Original + 3 copies — 1/29/76 — pages — Stoup

First Interview with Dr. Hanna Fenichel by William Dr. Horowitz--February 16, 1963, taped at her home 440 Tigertail Road, Los Angeles 49, and transcribed by Mrs. Jean Kamion.

H: Well, you know we are interested in any reminiscences that you have from any period during the history of the Society, or before its formation, or even, you know, European experiences that you recall that you feel may have a bearing and interest in our own development here. We don't have to go ~~chronicles~~ chronologically or anything---

F: Well, I could start out with some European reminiscences because the people who were in Europe together in the group where I was partly trained still are now, for the most part, in this country and that may be of some interest. It may also be of some interest how the group finally broke up, which was due to Hitler's invasion of Austria--so that people in Prague were, as you have probably heard from others--the one who founded the group was Mrs. Deri--I am sure that you were told that--~~and then~~ and then in 1930---let's see--I suppose it was 30----'36--Fenichel came from Oslo, took over the leadership of the group because Mrs. Deri went to Los Angeles, where she had been called ~~to from~~ by Dr. Simmel. To the group at the time belonged Annie Reich, Stef Bornstein, Henry Lowenfeld, Jan Frank, Emanuel Windholz, Liselotte Gero, and me--I don't remember at the moment whether there were other people. (Dr. Karpe, ~~Lachenbruch~~). All of them are now in this country.

H: This was in Prague.

F: That was in Prague. The Prague group was dissolved when Hitler marched into Austria--that was the danger signal for everybody to leave Europe. Let me tell you about the evening of Hitler's march into Vienna because that was dramatic and a very exciting and a very upsetting event. Many of the people of the Prague group had close relatives in Vienna and the telephones from Prague to Vienna were going all evening long--everybody trying to find out what had happened, if anything, to their relatives. I don't know whether somebody told you the story, which I remember with great pleasure, and that was

the last evening--the last meeting of the Prague Study Group, and I was supposed to give my acceptance paper for the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, which was our mother society, of which we were a branch in Prague. So in order to be a member of the Vienna Society I had to give a paper in Prague--because there was no way of getting to Vienna anymore at that time, or rather it was too risky to go to Vienna. So I was supposed to start--I gave that paper later as my introduction to the Los Angeles Study Group--but nobody was really ready and interested to listen, whereupon Otto Fenichel told a story, as he often did in somewhat difficult situations, which rescued the whole situation. He asked everybody to sit down and he told the following story: When my brother once was in a kind of a critical situation where he was very ill --my father was exceedingly upset about the situation in the evening when he came home, he was so upset he didn't want to sit down and eat, and finally my mother calmed him down so that he asked "What are you having for dinner?", whereupon she said, "We are having pot roast," so my father's answer was, "Well, pot roast, that one can eat in any life circumstance." After that story everybody sat down and I gave my paper. This was a characteristic attitude of Fenichel's that, very often with a story, he could rescue the situation that seemed to break up and was upsetting to everybody. So after that time, within a shorter or longer period, everybody left Europe and went to the United States.

H: How long was it when--before you left?

E: I left a few days, I think, after the paper of mine and arrived in New York on April Fool's day, 1938, which will be 25 years this year. I stayed in New York for a few days and then I went to Los Angeles, first to stay with Dr. and Mrs. Deri and then I--shortly after that I went on my own. At that time the meetings that we had were held at Dr. Simmel's office on Hudson; and I remember when I came there for the first time, I was received with great

[illegible]

cordiality and felt at home very quickly; and I ~~xxxx~~ remember that I got into very intimate touch with Mr. and Mrs. Lachenbruch, who were part of the study group, who had studied in Vienna, and at that time helped the new comers to know more about the language. So we had, I think it was once a week, we had language instruction; they distributed sheets with questions and the different kinds of answers to explain all the possible expressions. I enjoyed these evenings very much; in fact, I still have those sheets with questions that they distributed, and I cherish them ~~xx~~ as a very pleasant memory. Mrs. Lachenbruch asked me recently, I do not know exactly for what purpose, to lend them to her. I gave them to her for a short time. So gradually, in the beginning a kind of loose ~~x~~ study group became a much firmer organization.

