INTERVIEW WITH SAMUEL FUTTERMAN, M. D.

by

William Horowitz, M. D.

May 9, 1963

Committee for the History of the Society

Interview with Samuel Futterman, M. D.
by William Horowitz, M. D.
May 9, 1963

H: Sam, as you know, we've been interviewing members of the Society who have been in the organization for some time and can help in the writing of the history of our Society. What we've done so far is conducted a kind of free interview in which the people roam about whatever memories they have, without necessarily trying to be too organized, and we can just see where it takes us. You were mentioning to me before that you were thinking about your first coming here to Los Angeles.

F: Yes, I came to Los Angeles as I recall in May of 1945. I had been sent down here to open up the Mental Hygiene Clinic of the Veterans' Administration, and believed that I would be in town for some time. I had previously been stationed in Palo Alto in 1942, and had attended a meeting of the San Francisco Psychoanalytic Society, and heard Doctor Simmel at that time I believe present some material around the traumatic war neurosis; it was the beginning of the war at that time, and there was a spurt of interest in this subject. I don't recall exactly the name of the person at whose home that meeting was in San Francisco, but it will come to me probably in a few minutes, but it was attended by eight or nine members of the San Francisco Psychoanalytic Society. At that time there was no Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society, and Simmel had been invited out to give this particular talk.

H: Was he then President of the San Francisco Society, do you recall?

F: This meeting, as I recall, was at the home of Jacob Kasanin, in San Francisco; this was my first contact with the psychoanalysts on the West Coast. Then I came to Los Angeles, as indicated; I knew I was going to stay. I contacted Doctor Simmel and indicated my interest in psychoanalysis and in staying in Los Angeles, and he invited me to his home on Wilcox Avenue. We had quite a long talk at his home, and he indicated to me some of the general plans that he had for establishing a society in Los Angeles. Roughly, I believe that he indicated that there were four psychoanalysts at the time, and four more coming, and that they needed ten to form a society, and he indicated to me some of the people that were under consideration, and a few that were on route to coming out. He particularly mentioned Doctor Grotjahn as coming out to Los Angeles after he was through with his Service. Apparently there was some long conversation between Simmel and Grotjahn, in letters, about this whole subject. At the time, I indicated my interest in becoming a member of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society but pointed out that I had just graduated actually from the New York Psychoanalytic Institute, and that my membership in the New York Psychoanalytic Society had not as yet come up, and would not come up for another two years, and that I would prefer to first become a member of the New York Psychoanalytic Society and then become a member of the Los Angeles one, unless he needed my membership to be the tenth one. In other words, it was pretty close to ten that he now had. Doctor Newhouse was I think either the tenth or the ninth. Doctor Rahman was in the same position as I was with the New York Institute and Society, but I had certain reservations, and I wanted to complete in my old Society and then transfer, rather than to get in by a kind of reciprocity. It was in this way that I finally did not become a charter member; I first became a member a year or two later, as soon as my New York membership came through.

But Simmel also mentioned to me some of the difficulties that he had been facing in Los Angeles, particularly around the whole subject of practicing as a psychoanalyst without a medical license. He told me that some neighbors or other people had sort of complained about his practicing, that either officially or unofficially he did contact the authorities about his practice, and was given to understand that even though there was some possible danger of malpractice, medical malpractice, there was nothing more acute ensuing that he need fear could occur. At the same time there was a certain uneasiness about Doctor Simmel, about practicing without a medical license.

H: To go back a step if I may, you had your medical training in Switzerland, didn't you?

F: That's right.

H: Could you tell us about that?

F: Well, it was the usual story. Many of the graduate students in New York City in 1930, a certain number of us could not readily get into American medical schools so that it was necessary for us to apply to foreign medical schools, and a great number of us really ended up there. Locally there was Doctor Greenson, in Berne, who I met casually and in a kind of collision way, I believe on a basketball court in a game between the two universities.

H: That's very interesting.

