

LOS ANGELES PSYCHOANALYTIC SOCIETY (History Committee)

Dr. Charles Tidd interviewed by Dr. R. J. Stoller. 6/11/62

C.T. Well to start off with, I came to Los Angeles first in 1932, and during that summer I was waiting for an appointment at the hospital in San Diego for an internship. During that summer I met Dave Brunswick for the first time. As I recall I heard about Tom Libben at that time, but I think I didn't meet him that summer. I talked to Dave about psychoanalysis in which I was interested but since I still had to do the internship, I certainly didn't make any definite plans although I did talk to him about the idea of ^{personal} ~~training~~ analysis.

R.S. Was he and the Libbens the only people (T. 'I think so.') ^{doing} ~~analysis~~ analysis?

C.T. Yes I don't think there were any others. There were some other people Adlerians I think, but I didn't know them at all.

R.S. Adlerians? What is that?

C.T. You know the followers of Adler.

R.S. (ILLUMINATION) Oh Adlerians! I thought you said "At".

C.T. No Adlerians. As a matter of fact, also an interesting thing just in passing, the woman who was in charge of social work at the Child Guidance Clinic - ~~she~~ - had been a patient of Otto Rank and during that summer she invited Otto Rank out and had a cocktail party for him, and I met him ~~together with~~ I imagine Dave was there I'm not sure.

R.S. This is in 1932.

C.T. He seemed a very pleasant person. I didn't really know very much about the whole set-up at that time, except that I did know that he had broken away from Freud. And I heard sort of gossip about how he had worked especially with social workers in Philadelphia. He had quite a big following among social workers. I came back to Los Angeles after having done my internship and a year at Menninger's, and to start

Dr. Charles ... by Dr. S. A. ...

... I came to Los Angeles first in 1932, and ...
 ... I was waiting for an appointment at the hospital ...
 ... During that summer I met ...
 ... As I recall I heard about ...
 ... but I think I didn't meet him that summer. I ...
 ... in which I was interested but since I ...
 ... I certainly didn't make any ...
 ... I did talk to him about the idea of ...
 ... the only people (I think so) ...
 ... There were some other people ...
 ... but I didn't know them at all.

... that is true.

You were the ... of ...

(I thought you said ...)

... also an interesting thing ...
 ... in charge of social work of the ...
 ... had been a patient of Otto Rank and during that ...
 ... had a cocktail party for him, and ...
 ... I imagine have was there I'm not sure.

... 1932.

... I didn't really know very much about ...
 ... except that I did know that he had ...
 ... and I heard sort of ...
 ... He had quite a big ...
 ... I came back to Los Angeles after ...
 ... and a year or two ...

my analysis with Simmel. That was in 1934. At that time there wasn't anything in the way of organised training as we know it now, but I'm quite certain that the Study Group had been formed already or was in process of being formed especially with Simmel here and Dave, and I think the Libbens.

R.S. In those days was there any criterion for training like there are now?

T. No. It was a question of one person knowing another, and having some knowledge of what had happened in -- by way of training, by way of personal psychoanalysis, also in Europe.

R.S. So if Simmel were to say you were acceptable, then that would be enough for the American (T. 'That's right.') and for the International. So they didn't need the Institute set-up - ? - .

T. During the next two years, I had very little to do with the Study Group because I was in analysis. I may have gone to one or two sort of open meetings, but nothing in the way of serious study in -- or seminars, or that sort.

T. Then at the -- in 1936 my analysis was interrupted and -- by mutual consent and with the understanding that I would continue with training, and about that time I was invited back to Menninger's where I went in 1936. And while there I did controls both at Topeka and back (TOO FUZZY TO GET) for two years. Then I came back to Los Angeles in 1938. By this time Fenichel had come -- I should say the Fenichels had come -- and the Study Group was well organised. I think some of the pleasantest memories I have are of the seminars in that period between 1938 and 1942 when I went away to the Service. There was a feeling of development and worth (?) and constructive study that was just first-rate. I remember especially the seminars with Fenichel who was certainly one of the very best teachers I ever had; just outstanding.

my analysis with Stimmel. That was in 1931. At that time there wasn't
anything in the way of organized training as we know it now, but I'm
quite certain that the Study Group had been formed already or was in
process of being formed especially with Stimmel here and Dave, and I
think the Liberman.

In those days was there any criterion for training like there are now?
No. It was a question of one person knowing another, and having some
knowledge of what had happened in -- by way of training, by way of
personal psychoanalysis, also in Europe.

So it wasn't were to say you were acceptable, then that would be
enough for the American (T. F. F.'s right?) and for the International.
So they didn't need the Institute set-up - ? - .

During the next two years, I had very little to do with the Study
Group because I was in analysis. I may have gone to one or two sort
of open meetings, but nothing in the way of serious study in -- or
seminars, or that sort.

Then at the -- in 1936 my analysis was interrupted and -- by mutual
consent and with the understanding that I would continue with training
and about that time I was invited back to Henninger's where I went in

1936. And while there I did controls both at Topolca and back (TCC)
MURRY (T) for two years. Then I came back to Los Angeles in 1938.

By this time Fenichel had come -- I should say the Fenichels had
come -- and the Study Group was well organized. I think some of the
pleasantest memories I have are of the seminars in that period between
1938 and 1942 when I went away to the Service. There was a feeling of
development and worth (?) and constructive study that was just first-
rate. I remember especially the seminars with Fenichel who was
certainly one of the very best teachers I ever had; just outstanding.

R.S. Did he carry the main burden of teaching in those days or was Simmel -

T. Yes. Well Simmel (OVERLAPPING VOICES) -- Simmel also continued -- was an important teacher and a good teacher, but I think that Fenichel spent more time at it. I think he was more active in the teaching than anybody else.

While I was away in the Service from '42 to '46 the formation of the Society up in San Francisco occurred. Before that I had been a member of the Topeka Society -- had been made a member. When I got back about January of 1946, I found that -- I've forgotten -- exactly when did Fenichel die?

R.S. In January '46.

