INTERVIEW WITH MRS. MARGRIT MUNK

by

Dr. Arthur Ourieff

January 5, 1963

Committee for the History of the Society

INTERVIEW WITH MRS. MARGRIT MUNK
by Dr. Arthur Ourieff
January 5, 1963

O: Well, you were in the History Committee long before I was. You were here when Dr. Kandelin talked about this oral-history business. Remember?

M: Yes.

O: And he sent you the material.

M: Yes.

O: Well, what we're trying to do is to see if we can do it ourselves, more on an experimental basis. Greenson has been recorded. Tidd has been recorded. And Mrs. Deri, I believe, has been recorded, or should have been--was supposed to. I think Mrs. Fenichel. The Evans--but I haven't gotten to them. Have they had their baby, by the way?

M: No, I understand there was a mistake in their calculations. The baby isn't here yet.

O: Well, she was going to have it elective--

M: On the 28th, but the date has been set ahead.

O: I would have called them. Dick was even more reluctant than you. He said he takes one look at the recorder and goes blah.

M: Oh, you mean about this? Uh, huh.

O: He said he'd have nothing to say.

M: Just wait, I'll go blah.

O: All right--so what we're interested in is to have each of the people who were here at the beginning record their own personal experiences, from their own personal points of view, as to what went on in the early days. And we imagine that each person's description will be different, because it will be through their own eyes, and that's what the oral-history people say we should be interested in--not in having everybody tell us the same thing.

M: Not in having it chronologically?

O: Well, not only chronologically, but in terms of emphasis what one person thinks is important as opposed to what another person--or how one person experienced the experience as opposed to another person. So that whatever you remember, or whatever you can recall, should be the way you recall it--it's not so important as to its accuracy, that is, as to dates and so on, because that can eventually be checked. We don't know yet what will be done with the tapes, whether they will be transcribed or what have you, but certainly before anything is done with them you will have the opportunity to edit them, and nobody outside the Committee will see them until you have edited them.

M: This is really an entirely different project from which they originally

started out with--a new aspect--the old one has been chucked?

O: No, if this works, the old will be chucked perhaps. The feeling at UCLA is that you get much more information talking than asking people to write about it--mostly because people are more verbal than they are able to write, and you can get a freer account. Then, the next step is that somebody will have to come along and re-work them. Somebody will have to put them together into a chronological history. Now, analysts being sort of relatively non-communicative people, we don't know if it's going to work or not. Of course, Greenson talked and talked and talked and talked. Tidd--

M: Had trouble.

O: Had trouble. So that--you know, it's strictly an experimental sort of thing. What I may do when we have the meeting Monday night of the group who's doing this--

M: Who is doing it?

O: Well, there's Kandelin and myself and Stoller, who are doing the actual taping, but Brunswick and Lewy are the ones who want it done, and they'll be at the meeting too on Monday night. I may play sections of this, because nobody's ever heard a tape. The Greenson tape of course isn't typical because he finds it so easy.

M: He gave a lecture.

O: I imagine he gave a lecture. I didn't hear it. So--I understand that you and your first husband were the first two analysts in Los Angeles.

M: Uh, huh. That's correct.

O: He was an analyst too.

M: He had a peculiar history. During World War I he spent all the time in Zurich, Switzerland, and studied with Jung. Then he came back to New York for a few years.

O: He was a New Yorker originally?

M: Originally he was born in Russia and came here as a child, and grew up in Chicago.

O: He was an M. D., or--

M: No, a lay-analyst. Then a few years later he returned to Vienna with the intention of looking into the Freudian Institute, which by then had been formalized into a regular training center, and somehow on the way he got lost and ended up with Adler. He stayed with Adler for a few weeks, and then returned to New York, and at that time we got married.

O: This was in what year?

M: It was in the year 1924 I think. And then a few months later we returned to

Vienna together, this time for him to join the Freudian Institute, and we at that time, stayed three years in Vienna. He got his certificate; the Institute issued them, and after three years, that was in 1927--end of 1927, we came back, stayed a short time in New York, and then came out to the Coast. Soon after, we started the first very informal group here--

O: Let me ask you some questions. He first studied in Zurich prior to this?

M: Yes, in 1914.

O: What was his background? What made him in those days interested in analysis?

M: He was a psychology or philosophy major, but like so many people, neglected to finish his graduate work. He was a man of substantial background, and quite a scholarly man, but a very, how shall I say--quite an independent individual.

O: He must have been, to be interested in analysis in those days.

M: In those days, yes, and he had maybe the good fortune to meet the McCormicks of Chicago. Both, Mrs. Edith Rockerfeller McCormick and her husband, Harold McCormick, were in Zurich on and off working with Carl Jung.