F: Doctor Mindlin was with me for a year or so in Geneva; Doctor Fielding was at the time in Zurich, but I never met him at that time. Doctor Leventhal during those same years of 1931 to 1935 was in Edinburgh. I was in that city during that time, but did not meet him at that time.

H: So there's quite a group, then, of you who had this European experience before you came into the field of psychoanalysis.

F: Yes, it might seem strange that even though we were studying in Switzerland, and so close to the field of psychoanalysis, that as far as myself was concerned I was not drawn to the field or that knowledgeable about the field at that time.

H: You came back and got your psychoanalytic training in New York.

F: I came back and got my complete psychoanalytic training in New York between 1938 and 1942, at which time I went into military service and was stationed up and down the West Coast, stationed with the Veterans' Administration, and it was in this way that I became acquainted with the West Coast and decided to stay here after the war.

H: So then you were one of the first people who came to this Society already fully psychoanalytically trained.

F: That's correct. Then, my first contact with Doctor Fenichel I believe was at a meeting at the School for Nursery Years, probably in 1945, the

fall of that year, or early 1946; there was a monthly meeting, and I met him several times at these meetings. At one meeting Mrs. Margrit Munk was presenting a case, and Doctor Fenichel asked me whether I would be willing to present a case, which I then did. I presented a case at one of these monthly meetings; one of the particular aspects had to do with the possible role of anti-Semitism, and Doctor Fenichel discussed the case, and also indicated that a Doctor Adorno, a sociologist, was interested in this kind of material and was having a small group where such cases were being presented. Doctor Adorno was a sociologist, a very bright man, who had been working with Doctor Simmel and Doctor Hacker on material about anti-Semitism. He had a little forum group , where several of the analysts would meet, at his home on Bundy Drive. They included at the time Hacker, sometimes Fenichel, and I believe the psychologist J. F. Brown. One of the times in those early years that I remember, a meeting at the School for Nursery Years, was one in which there was a discussion between Doctor Fenichel and Doctor Alexander. It was soon the case that the discussion became quite temperamental, and it was around the whole question of the preference of character for analysis, around autoplastic and alloplastic, and a summary of this whole discussion I believe is in Fenichel's book where he discusses these two characters. Actually it also seemed to be a discussion between two characters, one of which was autoplastic and the other alloplastic, in the characters of Alexander and Fenichel. There was another meeting that I recall, the subject of which was "On Masturbation." A notice was sent out on a card and it was underlined that this was a closed meeting, which undoubtedly it should be on such a topic. At the time I can only recall a few of the members at those meetings; there were Otto Fenichel, Margrit Munk, Simmel, Estelle Levy, and perhaps Mrs. Deri, as well as David Brunswick, and often Doctor Epstein, who was a physicist from Cal. Tech. and a great friend of psychoanalysis in this community.

H: Could you perhaps tell us some of your personal recollections of Simmel and Fenichel?

F: I never knew either of them socially at all. I think I have enumerated really practically all the contacts I had with these two men. I believe the first meetings were at the Gaylord Hotel, of the newly-formed Society. The Gaylord Hotel was chosen possibly because at the time Doctor Greenson and Doctor Levy shared offices together at the Gaylord. Then, I think, slowly but definitely in those first years more and more of the analysts from the East did come out. I remember the difficulties I had in referring a private patient in the first year or two, that is in 1945 and 1946, to a psychoanalyst, because there were so few, and they were also busy.

Then what happened was that with the formation of an Institute and Society, a great number of possible candidates were on the scene, all clamoring for analysis and for training. This was particularly marked by me because so many of them had come through the V.A. Mental Hygiene Clinic, which I was the Chief through those years, and there was a terrific searching for any kind of psychoanalytic information, or lectures, or talks. We were able to have Doctor Grotjahn, who had just come out, become a consultant, and he conducted an evening seminar at the Downtown V.A., and these seminars would be crowded by about a hundred psychiatrists, all wanting some feel of psychoanalysis, and in 1946, 1947, and 1948 this was one of the few

places that they could hear about it. A good number of this group later became candidates and members and officers, and this was the contact with psychoanalysis in Los Angeles at that time. Most of the candidates and members went through the V.A. Mental Hygiene Clinic, during, I would say, the period from 1945 to 1952.