T. Yeh. I was going to say when I returned everybody that had been here when I left was still here, and there were quite a few new people, people who had come out from the War, who were in the Service. Fenichel's death was a great shock. I remember having felt such continued and increased admiration for him in connection with his decision to take an internship. I had been a little surprised to hear that he had done it, but as I say I was pleased and admired him for it.

R.S. Was he the only one? Did anyone else in the same situation do it?
I have never heard --

T. I don't know anybody else, no.

R.S. Alexander didn't, Grotjahn didn't, Lewy didn't. Why did Fenichel do that?

T. I don't know. He had made this decision while I was away - ? - .
The next thing was that Dr. Simmel called a meeting of the people who had been here before, plus the people who had come during the War

... the main burden of teaching in those days or was that -

... (SOMEONE) ...

... and a good teacher, but I think that ...

... the service from the ...

... before that I had been a

... had been made a member. When I got

... I found that -- I've forgotten -- exactly

... the ...

... in ...

... I returned everybody that had been here

... when I left was still here, and there were quite a few new people,

... people who had come out from the war, who were in the ...

... I remember having felt such

... and increased attention for his connection with his

... to take an interest. I had been a little surprised to

... but as I say I was pleased and surprised

... his ...

... the only one who was also in the same situation as his

... I have never heard --

... on, ...

... I'm not sure if ...

... do that

... I don't know, he had made this decision while I was away. - -

... the next thing was that Dr. ... called a meeting of the people

... who had been here before, since the people who had come during the war

and planned to stay. And I'm not sure at all that I can recall, in fact I don't know when that meeting was held, but I would guess in February or March of '46. This was a sort of a planning session for the setting up of the Society.

R.S. Would this have happened independently of Fenichel's death or did that precipitate it?

T. Oh I'm sure it would have happened had Fenichel lived. I feel certain it would have.

R.S. It didn't come any sooner.

T. No, no. I don't think so. (LONG SILENCE). As I recall, some of the new people who were included in that meeting were Van der Heide, Milton Miller. I think Norman Levy was there. These in addition to the people who had been here earlier. Dr. Simmel was definitely chairman of the meeting and it was he who carried all the plans -- suggested plans and carried them through, about the formation of the Society. When was the Society actually formed do you know?

R.S. I don't remember.

T. I can find out by looking -- (SOME ACTIVITY FOR SOME KIND OF A SEARCH).

R.S. I thought it was '47 but that's a guess.

E. Now this first meeting may have been just a preliminary. It took time to get the thing -- In fact I'm sure it would have to go to the American - ? - . (THE SEARCH APPARENTLY CONTINUES IN A LONG SILENCE BROKEN BY) Well this doesn't give the dates of the founding of the societies. It gives just the dates of the founding of our Institute. Now wait a minute -- yes it does. Well the Institute was founded in '46, so I'm sure the Society was founded before then.

and he had to stay. And I'm not sure as to what I can do about it.
I don't know when that meeting was held, but I would guess it
was probably on the 15th. This was a sort of a planning session for
the setting up of the Society.

World War II had happened independently of Roosevelt's death on the
15th. I don't know if there had been any other meetings. I don't know
if there had been any other meetings. I don't know if there had been
any other meetings. I don't know if there had been any other meetings.

It is not clear if there was any other meeting. I don't know if there
was any other meeting. I don't know if there was any other meeting.
I don't know if there was any other meeting. I don't know if there
was any other meeting. I don't know if there was any other meeting.

the people who had been here earlier. I don't know if there was
any other meeting. I don't know if there was any other meeting.
I don't know if there was any other meeting. I don't know if there
was any other meeting. I don't know if there was any other meeting.

I don't remember. I don't remember. I don't remember. I don't remember.
I don't remember. I don't remember. I don't remember. I don't remember.
I don't remember. I don't remember. I don't remember. I don't remember.

I don't know if there was any other meeting. I don't know if there
was any other meeting. I don't know if there was any other meeting.
I don't know if there was any other meeting. I don't know if there
was any other meeting. I don't know if there was any other meeting.

of the committee. It gives just the dates of the founding of our
Institution. Now what a minute --- yes it does. Tell the Executive
and I'm sure the Society was founded before then.

(MORE SILENCE) At the early meetings for the organising and then after the Society was formed, the question of lay analysts came up, was always present. On the one hand the lay analysts were afraid that -- or seemed to be afraid, that they weren't going to be treated properly, and on the other hand there's no question but that some of the medically trained people were concerned that the lay analysts would want to continue training. I think that the lay analysts had definitely accepted the situation that had been worked out in 1938 in the American, and I don't think there was anyone who really seriously felt that the training of lay analysts would continue.

R.S. Had it?

T. After 1938? Not that I know of. It may be that some lay people had continued to get some kind of training in connection with working with children but certainly not on any large scale. As a matter of fact having been away four years during the War I had not kept in close touch with what was going on so I don't really know anything about that. All I know is that the San Francisco Society (VOICE DROPS OUT OF HEARING). And I think I was never included as a member of the San Francisco Society. I think my membership continued in Topeka and then when the er --

R.S. Right through the war.

T. Yes. I'm pretty sure that's correct. Somewhere there's a directory of the charter members of all the Societies but I don't see them in this directory. But anyway I'm sure I was a charter member of the Topeka Society first and then of the Los Angeles, but I think not of the San Francisco. Well! At any rate, after the Society was formed and accepted by the American - ? - , then the Institute

...the early meetings for the organization and then after
 the meeting was held, the question of lay analysis came up. We
 -- first of all, on the one hand the lay analysis were already there
 or seemed to be there, that they weren't going to be treated properly
 and on the other hand there's no question but that some of the radical
 people were concerned that the lay analysis would want to con-
 sider themselves. I think that the lay analysis had definitely needed
 the attention that had been worked out in 1978 in the American, and I
 don't think there was anyone who really seriously felt that the training
 of lay analysis would continue.

