to feel similarly?
 I: Well, I expected that he was right. It was what everybody supposed,
 that he was right about everything he said about psychoanalysis, and

as you know it isn't easy for anybody to say, "It seems Freud was wrong in this or that." Everybody is inclined to feel it is most probable or even more than that, when he said something about psycho-analysis, ~~X~~ specifically or in general, it's right.

H: A question occurs to me. You have thought back and compared your early analytic case material with what you see now. In a similar way, since we're on the subject, do you have impressions about the kinds of people who enter the field of analysis now, compared to the people you knew then?

F: Yes, I do. You know it's very fortunate that one can make a good living being a psychoanalyst, but it has a very undesirable side to it. At the time people became psychoanalysts in the beginning of my training, and also later, we could not become rich, or quickly rich or wealthy, being a psychoanalyst. The opposition to psychoanalysis was greater and much more outspoken, and ~~that~~ ^{it} was still a struggle, as you know very well, how tremendous was the struggle at the very beginning of the advent of psychoanalysis, and it was not anything that promised wealth when you became a psychoanalyst, but you became a psychoanalyst because of the inner conviction, and out of devotion, and the financial viewpoint was no more outspoken than in any other profession -- that you wanted to make a living and maintain yourself, but not the idea that you could quickly reach a state of wealth and great financial benefits, that certainly was not the way.

H: Well, would you carry that on then? [?] What comments would you have to make about the kinds of people that go into the field now. [?]

as you know it isn't easy for anybody to say, "It seems Freud was
wrong in this or that." Everybody is inclined to feel it is most
probable or even more than that, when he said something about psycho-
analysis X specifically or in general it's right.

II: A question occurs to me. You have thought back and compared your
early analytic case material with what you see now. In a similar way,
since we're on the subject, do you have impressions about the kinds

of people who enter the field of analysis now, compared to the people
you know then?

Y: Yes, I do. You know it's very fortunate that one can make a good
living being a psychoanalyst, but it has a very unwholesome side to it.
At the time people became psychoanalysts in the beginning of my training,

and also later, we could not become rich, or quickly rich or wealthy,
being a psychoanalyst. The opposition to psychoanalysts was greater

and much more outspoken, and there was still a struggle, as you know
very well, how tremendous was the struggle at the very beginning of

the advent of psychoanalysts, and it was not anything that promised
wealth when you became a psychoanalyst, but you became a psychoanalyst

because of the inner conviction, and out of devotion, and the financial
situation was no more outspoken than in any other profession -- that

you wanted to make a living and maintain yourself, but not the idea
that you could quickly reach a state of wealth and great financial

prosperity, that certainly was not the way.

II: Well, would you carry that on then? What comments would you have
to make about the kinds of people that go into the field now?

F: Right now? You know that becomes a little ticklish. I don't want to be specific about it, because you know it is something that could be understood as an insult, or as a wrong accusation to the people who now go into psychoanalysis. I would think the devotion doesn't have a great-- that's not the right way to say it -- doesn't have the, in general, the devotion isn't as -- well, help me with the word, as great as it used to be.

H: Yes. Look, I don't know that we have to be so sensitive about this. I think you know, for instance, that it's been observed by many people that ~~for instance~~ the people who come to medical school nowadays are very different from what they used to be -- that they are not always the best students, that they are not always so dedicated to medicine.

F: That's the word I was looking for. I think the dedication doesn't have, isn't as intense, or, what other word do you use for dedication?

H: As great?

F: As great, I think, as it used to be. But you know I am for another reason a little bit hesitant to say that, because as we get older we always find the younger generation doesn't live up to the ideals the older generation has had, and I do not know how much this is the general attitude of people after they get older, so that they blame the younger generation for something that they may not have been so different about when they were younger. Still, I think there is something to it.

H: That is certainly true, but you know I think it's a fact that applications, say, to medical school have dropped off, and that applications we know now for psychoanalytic training are less frequent, almost

Q: Right now you know that becomes a little different. I don't want
to be specific about it, because you know it is something that could be
understood as an insult, or as a wrong accusation to the people who now
go into psychoanalysis. I would think the devotion doesn't have a great--

that's not the right way to say it -- doesn't have the, in general,
the devotion that's -- well, help me with the word, as first as
it used to be.

