INTERVIEW WITH DR. CAREL VAN DER HEIDE

by

Dr. Albert Kandelin

May 21, 1963

Committee for the History of the Society

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

INTERVIEW WITH DR. CAREL VAN DER HEIDE

by Dr. Albert Kandelin

May 21, 1963

K: How do you do, Dr. Van der Heide?

V: I'm fine.

K: A convenient way to commence, which other people have found convenient, is for you to give me, if you like, just a little brief identifying biographical sketch about yourself.

V: Well, I am a native of Holland, born in the city of Delft, October 22, 1904. I attended grammar school in Delft, high school in Leyden, and college and medical school at the University of Amsterdam from which I graduated (M. D.) in 1930. The next year I was a resident in pathology, followed by a residency in neurology and neuropathology and subsequently psychiatry, all at the University Hospital, Amsterdam. In 1934 I delivered my thesis, a monograph on Pick's atrophy of the brain[1] and so obtained my degree of Doctor of Medical Science. That thesis was mainly a study of cellular changes in the various layers of the brain cortex. I must say that, however, in 1932 my main interest had shifted to dynamic psychiatry and psychotherapy, and that I had started my first personal analysis (with Westerman Holstein) in 1932. During the remainder of 1934 and a good deal of 1935 I was in Vienna continuing my personal analysis, at that time with Grete Bibring, whom during subsequent summers I saw for further analytic work. In the end of 1935 I returned to Amsterdam and became an associate clinical professor of psychiatry in charge of resident training at the psychiatric department of the University of Amsterdam, at that time under the chairmanship of Professor Dr. K. H. Bouman.[2] I also was a consultant for the University General Hospital there, which brought me in contact with the various medical departments and thus I became more concerned with problems of psychosomatic medicine. It was that interest which, supported by the head of the department, prompted an application for a Rockerfeller Fellowship, which finally was approved at the end of 1938. For two years I would have an opportunity to study psychosomatic medicine and its development in the United States, in particular at the Chicago Institute, and the plan was that I would return to the University Hospital of Amsterdam as a teacher and consultant in that field. It was not until the spring of 1939 that things became final, and I arrived in the United States I believe, September 6, 1939.

Going back a few years, I may say that between 1934 and 1939 in Amsterdam I had a private practice in psychiatry and neurology, but after the first year the main emphasis was on psychotherapy and psychoanalysis. I continued supervision in Amsterdam with various people. I mention Drs. Karl Landauer, Van der Hoop, and Van der Waals, Hans Lampl and Jeanne Lampl de Groot. The Dutch Society and Institute at that time were still in the stage of formation, seminars were rather unorganized, often centered around clinical-case presentations, with occasional lecturers or visitors, among whom I recall Otto

---

[1]Carel Van der Heide, Klinisch-Anatomische Studie Over Picksche Ziekte, N. V. Drukkerij Jacob Van Campen, Amsterdam MCMXXXIV

[2]C. Van der Heide, Malariabehandeling Van Dementia Paralytica, Nederl. Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde, Jaargang 82. No. 27.(3331-3336). Zaterdag 2 Juli 1938
C. Van der Heide, Osteoporosis Circumscripta Cranii (Schuller), Nederl. Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde, Jaargang 83. No. 13. (1483-1484). Zaterdag 1 April 1939

Fenichel. There were two groups, Amsterdam and the Hague; at that time in the Hague we had Katan and Van Ophuisen and Theodore Reik. I do not know in which year I became a member of the International Psychoanalytic Association, but I believe it was 1936 or 1937.

Regarding the time I spent in Vienna, I should like to make it explicitly clear that I was never a formal candidate of the Viennese Psychoanalytic Institute. My personal analysis with Grete Bibring was arranged on a purely private basis, but, as a guest, I was granted the privilege of attending seminars in the Viennese Institute, of which I recall those by Anna Freud, Robert Waelder, and Helene Deutsch with particular joy. During my stay there, I had some supervisory work with Edward Bibring and Helene Deutsch, to whom I returned during the subsequent summers. Being a student of psychoanalysis in Vienna coincided with my work at the Vienna University Hospital, the psychiatric department at that time under the chairmanship of Otto Poetzl. I had the pleasure of knowing there Drs. Stengel, Bernhard Dattner, and Kautner, also Dr. Sakel who just had started the insulin shock treatment of schizophrenics.