...I know that I had not had any of the people had
 continued to get some kind of training in connection with working with
 children but certainly not on any large scale. As a matter of fact
 having been away four years during the war I had not kept in close
 touch with that and was going to be I don't really know anything about
 that. I know that the San Francisco Society (SFS) was never included as a member of the
 San Francisco Society. I think my membership continued in Boston
 and that was the end --

...I'm pretty sure that's correct. I don't see them in
 of the members of all the Societies but I don't see them in
 this situation. But anyway I'm sure I was a charter member of the
 Boston Society that and then of the New England, but I think not
 of the San Francisco. Well, let me say, after the Society was
 formed and accepted by the American -- ? -- then the Institute

here was formed and it seems to me that I had an office in one or the other, perhaps even both. At any rate I do know this that everybody was most concerned about setting up the training, and in the first two years I spent an awful lot of time on a lot of work connected with getting the Institute a tax-free status. I also spent a lot of time getting the Institute recognised as a training facility so that the people who had been in the Service could get GI benefits. You know Bob I believe -- cut it off will you?

(THIS INTERVIEW APPARENTLY ENDS HERE.
R.S. RETURNS TO THE RECORDING MERELY
TO ANNOUNCE THE DATE, 6/11/62.)

First transcript by Sophia Wyatt
Second " " "

name)

... to me in office and it seems to me that I had an office in one or the
other, perhaps even both. At any rate I do know that everybody
was not concerned about setting up the training, and in the first
two years I spent an awful lot of time on a lot of work connected
with getting the Institute a tax-free status. I also spent a lot
of time getting the Institute recognized as a training facility
so that the people who had been in the service could get GI benefits.
You know how I believe -- out it off will you?

(THIS INFORMATION APPLICABLE TO THE
YOUTH SERVICE ACT OF 1964, S. 3
TO DETERMINE THE DATE, 6/11/62)

LOS ANGELES PSYCHOANALYTIC SOCIETY (History Committee)

Dr. Charles Tidd interviewed by Dr. R.J. Stoller. 3/4/63

C.T. Well my contacts started in 1932 when I met David Brunswick. I was here for the summer waiting for an internship. And during that summer I happened to meet him and I remember being interested in him and I'm sure he said something -- In fact I remember discussing rather superficially the possibilities for the development of some kind of psychoanalytic set-up here in Los Angeles.

R.S. Were you interested in analysis?

C.T. Oh yes.

R.S. As far back as '32.

C.T. Oh I had gone into the medical school with the idea that I was primarily interested in psychoanalysis. And had helped set up the extra-curricular seminar which I think I told you about - ? - medical school which Blitzen ran. I knew at the time in 1932 that I had other things to do and I certainly wasn't making any definite plans although I was thinking strongly about settling in Los Angeles eventually. One other thing I was thinking about in connection with early days, sort of on the side, but someone invited Otto Rank out to Los Angeles and I remember going to a cocktail party and meeting him, and it was interesting. He seemed to me a nice enough person and I think a little bit subdued and as I recall that at that time he was living in Philadelphia and working principally with social workers.

R.S. This was after all the break-up with Freud had occurred.

C.T. Right. I imagine Dave Brunswick was there. I can't remember for sure whether ~~she~~ I met Margrit Munk that summer or not. If so she would have been Margrit Libben then. At any rate I left in September to do my internship down in San Diego and then the following year went to Menninger's for the first year there. And it was during

Dr. Gordon was interviewed by SA J. J. ...

1. I was interviewed on ...

for the summer ... I remember being interested in him and ... In fact I remember discussing rather ... the development of some kind of ... in Los Angeles.

Were you interviewed in ...

On ...

As far as ...

Dr. Gordon was interviewed ... And had helped set up the ...

... I think I think I think I think ... I had other things to ...

... I certainly wasn't ... I was ...

... I was thinking about ... I was ...

... I remember going to a cocktail party ... I think a ...

... I recall that at that time he was ... in ...

... this was after all the ...

... I can't remember ... I was ...

... I left in ... to do my ...

... for the first year there.

the time in Memminger's that first year, that I made definite plans to come back here for the personal analysis which I did. Because in the meantime I heard that Dr. Simmel had returned ... had come out here. So I came out ~~and~~ in '34 and started working with him and continued through '34, '35 and the end of '36. At that time in the meanwhile, Mrs. Deri had come out and there was very definitely the nucleus for the Psychoanalytic Study Group. I think this had been more or less formally started before I came in '34, but I remember that I went to an occasional meeting not to all, but then later after I'd made some progress in my own analysis -- I went to see Mrs. Deri for some controls. Then in about the summer of '36 I was invited to go back to Topeka and decided to accept with the idea that I could get some of my controls there and some in Chicago. So that for the next two years I worked in the Clinic there.

R.S. Were you one of the commuters?

C.T. Yes. I did controls in Topeka with Karl and with people up in the Institute in Chicago -- controls ^{and} ~~in the~~ seminars. Then finally I decided definitely to move to Los Angeles, and we came out in 1938. Now by this time quite a few other people had come: Otto Fenichel, er was here. Hanna Fenichel. Several others and the Study Group was a good deal more active than it had been when I had been here before. Or at least I was able to participate to a much greater extent. From '38 until the time I left in August '42 to go into the Service we had regular meetings of the Study Group and seminars. The one I remember best is the one with Fenichel which I think is one of the greatest educational experiences I've ever had.

R.S. What was it like? What was he like?

C.T. Well Fenichel was such a remarkable teacher. He was so clear and so

the time in Hamburg's that first year, that I made definite plans to get back here for the personal analysis which I did. Because in the meantime I heard that Dr. Simmel had returned... had come out here. So I came out here-- in '35 and started working with him and continued through '35, '36 and the end of '36. At that time in the meantime, Mrs. Berl had come out and there was very definitely the nucleus for the Psychoanalytic Study Group. I think this had been some or less formally started before I came in '35, but I remember that I went to an occasional meeting not to all, but then later after I'd made some progress in my own analysis -- I went to see Mrs. Berl for some controls. Then in about the summer of '36 I was invited to go back to Tokyo and decided to accept with the idea that I could get some of my controls there and some in Chicago. So that for the next two years I worked in the Clinic there.