H: This, then, was one of the few places outside the analytic Institute where psychiatrists had professional contact with the field.

F: Yes. At the time we had myself, who was a member, Doctor Mindlin, who was about to become a member; as consultants we had Doctor Grotjahn, Doctor Marmor, an occasional talk by Norman Levy.

H: I'd like to go back to something that you said earlier when you were talking about your practice and how hard it was to find analysts to whom to refer. What are your memories of your early cases, your early analytic cases? What were they like back then?

F: At that time I was doing very little analytic work, and did not, I believe, take my first psychoanalytic case in this community until 1947. I then had a case that I had tried to refer out; in fact I referred this patient to Doctor Lewy; the fee at that time was ten dollars, and he was busy, so I took on this case. This case was supervised by Mrs. Deri. I then had another case at that time, and it was supervised by David Brunswick. The usual fee at that time was ten dollars, and supervision also was about the same amount.

H: Were the patients relatively unsophisticated about psychoanalysis at that time?

F: I can't answer this question, because the cases that I had were more selected and had some kinds of contacts with psychiatry through the V.A., and I would not say that they were that sophisticated, but I think this had to do with the kind of selection of patients that came to me.

H: Do you have recollections -- can you help tell us about the flavor of the early Society meetings as it was developing, I gather, rather rapidly? Do you have memories of particular people, or events, during those years?

F: What I recall may be a bit colored, but I had the feelings that the presentations at that time were less formal than they are now; they were informal. The presentation of papers was not as carefully or overly done, as they seem to be done now; they left much more room for discussion, and there seemed to be more discussion. The meetings were usually very exciting, but particularly the discussion part, and the paper presentation did not seem as long as it does now.

H: I would gather there was a high degree of interest in the meetings, in that there wasn't this much psychoanalytic stimulation around that would dilute the interest in the meetings and the papers and the discussions.

F: Oh, quite definitely; the meetings were very well attended, almost a-hundred-percent attendance. You would look around and wonder who would be missing -- and there always seemed to be a lot of questioning if someone

was missing about whether the person was ill, or on a trip, because we knew one another and missed one another when one was not present. It was a pretty localized group. This was the only psychoanalytic center for anything, and it was an interesting kind of gathering that attended these meetings. As you know, rather soon Doctors Simmel and Fenichel left us, and my recollections of them had to do only with those early years that I have described. I remember one other incident. Doctor Grotjahn was giving some seminar, which at that time was held in one of the basements of the hotel in the Westlake area. The subject probably had to do around the death instinct. He asked Doctor Simmel to present his material, his paper on the death instinct, a particular one identified with him, and Doctor Simmel indicated to Doctor Grotjahn that he could not attend and would not attend because all that he knew was written in this paper; the implication was not to be curt, but more that we first should understand his paper well and then we could come to him with questions. One of the first visiting speakers from outside of Los Angeles that I recall was Sandor Lorand, who spoke on various technical aspects of psychoanalysis.

H: Sam, can I anticipate with you what was to come, and ask you whether in the opening years of the Society, whether you detected already any alliances or cliques that were to foreshadow the events that followed?

F: The only thing that I would say -- there began to form some kind of alliances around the Chicago group; that is, the members from Chicago that were out here, and this was probably promulgated by Alexander's book on brief psychotherapy. In other words, Alexander was promoting the idea that his book on brief psychotherapy, brief psychoanalytic therapy, was actually psychoanalysis, and in different meetings this problem would often come up. There was a tendency for some of the members from the Chicago group, namely Milton Miller and Norman Levy, to promulgate this Alexandrian idea. Doctor Grotjahn and Doctor Van der Heide, although from Chicago, did not seem to go along too well with this idea. May Romm was a very staunch personal friend of Doctor Alexander. Doctor Alexander would spend many summers and parts of the year in La Jolla with his wife. He would come into town here to talk or lecture. I drove with him several times from La Jolla to Los Angeles, since I was a consultant for some social agency in San Diego, and on these trips he would indicate his ideas, which seemed to be away from the importance of the Oedipal complex, away from the whole idea of libido theory, and he was rather forceful in his allegiances, people gathered around him, social cliques, and this was the first inkling of a possible split in the Society.