From this point may I jump over to 1939, early September, my arrival in the United States, which brought me to the Chicago Institute of Psychoanalysis. My interest at that time was in particular what work Alexander was doing on gastrointestinal disturbances, French on bronchial asthma, and Therese Benedek, who just had started her studies on the relation between psychological processes and the hormonal cycle. I made visits to the University of Illinois, psychiatry department at Cook County Hospital, and had a guest residency there, which rendered it possible for me to take a license to practice medicine in the state of Illinois (1941). I believe it was after two years that I was appointed a member of the staff of the Chicago Institute. I was at that time quite concerned with the relation between emotional disorders and skin pathology, in particular neurodermatitis. I had a research relation with the University of Chicago, Dr. Max Obermayer, and I studied a number of cases through interviews, while some were studied in research analyses arranged at the Chicago Institute. In Chicago I had some supervision with Alexander and Therese Benedek. My cases with Alexander were mainly on psychosomatic problems, skin and an ulcer case.[3]

It was during the last year of my stay in Chicago that Alexander became more and more preoccupied with modifications of technique and his ideas on psychoanalytic therapy, and was working on a project to put these experimentations in writing, in which Milton Miller and Martin Grotjahn were active participants. I may say that I felt somewhat bewildered by it, and that I kept aloof from this manipulative (psychoanalytic) technique. I have the feeling that Dr. Alexander did not like me for that attitude, and that it was the beginning of my awareness that I no longer had a place in the activities of the Chicago Institute.

At that time I had given up my Dutch citizenship, had taken out first papers, and felt strongly that I would gain for myself and my family in the United

---

[3]Carel Van der Heide, A Study of Mechanisms in Two Cases of Peptic Ulcer, Psychosomatic Medicine, Vol. II, No. 4, Oct., 1940
Carel Van der Heide, A Case of Pollakiuria Nervosa, Psychoanalytic Quarterly, Vol. X, No. 2, April, 1941

States by making myself available for military service. I was a consultant to the Selective Service in Chicago and in 1943 was granted a commission as Captain in the Medical Corps. I think it was in May, 1943, that I entered the service to work at the A. A. F. Selection Center in Nashville, Tennessee, and subsequently in various Air Force Stations, finally in Atlantic City. From there I was sent to the School of Aviation Medicine, Randolph Field, Texas, and in August, 1944, became a Flight Surgeon on active flying duty from then on. Following that I went back to Atlantic City and on to Pass-a-Grille, Florida, to work with Grinker on the psychotherapy of flying personnel returned from Europe with so-called "combat fatique."[4] Soon afterwards I was commissioned by the Air Force Surgeon to participate in a special mission to Europe to do a study of the psychiatric organization of the Luftwaffe, just around the time of the surrender.[5] I think that brings us up to 1945. May I say that during my tour in military service in the United States Army, I had an opportunity to take both specialty boards, the one in psychiatry in 1943 and in neurology in 1944. Upon my return from Europe in 1945 I was assigned to duty at the Santa Ana Army Air Base, California, where I had the pleasure of meeting Richard Evans, who was stationed there, and I believe occasionally Rangell and Greenson, who were visiting. What next?

K: You were at some point in 1945 where you had come to California.

V: Well, I'd like first to go back to the experience in Florida, working with Grinker and John Spiegel at the time when psychotherapy with Pentothal induction was developed. I believe that the experiences, and also I would say some of the results were most dramatic and impressive. I have not maintained any interest in psychotherapy with drugs as adjuvants, but I believe that if anywhere it is indicated and proper, it was with those subjects with intense traumatic experiences, which indeed, as Grinker described, were perceived very much in terms of the earlier emotional traumata of life. What did put me at some distance from Grinker was his great urge and impatience to see his ideas and results in print.