Were you one of the committee?
 Yes, I did controls in Tokyo with Karl and with people up in the Institute in Chicago -- controls in seminars. Then finally I decided definitely to move to Los Angeles, and we came out in 1938. Now by this time quite a few other people had come: Otto Fenichel, ex was here, Hanna Fenichel. Several others and the Study Group was a good deal more active than it had been when I had been here before. Or at least I was able to participate to a much greater extent. From '38 until the time I left in August '42 to go into the Service we had regular meetings of the Study Group and seminars. The one I remember best is the one with Fenichel which I think is one of the greatest educational experiences I've ever had.
 What was it like? What was he like?
 Well Fenichel was such a remarkable teacher. He was so clear and so

lucid and it was so obvious that he knew what he was talking about. It seems to me that he had a tolerance for people who didn't know. That was unusual too. I think I mentioned to you before, when I first started in his seminar I remember getting together for the first meeting and we discussed in general what we were going to do, what we were going to cover. And almost as an aside he pointed out that as far as he was concerned that a group of people who had a common interest were getting together to discuss the subject, ask questions and the thing that really pleased me, he said that no question is too naive. (SLIGHT LAUGH). As far as organisational matters are concerned, Dr. Simmel early had started making plans, first about the establishment of a sanitarium that would be run on ^{psycho analytic principles.} ~~(UNINTELLIGIBLE)~~. I remember being actively interested and at one point there was -- ~~it was~~ thought we would be given some land over on the other side of San Fernando Valley, somewhere out near Olive ^{View} ~~(A)~~ Sanitarium with the idea that we might set up a psycho-analytic sanitarium over there. Dr. Simmel also, I think it was he principally, who made the arrangements for contact with a group of analysts in San Francisco, and as I recall the first -- well we had several meetings -- I remember meetings up there in San Francisco -- I remember especially a meeting in Ojai, I'm not sure in which year it was, I would think, '40, perhaps Spring of '41, and it may be just (GENIALLY) the pleasure in thinking about "the good old days", but I think there is a good deal of evidence that those meetings were most productive. I don't remember -- well I do remember one specific subject at a meeting in San Francisco on "Sleep Disturbances" where this formed the principal theme of a seminar.

...and it was so obvious that he knew what he was talking about. It was to me that he had a tolerance for people who didn't know. That was unusual too. I think I mentioned to you before, when I first started in his seminar, I remember getting together for the first meeting and we discussed in general that we were going to do what we were going to cover, and almost as an after thought he pointed out that in fact he was concerned that a group of people who had a common interest were getting together to discuss the subject, ask questions and the thing that really pleased me, he said that no question in too naive. (SHEWELL THOMAS). As far as organizational matters are concerned, Dr. Shewell early had started making plans, first about the establishment of a committee that would be run on a (SHEWELL THOMAS). I remember being actively interested and at one point there was -- it seems though we would be given some kind over on the other side of San Francisco Valley, somewhere out near Olive St. Committee with the idea that we might set up a group -- analytic seminar over there. Dr. Shewell also, I think it was he probably, who made the arrangements for contact with a group of people in San Francisco, and as I recall the first -- well we had several meetings -- I remember meeting up there in San Francisco -- I remember especially a meeting in June, I'm not sure in which year it was, I would think '60, perhaps Spring of '60, and it may be just (SHEWELL THOMAS) the pleasure in thinking about "the good old days", but I think there is a good deal of evidence that those meetings were most productive. I don't remember -- well I do remember one specific subject at a meeting in San Francisco on "The Importance" where that formed the principal theme of a

- R.S. Perhaps some of your pleasure might have come from a small group of people who knew each other.
- C.T. That's part of it.
- R.S. That's just gone now.
- C.T. That's right. As a matter of fact, there were some difficult situations. There was the whole question of lay analysis.
- R.S. That early?
- C.T. Oh yes, yes. And there were people who held quite different opinions about it. In 1938, the American Psychoanalytic after a good deal of discussion, set down the ~~main~~ ^{minimum} rules for training and this included the rule that no more lay people would be trained ^{in the U.S.} ~~here~~. And this -- at least for me, made it uncomfortable to a certain degree, because I agreed with the American Psychoanalytic rules ~~(it)~~, and this doesn't mean that I didn't have a great respect for the people who were lay analysts that I knew -- not all of them. For example I've been pretty well indoctrinated about Thomas Libben and I think perhaps what I saw and heard about him influenced me and furthermore I decided -- worked it out on my own, that a medical background was the better way. Well my contact with analysis in Los Angeles was definitely interrupted when I went into the Service in '42. When I came back the early part of '46, there were quite a few analysts whom I hadn't known who had settled here, or who were planning to settle here, and in the meantime the Society had been set up, I believe in San Francisco --
- R.S. First in Topeka.
- C.T. That's right, that's right. I had been made a member of the Topeka Society before I came to Los Angeles and when I came here those people who were qualified were also members of Topeka, then during the war the San Francisco Society was set up. Now I was away then and hadn't

anything to do with that and I think I was not made a member of the San Francisco Society.

R.S. So you were a member of Topeka till you came back after the war.

C.T. That's right. And early in '46 Dr. Simmel called a meeting at his house, including er -- oh I don't know -- I imagine 8 or 10 people, some of whom had been here before and some who had more recently arrived. And it was a meeting called to organise the Psychoanalytic Society. There were enough qualified analysts here to do that, and in the next few months it was accomplished. I would imagine, I'm guessing now -- I think the approval for the Society came from the American Psychoanalytic at the meeting in May of '46. And then, very soon after that or perhaps even simultaneously Dr. Simmel started making plans for the organisation of the Institute. I'm not certain of the exact date of the start of the Institute but I think -- do you happen to know? Was it '47?

R.S. I don't recall. It was either '46 or the beginning of '47, but the Study Group continued on as a separate organisation for a while.

C.T. That's right. And from the beginning there was question as to what the relationship ~~was the relationship~~ of the Study Group to the Society and Institute would be. It finally ended as you know by the Study Group being absorbed and becoming pretty much the extension division of the Institute. With the formation of the Institute, I don't remember all the details but I had an office of some kind which er -- I believe it was Secretary-Treasurer, in which I know that a good deal of my time was taken up with organisational matters. It was something I was interested in doing but, again in retrospect it seems to me that I might very well have spent too much time in it. But at any rate the Institute was organised and we began to get

...with that and I think I was not made a member of the
the ... society.