O: They were interested?

M: Yes, Mrs. McCormick was a patient of Jung's at that time, and my erstwhile husband worked with Mr. McCormick, under supervision, and that's how the whole thing got started.

O: Now, what of your training?

M: I started my personal analysis, and my interest was mainly--children at that time.

O: This was when you went back to Vienna, after you were married.

M: The first time, yes, that I went to Vienna, and I worked at what you would call here a child observation and guidance clinic at the Childrens' Hospital.

O: Was Anna Freud there?

M: No, Anna Freud had not even given her first lectures as yet. She was still sort of in the background, very much of course close to her father, but her first lecture series on child analysis she gave in 1925, to a very informal group in the waiting room of the Freud place, an apartment, to about six people.

O: You were there, at the original lectures?

M: Yes, I was, but to go a little further back, my first lecture experience on analysis was a course that Bernfeld was giving to educators--on work with children, and that's when I met Anna Maenchen, who was then a trainee in the Institute. That was during the first months that I was in Vienna. Shortly after that Bernfeld left for Berlin and joined the Institute there. This

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

was my very first contact with analysis, in Vienna.

O: About 1924.

M: In 1924, and I had my analysis, started working at the Irving Lazard Clinic "Heilpaedagogische Abteilung" of the Professor Pirquet Childrens' Hospital and having no official standing at the Psychoanalytic Institute, I was given permission to audit all the lectures and some seminars.

O: Because your husband was there?

M: Yes, and I had an interest in doing work with children. Then of course I met August Aichhorn who at that time was director of the Child Guidance Centers of the city of Vienna. I accompanied him on his weekly rounds to the various clinics and met with him over coffee for discussions on the work I had observed at the clinics. Also we attended the Schilder lectures every Saturday night at the Wagner-Tauregg Clinic of Psychiatry.

O: Paul Schilde:?

M: Paul Schilder. Every Saturday night he had a clinical demonstration of a patient from the clinic, and it was a most interesting way to spend the evening.

O: On Saturday night?

M: On Saturday night.

O: Would there be a social gathering afterwards?

M: We would meet in a coffee house--like most other places the lectures at the Institute were in the evening, and we usually would go to the coffee house afterwards and sit another hour or two, just schmoosing.

O: A very small, intimate group, I suppose.

M: Yes, I think at that time the group consisted at the most of about twenty people. There were a handful of candidates at my time. There was Jennie Waelder, and Waelder himself, the Sterbas, and the Bibrings, Korngold. Some of the teachers at that time were Federn, Hitschman, Deutsch, Helene Deutsch, Reich, Theodore Reik, and Nunberg. The Professor didn't appear at the Institute anymore. There was just a handfull of analysts who were invited to his house--I don't remember whether it was every two weeks--something like that, for seminars and discussions.

O: Already there was a hierarchy now.

M: He didn't appear publicly anymore. In fact I never saw him at any meetings. I just saw him once when I went to see Anna Freud. He appeared in the doorway of the waiting room and that's the only time I did see him. He appeared officially at the time that Abraham died, when they had memorial services. That's the only time that I know of while we were in Vienna.

O: Was he analyzing candidates at that time?

M: Uh huh, yes.

O: So then, after three years you and your husband came back to New York, and then you came out here. What made you decide to come to California? You were also certified at that time?

M: Not certified, no, my training was not completed.

O: But you were working.

M: At what was available to me, and I hoped that in time there would be other opportunities, which came about when Simmel, Deri, and Fenichel came here.

O: Did you work, though, as a psychotherapist?

M: I met Miriam Van Waters, who was referree at Juvenile Court at the time when I came here, and she sent me some youngsters to work with.

O: You still had more training than anybody else at that time.

M: And I had some referrals of young people, young adults.

O: Now what was the feeling. You had not been to California before? Had your husband?

M: He was a Stanford graduate, and had lived in California, and had liked California. He had also been to graduate school in Chicago, to Clark University, and I think to Columbia University. He was sort of a --

O: Were you the only psychotherapists in Los Angeles at that time, or--were there psychiatrists practicing?

M: He was the only qualified psychoanalyst. There was a woman here by the name of Unger, who called herself a psychoanalyst, and I think that she had worked with--I'm not even sure whom she had worked with--but she had some inkling of analysis. And then there was Mrs. Wilshire.

O: Mrs.? How do you spell that?

M: Like Wilshire Boulevard.

O: Named after her?

