Rough transcript
This copy has ELL Lewy's corrections

LOS ANGELES PSYCHOANALYTIC SOCIETY

History Committee

Interview: Dr. Ernst Lewy by Dr. Albert Kandelin. Feb. 24th 1963.

K: Good morning Dr. Lewy.

L: Good morning Al.

K: A familiar first question is: when did you come to Los Angeles and what were some of the circumstances?

L: I came to Los Angeles in I believe July or end of June 1945. We drove across from New York where I had lived and practised for eight months, that is from September 1944 till June 1945. Before that I had been in Topeka. I came -- I don't know whether this is of interest -- I came after having contacted Ernst Simmel here to get his opinion whether a move on my part with my family to Los Angeles would be a wise one, and after having had reassurance from Dr. Frederick Hacker that I would have no reason to worry, that he would pro forma employ me and protect me since I would have no medical license.

K: Very good. I don't mean to interrupt you but I just wanted to get this question about the pro forma. Please continue if you recall where we left off.

L: Accordingly having received assurances as to the desirability of my coming to Los Angeles, we made that move. Some of these things did not turn out the way we expected, but I will not go into details about this. I'm referring to my relationship with Dr. Hacker which was terminated the following year, in May 1946, after which I started my independent practice. (PAUSE) I wish you would interrupt -- so that it doesn't waste -- It puts me under pressure ...

K: Very good. I wish you'd go back a little and tell me briefly about your sojourn in Topeka.

L: I came to Topeka after I had spent almost two years in a mixed internal neurological psychiatric open sanitarium near Morristown, New Jersey, as the head of the neuropsychiatric department which wasn't very much. My employment there had to terminate and I had to decide whether to go into private practice in New York or New Jersey where I had medical licenses or to do something else. Since at that time Karl Menninger happened to be in New York, I got in touch with him because I had always been very interested or even fascinated with what I knew and read about the Menninger Clinic, and came with some agreement with him to move to Topeka as a member of the staff there. This was around Thanksgiving Day 1938. There I stayed till September 1944, that is almost for six years -- a sojourn I'm very glad about. It was very interesting and very profitable for me in terms of meeting very interesting people and doing very interesting work. In the course of the development of psychoanalytic teaching in Topeka I got involved in the founding and the organising of the Topeka Institute which was first at that time under the jurisdiction of Chicago and also extended its jurisdiction over the California area both in Los Angeles and San Francisco. I was first formally the secretary of the Institute; I wrote up the pamphlet of the Institute taking as a model mostly the pamphlet that the New York Institute had published. Later I was for a short time the -- for one years -- the President of the Topeka Psychoanalytic Society, and the Director of the Topeka Institute. This was cut short by my departure from Topeka in the

fall of '44. What else would you like to know?

K: You recall I interviewed you once previously without the recording machine. At that time you told me what were the circumstances and who were the people in Los Angeles at the time you arrived here.

L: Well there was already quite a good if small group and I got immediately in touch with them. This was Otto and Hanna Fenichel, Ernst Simmel, Frances Deri, David Brunswick, and the others who are known from other documents or write-ups to have been in Los Angeles at that time. I had known Ernst Simmel and Otto Fenichel from way back in Berlin already for several years. I had taken part in Otto Fenichel's so-called Kinder Seminar in Berlin, which was not as the name seems to indicate a seminar on child analysis, but a seminar which was attended by the younger analysts and some of the students.

K: You are a native of --

L: I'm a native of Posen, which at the time when I was born up to the end of the First World War was part of Germany, the capital of a German province, and since then has been Polish. It is now called Poznań.

K: And your education and your training was where?

L: As usual I went to a so-called Gymnasium; that is a gymnasium that preferred classical studies, that is Latin and Greek, over Science and Mathematics, although of course we had a fair amount of that too. My medical training I received at the universities of Heidelberg, Munich and Breslau. I had my first acquaintance with psychiatry directly with Emil Kraepelin. He was the professor of psychiatry and I was a student there, and he was the one who taught us the first concepts of psychiatry. Everybody can imagine that whatever he mentioned about psychoanalysis which was extremely casual, was also

very critical and negative. I had a first slight brush with psychoanalytic concepts though even as a beginning student -- it must have been around 1910 or 1911 -- but it was not enough to really get me interested at that time in psychoanalysis. I remember though that I read book reviews of Otto Rank's -- THE MYTH OF THE HERO I think is the title of the book and I found it very interesting but obviously did not get sufficiently involved to be influenced by that at that time. However right after the war when I returned to regular medical work, my interest in psychiatry and psychology was already very strong. Part of that was probably due to the general interest that every medical officer had to take in the problem of the war neuroses. I had some experience at the end of the war in a military hospital with the treatment of war neuroses by hypnosis. Analysts probably remember that Ernst Simmel was very much involved in that, I think including hypnosis at that time. But very soon I began to be very dissatisfied with the usual psychiatric approach at that time, not even to mention the atrocious use of painful faradic electric treatments for the war neuroses which was designed to make the war neuroses even less desirable to the patients than the treatment, so that they would be willing to give it up. This was the general idea at that time.