A: Yes. Look, I don't know that we have to be so sensitive about this.
I think you know, for instance, that it's been observed by many people
that ~~the~~ the people who come to medical school nowadays are
very different from what they used to be -- that they are not always
and are students, that they are not always so dedicated to medicine.

Q: That's the word I was looking for. I think the devotion doesn't
have, isn't as intense, or, what other word do you use for devotion?

A: As great?

Q: As great, I think, as it used to be. But you know I am for another
reason a little bit hesitant to say that, because as we get older we
always find the younger generation doesn't live up to the ideals the
other generation has had, and I do not know how much this is the general
attitude of people when they get older, so that they blame the younger
generation for something that they may not have been so different about
when they were younger. Still, I think there is something to it.

A: That is certainly true, but you know I think it's a fact that
applications to medical school have dropped off, and that applica-
tions no longer for psychoanalytic training are less frequent, almost

as though people ~~are not willing~~, are not willing_x to undergo a long period of sacrifice and postponement, at least as much as in the old days.

F: Yes, that may be true, but on the other hand let's not forget, Doctor Horowitz, that the training for all specialties becomes so drawn out that, facetiously and sarcastically people have said, "You won't be an analyst before you've had your first coronary." And of course that isn't so, but there is something to it, that should make a person feel there is some justification in thinking of the duration of any kind of training on that order, that leads to so many years of studying before you can be independent in your profession; this is a hardship, even though it is not -- I do not mean to take back what I said before, but it is a hardship. Medical school didn't take as many years as it does now, and training for analysis, as you well know, ^{almost} from year to year ~~longer~~ takes a year longer. Pretty soon it will be ten years.

H: Well, this is exactly the point I wanted to ask you about. Would you have the impression, with patients and analytic candidates both, would you have the impression that both treatment and training has gotten longer and longer as the years have gone on, and ^{that} ~~the~~ the people involved have gotten more and more impatient?

F: The latter I don't know. I would say maybe the people in training have become somewhat impatient. Maybe it might also be so for the patients. As far as the duration of treatment goes, that brings me back to the point I had before, I mentioned before. I do not know whether lack of the much more extended and deeper understanding we have now isn't responsible for our expecting longer treatment than we did, or whether it is due to other reasons, namely, changes in the picture

...not willing to undergo a long period of sacrifice and discomfort, as much as in the old days.

Q: Yes, that may be true, but on the other hand isn't it not forgotten, however, that the training for all specialties becomes so broad

and that, especially people have said, "You won't be an analyst before you've had your first coronary." And of course

that isn't so, but there is something to it, that should make a person feel that is some justification in thinking of the duration of any

kind of training on that order, that leads to so many years of study - and before you can be independent in your profession; this is a hardship,

even though it is not -- I do not mean to take back what I said before, but it is a hardship. Medical school didn't take as many years as it

does now, and training for analysts, as you well know, from year to year takes a year longer. Pretty soon it will be ten years.

Q: Well, this is exactly the point I wanted to ask you about. Would you have the impression, with patients and analytic candidates both,

would you have the impression that both treatment and training has gotten longer and longer as the years have gone on, and ~~that~~ the people

involved have gotten more and more impatient. The answer I don't know. I would say maybe the people in training

have become somewhat impatient. Maybe it might also be so for the patients, as far as the duration of treatment goes, that brings me

back to the point I had before, I mentioned before. I do not know whether part of the mind more extended and deeper understanding we have

now isn't responsible for our expecting longer treatment than we did, or whether it is due to other reasons, namely, changes in the picture

of the pathology. I think it's longer, but of course one shouldn't forget that in different cases the time element plays a very great role. Some patients can be helped in a shorter period than others. It's all a very relative situation, and I want to be careful not to make flat statements which are not taking into consideration changes in the whole situation.