My earliest days in California around the Santa Ana Army Air Base thus permitted me visits to Los Angeles. The one person in whom I was particularly interested here was Otto Fenichel, whom at various times I had met in Europe, having heard him as a guest lecturer to the Amsterdam group. I saw Fenichel a few times during the fall of 1945, and discussed with him my intention to settle in Los Angeles upon my release from service. I did so for three reasons: 1) I had decided not to return to Chicago, 2) I had an interest to work if possible in close conjunction with Fenichel, with consideration of having more personal analysis with him, and for that reason turned down opportunities I had to settle in Boston or in San Francisco, and 3) because of my family who had come to like living in California. Of course with the untimely death of Otto Fenichel on January 22, the most important determinant for my settling in Los Angeles was gone; nevertheless, I went on as planned, finished the military tour of duty at Denver at the station hospital of two airfields there. I came to Los Angeles in the late summer of 1946 and was

---

[4]Carel Van der Heide, Capt., M.C., & Jack Weinberg, Capt., M.C., Sleep Paralysis and Combat Fatique, Psychosomatic Medicine, Vol. VII, No. 6, Nov., 1945

[5]Carel Van der Heide, Capt. M.C., A.U.S., Neuropsychiatry at the University of Amsterdam, Holland, 1940-1944, American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 102, No. 4 Jan., 1946

confronted with the demand that I take a rotating internship in an American hospital to qualify for a California medical license. I served that internship at St. John's Hospital, Santa Monica, from September of 1946 till September, 1947, and took my medical license examination, I believe, in December of the year, 1947. I started practicing psychoanalysis at the end of 1947, having my first office at 122 South Lasky Drive, from which I moved one year later to 9730 Wilshire Boulevard, where I am still established, fearing to become one of the oldest tenants of that building.

K: That's a very good building.

V: I think so; I never will move out of it. I have the smallest office, one which is called the broom closet, but it is very good.

K: It's very comfortable. I've been there and remember it very well.

V: I must admit my hesitancy to this interview; if one's picture is hung up in the Institute and one is put on tape, the idea suggests itself that one may not be around so much longer anymore. But let's continue anyway. In reference to my difficult start here with the internship and growing family (two more children were added) my capacity to participate in psychoanalytic development was quite limited. Of those early days I recall my envy of two of my former Chicago Institute fellow members, Miller and Grotjahn, the first having a California license and the second foregoing an attempt to obtain one, which permitted them to return to analytic work after military service, without delay, which was not my privilege. Instead I had my night service at St. John's and multiple I. V.'s, even some activities in surgery. It was in the fall of 1946 that I had my first contact with Ernst Lewy and Ernst Simmel and then met Mrs. Deri, whom I had not known before, as well as Hanna Fenichel, and I recall meetings in Ernst Simmel's house at which the formation of a Los Angeles Society was planned. I recall having been asked to become a charter member of that Society, and after having kept it in consideration for some time, I decided to decline, since I still was not quite certain that I would remain in Los Angeles. I may say that at that I was a member of The American Psychoanalytic since 1940 as well as a member of the Chicago Psychoanalytic Society, a membership which subsequently was transferred to Los Angeles. It was not until 1947 that I had sufficient time to establish contacts with members of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic group, and before very long, I became a lecturer in the Institute. I cannot give the year of that appointment, but I recall giving seminars on Freud papers, on psychosomatic medicine, and I don't know what other courses. Having become a member of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society, I believe I served for one year as its Secretary (I am not certain of that) and for another as Vice-President.

The Los Angeles Institute became more of the center of interest to me. With the earlier years of the formation of the Institute I, actually, had very little to do. It was in 1950 when Ernst Lewy was Dean, I believe, that it was proposed that I be a training analyst. I believe that was in the stormy, hectic, and dreary days of the Split, and I understood that my appointment was closely linked with the crisis then in full swing.

I recall little which I consider of historical importance with regard to the details of the days of the Split. I was a co-signer of the document which set forth our ideas of what psychoanalytic training and personal analysis should

be, a statement which I believe was drawn up by Greenson and signed by those training analysts who remained in the old Institute. I could do so with conviction and with the help of my personal impressions of individuals on both sides of the fence as representataves of psychoanalysis. I would say that any direct personal involvement on my end played a small or no role at all. Actually, the analysts in Los Angeles at that time to whom I could have felt closest belonged to the new Institute; to wit Miller and Grotjahn, with whom I spent four years on the staff at the Chicago Institute.