H: Do you infer that in the scientific meetings and in the discussion of papers you could already hear this position expressed, say, the Alexandrian position?

F: Yes. Also I believe Doctor Marmor followed some of these lines, and the two most vociferous people at that time, this is probably 1949 and 1950, were Doctors Marmor and Greenson, and a kind of personal and professional feud seemed to exist between these two, and many discussions and meetings were a kind of debate that these two could carry on, and I think this also aided in the setting up of the two camps.

H: Did you know either then, or do you know in retrospect later on, whether a parallel dissension was being felt in the Education Committee, parallel to what was happening in the scientific meetings?

F: I just heard at first just rumors that this was proceeding also in the Education Committee -- they were just vague. One account was that there were meetings, sort of secret meetings, being held all over town, first one group, then another group. There was a lot of question whether I should be invited to one group, and I was felt out -- whether I wanted to go. I believe at this meeting would have been Marmor, Norman Levy, Miller, May Romm; and I showed my hesitancy, and was invited once again, but never did attend. In other words these meetings were being held in town at that time.

H: Do you think that this was known about by members of the Education Committee? That is to say, some of the people I've interviewed who were on the Education Committee seemed not to be aware that anything was going on until open discussions broke out within the Committee.

F: No, this was going on at that time. There is no question in my mind that if the Education Committee was not aware of it that they must have been closing their eyes to it, because I'm sure this went on for at least a year before it came out in the meetings.

H: I see. So that actually your impression is that what proved to be the new splinter group was rather well-organized at the time of the open discussions that took place in the Education Committee. They had already been well-organized by then.

F: I believe so, and I believe they knew about it. As a piece of personal information I could indicate that my wife at that time was in analysis with Doctor Greenson, and my wife at that time must have known, because I told her, what was going on.

H: Now I take it that you were sounded out to attend the new group's meetings partly because of their having worked with you at the V.A. Mental Hygiene Clinic, and I suppose because they may have hoped potentially you would come with them.

F: Yes, this was the general idea.

H: Do you think that this process took place with other people too, that is, their trying to gain strength for their new group among the membership?

F: I really feel this is so. That doesn't mean that I think that the so-called old group was innocent about this whole thing. I might illustrate this by an incident, not by an incident, by a whole situation that occurred at the -- at one of the opening meetings about the Split. I was always against the Split, I didn't see any need for it, I didn't see that there was that much dichotomy of professional differences. I believe there were certainly some, a great deal to do with frequency of hours, libido theory, and Oedipal complex, which of course are crucial, but I felt that this existed only in a small number of the analysts in the other group, maybe perhaps three of the analysts, and I felt that this could be corrected

some other way. I therefore was against the Split and tried everything in my power to prevent it. I contacted The American Psychoanalytic at that time in an open letter, indicating my disapproval, and wondered whether they could do anything to dissuade the factors in a letter written to Doctor Knight. I believe I have his reply somewhere indicating that they did not have any power over the local groups. Then, at this one particular meeting, I felt that everybody was being pressured by everybody else, and that everybody was not really speaking their minds, and that the only way this could be done was by having a closed ballot as to whether a tentative vote could be taken about the question of whether people wanted a split or not. I was sure my voice, and I believe Doctor Frumkes's voice, were speaking for a non-split, and that the others would go along with us, and this could only be shown by a closed vote. Well, we did a closed vote, and to my surprise the actual count was eighteen for a split and two for a no-split.

H: That is very surprising.

F: You didn't know that?

H: I didn't know that.

F: It must be part of some minutes somewhere.

H: I knew that you were actively attempting to see if a breach could be avoided, but I did not appreciate that you were in such a small minority.

F: This was a great surprise to me. Once I saw this, then my voice was stilled. It was too great. I believe it was Doctor Frumkes and myself who voted for the no-split.