M: Named after her husband, who played some civic part here in Los Angeles, I don't recall what it was, but she was sort of an artist-type person, you know--I never met her personally--who succeeded in getting quite a following, based on making use of transference and perpetuating friendships with patients. I understand that she wore Grecian clothes. I don't know what her background had been, but she called herself an analyst. And I think that was the extent of analytic representation in Los Angeles.

O: And what was the reception you got from the community, the medical community, the psychological community, as analysts in those very early days?

M: I'll tell you how the first contacts were made. As I said, my erstwhile husband was quite an interesting person, and he had been one of the Hull House proteges in Chicago whom Jane Adams had befriended. Through Jane Adams he made various contacts, among others a Mrs. Drummer, an influential person in the field of mental hygiene in San Diego. Through her he got an introduction to Miriam Van Waters, and Miriam Van Waters again introduced him to some psychiatrists here; one of them was Glenn Myers. You remember Glenn Myers? And Arthur Timme.

O: Timme is still here.

M: He is still here. He was one of the early charter members of our group.

O: We saw at the Clinic a child of a child whom he had treated at the --

M: Is he still active?

O: He still has an office. We have written him a letter, but have not received an answer.

M: And then another person who was here was Dr. Elizabeth Woods. She had a somewhat ambivalent attitude about analysis, but she was an informed person. She was Chief Psychologist at the Board of Education.

O: There weren't much more than 100,000 people then, were there? Maybe a little more.

M: No, I think it was more, but this goes back 35 years. To speak of the city, the city ended at Rossmore or Highland, then there were fields, and then Beverly Hills began. You could not go straight on Wilshire Boulevard to Beverly Hills. There was no bus yet. You had to take the street car over on Venice to get into Beverly Hills. That gives you an idea of how things were.

O: Did you find the patients you were sent and your husband were sent were analytic patients? Was it difficult to get patients? I'd like to get some information as to how you worked into the community--did you have to do much educational work? Was there much negative attitude to being an analyst, that is--or was it something that in the beginning was accepted.

M: Well, I think just a handful of people, like Glenn Myers and some of the people he worked with were anxious to learn more about analysis.

O: Well, UCLA? No, that wasn't there yet.

M: No, the Psychology Department at UCLA, I think--wasn't Dr. Shepard Franz at that time Chairman? He died shortly after that, and then the Department became very conservative, but I think Franz had a peripheral interest in analysis, and was a little more on the progressive side. Then there was in Berkeley Dr. Kroeger, the anthropologist, who came down here to our meetings occasionally, but I mean it was really just a few people who had an interest, and Miriam Van Waters was one of them who was very much--

O: But you did have patients.

M: I --

O: What about your husband?

M: Not so much from her, because he didn't work with children, but she sent me a few youngsters in trouble, and I did the best I could. And then we formed shortly after our arrival a Study Group --

O: And your husband started --

M: And Paul Epstein, in Pasadena, the mathematician, who during his stay in Zurich had been analyzed by Hanns Sachs (?) had a theoretical interest in analysis. He was one of the original members of the Study Group. He brought Ruth Tolman and Ruth Valentine, both psychologists. They came to our meetings, Elizabeth Woods came occasionally--

O: Your husband started the Study Group now?

M: Yes, he and Epstein brought some people, a small circle, and I think Creswell and Helen Burns, who had joined Compton Hospital under Dr. Myers; they came, and one thing led to another.

O: So there was an interest right from the beginning.

M: A very small group.

O: A small group. Well, it's still a small group for the size of the city.

M: Yes.

O: And then--but your husband was the only analyst, and you were the next, though not fully trained.

M: Yes.

O: And then what happened, as the years went on?

M: Well, I think about two years later David Brunswick came here, and after him I think Estelle Levy came. Soon after we had arrived here we just briefly met Marjorie Leonard, who was on the point of going to Berlin to get training. About two or three years later she came back to the city, and --

O: She was originally from here?

M: Yes, she lived here. I don't remember who came next. Then the Hitler business started, and Simmel came in 1935 I think.

O: That's almost ten years after you were here, though. Eight or nine years.

M: Seven years.

O: During those very early years, was it a stimulating environment? That is, did people sort of--the small group--was it an interesting group? Did they take to analysis? Was it an ever-spreading sort of influence?

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

M: You mean did the group itself grow, or did the community--

O: Both.

M: I would say that there were always enough patients, but I don't think that the group in itself became more significant--it was a closed group.

O: Was it difficult being so isolated from the rest of the analysts? Did you and your husband --

M: Outside the city?

O: New York, Chicago.

M: There was no contact, no official contact, because we were a Study Group, we were not a society--we weren't on the map as far as they were concerned. They really only started focusing on us when Simmel came.