The first idea that one might be able to get more satisfactory answers to the problems one encountered with psychiatric patients was getting acquainted with Alfred Adler's teachings. This at that time hit me like a Revelation and I got extremely interested in it. However, this lasted only about a year and at that time I saw the shortcomings of this kind of approach and looked for more satisfactory answers. In 1920 I moved to Berlin from Rostock, the university where

I had worked up to then. Rostock is in northern Germany, in Mecklenberg. I very soon got into the swing there of the beginnings of psychoanalytic teaching that just started there. I think it was in 1920 that the first courses were given and that the Poliklinic in the Berlin Institute was founded, and it was at that time that I started to get interested and to attend some of these courses. It took until 1923 before I applied formally for training and was accepted at that time.

K: You have shown me your correspondence with Abraham.

L: Well it was just a post card really that he sent me. That was in order to notify me of the three interviews that were customary at that time for applicants for training; three training analysts. One was Abraham, one was Hans Sachs who at that time was already in Berlin, and the third one was Felix Boehm, to whom I was assigned as an analysand.

K: I have here notes of our interview of June 1961 which gives us some --

L: That long?

K: Yes. Dr. Simmel was the principal, perhaps the most important individual on the scene --

L: Yes. I can take up here again and say that I got in touch immediately with Simmel especially and the others and joined them in whatever organising activity was going on at that time. I think the Institute and the Society were formally organised in the beginning of '46. That was around the time when Otto Fenichel died suddenly. Even before that time I remember that er -- as I think I have probably written in my narrative, I was looking around under Ernst Simmel's guidance and interest for a place that might possibly be suited to found a psychoanalytic sanitarium. We went to different places in the Valley and

around there, but nothing seemed to be practical and nothing came of it. I remember that once we were accompanied by Manny Lippett who drove us. As soon as an Education Committee was constituted, it occurred to me remembering my activities in Topeka, that somebody should take a pad and pencil and write the procedures down, which I offered to do and started doing from then on, which then ended in my becoming the secretary of the Education Committee. I don't think I have anything to add to the things I have told in the written narrative.

K: Don't worry about duplicating. Here is a chance to say it again and possibly expand if you wish.

L: I think my memory of these events has become a little bit hazy, so I don't think I would be able to recount these things in the precise sequence in which they occurred.

K: I have a question going back to the activities relating to trying to establish a psychoanalytic sanitarium and that is the possibility of investigating facilities at Santa Barbara and the involvement of the man named Hopkins. Can you elaborate?

L: I have only been told about these things. I believe that this all took place before I was on the scene. I have seen that place that was intended to be given to our group by Mr. Hopkins -- this was what later was the Hotel Samarkand. It turned out -- this was mentioned before I believe -- that it didn't even belong to him so the whole thing fell through. But this all happened before I was here. I only met once Judge Westwick -- I think that is his name -- in Santa Barbara.

K: A number of people have commented about Simmel's personality and a tendency toward gullibility? Can you add anything from your impression or experiences?

L: Well, I don't know whether I should mention names. Er -- in regard to

Martin Grotjahn, I think this thing applies. Martin Grotjahn was urgently invited by Ernst Simmel after the war to settle in Los Angeles which he then did, but very soon Martin Grotjahn's attitudes and activities and behavior made Ernst Simmel quite unhappy, and he very openly said to me once that he regretted very much that he had invited him to come. But I only know from previous things that also happened before I was here that he was several times taken in by unqualified people who pretended to be bona fide analysts and that this turned out to be very embarrassing for everyone concerned. As far as Ernst Simmel as a person and scientist was concerned I think he was a very original mind. He had a lot of energy and enthusiasm and imagination, more so perhaps than more systematic minds like Otto Fenichel who's forte was more in another field of extremely general and penetrating and detailed knowledge of every field and every part of analysis, of -- how do you call this -- of memory, a memory that enabled him already in Berlin -- he was famous for that in Berlin -- to tell the page of a certain passage of Freud's writings.

K: To me, from what I know about some of the early history and Simmel's involvement, it seems tragic that he was displaced as President of the Society and as Chairman of the Education Committee almost within a year after founding the - ? - group.

L: Yes. I think that also has been described already in writing how our naive circle of friends around Ernst Simmel were kind of taken by surprise by some political maneuver of the -- those people who finally formed the other Institute, in order to topple Ernst Simmel from the chairmanship, which then led to my becoming the chairman. This was of course a very painful and very unfair and regrettable, but the most tragic thing was the premature death of Ernst Simmel that tore him away from so many things that he still wanted to accomplish and

pursue. It was really pathetic because a few days before he died, he talked to me about this and expressed that; -- the anxiety of having so many things that he wanted to do and being so ill.