It was 1952 that I was appointed a training analyst, and I recall it was 1953 when I was appointed Dean, to serve one year of the unexpired term of Ernst Lewy. I was re-elected to be Dean in 1954 and served until 1957, to be succeeded by Ralph Greenson. From 1953 until 1957 Ivan McGuire was Assistant Dean, and from this period of service in the Institute I should like to recall the most important features and events. I'd like to mention in the first place the reorganization of the administration, with particular emphasis on more extensive and complete records on the candidates, a better system of collecting data of interviews with applicants, with numerical evaluation, and even some predictions with regard to the outcome of the course of training, and a reorganization of the curriculum (which now is known as the old curriculum) and which was "chronologically" structured. I do not know what other important events took place except meetings with the APA visiting teams, Lewis Robbins, Reider, Gill, Lewin and Ross. We had considerable enlargement of the Education Committee, four training analysts being newly appointed; I believe they were Friedman, Rangell, Vatz, and Kupper. I had the help of the Education Committee in the formulation of some policies with regard to elections and various didactic procedures, part of which since then have become the By-Laws of the Institute, under the auspices of a committee of which at times I was chairman and often a member. Also during those years I attended a number of APA meetings as a Fellow and was a participant on various panels on psychoanalytic education.

K: Historical viewpoint often focuses on a big landmark in local history; namely, the Split, so I'd like to go back and ask you a few questions about the Split. First of all in your opinion was it necessary or desirable? What would you say?

V: I certainly believe, at that time, the Split was both necessary and desirable. I don't minimize the personality difficulties, the violent tempers, and personal feuds which existed between the people involved, but just because I was no part of what was going on in personal matters and of what had been going on before, I think I was in a somewhat objective position to recognize the attitude toward psychoanalytic training being quite expedient, political, and opportunistically slanted at one end, and to me, impressively serious, dedicated, and scientifically oriented at the other. I believe that what's happened since 1950 to a large extent has proven the Split to have been a useful one, that it provided differentiation in the very terms which I just used and I believe nowadays still can be used, and with justification. Of course that still leaves room for sad failures in our Institute and the picture of good workers in the other Institute. Does that answer your question?

K: Yes, very much so. I asked the question because there are some opinions, somewhat in the minority, who regret the Split, and who say it was neither desirable nor necessary. I just read today an interview with Futterman who felt that

this was the case, both undesirable and unnecessary, and a week or two ago I interviewed Friedman, who had somewhat the same opinion.

V: In answer to that question I find it difficult to be absolute. I have the idea that for the time being the two Institutes in Los Angeles are guaranteeing a certain balance, and that such polarity is useful. However, I feel that this is of minor importance in view of developments on the national scene. After all the neo-Freudian movement is on its way; there is the Academy, there are many members of The American Psychoanalytic Association who have one leg, if not one-and-a-half, in the Academy, and I very well could foresee a split on a national level in the years to come. Returning to those connected with the local scene, it is interesting that two people who made quite a career in the Los Angeles Institute actually were analyzed by a training analyst who became a member of the New Institute.

K: Yes, I would add too that the opinion which regrets the Split does seem to come from people who are somewhat younger and less involved with the genesis of the Split. Do you see my point?

V: I see your point, but I wouldn't agree with it, because I think the issue of the Split can be viewed as of today without involvement of the past and these very personal things which were happening in that situation.

K: Some of this is based on the feeling that psychoanalysis locally has suffered by being divided in this way, whereas of course the majority opinion feels that it was a way for psychoanalysis to survive and to continue, which I believe is your viewpoint.

V: Certainly. I would be much inclined to believe that the Split has been to the good of psychoanalysis in Los Angeles, even if the New Institute may excel in the number of candidates in training. As of this date I don't believe they are superior in training or in the products of their training however.

K: You seem to have been much involved with matters of organizing, and there have been comments about how the organization has developed into parallel Institute and Society, to the disadvantage of psychoanalysis. Would you have any comments or opinions about that?

V: As to the organization, I can recall more organized admission procedure, the increase of admission interviews to five, the establishment of the curriculum, and beyond that the establishment, which I forgot to mention earlier, of the so-called Colloquia, the first one being designed to evaluate the candidate's ability to do clinical analysis, and the second, at the end of the three-year course, to ascertain his ability to do psychoanalysis unsupervised. Continuing on the subject of organization, I believe that during the years of my Deanship, we established form reports on supervised cases in terms of numbers of hours, the number of supervisory hours, duration, length, sex, age and diagnosis of the patient, course and the duration of analysis, a critical report as well as a written opinion by the supervisory analyst on the given case. These things you may head under the chapter of organization. I believe they are on the fringe, and they are indeed external, but I do believe that they are needed to have some outline of what went on during the years of training, and these reports have been considerably appreciated in The American Psychoanalytic Association; they were selected for mention by Lewin and Ross when they were

out here for their survey. But I would be the first to admit that it doesn't go to the heart of psychoanalytic training, which, as you know, is of a more private nature and is hard to spell out in any form. But I did not answer your question on the parallel of Institute and Society.