...you were a member of ...
...in ...

...some of them had been here before and some who had come recently
...and it was a meeting called to organize the ...
...there were enough qualified ...

...in the next few months it was accomplished. I would ...
...I think the approval for the ...
...at the meeting in May of ...

...very soon after that or perhaps even simultaneously ...
...plans for the organization of the ...
...of the exact date of the ...

... -- do ...

...I don't recall. It was either ...
...the ...
...and from the beginning there was question as to what

...the ...
...the ...
...and becoming pretty well the extension division of the

...with the formation of the ...
...I don't remember
...I had an office of some kind which ...

...I was interested in doing ...
...I might have spent too much time in ...

...the ...

candidates for training. The pleasant, informal atmosphere that had been present before the war I think never -- at least I never felt it after the war, partly I suspect because of the new people who came in and people didn't know each other quite so well and then almost from the beginning, well certainly from the beginning there were differences of opinion regarding analysis and particularly about training. Now these differences were the differences that later resulted in the Split, and for our purposes now -- as far as my account is concerned all I'm going to say is that I think there isn't any question but that there were personality differences, but beyond that I think that there was a fundamental difference in the -- as to the question of -- in the first place, Just what is psychoanalysis? and perhaps more important regarding how psychoanalysts should be trained. And again and in a purely personal vein, my feeling about it was that experimentation in psychoanalysis, fine; but experimentation in teaching I felt should be done very very carefully and certainly not on an individual basis. I felt that any innovation or change with reference especially to the personal analysis should be done if at all, very very carefully ; and the whole question of the number of meetings per week and so forth which I think really was an oversimplification, really stood for some fundamental differences concerning the way in which analysis should be done and particularly training analyses.

R.S. The number of hours a week was not as critical as the attitude --

C.T. That's right!

R.S. -- was trying to be expressed at.

C.T. Exactly. That's right. This whole matter had been very strongly

conditioned for training. The pleasant, informal atmosphere that
had been present before the war I think never -- at least I never
felt it after the war, partly I suspect because of the new people

who came in and people didn't know each other quite so well and
then there was the beginning, well certainly from the beginning
there were differences of opinion regarding analysis and practice
clearly about training. Now these differences were the differences
that later resulted in the split, and for our purposes now -- as

far as my account is concerned I'm going to say as this I
think there isn't any question but that there was personal
differences, but beyond that I think that there was a fundamental
difference in the -- as to the question of -- in the first place,
that that in psychoanalytic and perhaps more important regarding
how psychoanalytic should be trained. And again and in a very

general way, my feeling about it was that experimentation in
psychoanalysis, like; but experimentation in teaching I don't think should

be done very carefully and certainly not on an individual
basis. I felt that any innovation or change with reference especially
to the general analysis should be done in a very very carefully
and that the question of the number of sessions per week and so

forth which I think really was an oversimplification, really stood
for some fundamental differences concerning the way in which analysis
should be done and particularly training analysis.

The number of hours a week was not as critical as the attitude --

Therapist

-- was going to be experienced at.

... This whole matter had been very strongly

influenced by the Chicago Institute Group and I felt that their attitude was incorrect. So, over a period of a couple of years this conflict came out in the open and finally was solved or resolved by forming a second Institute. After the Split I had the feeling that in the Los Angeles Institute there was a much greater feeling of solidarity. I think in many ways this drew the members of the Institute, the Training Committee especially, much closer together, and again my attitude was that I felt the Split was accomplished and it was up to us to give the very best psychoanalytic training possible.

R.S. There are still occasional people in our Society and Institute who would question whether it worked out - ? - if we had a Split (?).

C.T. I know! As far as I'm concerned I don't see how there could have been any other solution at the time.

R.S. Because the pressures under which everybody was living were so terrible. I don't see how you could continue having meeting after meeting of the sort that I've heard there were. (CHUCKLES)

C.T. Oh it was really, really impossible. It was certainly interfering with any productive activity I think on the part of most people.

~~Well --~~

R.S. What do you think of the solidarity now?

C.T. Well wait (BOTH LAUGH) before I get into that I think, the deaths of Dr. Simmel and Dr. Fenichel were especially unfortunate coming when they did. I think if either or both had lived that a great deal of difficulty would have been avoided. I think that there still would have been problems with the growth of the Institute. As far as the Institute is concerned now, of course as you know I haven't really been active for quite a long time -- but I feel it does tend to operate on an honest, solid basis. And I know that there are a great

many people who put an awful lot of effort into setting up the curriculum and it's my impression that the curriculum as it was worked out here is certainly one of the best in the country. I think that there have been difficulties in communication among members of the Training Committee. I think it has been difficult to settle some questions. I'm talking about more recent years. As I get older I wonder if I for one and perhaps others, haven't expected too much of people who are analysts, people who were analysed; I'm pretty certain that I have, in the past. I think that regardless of how good an analyst or how much analysis any person has had, that there are still personalities that may clash with others and may make it difficult. In other words they continue to be human beings. I've heard recently that there's been a good deal of concern about not getting enough candidates. I personally feel -- Well I'm sorry that there aren't enough candidates, but I still insist that this is no reason for letting down the requirements for admission as a candidate. More recently still, or within the past few years there's been the question of, should psychoanalysis continue to be taught in Institutes or should it be brought into the Medical School, and I've been very much interested in this. My own, again, personal opinion is that at the present time it is much better to have psychoanalysis taught in Institutes. And I think this should continue until there is absolute certainty that what is taught and by whom would be determined by people who know something about psychoanalysis. I would object most strenuously to anybody having any kind of administrative authority who didn't know a great deal and who hadn't had a good deal of experience personally in psychoanalysis.