H: Well, I'd like to get back to something you said earlier. Do you think any of this that we have been talking about, about what seems to be the present-day character both of patients and of trainees in the field, do you personally regard any of this as possibly having to do with ~~any~~ American culture ^{compared to} ~~versus~~ European?

F: I think there can be no doubt about it. As in every other situation, the character of the nation gives its imprint on the people. I very much think so. I'm thinking now of something, for instance, that I remember was a marked difference in the patient types in Europe and in America, the United States. See, the marriage situation in the United States, for instance, impressed me as being quite different in one specific factor. I can only talk about Germany and about middle European -- Czechoslovakian and Austrian situations, in which I think the situation was similar. What was marked was that the men had quite a different role in the family than the woman. Now I suspect that this has changed now in the last twenty-five years since I was there, but the woman would have ~~no~~, I should put it the other way around -- that the man would not be regarded as the authority in the family, ~~that~~ that was unthinkable, at least in Germany, in the group of people whom I knew.

of the psychology. I think it's a matter of course one shouldn't
 forget that in different cases the time element plays a very great role.
 Some instances can be helped in a shorter period than others. It's all
 a very relative situation, and I want to be careful not to make this
 statements which are not taking into consideration changes in the
 social situation.

So you see, I'd like to get back to something you said earlier. Do you
 think any of this that we have been talking about, about what seems to
 be the present-day character both of patients and of treatment in the
 field, do you personally regard any of this as possibly having to do
 with the American culture ~~versus~~ European?

I think there can be no doubt about it. In every other situation
 the character of the nation gives its imprint on the people. I very
 much think so. I'm thinking now of something for instance that I

noticed was a marked difference in the patient types in Europe and
 in America, the United States. See, the marriage situation in the
 United States, for instance, impressed me as being quite different

in one specific factor. I can only talk about Germany and about middle
 European -- Czechoslovakian and Austrian situations, in which I think
 the situation was similar. What was marked was that the men had quite

a different role in the family than the women. Now I suspect that this
 has changed now in the last twenty-five years since I was there, but
 the women would have no I should say in the other way around -- that the

man would not be regarded as the authority in the family. That was
 unthinkable, at least in Germany, in the group of people whom I knew.

and in the social situation in which I grew up. The father's word was the last word, and the mother submitted to that as the children did. He was, in a certain way you could say, a patriarch, which I didn't find was so in the United States at all. It has to do also I'm quite sure with the fact that at the time ⁻⁻⁻ within the last twenty-five years or so I'm sure things have changed greatly ⁻⁻⁻ ~~there~~ there were not as many women working professionally, as mothers and as wives, as were here when I got to know the family set-up in the United States.

H: Let us make a leap now to something very specific and germane to our local situation, after these general background remarks. I'm referring specifically to events which led to a split in our professional society. Now many people have lived through this period and have commented on it; they have brought up many factors which they felt played a part. In line with what we have been conversing about, I wonder if you feel some of these considerations may have been relevant?

You know one can look at the groupings that took place in the ^Split partly in terms ~~both~~ of age, and in terms of European versus American backgrounds. Do you think that these considerations were relevant?

F: They might have played a role. How relevant they were I wouldn't be able to say, but they played a role, and this I think is borne out by the remarks ^S that those analysts ^{said} who did not agree with the people who came from Europe, by a remark that you could hear very often; it was not only the ^{" "} old, but always the old European analysts; ^{" "} which makes it I think quite clear that they considered the Europeans ^{as} ~~X~~ having different ways and attitudes, looking at psychoanalysis different from