K: An interesting other sort of main topic, which you may or may not have some opinions or feelings about, is the question of lay analysis, which was probably much more controversial in earlier times, and even in Europe. Yet there are certain rumblings about lay analysis, and certainly it seemed to contribute a certain side issue to the Split, did it not?

V: The matter of lay analysis is not very close to my heart. I have no firm or definite opinions about it at all. In our local group I have a tendency to forget who is a lay analyst and who is a medical analyst, and in our Education Committee, I believe, the lay members are of the highest caliber as analysts. I have never had to take a stand in the national organization with regard to its policy of excluding lay analysts from membership. However, I believe that before too long we will see well-formed and well-organized training institutes run by clinical psychologists, probably supported by psychoanalysts who are M. D.'s, and the view that only M. D.'s should practice psychoanalysis might well become a thing of the past.

K: Well, therefore we feel that some of the narrow interpretation of excluding lay analysts from psychoanalysis is not a very valid or even constructive one. Is this not your position?

V: Well, there are two different questions. One is that concerning trained analysts who are lay people, and whom we personally know, and to whom we have no hesitation to refer patients because we know of their judgment and maturity. I have no particular experience or position with regard to licensure problems in this state, so I have nothing to say about that. Another question is whether in the future we should accept lay people for training, and I think that if we do, they should be indeed of the highest professional qualifications. Beyond that I have some hesitation about what is going on now, sponsored by The APA; namely, the training of non-medical people to do research in psychoanalysis. This is a subject which presents some difficulty because I think the only research in psychoanalysis--I don't mean the application of psychoanalysis in other fields of research, but research in psychoanalysis itself, only can be done by those who have extensive clinical experience in psychoanalysis, and therefore I cannot see how people can be pushed through psychoanalytic training to do research in our field.

K: Yes, I feel I understand your point. Another topic would be what about dilution of psychoanalysis, such as psychoanalysis being applied to medical education or preventive psychiatry, etc. There are proponents on each side, so it does become a controversial issue; on the one side those people who feel that psychoanalysts should limit themselves, on the other hand those who feel that psychoanalysts should not limit themselves and should get out into the community, educational and otherwise.

V: I am very much in favor of the application of psychoanalytic knowledge in the widest possible sense, whether that be in the courts of law or in sociology, anthropology, or wherever you may go. I admire and respect the analysts who are so doing, and we all see very fortunate examples of that effort, such as

the institute for educators at Reiss-Davis, or the seminars for lawyers which are in the process of being set up in the Extension Division. I, of course, feel that the representation of psychoanalytic psychology in the medical schools has its place, and is . . . . . however, we are up against a peculiar phenomenon, in that the number of people who have great enthusiasm in that direction at the same time are those who like to reduce the number of psychoanalytic hours in their practices, and evidently quite often also are those who personally are impatient with psychoanalysis, or lack the extensive experience in clinical analysis which one would like them to have. That's a phenomenon which one could of course elaborate at great lenth.

Your question, naturally, leads into how psychoanalysis can be properly presented in medical education or even training in psychoanalysis can be organized within the realms of the psychiatric department of a medical school. We are told that at many places it is done, and well done; it appears at this very moment that Columbia, Pittsburgh, and Down-State New York (?) are examples. A very interesting question is that of the residency being linked with the personal analysis, meanwhile isolating the supervisory, clinical work from the personal analysis. One feels like saying, Bless them and wish them luck on that course, but one likes to look away from the unfortunate pseudoanalytic training in psychiatry, which in some medical departments, perhaps even in this area, can be seen, and which to me appears like a monstrosity. In my work as a training analyst I have encountered a number of candidates who have all the "terms" which are used as jargon and which is a well-developed part of their system of defense (intellectualization). I think I should stop at this point.

K: Do you mean stop on this question? You don't mean, I hope, stop the interview. Getting away from anything controversial, I have found very interesting reminiscences coming from people about your vintage regarding some of the pioneer names in psychoanalysis. For example, was it ever your pleasure to meet Freud or others in his inner circle?