K: How old was Simmel when he died?

L: I'm not sure. I think he was 67, but I'm not sure.

K: What were some of his plans besides his ambition always to have a psychoanalytic sanitarium?

L: I recall one idea which he talked about which I personally feel probably wouldn't have led very far, and that was some very far-reaching ideas of world wide mental health movements, of course with a psychoanalytic approach. That is one thing I can remember. Then of course as we know now there were a great number of unfinished or unpublished papers that he probably felt should be published -- would have wanted to be published in the course of time.

K: Mrs. Deri commented a little on some of the unhappy circumstances of his personal and family life. Would you care to add anything?

L: Well, his wife was a very sick woman who caused him very much emotional grief and much practical difficulties, financial difficulties, in addition to his inability really to deal with financial matters in a reasonable and practical way. I think that his son from that marriage was somewhat of a problem child at that time, and so was the older son from the first marriage.

K: The older boy was Simmel's son --

L: Simmel's son from his first marriage. But the main trouble I think was caused by the instability of his wife -- his second wife Herta, who later committed suicide after his death. His last days were very much more difficult than they had to be because of the financial difficulties

which really to a great extent were of his own doing. So that he was never free from worry about that.

K: Equally tragic, and from one point of view even more so, was the premature death of Fenichel. He died at the age of 47 didn't he? (L:'Mm-hm.'). Perhaps you could in the same way that you've commented now on your personal impressions of Simmel, say something in a similar way about Fenichel.

L: Well I didn't know Fenichel personally so very closely. I knew him very early in the late 20's in Berlin. As I said we had this Kinder Seminar at his home at that time. I knew his first wife, not close though and his little blonde angel daughter of that time, and knew that he was very fond of playing ping-pong, but I can't say I was a close personal friend ever.

K: Mrs. Deri commented how he was a very vital person who had many interests apart from his professional work, such as travelling locally right here in Los Angeles.

L: That I don't know from direct experience, but Hanna has told me about that. But what I wanted to say is that I consider it particularly tragic in regard to the development of the psychoanalytical movement here and the unhappy situation that led to the Split . It is my firm conviction that if he had lived this would not have happened, because he towered so highly over every other person in the analytic group here as a teacher and as a personality, that he would have been able to keep things together, to keep those who tried to do mischief in check, so that they would not have assumed the important roles that the difficult situation put them in, to which they were not really entitled, and things would have been straightened out. He was so superbly able to express opposing views in a way that was neither offensive nor ineffective at the same time. At the same time he

was able to be tolerant when tolerance of an opposing opinion was necessary.

K: Yes. I recall one of the first meetings I ever attended was in August 1946 at the old Nursery School on Rossmore (REST LOST AS L. SAYS)

L: On where? (CATCHING IT NOW) Yes. He was quite sharp there, but this was a good example of how he functioned, and how he was head and shoulders above everybody else who would discuss. But he didn't take any personal advantage of his ability in the way of being self-seeking as so many people do.

K: Yes and not a narcissistic man. (L:'No.'). Some people have been curious about why Fenichel felt he needed the interneship and the medical qualifications.

L: I don't know anything about this. I never talked with him about that. As I said, we were not really close friends.

K: Who on the local scene now did you know in Europe and what were your relationships in Europe?

L: I knew Ernst Simmel, I knew Otto Fenichel, I knew Frances Deri in Berlin. Frances Deri was a student at the Berlin Institute about the same time that I was a student there, and we sat in a few of the lectures and seminars especially in that formerly mentioned Kinder Seminar. This is the only certain, specific seminar that I recall. This was held rotatingly in different homes -- homes of teachers, homes of candidates -- Mrs. Deri happened to live across the street from me. Ernst Simmel I only knew at that time from the meetings of the Society and from lectures.

K: Mrs. Deri described several meetings with Freud. Did you meet with Freud?

L: I never met Freud, and curiously to some extent I'm glad of it.

K: Do you mind explaining why?

L: Well I see so much that er -- There is a kind of a personal loyalty

sometimes involved, even sometimes a kind of a religious fervor in the emotional component that accompanies ~~much~~ certain scientific attitudes and convictions in some analysts, and I think this is regrettable and should be eliminated. It should be really analysed out but very often is not, and I feel that at least this particular factor did not play any role in my scientific development.

K: Yes I think your point is clear to me. You mean some people would exploit personal contacts with Freud toward this end of a --

L: Yes, not only that but they also cannot become real independent thinkers because of a certain personality cult one could almost say, that easily takes place. It may sound very strange for me to say that who is supposed to have been the evil old man if not the hard-drinking man who initiated and organised the Split; which meant that our group was the rigid group - ? - the orthodox group. It may sound strange for me now to say such heretic (SLIGHT LAUGH) things about the attachment and non-attachment to Freud as a person.