O: Now before Dr. Brunswick came, did he contact you to find out what the situation was, or did he come quite independently?

M: No, I don't think he contacted us, and I don't know what brought him here, actually, I think that he had some friends here, and Dore Brunswick some years before had been out here at the Pottenger Sanitarium, and I guess that's how they met a nucleus of people here.

O: Pottenger?

M: Pottenger. It was a Tb. sanitarium; they're not in existence anymore?

O: I've never heard of it.

M: And Dave knew the Tolmans, and knew some people I suppose dating back--

O: Did you meet him right away?

M: Yes, we met him right away after he came here, and he joined our Group. I mean he was very friendly.

O: There were enough patients for everybody?

M: Yes. Each one had sort of his own contacts--I didn't work full time at that time. I started a family, and had some other duties to perform, so I would say perhaps I worked half a day.

O: So David came here in about what? In about 19--?

M: About 1930.

O: So the three of you then--no, then Estelle Levy came.

M: She came when Hitler got going.

O: This was 1932 or 1933.

M: Around 1932 I would say.

O: Now David was at that time also a fully trained analyst.

M: He was -- well, I think, I know he was a student at the Institute in Vienna. I don't know just what his --

O: He already had his Ph. D. and was ready to practice, and so on.

M: Yes.

O: Now, when Estelle Levy came here, did she contact any of you? What brought her here?

M: She contacted David. I don't know what brought her here; maybe she heard that there was a lay group here. I suppose that was the main thing--somehow it never came up, but she had known David in Vienna. She came to Vienna just about the time we left, and I recollected just meeting her superficially. She was really planning to remain in Vienna, because she was welcome there, and she liked it there, but then her family insisted that she come back, and rightly so.

O: When she came to America--

M: She came from Vienna; she was a resident of Vienna. She was originally a New Yorker, but came to Vienna to study analysis just around the time we left Vienna. She had been a social worker by training.

O: Now were you instrumental in bringing Simmel here, or did he too come independently?

M: No, we invited him to come here--that is David Brunswick, ourselves, Marjorie Leonard, and Estelle Levy. The five of us signed the affidavit, and we all, with the exception of my husband, we all felt we'd like to have someone here who had good training.

O: And your husband?

M: Well, he felt he was trained, and whatever training we needed he could give us. I mean, he was that kind of a person.

O: And David was--

M: David wanted more training too. He felt that we needed a stimulus here. (I think before Simmel came we had another newcomer here by the name of Daniels, who had had some training in Vienna, and he might have been one of the co-signers too of the affidavit--I don't recall.)

O: Now, by this time were any of the local people practicing psychotherapy or analytic type of psychotherapy, if not analysis itself--any of the people who joined the Study Group, like Myers or Timme?

M: No, I don't know what Timme did, but Myers was in a strictly psychiatric practice, and very much involved in his hospital. Timme I don't know--

maybe you know better than I do--and Ruth Tolman was a psychologist by training, and I think at that time she was already at UCLA (?) teaching psychology; later she joined the VA as a psychologist. There was also Caroline Fisher (?), who was a psychologist at UCLA. She came to the Study Group meetings occasionally.

O: But none of them got any training as such sufficiently to go into practice themselves.

M: No. I mean they came just to partake in discussions. There was no training.

O: But there wasn't any training any place really, in this country.

M: Oh, yes, there was the New York Institute, the Chicago Institute, I think Alexander was already in Chicago.

O: That was 1930 or 1931.

M: Yes, but the New York Institute was already in existence, but there was nothing out here on the West Coast, no analysts in San Francisco.

O: No analysts in San Francisco.

M: Berliner was the first one to come here, and that was also around the time that Hitler got busy in Germany, which must have been around 1932, 1931 or 1932. No, Berliner came later because Simmel was already here at that time. I remember we met him socially. And Berliner had (I believe) a sister in San Francisco, who sort of established contacts for him. And after Berliner came Bernfeld. Following Bernfeld came Maenchen, or the other way around.

O: They went to San Francisco?

M: Uh, huh, that's how the group started. I remember Bernfeld--

O: Now, in terms of hierarchy in those days, was Simmel senior to Bernfeld as a teacher?

M: Yes.

O: Yet Bernfeld was not young enough to be a student of Simmel's--more contemporary I suppose.

M: On, no, Bernfeld had already been a training analyst in Berlin and Vienna when he came here.

O: And so was Simmel.

M: Bernfeld was an analyst when we came to Vienna, and my husband at that time went to Bernfeld first in analysis. Bernfeld was already an established analyst and training analyst.

O: It was a small world, when he came to San Francisco, it must have been a very small world, with all the analysts in Vienna. Now was Berliner also an analyst?