H: Do you --

F: Now I would think from this there was a certain amount of proselytizing on both sides, for such a decisive vote.

H: That's an interesting idea. By then, you're saying, the old group too was politicking in some form.

F: I believe so. I only have proof, as I've indicated, about the new group, but I couldn't see how such a decisive vote could be arrived at without a great deal of decision-making beforehand.

H: You hinted at something on which I wonder if you would like to elaborate. You've indicated that there were some scientific differences of opinion, you've indicated there were some personality clashes that had to do with the growing breach -- I'd like to ask you if you feel in addition to these factors whether there were qualities in the leadership of the Society that promoted a rebellion or a reaction?

F: This is a hard one to really ascertain. It seemed to me that there had been some seeds of division in the psychoanalytic group here before the formation of the Society, that the few number of analysts that were here -- there seemed to be some difference of opinion between May Romm and the

rest of the psychoanalytic group. Also, later on, the new group seemed to be much more led on by May Romm, and it seemed part of it to be a carry-over of the old feud that existed before the formation of the Society. As I understood later, there was a great deal of feuding between Simmel and May Romm, particularly in the selection of candidates and whether certain candidates should be chosen, and also whether certain candidates, certain psychiatrists should be in analysis with training analysts before they were accepted as candidates.

H: Let me sharpen my question a little bit. Do you feel in the leadership of the Society that there were any qualities, say, of intolerance or inflexibility, or autocratic quality, that would have encouraged or promoted a rebellious reaction on the part of the new group?

F: No, this I cannot answer. I don't know the answers to this. I don't recall who was in power or who was President. I don't recall that that made any difference. There seemed to be an allegiance set up around May Romm, and an allegiance set up about the so-called older group, meaning around Lewy, Brunswick, Greenson, and Mrs. Deri. This is about all I can say. I believe that it started in -- there's no question in my mind that it started in the Education Committee, not in the so-called Society.

H: One of the striking things about the grouping that you've just mentioned is the age difference.

F: Yes, I think the age difference, and this I think started the idea of the usage of the term "the old group" and the new group.

H: That is, you were more or less aware that the camps were divided partly by age.

F: Partly by age, partly by allegiance to the Alexander group, except for Van der Heide. I might also add that, with all that has been said, that Doctor Grotjahn was on the fence most of the way. He had an old allegiance with Simmel, that I've mentioned previously, which had some of its antecedents somewhere in Europe, I believe with maybe his father, and then there was some allegiance that Grotjahn had with Alexander in Chicago and in the writing of his book. It became a very difficult matter for the candidates at that time, in that there was a time when candidates had to present a thesis, and it produced anxiety in them because they felt that they themselves were being assigned to one group or the other, and feared that their theses would be criticized on this basis. Some of this came out in the idea that Doctor Mindlin was the first one to present his thesis at the time of the actual Split, and I was helping him present, prepare this thesis, and shared with him his anxieties about whether it would be acceptable to one group or the other, depending on where they felt he stood in the Split, because there then occurred a vying for candidates, with the idea that the candidates generally, almost 95%, went along with the training analyst that they had. There were just a few exceptions to this, with many recriminations.

H: Recriminations? How?

F: In a few cases, the candidate did not go along with the choice of the training analyst, and often the training analyst would express his resentment to the candidate for making such a choice. So that this, as you see, becomes a very important thing, in the idea that as much as we analyze transference, certainly there is this much that certainly has not been analyzed, if such a tremendous number, percentage-wise, goes along with the choice of his training analyst.

H: Yes. That's a good point. But you've also brought out very clearly I think, with the example of Doctor Mindlin's paper, how intolerable the situation was by then and the necessity for making a split. Actually, psychoanalytic education could not continue in that kind of a climate.

F: I feel it could not continue in this kind of climate locally. I still feel that if there was a strong American Psychoanalytic Association that this and other splits would not be necessary, but it has been the feeling of The American Psychoanalytic that these are local affairs, and as such, there will be many, many more splits in different societies through the years.