K: Your reasoning is very clear to me and I'm happy to hear what you have to say.

L: So whatever adherence to the so-called orthodox line I pursued or had, I certainly feel had nothing to do with any personal involvement with Freud.

K: Mrs. Deri described briefly the establishment ~~of~~ at Schloss Tegel. Did you visit there?

L: No I never went there. I was during my training slightly er -- not fully occupied with the psychoanalytic training because I had a very large neuro-psychiatric practice still at that time, and had to see how much

time I could give to the goings on in the psychoanalytic group.

K: Before we turned the machine on you made some interesting remarks and comments about family background which favored presumably professional and intellectual study.

L: Yes I feel I was fortunate in having a family background which was conducive to development of scientific, literary and so on, cultural interests, which not only started me on independent reading very early -- as soon as I was able to read after six or eight or seven -- but also because my father was a man who was up at the farthest scientific frontier with his interests and occasionally gave me some inspiration and directed my interests towards such things. He had studied chemistry and was a Ph.D. in chemistry and had worked as a chemist and had had very wide intellectual interests in other fields too as a student, but then had to abandon this field because of the first wave of anti-Semitism in Germany which forced him out of employment as a chemist in a chemical plant. So he took over the long-standing wholesale business of his father where he prospered, but he always kept his scientific interests going. So when for instance Einstein's Relativity Theory was very new he was already preoccupied with that and followed that more closely than I was ever able to do, because he was much better in mathematics than I ever was.

K: I'm trying to recall: were you one of a small family?

L: Yes. We were a small family. I was an only child. This scientific inspiration had no influence on my becoming an analyst, because in that field he had no advanced knowledge or interest in particular. But he always respected my interests.

K: Before you came to Los Angeles, you sampled life in New York. Was this with the aim of settling there?

L: Yes. I did settle there and opened a practice. I had an office on

East 70th street together at that time in the same house with Mary O'Neil Hawkins whom I had known in Topeka. But I was sick most of the time and the climate was very hard on me so that I was finally advised by my doctor to move to a better climate.

K: Did you consider other climates apart from Los Angeles?

L: No. I never did and I think I'm very satisfied with the climate here.

K: Did you ever consider San Francisco?

L: I really never seriously thought of it. I'm sure I would like San Francisco as a city and as a place to live but for some reason or other that never -- that never --. One of the reasons why we chose Los Angeles was the fact that our daughter -- older daughter -- Brigitta, lived here after having moved here from Salina, Kansas, in I believe '43 or '44 and always urged us to come out here.

K: In speaking about the local analysts when you first arrived, the personalities of Simmel and Fenichel dominate. However we needn't overlook the fact that there were others. What were your relationships to Brunswick and Mrs. Munk and Albert Slutsky and many other interesting and important people?

L: I had no close relationship ever to Albert Slutsky. Our contact was entirely through the Education Committee. With Margrit Munk and Frances Deri and David Brunswick and Hanna Fenichel, we very soon developed a very good and satisfactory friendship, that lasted till now. It's still there.

K: This reminds me that one of the controversial issues which sometimes has occurred, involves the question of lay analysis. What are some of your opinions or recollections about this question?

L: Do you mean what I recall historically about this as a general problem

in psychoanalytic circles -- groups -- or my personal attitude about it?

K: Both. Of course I'd be very interested in not only the present or local situation but even in the history of analysis beyond the local scene.

L: Well as far as I remember, in Berlin this problem didn't seem to exist at all. As far as I know -- of course I didn't belong to the inner circle really there because I didn't do any teaching; I took my good long time to finish my training, so I don't know whether it played any role in the inner circle of the Education Committee, but I don't believe it did. I never heard of it. Here I think we all know that this was a very controversial issue from the very beginning. When I was still in Topeka I knew that out here in Los Angeles this was a very unpleasant topic and people were at odds about it. For instance both Haenels -- Dr. Irene Haenel and Dr. -- what was his name?

K: Joachim?

L: Joachim Haenel were very strongly opposed to lay analysis, to that extent that they never resigned from the Topeka Society and never joined the local organisation, and kept apart. I personally have always felt as I have sometimes expressed it, that having studied medicine has never yet helped anybody to be a good analyst. However there is one little point that I feel has to narrow this down a little bit, namely that I feel that a certain minimum amount of psychiatric experience is necessary and should be acquired by non-medical people who want to become analysts as far as that is still possible too. So I am somewhat in sympathy with the idea that Kubie has expressed of the medical psychologists. I don't think it is necessary to have a three years psychiatric residency. I think that one year that is used well to accumulate a lot of clinical

memories and clinical experience is sufficient. But I think it's important in order to know what one is dealing with in one's patients. But beyond this I don't feel that medical knowledge and medical studies add anything to anybody's becoming a good psychoanalyst. And I think there is even a certain danger in thinking too much in analogies of let's say in terms of clinical entities like physical sicknesses if one tries to apply this to psychiatric concepts. I think that is misleading.