M: Berliner was an analyst.

O: But not a training analyst.

M: I don't think so. He came from Berlin I think. Bernfeld came from--Southern France where he had gone when Hitler came.

O: So that San Francisco started really with the training analysts.

M: I think Bernfeld did some work, even though Berliner was there first.

O: But not by very much.

M: I have to--sort of be careful. I don't think that Berliner was too anxious to get lay people to come to San Francisco--like Bernfeld was a Ph. D., and so was Anna Maenchen, and he was not too friendly, but of course Bernfeld was a very magnetic, scholarly person, and there was no question that he would put analysis really on the map in San Francisco. He immediately started teaching at the Extension Department of the University, and really--

O: He published a lot of papers and was well known.

M: He was known. He did a lot of work with social workers, who probably were the first ones to be interested in analysis in San Francisco. Bernfeld did a lot of work up there, a lot of ground work.

O: Simmel came in 1935, and Bernfeld must have come in 1936 to San Francisco.

M: Let me see--when Bernfeld came Mrs. Deri had already been here, also Simmel, of course-- because I remember going down to the station with her to meet the Bernfeld family.

O: Oh, Bernfeld came here first, and then went up to San Francisco?

M: Yes, he arrived here and spent a few days with us.

O: You couldn't keep him here?

M: No, I think he came with the intention of going to San Francisco, but he stayed a few days with us here, and just visited, but he was San Francisco bound, where he had a sister living.

O: Sight unseen?

M: Sight unseen, that's right. I don't know how he contacted San Francisco ahead of time. But I know that Mrs. Deri came soon after Simmel.

O: Was she already a training analyst?

M: She was a training analyst in Berlin.

O: Did Simmel bring her? Did he have some influence?

M: Yes, he invited her to come, and then he also invited the Haenels to come,

Irene and Joachim. Hanna (Heilborn) was already here when the Haenels came, and I think Fenichel also had arrived, he came within six months of Hanna.

O: Following Mrs. Deri.

M: Following Mrs. Deri.

O: Now were they invited by the group also; was it then a pipeline--one would invite the other?

M: Well, Mrs. Deri brought Hanna, and she brought Fenichel, though he was sent a contract by the Study Group to teach, and Fenichel, I mean Simmel, brought the Haenels. Who else came? I think this was it.

O: But Simmel brought Fenichel?

M: Mrs. Deri.

O: Mrs. Deri brought Fenichel.

M: But I mean all this went with the approval of the original group; we all gave affidavits--the original Study Group.

O: Did you have a selection for this, I mean, were there many European analysts who wanted to come, and you could to a certain extent pick and choose who was recommended? Or--I don't know quite how to put it, the question.

M: I think David wrote to--he can answer this--it seems to me he inquired from I don't know who--whom we should invite. I mean, the European analysts wanted to leave, they were very anxious to leave, and there were several people being considered--I can't tell you who any more. But then we decided that we wanted Simmel here, and made the arrangements affidavit-wise, and so on, to bring him here.

O: Do you recall why you were particularly interested in Simmel? Was it because of his hospital work, or--

M: David can answer this better, just why Simmel was--I don't recall now. I don't remember whether Simmel had also contacted Menninger. I just don't know. Maybe going through the correspondence--you know, we had some minutes of those days, but they can't be found anywhere--all this would probably be found in it.

O: Now as the different individuals would come, generally would they be happy here, professionally? I mean, for instance, what about the language situation? Was that a problem for them at that time?

M: For Simmel it was quite a problem. He had quite a struggle with the English language, but he had some basic knowledge, and I guess people just were patient.

O: But the change must have been so tremendous. Yet they seem to have adjusted to Los Angeles relatively quickly.

M: I think some of them got some instruction. I think the Lachenbruchs were quite helpful in making the transition, because they had done quite a bit of translating; they both had lived in Vienna, had been analyzed in Vienna, and knew the analytic language, and they worked with Simmel, and I think they also worked with Fenichel.

O: But they moved quite rapidly into the life of the city.

M: Yes.

O: Or did they remain an island unto themselves, you know, the analytic group? Did they begin to move out?

M: Well, I think each one was eager to make contacts. Simmel particularly was awfully anxious to get a hospital started here, so he was anxious to meet the medical profession here. And there was a man who came to town by the name of Urbantchitsch--I don't know whether that is a concept for you--Urbantchitsch's father was a good friend of the Professor in Vienna, and Urbantchitsch was sort of an enfant terrible. He was a psychiatrist, had some nibblings at analytic training. He was considered a problem in Vienna, and he never had official standing as an analyst. But through his contact with the Professor people sort of put up with him, and he appeared here in town too. Simmel in his eagerness to have people who would be interested in furthering his hospital fell right in with him, to his own detriment, because he turned out to be a phony.