V: I never had the pleasure of meeting or even seeing Professor Freud in person. Distantly I knew Anna Freud in Vienna in 1934; I met her again in 1939 at the house of her father in London, at which time I was delegated by Hans Lampl to bring cigarellos to Freud, the only cigars which at that time he was able to smoke. That was in the spring of 1939. Since then I have had occasional contacts and correspondence with Anna Freud. You, Doctor Kandelin, asked me about the inner circle; there were many others whom I had the pleasure to know, either to hear in seminars or to meet after seminars in the Schlossen Cafe on the Schlossering in Vienna. They belonged to that group of people who from Vienna found their way to the United States and who did so much to promote psychoanalysis here. I'm thinking about the Bibrings, both of whom I knew quite well, the Waelders to a lesser extent, both Kurt and Ruth Eissler, oh, I am sure there are many others whose names right now don't come to mind.

K: Did you know any of our local people already in Europe?

V: Who were in Europe at the time?

K: Yes.

V: Of the analysts who left Europe for Los Angeles, I believe Otto Fenichel is the only one whom I knew in Europe. I may overlook a name there, but I can't find it now. I did not know Grotjahn in Europe, although for a long time he claimed he came from Holland.

K: We are always looking for any personal touches about -- anything you care to say -- who among the local people do you esteem as being important historically in organizing and establishing our local psychoanalytic structure?

V: The names of the people who have contributed greatly to the formation and the development of the Institute are well-known to you. Some of them have been characterized by -- I would say great steadiness in their sense of responsibility and loyalty to the Institute and their readiness to give time and to stand in the proper place. The one name which, if I describe it that way, comes most to my mind is that of David Brunswick, who has been with it from the very beginning on, and has impressed me by an unwavering persistence of mature judgment. Now if you come to the closer circle, namely the Education Committee, I say that it is a rather special group, where loves and hates may flare up high and fall very low, which is not really a good business executive committee, one which is always plagued by its administrative responsibilities and never gets much of a chance to come to the deeper and greater issues of psychoanalytic training; one with a multitude of differences of opinion, but which I find striking because when it comes to major issues, unanimity is not so hard to obtain. I wish to remind you that I have been Chairman of that Committee for four years and that my approach was directed to creating some order in certain areas where there seems to be none. I don't think I was loved for that, but it worked. It may be known to you that in the last year of my Deanship I was handicapped by my illness, which caused me a great deal of fatigue, but perhaps that does not belong in this interview.

Perhaps I may continue on that personal note I made, which may be one suitable on which to close. I am referring to an effort I made to cause the Education Committee to function, to get things done, to have proper records, and to build up a collective responsibility in relation to the candidates -- individuals and the group as a whole -- and in relation to The American Psychoanalytic Association. It may be that this striving for appropriate administration, in places, appeared to be pedantic or overdone, but it has been my pleasure to notice that in the subsequent Deanship of Dr. Greenson the basic features of this administrative reorganization have been maintained and adhered to and, as a matter of fact, through the subsequent Deanship of Dr. Friedman as well. There has been only one major change, and that was that in the curriculum. The change from the historical chronological approach to that by topic was a drastic one and has been in operation now for some four years, I believe, and that right now is beginning to create some headaches and doubts in the Curriculum Committee. If I mention the Curriculum Committee then I should add that the division of labor within the Education Committee, in a way, was also initiated during the period of my Deanship; the Admissions Committee, the Curriculum Committee, what else do we have?

K: Faculty Committee.

V: Yes, the Faculty Committee also was established during that time.

K: You speak a good deal about local organization and somewhat about national

organization. An interesting question that I've encountered recently is the balance between the two; namely, isn't it true that a strong local organization has really preceded the formation of a very strong national organization, and isn't there some measure of balance which is optimal between the two? The question would be, have we reached that optimum balance between local and national autonomy? For example, could a split have been prevented by a strong, or stronger, national organization?

V: No, I think it would not have been good if that had occurred. You speak about autonomy -- we also could speak about a certain discipline which The American has over the local groups. An example of this interrelation comes to mind now, and it is the function of The American Psychoanalytic Association which is to determine applicants' qualifications for its membership. Recently that has led to -- no, in the past few years, it has led to supervising analysts being asked to write extensive reports on the work a given candidate did in supervision. There I think you see a kind of failure -- that the national association puts itself above the local institute in the evaluation of the quality of the candidate's work. I believe an institute should assume the responsibility for the training and graduation of a candidate and that should be the end; and if there's reason to doubt the quality of his work, then there's also reason to thoroughly examine the institute which graduated that given candidate. I have taken a personal attitude about it; I have written to the Membership Committee to advise them to limit their inquiry about the quality of an individual's work and his status as an analyst and so on, to the two years which lay between his graduation and his application for APA membership. Otherwise I do not feel that the local institutes are in any way inhibited or overdisciplined by their relations with The American Psychoanalytic. Things which are going on now, in the various subcommittees of The APA, suggest that interchange of knowledge and experience in policies and training between the various institutes is very useful and very informative and can be of great help toward improvement.