K: Isn't it true that the lay analysis question became to some extent an issue in The Split? I mean one side had lay analysts and the dissident group who were all -- (REST OBSCURED AS L: COMES IN WITH)

L: Yes the dissident group who split up and formed the so-called new Institute were much more opposed to the acceptance of lay analysis and lay analysts, that is true.

K: This brings us into the area of The Split, and probably you should and can comment on some of your reminiscences about the theoretical and emotional elements which were so active at that time.

L: Well you would know that most of the people who now form the teachers of the other group came from either Chicago or the Rado Group in New York; and you know that their teaching at least in Chicago at that time differed pretty essentially from the traditional, classical psychoanalytic teaching. You know the Alexander group and their teaching of psychoanalytic psychotherapy which is a very admirable thing, which was flourishing at that time. This was the influence under which especially Dr. Milton Miller and Dr. Martin Grotjahn were when they came here to teach. Later also, Norman Levy. May Romm came from the Rado Institute and I don't have to go into details about the deviations of Rado's teaching. This all amounted finally in my opinion and that of those people in our group who had the same view,

in a deterioration of the teaching of -- especially of the teaching of technique. I wouldn't even hesitate to call it a sloppy kind of teaching. To us who thought that in order to be able to practice whatever psychoanalytic oriented psychotherapy one wanted to practise, teaching would first have to be based on a knowledge of classical psychoanalysis. This was really the main issue, and together with it the necessity of preserving clear-cut classical teaching standards as a basis for whatever further therapy one wanted to do. And this then very soon led to insuperable difficulties. This was only aggravated by the personality traits of some of the different training analysts.

K: Well give us some of the details about some of the personality conflicts and elements which were so important in this controversy.

L: This is a very unpleasant subject. (SLIGHT LAUGH). Very difficult for me to get in to.

K: Yet quite important you must admit from the historical interest.

L: (OVER LAST WORDS) -- and very easily goes too far and comes to a point where it cannot be utilised later for writing a history of the er -- that is supposed to be published, (PAUSE) because one has to get very personal.

K: Well perhaps 100 years from now this will be quite important as data for some historian at that time. I can only leave it to your judgment, but I don't hesitate to remind you that in retrospect perhaps some more personal things about the dissenters at the time of Freud would be a very useful source of information to tell us about the status of psychoanalysis.

L: Well as I said, whatever the personal aggravating traits were, it always mostly amounted to a muddling up of the differences between psychotherapy

and psychoanalysis. Grotjahn was always very unpredictable; probably a very brilliant teacher but one who never knew the dividing line between psychotherapy and psychoanalysis,- I would even say effective psychotherapy but not what we considered necessary as a basic requirement to teach psychoanalysis, as a basic teaching. Milton Miller obviously is a very intelligent man, very capable scientifically and I think with a very strong and honest drive to pursue his scientific convictions, but as a person extremely difficult, sometimes even close to the paranoid. May Romm had a particular way of muddling up things in her way of doing therapy which seemed to make her completely unable to pursue a clear-cut psychoanalytic technique. She always seemed to have the need very strongly to play the good mama, and obviously had no understanding of the basic rule of not to gratify the patients too much, which can be overdone too, to be sure; and also had a particular unpleasant trait of deviousness in the way of going after her objective. Is that correct? I remember for instance that when we had laid down the rule that no matter who and how desirable the applicant might be, he would not be accepted unless he had gone through the procedure of being interviewed and being discussed by the whole Education Committee, she tried to circumvent that with all kinds of devious ruses, as for instance that, Oh it was absolutely necessary for her to take this particular man into analysis because he needed <u>therapy</u> so badly. And this was a man who later moved away, who had come from Boston with a very high reputation as a very brilliant man, was very successful here both as a -- in his standing among the medical profession as well as monetarily, and must have been a very prize package to May Romm.

K: I know you're referring to Dr. Solomon. (L:'Yes.') So I won't hesitate

to mention the name.

L: So this kind of way of slyly circumventing the direct and honest way was very characteristic of her, besides her really very confusing teaching of technique to the candidates, which came to the point that some of the training analysts forbade their analysands to attend her courses on technique, because it was so confusing.

K: I have read some of the Education Committee notes at that time immediately preceding The Split and it is recorded -- her comments to this very point that you just mentioned, and her complaints that certain analysts didn't refer candidates to her for supervision.

L: Mm. You can imagine what a confusion and unpleasant pressure this must have put the candidates under, at least some of them. I think you must have been within the candidate's group at that time?