O: How do you spell his name?

M: He called himself--I don't know whether he's still alive--. From here he left town and the next thing I heard was that he was an analyst in Carmel, and by then his name was Urban--but in the days that we knew him here, and had heard about him in Vienna--he had also done some writing, and there was talk about involvements with women who had killed themselves on his account--you know, just a person that you want to stay away from. But Simmel only saw his dream come true, and so he hoped that maybe Urbantchitsch, who supposedly had access to money, would be helpful to him. We were rather afraid to have this man in our group, but fortunately he was not here very long. Then another man came to town by the name of Montgomery--(you'll find it in the notes)--who called himself an analyst, but he was just a phony too. He was also in our group and kidded Simmel into helping him establish a hospital. Montgomery turned out to be an absolute fake.

O: Simmel wasn't familiar with the American psychopath?

M: And then, after he had been smitten by these people, or fooled by these people, he became overly careful, so that when May--this is not being edited officially, this tape?--when May Romm came to town he, in view of his experience, asked her why she came here, and right away made an enemy of her. She took this inquiry very much amiss, and right from the beginning they didn't see eye to eye.

O: When did she come?

M: She was already here when Fenichel arrived, so it must have been--

O: She came from New York, didn't she?

M: Yes, but she just resented Simmel's inquiry why she came here. He did it because of his previous experiences, and so they didn't hit it off right from the beginning.

O: So that by 1938, let's say, you already had you and your husband, David Brunswick, Miss Levy, Simmel, Marjorie Leonard, Deri, Mrs. Fenichel, and Dr. Fenichel.

M: Her name was Heilborn at that time; she wasn't married yet; Hanna Heilborn.

O: Related to the Heilborn from up North?

M: No.

O: And the Haenels.

M: I think that's all.

O: Were both Haenels analysts?

M: Both Haenels, yes.

O: So you already had quite a group. Now Simmel--you still had the Study Group.

M: We still had the Study Group, which was reorganized when Simmel came, and he became the leader. San Francisco also had formed a group, and I think the first meeting that we had with the San Francisco Group was in 1938 in San Francisco--or was the first meeting in Ojai in the fall of 1939, and the San Francisco people came down here? This initial meeting started sort of an exchange of what is now the West Coast Meetings, but these were still informal groups.

O: And our group must have been much larger than their group at this time.

M: Probably, yes, I suppose so. I'm just trying to remember who was in their group; there was MacFarlane, and a man by the name of Sanford--he was I think a psychologist at Berkeley, I don't know what has become of him now--and Anna Maenchen, Bernfeld, Mrs. Bernfeld, Berliner--there must have been others, but--if we could find the notes.

O: Now then, the Study Group was reorganized in 1935.

M: When Simmel came, yes.

O: Now, what happened to the Study Group when Fenichel came, and when Deri came?

M: I think that two or three years from the time Simmel came, he and Fenichel became members of the Topeka Group. I'm not clear now, but this is I'm sure already in the available notes. The M. D.'s, I think, who were in our group by now, could belong to the Topeka Group, Topeka being the nearest to the West Coast, and I think the San Francisco people also joined the Topeka Group. A little later they had enough members on the West Coast to form a

San Francisco Society--they needed twelve (?) charter members. So the people here became members of the San Francisco Society, and several had contact from Topeka, so by now we had two societies, I mean, we had the Study Group and the San Francisco Society. Then still later on, when there were enough people here, the Los Angeles Society was founded.

O: So that really from the beginning there was the conflict between the lay- and the medical groups in terms of administrative control and so on.

M: Well, not really, not in the days that we had the Study Group. This only started with there being more M. D.'s by then. Charlie Tidd was already here; he was here a short time and then went back to Menningers, and I'm sure the trainees started with--

O: Who was the first trainee?--I'm trying to recall who the first trainee was. Was it Evans? Or Sperling?

M: I think Charlie was the first one here, but he was here only--

O: He wasn't the first candidate. Who was the first candidate? There was Newhouse; at the beginning there was Newhouse, Sperling, Reider, Greenson, and Evans.

M: Newhouse, Sperling, Reider, Greenson--those were the so-called "Fenichel boys," and Sperling was one of the four. They all started with Fenichel, I think, that's why they were called the "Fenichel boys."

O: So Simmel didn't have any?

M: Simmel had--I don't know who he had. Who was with Simmel?

O: Evans? Newhouse? No, Newhouse was with--

M: Newhouse was with Fenichel.