and in the social situation in which I grew up. The father's word was
 the last word, and the mother submitted to that as the children did.
 It was, in a certain way you could say, a patriarchal, which I didn't
 find was so in the United States at all. It has to do also I'm quite
 sure with the fact that at the time within the last twenty-five years
 or so in some things have changed greatly. There were not as many
 women working professionally, as mothers and as wives, as there have
 when I got to know the family set-up in the United States.
 It has made a leap now to something very specific and pertinent to
 our local situation, after these general background remarks. I'm
 referring specifically to events which led to a split in our professional
 society. How many people have lived through this period and have
 commented on it; they have brought up many factors which they felt
 played a part. In line with what we have been conversing about, I
 wonder if you feel some of these considerations may have been relevant?
 You know one can look at the groupings that took place in the split
 partly in terms of age, and in terms of European versus American
 backgrounds. Do you think that these considerations were relevant?
 They might have played a role. How relevant they were I wouldn't
 be able to say, but they played a role, and this I think is borne out
 by the remarks that those analysts who did not agree with the people
 who came from Europe, by a remark that you could hear very often: it
 was not only the old, but always the old European analysts, which
 makes it I think quite clear that they considered the Europeans having
 different ways and attitudes, looking at psychoanalysis different from

the way they did, and it was often said this was ~~the~~ ^{from the} different situation in the United States. People looked at things, the psychology, the attitudes are different from the way you are used to in Europe. I don't doubt this has played a role in the dissension that developed.

H: Did you have the impression, or do you now in retrospect, feel that there may have been a quality, say, of patriarchy in our organization which was an irritant to some of the members who were not used to this quality?

F: I don't know whether we could put it that way. Maybe one could. If it wasn't there it was felt to be there. I don't know how many misconceptions the Americans had about the European ways of looking at situations, people, how they lived, and what their beliefs, attitudes, ideas were. I have heard many ideas that profess or express misconceptions about what they thought European behavior was. I remember for instance one patient of mine married a European, and her parents were appalled about it because they said, "Well, if you marry a European you marry a tyrant." That was I think fairly widespread, and I remember hearing from another patient who said, "I wish the husbands here were like European husbands, that they dictate and the women have to take it and shut-up." These are only two examples, but they highlight what I very much had the impression of -- that there was the idea Europeans' psychology is very different, hence European psychoanalysis is different, and with this went some kind of misconception about European psychology and what the European attitude toward psychoanalysis was. How much, or how predominant a role this played I would not be able to say. I would

488

the way they did, and it was often said this was the difference between

in the United States. People looked at things, the psychology, the

attitudes are different from the way you are used to in Europe. I don't

believe this has played a role in the dissertation that developed.

It didn't have the impression, or do you now in retrospect, feel that

there may have been a quality of personality in our organization

which was an irritant to some of the members who were not used to this

quality.

I don't know whether we could put it that way. Maybe one could.

If it wasn't there it was felt to be there. I don't know how many

misconceptions the Americans had about the European way of looking

at situations, people, how they lived, and what their beliefs, attitudes,

ideas were. I have heard many ideas that express misconceptions

about what they thought European behavior was. I remember for instance

one parent of mine married a European, and her parents were appalled

about it because they said, "Well, if you marry a European you marry a

tyrant. That was I think fairly widespread, and I remember hearing from

another parent who said, "I wish the husbands here were like European

husbands, first they discuss and the women have to take it and shut-up."

There are only two examples, but they highlight what I very much had

the impression of -- that there was this idea European psychology

is very different, hence European psychology is different, and with

this was some kind of misconception about European psychology and

what the European attitude toward personality was. How much, or

how predominant a role this played I would not be able to say. I would

think it was a part, but how much I don't know.

H: Well, you know, in reading over the minutes of our Society during the actual time of the Split, one can see references, quotations, from people who got up and protested that this or that was an example, another example ~~say~~ of autocratic behavior. Do you recall that this was a bone of contention in the meetings?

F: I would say there was a certain amount of that present, I would think so. See, something else might have added to it. The people who came here, they were not only the older people, they were not only the European people, but they were those who had had personal contact with Freud at one time or another, that may have given them an undue feeling of "I know better than you do", and it probably gave those who heard this, or who were present, the feeling that "they think they know better than the Americans do". That I think very much must have played a role, even though it was probably more an undercurrent and in the atmosphere rather than outspoken. But the phrase "the old European analysts" I think substantiated that idea. It was always put together, not only old, but always old European.