K: Yes, I was a candidate.

L: (QUICKLY) Were you aware of that?

K: Yes and no; yes to the extent that I knew there were strong preferences and strong smaller groups even in those early years --

L: But did it make you confused about the teaching, that some of the teachers taught one thing and others taught other things that didn't agree with this? (K: 'Er --'). Or was it just the feeling that there were personal discord?

K: It didn't dishearten me (?) -- Probably I was not too bright, but I was bright enough to know that this was still an infant science and I feel that on the most part I took from those who seemed to have the more valid and substantial viewpoints.

L: Then from your point of view The Split was certainly not a desirable thing to come about.

K: From my point of view as a candidate, not er --

L: Neither was it to me by the way, as you know very well from my initial attempt to keep all the things under one roof.

K: You refer to your labors to the end of the London Plan (L:'Yes.') which tried to preserve the unity (L:'Yes.') --

(THE TAPE RAN OUT AT THIS POINT. 2nd TRACK CONTINUED AS FOLLOWS).

L: Have you ever gone through the fund-raising file?

K: Yes I've gone through that and wrote the -- It's a 3 or 4 page summary -- of this file.

L: Some of it must have struck you as very strange, -- what went on there, but I finally called it Drive Against Fund-raising. (SLIGHT LAUGH) But this is of not very great consequences for the Institute, first of all because nothing came of it, and there was much more personal emotional involvement than the whole thing was worth.

K: True not much money was raised, but as a historical episode it remains very interesting if only to demonstrate the resistances that exist towards money raising as far as any kind of psychiatric or psychoanalytic institution.

L: But at that time it wasn't the outside reluctance; on the contrary, the outsiders, the non-psychiatrists were extremely eager to work. The resistance came from the inside which was to me the exasperating thing.

K: Yes you are right.

L: (FAST) Again I won't mention any names, but having gone through the file you must know what I'm talking about. (K:'Yes again you er --'). By the way there is something else that occurred before the Split, shortly before The Split and that was the attempt to establish the psychoanalytic service -- the clinic, which was called first the psychoanalytic service I think. I tried too, remembering the situation

in Berlin where every analyst, every member of the Society pledged two hours of his work to work with low or non-paying patients, to establish something of this kind here.But again I encountered the most formidable resistance. I once brought it up in the Society -- that may have been in 1948 -- it must I think appear in the Society minutes somewhere -- and was flatly turned down. There was no understanding for that at all. And then I brought it up in the Institute and the Education Committee and again there was a good deal of opposition and emotional opposition, to the extent that Martin Grotjahn called it a slave labor that I wanted to introduce, but it finally was voted in favor of and established. I'm not sure that with the experiences that we have had, the way I see it now that I would do such a thing again but at that time it seemed to be a desirable thing to do.

K: Yes if only to learn by experience what its benefits were and equally what its shortcomings were.

L: What is your opinion what prevails -- the benefits or the shortcomings? (K: 'I --') I have grave doubts about whether it's worth it. (K:'Well --') -- (UP) This is not Europe and not old Berlin in the 20's; this is America and I think it causes so much resentment, and the benefits are so little in comparison that I have grave doubts whether this is worth continuing.

K: Let's go back to The Split and your labors to try to preserve unity with the method of the London Plan. Just when we were starting I had to turn our tape over.

L: Well I may not have had the best information about how this plan in London worked and how desirable it really was. I have heard a number of times since then that the people in London are not happy at all about this kind of a solution. But at that time in looking around for a solution which we needed desperately at that time to get out of this terrible internal

friction and politicking and jockeying for position and fighting and confusion, this was what I felt might be a solution that might ease the tension and might enable each group in a tolerant way -- being tolerant of the other -- teach what they considered their scientific conviction and still remain within one Institute. And I still believe that it was pure consideration of political factors and of prestige on the part of the others that made them reject this proposal. Our group was unanimous, I mean as I gradually approached the individual members in our group and enlarged the group, in adopting this plan and offering it as a solution.

K: Yes I have seen in reading notes that particularly Miller and Romm seemed very much to prefer complete separation and establishment of their own Institute and Society.

L: I think that they were afraid that they would rate second if they remained within the Institute; that they would not be considered Freudian analysts, which is something that none of these deviationists seemed to be able to give up, whether they are Freudian analysts or not. (LONG PAUSE) You are familiar with the London situation, that there are three groups mainly, not only two.