H: This is a very fascinating topic, and I'd like to ask you more about it. Can I interrupt a moment to change the tape? (PAUSE) Sam, before we interrupted you were expressing your feelings that a stronger American leadership or interest in the local problems could have possibly either prevented or influenced the Split and how it took place.

F: Yes, my own feeling at the time was something was being engineered by the Educational Committee, which consisted probably of six to eight members, that as such they were sort of determining what the Society should do, that is, the other members. I think that it should have been a reporting to The American of what was occurring, and let The American come in and make some decisions, which they later did; it was only later that The American came in and indicated the frequency of psychoanalytic sessions for didactic training. This was a few years later. If they had done this earlier, and insisted on it, then I believe that this would have corrected a very big problem that was occurring in the Split.

H: Do I understand you to say that you feel that the decision on that issue was not properly left to the local Society, that it was the responsibility of The American organization?

F: Yes, because later it did assume this responsibility; it knew it had to assume it, and then did it. I said earlier in an offhand statement which I want to correct that the importance of the Oedipal complex and the libido theory was being minimized by the new group. This was, and is, very serious, and I believe it was only done by two of the training analysts in the other group, namely May Romm and Norman Levy. We respected greatly Milton Miller's ability, and particularly his work as a supervisor; he was particularly gifted in the use of dreams.

H: I'd like to ask you another question. When you felt that stronger leadership from the national organization was called for and would have been very helpful, did you also feel that stronger leadership locally might have healed the growing breach?

F: Definitely. I feel that a good strong leader -- but it had to be someone in the form of a Simmel or a Fenichel. If Fenichel had lived the Split would never have occurred, and I think this is what happens at the death of a leader: children squabble amongst themselves for leadership, and this is what occurred during that period.

H: Then you are saying not only if he had lived would this not have occurred, but his death was one of the causes of the power struggle that ensued.

F: In the dynamics that I mentioned, because I know that ten years previously I had gone through the same thing in the New York Psychoanalytic Society; with the death of Freud in 1939, within a year three psychoanalytic groups started in New York, where at the time of Freud, when Freud was alive, there was but one.

H: It's a very interesting point you're making. You're saying then that one of the disadvantages of monolithic leadership is the disorganization that takes place when that leadership is gone, as stimulating as it may have been scientifically to the group to have such an outstanding leader.

F: Yes, now we have to realize that at that time it was a Society of 20 or 25, and this is not a big society. At the present time, with a Society of almost a hundred, one could understand a difference of opinion. The need at that time for a singular Society was certainly greater than at this time. When there are so many analysts, there might be greater need for separate Societies.

H: On the other hand, would it not be your impression that with our Society of around a hundred, with the amount of diversity that may be present, the possibilities of strong alliances building up that could potentially lead to a split are less in our present group than existed before? Would you feel that way?

F: I think the differences are taken care of in a different way at the present time. I think the differences are taken care of by smaller study groups isolating themselves, by the members finding analytic interests outside of the Society, in their teaching, in their medical-school associations, and in other organizations, so that they don't have the concentration for analytic stimulation just within the Society meetings. And I think this is also exemplified by the idea that attendance at Society meetings is not anywhere near what it used to be in the earlier days.

H: That's another very interesting observation. You're saying, aren't you then, that the individual members are less intensely involved in the organization, that they have other sources of stimulation and activity outside of it, in contrast to the early days, and that among other things this accounts for not only the lower ratio of attendance, but also the lower interest in scientific discussions, as we all observe.

F: Yes, I think numerically the attendance at psychoanalytic meetings of fifteen years ago would be practically a hundred percent and now it's down to fifty percent.

H: I'd like to branch out into a slightly different area, if I may. You originally came into the Society as a fully-trained analyst from another

community, and you came into the newly-organized local Society, and since then you have been very active in Society affairs and risen to the post of President of the Society, so that you have been on the outside and the inside both. Are there organizational problems that you have struggled with which you'd care to comment about? In particular, are there problems that you've been aware of that you can see the genesis of back many years ago?