H: Certainly, if my impression has any validity, in the years since the Split I think most of the members of what is now called the old group, our group, certainly have the feeling that the new group has lost a good deal in having left the fold. Do you feel that this is a --

F: Yes, I would agree to that, but you know if you think in terms of historical ~~development~~ development, one doesn't know whether there might be something gained that at the moment isn't apparent. You know movements have a history, and if you're in them you don't see

I think it was a part, but how much I don't know.
 Now, you know, in reading over the minutes of our Society during
 the usual time of the night, one can see references, questions, items
 people who got up and presented that this or that was an example, another
 example of antisocial behavior. Do you recall that there was a case
 of connection in the meetings?

I would say there was a certain amount of that present, I would
 think so. See, something else might have added to it. The people
 who came here, they were not only the older people, they were not only
 the European people, but they were those who had had personal contact
 with them at one time or another, that may have given them an undue
 feeling of "I know better than you do", and it probably gave those
 who heard this, or who were present, the feeling that they think they
 know better than the Americans do. That I think very much must have
 played a role, even though it was probably more an undercurrent and
 in the background rather than outspoken. But the phrase "the old
 European analysts" I think substantiated that fact. It was always
 put together, not only old, but always old European.
 Certainly, if my impression has any validity, in the years since
 the split I think most of the members of what is now called the old
 group, but group, certainly have the feeling that the new group has lost
 a good deal in having left the fold. Do you feel that this is a --
 Yes, I would agree to that, but you know if you think in terms of
 development, one doesn't know whether
 there might be something gained there at the moment but I suppose
 you know movements have a history, and if you're in them you don't see

Historical

very often the course that it's going to take, and later on in retrospect you might have quite a different evaluation of the course it has taken^x than while you are still in the changing of the movement.

H: One of the things I asked you about last time, which you indicated you might have something to say about if you gave it some thought --

F: I know what you mean, and I don't think I can now -- specifically how certain members influenced the whole group. I don't think I can. I don't know why I can't. It's really very difficult. I know of course that my late husband had a tremendous influence, not only on the group but on the whole development. Simmel was another one. But other than that^{...} I could maybe say something if I would recall specific instances, but I don't. It would have to be, for instance, a situation where I recall a meeting, and what somebody said and what effect that had on the whole group, but unfortunately I can't tell. I have much more general impressions than specific examples of specific situations. So I have to disappoint you on this, I am sorry. You will have to get that from somewhere else. Maybe ^{ROM:} ~~Henry~~ Greenson, I suppose you have interviewed or will interview.

H: He has been interviewed, yes.

p.10 F: So he probably, with his excellent memory, will be able to tell you much more about it. Did you interview him?

H: Not personally, but he has been interviewed.

F: And I suppose he remembered a great deal. In particular, since he has been here^x and lived in the European background^x when he studied medicine, and since he probably remembers the changes and development much better.

very often the course that it's going to take, and later on in the
 after the course it has a different evaluation of the course it has
 taken. I mean while you are still in the changing of the movement.
 I: One of the things I asked you about last time, which you indicated
 you might have something to say about if you gave it some thought --
 I: I know what you mean, and I don't think I can now -- specifically
 the whole group. I don't think I can, I don't think I can.
 I don't know why I can't. It's really very difficult. I know of course
 that my husband had a tremendous influence, not only on the group
 but on the whole development. I think was another one. But other than
 that, I could make any statement if I would recall specific instances,
 but I don't. It would have to be, for instance, a situation where I
 recall a meeting, and what somebody said and what effect that had on
 the whole group, but unfortunately I can't recall. I have much more
 general impressions than specific examples of specific situations.
 So I have to disappoint you on this, I am sorry. You will have to get
 that from somewhere else. Maybe ~~from~~ ^{from} someone, I suppose you have
 interviewed or will interview.
 I: He has been interviewed, yes.
 I: So he probably, with his excellent memory, will be able to tell
 you much more about it. Did you interview him?
 I: Not personally, but he has been interviewed.
 I: And I suppose he remembered a great deal. In particular, since he
 has been here and lived in the European background when he studied
 medicine, and since he probably remembers the changes and development
 well better.