K: Right, left and -- (OBSCURED AS L: COMES IN WITH)

L: The Anna Freud group, the Melanie Klein group and the intermediate group. (LONG PAUSE) I mention Ernest Jones, but I don't know whether this is of much interest. It is historically interesting in some way. This was in 1935. I was still in Berlin and this was at the time when the Nazis finally put on more and more pressure to get the Jewish members of the Psychoanalytic Society out of the Society. There had been initial resistance among the analysts, I think including most of the non-Jewish analysts to this aim, and this became a critical situation in 1935, and

I believe that was why Ernest Jones as the President of the International Psychoanalytic Association was called in and came to Berlin to see what he could do. It was very interesting to see how he was absolutely unable to understand what was going on, being a (SLIGHT LAUGH) decent and er -- man thinking in terms of law and decency, that he just couldn't understand what was going on, and was hopeful that he might prevent the elimination of the Jewish members. This was what impressed me so.

K: You mean his optimism?

L: Well his optimism and his ... his being -- I don't know -- flabbergasted by the situation that he found there.

K: This gives us an opportunity for you to say something about Jones as a person.

L: Well I don't know Jones as a person well enough. I have only seen him briefly at meetings, and at this particular occasion in Berlin. The last time I saw him I think it was in 1956 at the meeting in Chicago -- at Gitelson's house -- or apartment. That was not very long before he died. I just exchanged a few words with him.

K: Also going back I should like to know something of your experiences as an army doctor during the war.

L: That was the first World War. (SLIGHT LAUGH) This had notmuch to do with psychiatry. The only psychiatric experience I had was kind of intuitive I must say, inasmuch as I recognised a hysterical reaction in one of the old -- what would you call -- a territorial er ... er ... soldiers to whom I was assigned at that time, and that I was able by, shall I say -- firmness to get the man quickly out of it. So I must have had some kind of an intuitive understanding of it. I was still very young at that time. I hardly had finished my studies.

K: Where were your army assignments?

L: They were all in the East. Short time at the Eastern Front in Russian-Poland and then most of the time in the -- I don't know what you call the zone behind the real fighting -- in Poland and in the Baltic provinces. I once had to function as an obstetrician not knowing the first thing about it except the thing what you call the Credé. Do you remember that? -- which is to express the placenta that doesn't come out (CHUCKLING) spontaneously, which immediately made me a very famous obstetrician in the region which made it necessary for me to go into hiding, because I didn't know anything except that. There were no civilian doctors. They all had fled, so I had to do some general practice there for the civilian population too. And I had my horse and led a very pleasant life most of the time. (RUMINATIVELY) Life of a lord. (SLIGHT LAUGH).

K: Did you ever travel to Vienna and have any contact or acquaintance with the psychoanalytic movement or scene?

L: No. I was never in Vienna before 1959 I believe (SHORT LAUGH). By the way, at the end of the first War as I mentioned before, I had the opportunity to work in a military hospital that was a psychiatric department -- a psychiatric hospital, and I there learned hypnosis which I also used several years in my own private practice, but not with very great gratification. In fact I have really developed a dislike for it.

K: Did you travel to other cities or psychoanalytic centers in Europe?

L: No. I didn't even attend any of the international congresses at that time; only one smaller kind of congress I attended once in Dresden in Germany. I think Austrian and German psychoanalysts attended. That must have been in either 1927 or 1929 -- around that time. That was kind of an intermediate smaller kind of a congress. I remember to have been impressed there by a public lecture that was given by Karen Horney, and another one by -- who created the concept of the id? (K:'Groddek?') Groddek, ja.

Groddek whom I also once heard in the Berlin Institute.

K: Simmel was always impressed by Groddek.

L: Yes he was very -- an extremely intuitive man with an unusual ability to understand the unconscious, especially symbolisms, and to translate them. He had come from a very different angle to psychoanalysis. He never had any training really. He was an internist. He ran a sanitarium in the Black Forest, and out of a -- kind of a native talent arrived at this kind of psychoanalytic practice.

K Therefore became a psychoanalytic practitioner?

L: I believe he did. I don't know to what extent. But you know that Freud adopted his concept of the Id -- Das Es -- from his writing.

K: Yes I recall Simmel told me to read the BOOK OF THE ID by Groddek.

L: (AFTER LONG SILENCE) In Topeka the most important acquaintance was perhaps David Rappaport for me. You know that he suggested that we collaborate on a theoretical paper together, which we did, which was a very inspiring and very enjoyable time for me; on the Theory of Memory -- psychoanalytic theory of memory.

K: Do you recall being in the Rocky Mountains in the summer of 1941, where David Rappaport fell off a horse?

L: (BOYISH LAUGH) I didn't know that he fell off a horse. We rode on horseback together and I kidded him and called him the Mounted Psychologist, (SLIGHT LAUGH) or the Psychologist on Horseback.

K: I recall because I examined his leg after he injured it in this fall. It was fortunately only superficial.

L: You know he was not a newcomer to riding on horseback. In Palestine where he had lived before and was a surveyor, he had done his surveying on horseback. That was before he came back and finished his Ph.D. in Budapest, I believe and came to America.