R.S. What do you think would be the advantages? Suppose the analytic

many people who put an awful lot of effort into setting up the cur-
riculum and it's my impression that the curriculum as it was worked
out here is certainly one of the best in the country. I think that
there have been difficulties in communication among members of the
Training Committee. I think it has been difficult to settle some
questions. I'm talking about more recent years. As I get older I
wonder if I for one and perhaps others, haven't expected too much of
people who are analysts, people who were analyzed; I'm pretty certain
that I have, in the past. I think that regardless of how good an
analyst or how much analysis any person has had, that there are still
personality differences that may clash with others and may make it difficult
in other words they continue to be human beings. I've heard recently
that there's been a good deal of concern about not getting enough
candidates. I personally feel -- Well I'm sorry that there aren't
enough candidates, but I still insist that this is no reason for
letting down the requirements for admission as a candidate. More
recently still, or within the past few years there's been the question
of, should psychoanalysis continue to be taught in Institutes or
should it be brought into the Medical School, and I've been very much
interested in this. My own, again, personal opinion is that at the
present time it is much better to have psychoanalysis taught in
Institutes. And I think this should continue until there is ad-
equate certainty that what is taught and by whom would be deter-
mined by people who know something about psychoanalysis. I would
object most strenuously to anybody having any kind of administrative
authority who didn't know a great deal and who hadn't had a good deal
of experience personally in psychoanalysis.

What do you think would be the advantages? Suppose the analytic

training could be autonomous of the university, what would be the advantages of bringing it in?

C.T. I can't remember the name of the man in Washington who recently wrote a paper in which he recommended that psychoanalysis be taught in the university but not in the medical school, but that it be set up as a separate department.

R.S. Brodie?

C.T. No.

R.S. There was an article by Gene Brodie who was quoting Kubie or talking about some of Kubie's ideas.

C.T. No this is a man who I believe -- (THINK PAUSE) -- I can't remember his name. I can look it up. I have a copy of it. In those medical schools where psychoanalysis is being taught, I think that as long as the people who are in control continue to be in control, perhaps it'll work out. But I also feel that if in any way the control passes into the hands of people who really don't know psychoanalysis, then I think it should be stopped.

R.S. - ? - control, why should it come in in the first place?

C.T. Beg your pardon?

R.S. What would be the advantages?

C.T. (LONG PAUSE) Well one thinks of a university as a place where subjects are studied. As a matter of fact I can't think of any specific advantages. Oh! there is this: I have felt from the very beginning that it is a mistake to try to teach or learn psychoanalysis as a part-time activity; namely the idea of having seminars and controls at night, when people are tired and I feel that it's such an important and time-consuming occupation, that it deserves full time, day-time doing. Now I recognise perhaps if it were in a university there would be economic advantages. Maybe it could be done some way.

training could be sponsored by the university, which would be the
 advantage of having it in
 I can't remember the name of the man in Washington who recently wrote
 a paper in which he recommended that psychologists be taught in the
 university but not in the medical school, but that it be set up as a
 separate department.
 I don't
 No.
 There was an article by Gene Ericson who was writing about or talking
 about some of Ericson's ideas.
 It's this man who I believe -- (THOMAS SAUNDERS) -- I can't remember
 his name. I can look it up. I have a copy of it. In those medical
 schools where psychologists are being taught, I think that as long
 as the people who are in control continue to be in control, changes
 will work out. But I also feel that in any way the control
 passes into the hands of people who really don't know psychology,
 then I think it should be stopped.
 - ? - a school, why should it come in in the first place?
 It's your problem.
 That would be the advantage.
 (THOMAS SAUNDERS) Well one thing of a university as a place where subjects
 are studied, as a matter of fact I can't think of any specific
 advantages. But there is this: I have felt from the very beginning
 that it is a mistake to try to teach or learn psychology as a
 part-time activity; namely the idea of having seminars and courses
 at night, when people are tired and I feel that it's such an in-
 efficient and time-consuming occupation, that it deserves full time,
 day-time study. Now I recognize perhaps it is true in a university
 there would be economic advantages, maybe it could be done some way.

But there are a lot of questions of an economic nature; for example the cost to the candidates of psychoanalysis as it is today.

R.S. If you're going into the university you're bringing it into the residency program.

C.T. No, no not as far as I'm concerned (OVERLAPPING VOICES). No it would be completely --

R.S. This would be separate from the Department of Psychiatry.

C.T. Not necessarily but it would certainly be separate from the residency training program.

R.S. So some residents might be candidates of course.

C.T. That's right. But --

R.S. The residency and the candidacy wouldn't be synonymous.

C.T. Not at all. In fact even if there were a psychoanalytic division here now, I still would feel that it would be wise to hold the rule that we have, that no resident apply for psychoanalytic training until the end of the second year of his residency. Now you know this is open to discussion. I might be quite incorrect about it. For example I've also had some fantasies about the idea that for people who have some basis for making a choice earlier, who show an interest and who seem to have some talent, if an arrangement could be made for such people for example while in medical school could get some personal analysis, I think this would be a great advantage. I think that such people would get a great deal more out of their psychiatric residency experience. But as it is now I feel that it would be much better to keep the residency training and the psychoanalytic training quite separate.

R.S. Oh that's a long way off I should think. There are so many details that would have to be worked out.

But there are a lot of questions of an economic nature for example

the cost of the candidates of psychoanalysis as it is today.

It would be good to bring the university into the picture

residency program.

It is not as far as I'm concerned (OUTSTANDING VOICES). No it would

be a mistake --

This would be separate from the Department of Psychiatry.

Not necessarily but it would certainly be separate from the residency

training program.

So some residents might be candidates of course.

That's right but --

The residency and the candidates wouldn't be synonymous.

Not at all. In fact even if there were a psychoanalytic division

here now, I still would feel that it would be wise to have the rule

that we have, that no resident apply for psychoanalytic training

until the end of the second year of his residency. How you know

this is open to discussion. I might be quite incorrect about it.

For example I've also had some fantasies about the idea that for

people who have some basis for making a choice earlier, who show

an interest and who seem to have some talent, in an arrangement

could be made for each case for example while in medical school

could get some general analysis, I think this would be a great

advantage. I think that such people would get a great deal more

out of their psychoanalytic residency experience. But as it is now

I feel that it would be much better to keep the residency training

and the psychoanalytic training quite separate.

On that a long way off I should think. There are so many details

that would have to be worked out.