H: One of the topics that has come up in some of the other interviews, which is partly in people's minds I suppose because it's being actively discussed now, is the whole question of possibly reorganizing the Institute and Society structure. I wonder if you have thought about the subject in general, and in particular whether you detect some historical determinant to the way the separate Society and Institute structure has evolved?

F: I don't think I quite understood your question. Would you reformulate that a little, Doctor Horowitz?

H: Well, as I understand it there is active discussion going on now about re-evaluating the roles of the Society and Institute as --

F: Separate entities.

H: Separate entities. My question would be: do you have thoughts about how this has evolved historically?

F: The separation between the two came about? I'm sorry, I don't remember. That must be in the minutes.

H: I don't necessarily mean in our own organization, but within the whole psychoanalytic movement.

F: No, I don't remember, but I would say one general thing. I think that ^{when} ~~an~~ organization develops ^s very much, ^(growth?) ~~everywhere~~ ^{occurring} differentiation ~~of the different parts,~~ the different, ~~what~~ ~~could you say, what is the word for that,~~ functions, ~~x~~ come about, and sooner or later there will either be committees, or there will be split-off parts, not societies, but parts, what do you call that part organization, to divide up the functions, because they cannot so easily

...one of the things that has come up in some of the other interviews, which is partly in people's minds I suppose because it's being actively

discussed now, is the whole question of possibly reorganizing the institutions and society structure. I wonder if you have thought about this subject in general, and in particular whether you based some historical

development to the way the separate society and institute structures are evolved.

I don't think I quite understood your question. Would you reformulate that a little, Doctor Horowitz?

Well, as I understand it there is active discussion going on now about re-evaluating the roles of the society and institute as --

separate entities.

Separate entities, my question would be do you have thoughts about how this has evolved historically?

The separation between the two came about, I'm sorry, I don't remember. That must be in the minutes.

I don't necessarily mean in our own organization, but within the whole psychoanalytic movement.

Don't remember, but I would say one general thing. I think

~~that the organization developed very much in a~~ ^{different} ~~way~~ ^{way} ~~from the~~ ^{way} ~~other~~ ^{way} ~~institutions~~ ^{way} ~~of the~~ ^{way} ~~movement~~ ^{way} ~~and~~ ^{way} ~~the~~ ^{way} ~~difference~~ ^{way} ~~was~~ ^{way}

~~confusion~~ ^{confusion} ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~word~~ ^{word} ~~for~~ ^{for} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~functions~~ ^{functions} ~~come~~ ^{come} ~~about~~ ^{about} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~soon~~ ^{soon} ~~or~~ ^{or} ~~later~~ ^{later} ~~there~~ ^{there} ~~will~~ ^{will} ~~either~~ ^{either} ~~be~~ ^{be} ~~committees~~ ^{committees} ~~or~~ ^{or} ~~there~~ ^{there} ~~will~~ ^{will} ~~be~~ ^{be}

split-off parts, not societies, but parts, what do you call that part organization, to divide up the functions, because they cannot so easily

be taken care of within one organization. That I think happens everywhere, where an organization develops and grows very much. What the specific reasons were at the time I really don't remember.

H: Do you personally feel that there are any disadvantages or drawbacks to having as much separated function~~X~~ as there seem~~s~~ to be now?

F: I think that it looks like much duplication takes place with the division that has been instituted, and that it might be a good idea to unify the organizations again, in the Professional Committee and the Board of Trustees, for instance. In the meetings there are so many duplications that the same things will be repeated in the second meeting that have been discussed in the first meeting, and only few specific viewpoints come up in the second of the two meetings.

H: Well, one of the things for instance that you ~~helped~~^{lived} with historically -- you were in contact with both the Berlin and the Prague groups. Now was there such a distinct separation between Institute and Society?