K: I personally am pleased that psychoanalysis has, and continues to have, an international flavor. Certainly people like yourself, with your European origins and background, illustrate this point. I think it is a very good influence, of course, and needs to be recognized and needs to be encouraged, that we do not become too limited or provincial in any kind of a local group. Do you see my point, and don't you agree that we need to think of ourselves on an organization scale which is international in scope?

V: Well, I think that the need for that may gradually disappear. The internationalism of psychoanalysis, as I have known it, was greatly promoted and facilitated by the fact that so many analysts from Europe came to the United States; in particular the Viennese group, as you know, spread its members over a number of centers: Philadelphia, Baltimore, Chicago, and ultimately Los Angeles. That is one type of internationalism which is different from what the future may hold; namely, lively, active, and productive psychoanalytic centers in various nations and in places where the local leaders had their origin and training. You see that now already; it is possible for somebody to be born in Boston and to practice analysis in Boston; the same may not be true for Mexico City, but twenty-five years from now you may see the same thing there, or Buenos Aires. So far as the international aspect of psychoanalysis is concerned, I believe that could be sized up by saying that if possible, an analyst should be a man of a wide cultural background,

which may imply his having traveled or having knowledge of foreign countries, and having friends all over the world, and sharing the study of mankind and its behavior in its widest possible scope; is this what you're saying?

K: Yes, certainly.

V: Meanwhile, of course, it should be given full recognition, as I believe at one time it was stated by Ekstein in a talk at Reiss-Davis, that the really rapid development of psychoanalysis and its various applications could be possible in America only. Freud foresaw this happening and occasionally referred to the danger that it would be the "embrace which kills." It is not up to me to say whether the embrace really will be that harmful.

K: It's interesting because of Freud's personal prejudice, is it not true, some degree of personal prejudice against the American scene, that probably this was more emotional than intellectual?

V: No, I would say that there is such a thing, that there is a typical American overselling and subsequent deterioration of an idea having its origin in Europe. Right now I see something of that nature happening in the Montessori Schools, which in Europe were rather "pure" and sound institutions and in the U. S. tend to become, what would I call it, overdone, commercialized, or fashionable, and in danger of losing some of their original character. Now, that certainly is true of psychoanalysis too, which has found its ways and by-ways, and unfortunate by-ways into American culture, reaching out successfully into the movie box offices. I don't mean "David and Lisa," but there are too many failures in the representations of psychoanalysis on the screen. However, I think this is largely compensated for by the good analytic work that we know is going on in this country. Would that be enough, Dr. Kandelin?

K: We have talked a lot. Of course it's not yet enough in the sense that I have some zeal as an amateur historian, but I do respect any person's limits for one interview. Is there any closing note that we could establish here? I think you've been a very easy person to interview, because I've had to ask you very few questions, and you've carried the ball pretty energetically and with considerable zeal.

V: O. k., but when I see this in writing I may feel a little differently, and I may need to make some corrections, if not take some things back I have said. Of course one can talk for hours about all this, and I have made no preparation for it, so it comes very much "ad hoc." I really don't know what at this time I can add. Perhaps we could talk about certain dangers in the current development in psychoanalysis, theory and technique, but I don't think that I personally have very much of importance to say about this. The problems of psychoanalytic training, the relationship to the medical schools, the psychoanalytic influence on so-called clinical psychology, are additional matters about which one can think and express an opinion, but they have been very well surveyed by The APA.

K: Very good. Well, I suggest we terminate our interview then for today, but please I hope to have the privilege after you have seen the typed script of soliciting from you any further remarks or comments, anything at all that you might have to say in the future.

V: I'd like to add only one thing. I think that this whole project of an historical survey is rather impressive, and evidently very well executed. I admire your energy and determination to carry on this task.

Recorded on tape at 9735 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills
(Dr. Kandelin's office)

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