C.T. Well I don't know unless there --

R.S. Yeh, let me ask you something else, more about the atmosphere, and I've heard this from other people what you were just expressing then. It used to be when you would have a seminar for example, I presume it wasn't only Fenichel (C.T.'No.') and his personality but that there was a -- I don't know whether it's a commitment to analysis was greater and you were touching on that when you talked about the part-time training, the smallness of the Society and the number of candidates --

C.T. I think Bob that a part of this difference in the atmosphere had to do with the feeling before the War. Maybe it had something to do with the idea of being pioneers. And I think that there were fewer people who were there for what I would consider extraneous reasons. I think that after the War a good many people became interested in psychoanalysis because it became more ^J respectable, and there was not the same feeling of interest it seems to me. Now in some of the seminars that I've seen since the war there was no question about the interest of everybody concerned. But there wasn't the same -- It was more organised, more formal, and there was less opportunity I believe ~~given~~ to give and take.

R.S. Look what happens now at the Society meetings. (CHUCKLES).

C.T. Well in this connection I think that there has been difficulty from the ^{very} beginning in our Society and Institute, in a free exchange of ideas. This I'm sure is -- There are many reasons for this. It's partly because of the attitudes that one encounters. Some are much more articulate than others.

R.S. You know if a hierarchy develops the way this particular one has

... and unless there

... you something else, more about the atmosphere, and
... from other people what you were just expressing them.

... you would have a seminar for example, I presume

... (S.T.M.) and his personality but that

... I don't know whether it's a commitment to analysis

... and you were focusing on that when you talked about the

... the analysis of the Society and the nature of

--

... I think that a part of this difference in the responses had to

... the feeling before the war. Maybe it had something to do with

... And I think that there were fewer people

... who were there for that I would consider extremely serious. I think

... that when the war a good many people became interested in psychoanalysis

... because it became more respectable, and there was not the same feeling

... of interest it seems to me. Now in some of the seminars that I've

... seen since the war there was no question about the interest of every-

... body concerned. But there wasn't the same -- It was more organized,

... and there was more opportunity I believe given to give

and

... (S.T.M.) ... the Society meetings.

... I think that there has been difficulty

... from the beginning in our Society and Institute, in a free exchange

... of ideas. This I'm sure is -- there are many reasons for this. It's

... the attitude that one acquires. Some are more

... than others.

... developed the way this particular one has

it seems to me you partly have to account for it by the fact that people are satisfied with it. No matter how much open complaining there is, and there is, and there is great dissatisfaction, there isn't just superficial complaining. But if it wasn't the result of many forces and its imbalance let's say, I don't see how it would stay that way. I would presume that there are forces from above among the senior people that keep it the way it is, and forces from below from the candidates and the junior members that permit it to stay on this way, or that they don't contribute in any other way. It's really a dynamic equilibrium that's ending up with lousy meetings. It makes almost no difference who the person is who's presenting or what the material is, you can be pretty sure that the discussion is going to run in the same form after he's done talking. (C.T.'Mm-hm.') The same people will say what they have to say and most of the people in the Society are observers and not participants.

C.T. Well that's what I was referring to. Something I think stood in the way, so that younger people were not encouraged, or made to feel safe enough so that they could express ideas.

R.S. Is it like this in other cities? I presume that it is similar in all of them but I haven't been so I don't know.

C.T. I don't know. All I can say is that it's different than it used to be here.

R.S. One of the things that has impressed me is that there is no pride in scholarship, and by that I mean in research interests, or presenting or writing, or discussing or whatever it is in the Society. There is within individuals, (C.T.'That's right.') and there's no

to account for it by the fact that
 people are related with it. It is not
 there in, and there is great dissatisfaction.
 to the fact that it is the result of
 many factors and the balance that I don't see how it would
 work out. I would guess that there are forces from above
 among the various people that keep it in the way it is, and forces from
 below from the individuals and the human members that keep it so.
 apart on this way, or that they don't contribute in any other way.

It is really a dynamic equilibrium that's coming in with today
 working. It is not almost no difference in the person in that
 presenting or what the material is, you can be pretty sure that
 the situation is not in the same form after it's done
 talking. (I.E. 1940-1941) The same people will say what they have to
 say and none of the people in the society are observers and not
 participants.

Well, it's what I was referring to. Something I think stood in the
 way, so that younger people were not encouraged, or made to feel
 safe enough so that they could express ideas.

It is the same in other places. I guess that it is similar in
 all of them but I haven't been as I don't know.

I don't know. All I can say is that it's different than it used
 to be here.

The only thing that has increased is that there is no grade
 in education, and that I mean in research interests, or

grounding or writing, or discussing or whatever it is in the society.
 There is a shift in individuals, (O.E. 1940-1941) and there's no

question but that our Society has contributed to the national psycho-analytic scene in a great way (C.T. 'That's right.') but there's no pride in it! There's no reason for a younger man to want to get involved in the scholarly aspects of analysis. That they're involved in practice there's no problem about that. That job has been done very well.

C.T. Yes you're right. It's been more a matter of individual interest. And I think for - ? - . On the other hand I think our Society and Institute has fostered a feeling of interest in community affairs and has helped quite a lot.

R.S. I'm not sure that I agree. You would know better than I but my feeling is that the community affairs interest among psychiatrists and psychoanalysts this would have gone along if the Society hadn't done anything. It's just been snowballing with time and I don't know that the Society has anymore than just kinda slid along (LAUGHINGLY) hasn't been pushed or dragged. Let me ask you --

C.T. Well I think for example ⁱⁿ the Extension Division of the Institute -- it has varied from time to time -- but a good deal of effort has been made to work with teachers and social workers and interested lay people.

R.S. But that's throughout the psychiatric community. Everybody's involved.

C.T. Mm-hm, but I think there is something special in the extension division.

R.S. I was going to ask you about something a little different. What were the reasons that papers were no longer required, that is for graduation? I know one good reason is because they piled up, and

...the national ...

...in a ...

...for a ...

...involved ...

...has been ...

...very ...

...It's been ...

...I think ...

...has ...

...quite ...

...I'm not ...

...is that ...

...analysis ...

...thing ...

...the ...

...been ...