F: No, there wasn't, but let's not forget that the Berlin Society was larger; the Prague Society was very small, and to make a division there would have been something ridiculous. The whole organization consisted of about I think ten people, and it was all unified, and there was ^{no} reason whatsoever to make a ~~decision~~. *division. division.*

H: Now, if I understand my historical facts correctly, Berlin was the first group set up outside of Vienna, was it not?

F: Yes.

H: In the original organization in Berlin, was it set up as a separate training institute and society originally, do you know?

Q: ... I think happens every...

A: ... an organization develops and grows very much. That the

... I really don't remember.

Q: ... you personally feel that there are any disadvantages or drawbacks

... as there seemed to be now?

A: ... it looks like much duplication takes place with the

division that has been instituted, and that it might be a good idea

to unify the organization again, in the Professional Committee and

the Board of Trustees, for instance. In the message there are so

many duplications that the same things will be repeated in the second

meeting that have been discussed in the first meeting, and only few

specific viewpoints come up in the second of the two meetings.

Q: ... one of the things for instance that you ^{lived} ~~talked~~ with historically --

... you were in contact with both the Berlin and the Prague groups. Now

... a distinct separation between Institute and Society.

A: ... but let's not forget that the Berlin Society

... was larger; the Prague Society was very small, and to make a division

... there would have been something ridiculous. The whole organization

... I think was split, and it was all unified, and there

... was a reason whatever to make a ~~division~~ ^{separation}.

Q: ... I understand by historical facts correctly, Berlin was the

... group set up outside of Vienna, was it not?

A: Yes.

Q: ... in the original organization in Berlin, was it set up as a separate

... and society originally, do you know?

F: No, as far as I remember the training school was part of the Society; that's as far as I remember. But you know these things I think you can, and you better, make sure that I'm correct in what I am remembering.

H: I ~~kind~~ ^{have the} ~~of~~ ^{ing} feel that I have asked you many questions today, and perhaps not allowed you an opportunity to talk about your own reactions to what you talked about last time. Do you have --

F: Do you mean, could I accept what I told you, or what, dissatisfied or critical of what I am telling you?

H: No, I meant whether you had your own trains of thought that were stimulated by our last interview.

F: Whether I had thought of other things to tell you? No, I don't think so. I think the stimulation brings back to my mind certain things, and without it I don't think I would give it much thought, except ^{if} there is a special stimulus to thinking about what happened in the past, or thinking about differentiations between the situation now and as it was. No, I think that your stimulation was necessary to make me think of all those developments.

H: Do you have reflections about predictions or hopes about what is going to occur in the future, psychoanalytically?

F: That is a question of quite an order. I don't know what to say about that. Hopes, of course, that it retains all of what is essential, and has been essential, and that it adds what should be added in essential things, but you know that's meaningless as a general statement. I don't know whether I can have any other remarks about that.

Q: ... as far as I remember the training school was part of the ...
 A: ... as far as I remember, but you know these things I ...
 think you can, and you better, make sure that I'm correct in what I am ...
 remembering.

Q: ... I have asked you many questions today, and perhaps ...
 you allowed you an opportunity to talk about your own reactions to what ...

Q: ... you said about last time. Do you have --
 A: ... I accept what I told you, or what, disassembled

Q: ... on whether or what I am telling you?
 A: ... I mean whether you had your own train of thought that were

Q: ... stimulated by our last interview.
 A: ... whether I had thought of other things to tell you? No, I don't

Q: ... I think the stimulation brings back to my mind certain ...
 things, and without it I don't think I would give it much thought,

Q: ... except there is a special stimulus to thinking about what happened in ...
 the past, or thinking about differentiations between the situation now

Q: ... and as it was. So, I think that your stimulation was necessary to make ...
 me think of all those developments.

Q: ... Do you have reflections about predictions or hopes about what is ...
 going to occur in the future, psychologically?

Q: ... That is a question of quite an order. I don't know what to say ...
 about that. Hopes, of course, that it retains all of what is essential,

Q: ... and has been essential, and that it adds what should be added in ...
 essential things, but you know that's meaningless as a general statement.

Q: ... I don't know whether I can have any other remarks about that.