O: And what about Deri--she was a training analyst, wasn't she?

M: I know Charlie Tidd was with Deri awhile, and who else was with her? It's possible that some started with Simmel, and then switched over to Fenichel or Deri--Deri can tell you that, but who was--

O: Was there a feeling in those days about the therapeutic abilities of the different training analysts and the teaching abilities? Were there differences in their talents and so on?

M: In those days there was no such feeling. We met regularly with Simmel, with Deri, and with Fenichel when he came. Every week we met as a group, and I still remember we sat around their dining room tables, just about ten people. It was very nice. And there really was no unfriendly feeling. We were all there to learn what we could.

O: And each week one would lead, in rotation?

M: Each week we met with one, yes, maybe twice a week(?).

O: Would the others come to the meeting and sit in, or--

M: No. This was by now just analysts.

O: No, I mean would the three of them come to each meeting?

M: No, but we had our Study Group meetings, once a month, and everybody came there.

O: Now who were these ten, did they have to be accepted by anybody? Did they have to be screened? For instance, who decided who was to attend these weekly meetings, as opposed to the whole Study Group, or was it a matter of just choice?

M: Just those who practiced analysis.

O: That was the restriction.

M: For instance, people like the Burns, or Tolman--others were not invited to come--were only invited to the Study Group.

O: So that in 1938, let's say, when this began, there were then ten practicing analysts, people who practiced analysis, not all fully trained, or certified, but all practicing analysis, and three training analysts, people who had been accredited, who--or whatever they did in those days in Europe. So you had thirteen analysts already by 1938.

M: You'd have to look that up in the membership lists.

O: Well, you say there were ten around the table.

M: About.

O: About ten.

M: Just like a handful.

O: Now did that include Greenson, and--they came a year later?

M: No, let me see, I think Greenson I first saw when he enrolled Danny at the nursery school, and he came to Study Group meetings with Leo Rosten, when Simmel had an office on Hudson, now when was that? That would be in about 1937, 1938. And then Romi went into the Army, and he really only started--he started analysis with Fenichel before he went into the Army, and then had to interrupt, I think, that's how it was, but Hanna can bring you up more definite data.

O: I want to get to the origin of the nursery school. But before that, what would go on at these weekly meetings, how were they structured? Were they just free case presentations?

M: There were case presentations, or maybe something out of the literature that would be discussed.

O: Would it be assigned to somebody to prepare and to--

M: Very informally. Or maybe just short contributions. Everybody would have something that he was particularly interested in, wanted to bring up for discussion. You are speaking of the Study Group meetings?

O: Of the Study Group meetings and the weekly meetings.

M: Well, in the weekly meetings we might read some Freud together.

O: In German?

M: No, in English. That was more structured, the weekly meetings. And we would have a seminar on technique. We would also have case presentations.

O: Now who would decide this? Would the three of them work as a curriculum and education committee in a way, and informally--so that you had a course?

M: Well, I mean, Fenichel, let's say, would pick metapsychology, and we'd all read, and maybe we would have assignments, or we would just bring questions.

O: Now, what was the relationship between the three of them, as you could see it?

M: Simmel, Fenichel, and Deri? Nothing that--

O: Nothing to report historically?

M: No, I think--

O: They got along well and were friendly with each other?

M: They got along well together, sure. Maybe Simmel felt a little bit that Fenichel--

O: He was quite a dynamic person, wasn't he?

M: Yes.

O: Students must have migrated toward Fenichel.

M: Maybe that was his feeling, never expressed.

O: Did Simmel hold his own in discussion with Fenichel?

M: Oh, yes. Simmel was a very scholarly, very informed man. He had to some extent language difficulties, and he was a very different personality from Fenichel.

O: What was his personality? You know, very few people know him. It would be interesting to put down something about him as a person.

M: I would say to some extent he was--

O: Was he older than you? What was his age? I have no idea how old he was in

relation to Fenichel or to Deri, or to anybody else. Was he a young man when he came here?

M: No, Simmel must have been fiftyish, I would say. Deri was a few years older than he, I think. He had a terrific sense of humor, but he was also very--I mean, you couldn't reach him easily, as easily as you could, for instance, Fenichel.

O: He was reserved?

M: More reserved--shall I say more German in his whole approach. The typical German scholarly person.

O: Kind of compulsive? Distant? Cold?