...Well ...

...has ...

...made ...

...people ...

...But ...

...involved ...

...I ...

...division ...

...I ...

...were ...

...production ...

people were not going to spend their lives listening to poorly formed papers. And I guess (LAUGHING) that's a very good practical reason.

C.T. I remember some discussion of this in the Education Committee meetings, and I don't know that I can answer. As I look back I think that it's a mistake to have dropped the requirement of a thesis, for graduation.

R.S. Yes. It could have been handled in some other way besides everybody having to listen to it. I wouldn't want to go to listen to two of those a month.

C.T. It could have been handled by sub-committee.

R.S. It could have been like a doctoral thesis here at the University.

C.T. Exactly. I agree. I think it was a mistake to have given it up.

R.S. I really do. I think that the repercussions of this, we're going to have to live with for a long time. What we're talking about is the meetingx

C.T. Yes. I don't think there is any question about it. From the beginning of the formal organisation of the Society and Institute the emphasis was definitely placed on training and I think it's continued that way. And I think that some individuals have been interested in pursuing whatever they could and in writing and in studying, but there has been except for the special seminars for members, and I haven't kept touch with them, I don't know how they're going, how well they are attended -- . Do you know?

R.S. I just got a call today -- A seminar which probably would never have created itself but was created because the American ~~was something~~ sets up a committee and Leo was in charge of it (C.T. 'Yes.') that committee, and so then we tried locally here to see what kind of interest there is in post-graduate education and so on, but administering this er -- Forms were sent out for people to express

people were not going to agree that lives are being saved

because, and I guess (MURKIN) that's a very good practical reason.

I remember some discussion of this in the Education Committee meeting.

and I don't know that I can answer. As I look back I think that it's

a mistake to have dropped the requirement of a thesis for graduation.

Yes, it could have been handled in some other way besides everybody

having to write a thesis. I wouldn't want to go to listen to two of

these a month.

It could have been handled by sub-committee.

It could have been done like a doctoral thesis here at the University.

Probably, I agree. I think it was a mistake to have given it up.

I really do. I think that the requirements of which we're talking

to have to live with for a long time. What we're talking about is

the meeting.

Yes, I don't think there is any question about it. From the beginning

of the forces of integration of the Society and Institute the emphasis

was definitely placed on training and I think it's continued that way.

and I think that case individuals have been interested in pursuing

whether they could and in writing and in studying and there has

been enough for the social sciences for teachers and I haven't kept

track with them. I don't know how they're going, but well they are

apparently -- do you know?

I think you call today -- a seminar which probably would never have

existed itself but was created because the Western Renaissance

committee and I was in charge of it (I.E.S.) that

committee, and so then we tried locally here to see what kind of

interest there is in post-graduate education and so on, but ad-

think they're fine or -- forms were sent out for people to express

whatever interest they had. And then that was boiled down. Another form was sent out and that was boiled down, and we set up a few seminars. The boiling process boiled away. An awful lot of people who were interested but not interested enough really to take part if it even required sending in a second form, a certain number of them would in thinking twice ^{dropped} ~~drop~~ away from it. So anyway from a huge list that somebody had compiled before I ever got here, we got down to a list of a very few seminars which would have been new seminars, and none of them (UNINTELLIGIBLE). I was just saying I got a call today that one of the seminars three people did show up for the initial meeting, and they all decided, aw hell! (LAUGHS) So it died before it was born.

C.T. I think this takes the effort of an individual or a small group of individuals.

R.S. Do you mean to get the seminar going?

C.T. That's right to get it going and to keep it going.

R.S. Well what it takes -- There are seminars that are going (C.T. 'Yes.')

and they are very successful. They started by themselves independent of anyone saying, "We ought to have post-graduate education ." They were people who wanted postgraduate education. They got together among themselves. They've been doing it for some years. They are continging to do it. They don't want new people in their group because they're doing so well. Those are doing grand! and there's no need for anything except to leave them alone to do what they want to do.

C.T. Well maybe that's the better way.

First transcript by Sophia Wyatt
Second " " " " (name)

...and then that was boiled down.

...and that was boiled down, and we set up a few

...The boiling process boiled away. In which lot of people

...but not interested enough really to take part

...it is even required sending in a certain number of
broads

...then went in thinking twice away from it. So anyway from a

...I even got here, we got

...a list of a very few seminars which would have been

...I was just saying

...I had a call today that one of the seminars three people did show

...and they all decided, we held!

...it was down.

...I think this takes the effort of an individual or a small group of

individuals.

...to get the seminar going?

...that's right to get it going and to keep it going.

...There are seminars that are going (L.A. area)

...They started by themselves independent

...the ought to have post-graduate education. They got together

...They've been doing it for some years. They are

...They don't want new people in their group

...Those are doing great! and there's

...no need for anything except to leave them alone to do what they

want to do.

...well, maybe that's the better way.

R.S. And that's the natural development of it. What we're missing here that apparently they have in other places is er -- you get some person with the personality and the background and then the intellect and the reputation, you know like the Kris group. Apparently in New York they have no trouble at all because they get some hot shots in running it, but in our community where you have no hot shots (LAUGHING) the Society seminar is going and so there isn't that special pull. If Rapoport were here we'd have had no question a lot of post-graduate education going on. If Fenichel had lived there'd be no problem. We don't have a person of this sort in our community. (C.T. 'That's right.'). So it's like trying to beat a dead horse to produce post-graduate education.

C.T. I don't know that this belongs in the record but --. Well I can't think of anything else.

and that's the natural development of it. That's what we're talking here.

that's generally they have in other places is -- you get some person with the personality and the background and then the intellect and the reputation, you know like the first group. Apparently in New York they have no trouble at all because they get some hot shots in running it, but in our community where you have no hot shots (PARTIAL) the Society continues as going and so there isn't that special skill. If reports were here we'd have had no question a lot of post-graduate education going on. It's typical and I think that's the problem. He doesn't have a person of this sort in our community. (PARTIAL) that's right. So it's like trying to beat a dead horse to produce post-graduate education.

I don't know that this belongs in the record but -- Well I can't think of anything else.

7.2.7

7.2.7