You know one thing is of course very much on all our minds, and that is, is the future course of psychoanalysis such that it will become part of the universities.² It looks like it might be unavoidable. I don't know. It looks like by that psychoanalysis might lose its uniqueness. It may not necessarily lose its uniqueness. I don't know how much a development, once it has started, has its own autonomous development and its momentum, and there is little you can do about this inherent momentum. You know institutions take on a life of their own that are made by certain groups, and after awhile they seem to become autonomous, and then the people who have made them are their tools, and no more their guides or directors. It might be that this happens to psychoanalysis, I don't know, but there's much talk, as you know, about it, wishes for it, fears about it, attempts to see what can be done, attempts to see that if it has to happen ~~as~~^{it} happens in a way that psychoanalysis retains its uniqueness -- that of course everybody knows.

H: I take it that you are expressing a preference that psychoanalysis not become too closely identified with the universities.

F: As the situation is now, I would say yes. If autonomy could be granted, guaranteed, there would be nothing wrong with it; but I have real doubts whether that is possible, that it be guaranteed its autonomy and its uniqueness; and to let it become a subdivision of something under ~~which~~^{whose} its tutelage it has to live then, and become part of general psychiatry~~x~~ in a way that it has to give up all its very special kind of training, considerations, viewpoints, ideas -- that I would certainly not only regret, but that I would think would be like losing psychoanalysis

You know one thing is of course very much on all our minds, and that is
 that the course of psychoanalysis which I will become part
 of the university. It looks like it might be unavoidable. I don't
 know. It looks like by that psychoanalysis might lose its uniqueness.
 It may not necessarily lose its uniqueness. I don't know how much a
 development, once it has started, has its own autonomous development
 and there is little you can do about this inherent
 momentum. You know that institutions take on a life of their own that are
 made by certain groups, and after a while they seem to become autonomous,
 and then the people who have made them are their tools, and no more
 their guides or directors. It might be that this happens to psycho-
 analysis, I don't know, but there's much talk, as you know, about it,
 what's to be done, what's to be done, what's to be done, what's to be done,
 and it has to happen ~~in a way that~~ it has to happen in a way that
 psychoanalysis retains its uniqueness -- that of course everybody knows.
 It takes it that you are expressing a preference that psychoanalysis
 not become too closely identified with the universities.
 It is the situation is now, I would say, yes. If autonomy could be
 guaranteed, guaranteed, there would be nothing wrong with it; but I have
 real doubts whether that is possible, that it be guaranteed its autonomy
 and its uniqueness; and to let it become a subdivision of something
 under which the university has to live then, and become part of general
 psychology in a way that it has to give up all its special kind
 of training, considerations, viewpoints, ideas -- that I would certainly
 not only regret, but that I would think would be like losing psychoanalysis

as what it is.

H: Perhaps your expressed interest and concern about the ^{future} ~~picture~~ of psychoanalysis might be an appropriate place for us to stop today, unless you have some other comments you'd like to make.

F: No, I don't think I would be able to say anything. You know, Mrs. Deri once made a remark when somebody said to her, it might have been a patient, what would happen in the future about this or that, and her answer to that was, "I haven't learned to make predictions; that hasn't been my training," which I think could be a closing remark for this interview.

H: Very good. Doctor Fenichel, I want to thank you again for a very interesting and stimulating interview.

F: You're most welcome. It was great fun.

~~1st Draft by [unclear]~~

at the end of

future
11: Perhaps your expressed interest and concern about the future of

psychologists might be an appropriate place for us to begin today.

Unless you have some other concerns you'd like to raise.

12: No, I don't think I would be able to say anything. You know, we

just once made a remark when somebody said to her, "It might have been

a pattern, what would happen in the future about this or that, and her

answer to that was, "I haven't learned to make predictions; that hasn't

been my training, which I think could be a closing remark for this

interview.

11: Very good. Doctor Tauscher, I want to thank you again for a very

interesting and stimulating interview.

12: You're most welcome. It was great fun.

[Handwritten signature]