K: Yes he had a very varied and interesting life. The only thing I recall seeing about it was in the obituary notice in the Psychoanalytic Journal which gave some of these details about his interesting life. Again an instance of a premature death of a brilliant individual.

L: Yes. When I was in Berlin there were a number of prominent analysts there at some time or other, like Bernfeld and Helene Deutsch. Rado of course was a prominent member of the faculty there and I sat in one seminar with him together with Ives Hendrick and French -- Thomas French among others.

K: Who were the other American doctors studying in Berlin?

L: I once had a glimpse of Zilborg, but there were a number of them whom I never saw there in Berlin. I never saw Bertram Lewin who I know was there, and Kubie and others.

K: And of course you knew Alexander?

L: Yes. I attended lectures of Alexander's -- Karen Horney and Harnick -- Jeno Harnick. I don't know whether you ever heard the name, but in the 20's he was quite a prominent and scientifically significant man.

K: Was Alexander's personality always of such a type that one might predict that later he would become so controversial?

L: That I can't tell. I didn't have enough personal contact with him either. He kept company though very much with this Hugo Staub, you know who had this unfortunate later career in Santa Barbara. He was kind of flashy.

K: Say more about that because it's --

L: (BREAKING IN) I only knew them from sight so to speak; I had hardly any personal contact but their group impressed me as kind of flashy and -- slightly glamorous, (K:'You are now referring --') which to me always had a slightly phoney ring.

K: You are now referring to the group of analysts who lived and worked in

Santa Barbara?

L: I don't know of any group of analysts in Santa Barbara. I only mentioned Staub because I knew he was there for some time, till he had to leave -- till he left.

K: Well why did he have to leave?

L: Well you know why (SLIGHT LAUGH). He ran away with Judge Westwick's wife. That's what I was told.

K: Very good. That's what I wanted you to say. Also in Santa Barbara there were some analysts who were hired to take care of the heir to the Harvester millions, who was a chronic schizophrenic.

L: I only know about that from Dick Evans, but I think this was a psychiatrist and not an analyst, as far as I know. But I know nothing about this from my own experience.

K: My conjecture is that we are both right. He was a psychiatrist but also had membership in the Psychoanalytic Association at that time which by some standards makes him an analyst. (L:'Mm-hm.'). Earlier we were mentioning Estelle Levy. Would you tell me now what you recall about her and what you -- whatever else you would like to say concerning her.

L: Well, I know that she had some training in New York -- and mostly in Vienna. I think she was a bona fide analyst. She was director of some social agency in New York I believe, before she left for Vienna. I think she came to Los Angeles around 1930, but I don't know the exact date. After I came here she was always taking part in seminars; she occasionally presented cases in the seminars. You know perhaps that there was in the early years of the Society here, a regular bi-weekly I think or monthly seminars for members which were chaired by Mrs. Deri, that took place rotatingly in different homes. Do you know that?

K: No, not that specific detail.

L: I don't know why it finally faded out, and I don't know when exactly. Maybe even at the time of The Split, but I don't know.

K: Isn't it likely that was one of the activities of the old Study Group?

L: Possible.

K: So many of the Study Group activities were overlapping.

L: That's not impossible, but I'm not sure about it.

K: The history of the Study Group in itself is interesting inasmuch as it was the first formal psychoanalytic organisation in California or west of Topeka.

L: In fact that was the group which I joined when I first came here, because there was no psychoanalytic society then, so I attended the meeting of the Study Group at that time. And also later, even after the foundation of the Society I still went to the meetings of the Study Group -- for some time.

K: A question that occurs to me is: who are your friends in San Francisco among the analysts?

L: Well I have known Reider from the time we were together in Topeka where we were quite friendly. Since coming here I met Anna Maenchen and Windholz and became very friendly with them. I think those are the ones I'm most friendly with. (AFTER A VERY LONG SILENCE) Na?

K: We still have plenty of tape left. Are we running out of talk?

L: It seems so.

K: I think we've talked long enough on this occasion. What I'm going to do is have this transcribed, and I will supply you with a copy of the transcript for your corrections and amplifications, and if you and I together decide that it would serve a useful purpose, we can sit down again and continue where we are leaving off today.

L: I'll be glad to although I can not really imagine that there is more

to say. But if you find out something we missed I'll be glad to talk again.

K: Well thank you Dr. Lewy. We'll conclude this interview, February 24th 1963. It's a beautiful Sunday and I think we can both get out of doors and get some of our beautiful Californian sunshine.

L: Just like in old times. (SLIGHT LAUGH).

Recorded on tape in the home
of Dr. Ernst Lewy, 1585 Manning ave.,
Los Angeles 24, California.

FIRST TRANSCRIPT by
Sofia Wyatt

FINAL TRANSCRIPT by
JEAN KAMEON