M: I wouldn't say really cold. I knew him quite well, and we related well. He had a terrific sense of humor, and a marvelous store of anecdotes and stories, and when he got started he was really just marvellous--tears would stream down our faces. And he had quite a literary interest too, but analytically he hadn't published very much. There's a lot of unpublished material that we are trying to get out now, translate some of his papers that were never translated, and also look through unpublished papers. But he had one difficulty--he had a very disturbed, neurotic wife, who blocked his social needs, and that tended to isolate him at times, and, as I say, his often unfortunate way of choosing people made it hard sometimes for him to be free in communicating with us, because I think he was criticized for it. What else can I tell you?

O: I think that's enough. Now, what about the nursery school? How did that get started?

M: Some of us who had young children at that time were looking for a nursery school, and we heard of a nursery school called the Parents' Co-operative Nursery School, which had been started two or three years earlier by Elizabeth Woods, as the first experimental attempt by the Board of Education at having a nursery school. I think she got some money to run this experiment for about two years or one year, I forget. She got a trained nursery-school teacher by the name of Rebecca Earle, who was a teacher. She had gone through nursery-school training in the Middle West, I believe--there's a school by the name of Merrill Palmer, something like that, Palmer Training School for Nursery-School Teachers--anyhow, she ran this project, but the money gave out, and Elizabeth Woods couldn't get any more funds, so the parents who were in the nursery school at that time started the Parents' Co-operative Nursery School, rented a house over on Third Avenue near Washington, and this was the first contact that I had with that nursery school.

O: Now what year was that, do you recall?

M: Let's see, that was in 1932, I think.

O: 1932?

M: Yes, I think it was 1932, and slowly either analysts' children, or analytically interested peoples' children joined the school; there were the Evans,

who moved down from Santa Barbara, their children came; the Lippett--

O: Manny Lippett?

M: Manny Lippett's boy came, Danny Greenson came, and the Brunswick child and Simmel's boy also came by then. Pretty soon there seemed to be developing a "Split" among the parents. Some were afraid of us. We were about half and half. And Rebecca Earle was not--she was still Director of the school, but she had gone back to public-school teaching because she couldn't afford to work for us.

O: Same old problem.

M: She lived in the building and she kept an eye on what was going on, and pretty soon she asked me and David Brunswick to spread the gospel, and interest the parents in our way of looking at things, and also such teachers as we had at that time--we tried to teach them a few analytic concepts.

O: Now this was who? Who did this? Elizabeth Woods asked you to--

M: No, Elizabeth Woods by then was out. Rebecca Earle--who still had an interest in the school. We started meetings, informally, to discuss children, what we call now case-study meetings. And some of us felt we would like to start a kindergarten, not only a nursery school. Still later we started a grade school in connection with this Parents' Co-operative, but after two years we had to give up, because we didn't have the money to get the proper personnel, and by then there was also the philosophical split in the school, so one day we just decided we had to get out of there. By now it's 1939, I think, when we started the School for Nursery Years.

O: By the analysts?

M: By the--well, Betty Evans especially was the moving factor there, and the charter members of the Board were Simmel, David Brunswick, and Betty Evans, the three people.

O: At that time Betty Evans was the teacher at the nursery school, or was she also taking courses in the Study Group and Institute?

M: This takes me to an omission. After Fenichel got here, Mady Olden was invited to come here. Now she had been a child analyst in Prague, trained by Fenichel, Bornstein, etc., so she came and was here for about a year. That's around the time that the nursery school was started, and Betty worked with Mady Olden; she didn't teach at the nursery school but she was--observing children, and doing some play therapy with children. I don't remember who were our teachers then, have to look that up, but we had rented the house over on Rossmore. The Study Group meetings started meeting there too--that was our headquarters during the war. We must have been over there about four years, and at the end of the war we built the building on Alfred Street. By then Eleanor Nordlinger, who was at that time Eleanor Francis, with Betty Evans together, ran the school.

O: During the war years, what was the analytic community and the school community during those years, when most people were gone, or were they gone?

M: Not most people were gone. Romi and Sperling were gone, but they came on visits here, because Romi was in Yuma, Arizona, and Sperling was also not too far away from here, and gradually other men in uniform came--I remember Futterman and Frumkes attended meetings in uniform. Dick Evans was down in Santa Ana, so he came, and I think Milton Miller was in Santa Ana too.

O: Who?

M: Miller.

O: Milt Miller?

M: Yes. But I believe that was before the--what year was the Society formed here, in 1942?

O: No, the Society was formed here in 1945 or 1946.

M: In 1942 may have been San Francisco.

O: Yes. Well, I think we've done enough.

M: Now, this is quite a jumble.

Recorded on tape at the home of Mrs. Margrit Munk
290 South Westgate
Los Angeles 49

First transcript by Mrs. Jeanne Herzog
Final transcript by Mrs. Jean Kameon