F: I think that in the growth of Societies there has always been the problem of the proper placement of the Institute and the Society, and that members are in conflict as to their allegiance to one or the other. For the most part, the history of the psychoanalytic movement has been a history of the Institutes where training and teaching were essentially carried on. I think now in the last five to eight years with the importance of Society membership and participation, this has caused a kind of a shift to occur, but there is a big lag, meaning that the Institutes in some general way become a more premium goal for members to shoot at and to gain recognition in, and as such, training and teaching still are the predominant goal of Institute and Society. I think that these two groups, the Society and Institute, do have separate functions and do have separate importances, and I think that -- I would hope to see that each would have respect for the other, without giving one a kind of ordinal premium order of importance in the place of the psychoanalysts. I think that the Institute has always felt itself superior, more important, and in control of psychoanalysis, not only in training and teaching, but in all the other activities that the psychoanalyst performs, which at the present time are getting greater and greater. The psychoanalyst of the present spends much more time in his private practice, doing psychoanalysis, doing psychotherapy, teaching, contact with the community, and so forth, which has a special importance to certain members. In the past, and still in the present, this is not felt as important by -- as compared to training and teaching. I think that unless this can be resolved that there will be further dissension among Society members. I think that splits in other Societies around the country have been due to this problem.

H: That's a very interesting observation. As I am sure you are aware there are discussions going on now about the possibility of reorganizing our Society and Institute structure, and seeing whether it is necessary, and to what degree it is necessary, to maintain this separation. Do you personally feel that the amount of separation that exists now is necessary and justified? Or do you perhaps feel this is partly historical, an accident, a development that just grew this way?

F: I think it's an historical thing, meaning that so much time of the psychoanalyst, and the older psychoanalyst in the past, has been spent in doing training and teaching that this became the most important function of an Institute and Society. I think that as more analysts became members, first, that there was less need, percentage-wise, for this amount of involvement in the training and teaching, and secondly, as indicated, there were so many other things that psychoanalysts wanted to do besides train and teach. And they have not given the credence and importance that they deserve in these areas, other than this repetitious phrase, training and teaching. There is some more recognition for research. I don't think that research and any of the Extension Division things

should be a part of the Institute; that should be a Society function. It's a kind of monopoly that the Institute keeps this to themselves, almost as a way of keeping this dichotomy; an importance of one segment of a local organization superior to the other.

H: One of the things that you seem to be saying is that from the understandable degree of isolation that is necessarily entailed in training analysts, perhaps staying out of many of the activities of the whole organization, has grown a kind of exclusiveness and privacy about all the activities of the Institute, and perhaps a gathering unto itself many of the activities and an unwillingness to share them with the Society.

F: This is essentially so. You bring in this idea that training has to be private and personal and confidential, but I don't think secretiveness necessarily means superiority.

H: I'd like to ask you another question. You are American-born and raised. You've had a medical education in Europe. You have known a good many European colleagues as well as American colleagues. Do you have any impression that psychoanalysis altogether as a national movement, or locally, is becoming more Americanized, or more democratic? Do you have the feeling that some European traditions are separating themselves out of psychoanalysis and not being perpetuated?

F: This is a hard question. I think that certainly the whole field of psychoanalysis in America is being so-called more and more Americanized. I think the European tradition still pervades over the scene; it does seem to be at a premium as far as some training is concerned, and I think that this is something that we will slowly evolute out of. I think you can't get away from heritages, and this will have to take its time, that's all.

I feel that this is about as much as I can sort of recall at this particular time. If there is some further information that I think about I will note it down, type it out, and hand it in to the Committee. I hope some of this has been of value, and not repetitious for you.

H: Well, having seen the other interviews, I can tell you this is not repetitious. One of the interesting things is that everyone sees these events in their own way, and there's very little in the way of overlapping. I think this is a very interesting interview, and let's see how it looks typed out, and if we both -- if you want to add more you could either type it out or we could talk about it further. Thank you very, very much.

Recorded on tape in the home of Samuel Futterman, M. D.
11655 Gorham
Los Angeles 49, California

First transcript by Jeanne Herzog
Final transcript by Jo Ann Smith