H: May I interrupt you? Were you married to Dr. Otto at that time?

F: No. I married him in ~~--when was it?--in--I came in '38, and we were married in~~ September of 1940. There are many amusing personal anecdotes around that ~~thing~~ event, a few of which I can tell you.

H: Yes?

F: We decided to go to the City Hall in Santa Monica so that the fact that we got married wouldn't be spread all over Los Angeles; in particular, we didn't want the patients to know about it before we would make it public. The result of this was that when I came back from the honeymoon, every patient greeted me with telling me that I got married on my vacation, which stunned me to a certain extent, because I didn't think that so many people would read the, what is it called, Vital Statistics?

H: Yes.

F: So it was known before I had a chance, we had a chance to tell anybody about it. So what else? There are a few other personal anecdotes, which I don't think belong here.

H: You met Dr. Otto when he came to ~~(rest obscured)~~ Prague?

F: No, I, yah, I had known him before from Berlin, and I met him again in Prague and we had a very close friendship in Prague, then got married ~~a year and a half, not quite a year and quarter~~ about a year after he had come to this country. So what now of the beginning in--of the Society here. It was a lively group, everbody participated in it. As far as I remember there were a few non-analysts who were steady participants of the meetings. Dr. Simmel was very much stimulating the meetings and the discussions. We enjoyed the meetings very much. ~~There was no~~ There was no ~~[illegible]~~ organized training, no organized seminars as there are now or as they were some time later.

H: At that time the sponsoring institute was Topeka?

F: At that time the sponsoring institute was Topeka. I think at the very beginning the sponsoring institute was Chicago, or it may be that Topeka and Chicago belonged closely together--I don't remember how the affiliations were, but I know that our direct affiliation was with Topeka.

H: Which--

F: Dr. and Mrs. Haenel came--I don't know in what year--a certain time after I had been here, maybe a year, maybe two years. Dr. Simmel had suggested to them to come to this country.

H: Do you recall who else was in the Study Group when you came in 1938?

F: I remember that Dr. Timme, a psychiatrist ~~--I don't know--~~ I think he was in Pasadena--was there, Dr. Burns and Dr. Rislow, Burns or Mrs. Burns, were--belonged to the Study Group. I think Dr. Prynce Hopkins belonged to it. I certainly remember that

Judge Westwick was part of the Study Group, and Dr. Simmel had a very close working relationship with the Judge and had hoped and tried that the Judge would disseminate psychoanalytic ideas in relation to law, court procedures and so on; and I know that Judge Westwick was very interested in it and tried to imbue the practice of law, to a certain extent, with psychoanalytic insights and ideas. I remember also that Dr. Hugo Stoup came and was here for a short time, went to Santa Barbara--he had been a lawyer before he was an analyst--went to Santa Barbara and got into conflict with ~~the Judge,~~ Judge Westwick. (off record) Well, Simmel was a very complex character. ~~For one thing~~ I think he was as devoted to psychoanalysis as you can find anybody, and his great wish and hope was that he could found a psychoanalytic sanitarium. He was particularly interested in borderline people and those who would have needed hospitalization and couldn't be treated in private practice, and he tried as long as I know to get the funds for ~~it~~ a sanitarium, and funds were often promised to him--quite frequently from movie people--but nobody ever came across--so that with all of his great endeavors he could never see his deepest wish, namely, ~~for~~ a psychoanalytic sanitarium, fulfilled. He had had ~~that~~ a sanitarium, as everybody knows, in ~~Berlin~~ Tegel (Berlin) and he was cheated by one of the business partners there so that the sanitarium folded up. He was not a very good business man and therefore it could happen that he would with great confidence get into business contacts and not be aware of the fact that the people might not be reliable. He was especially interested, as I said, in borderline cases and in the--

H: Socially and professionally, apparently.

F: Well, you could say that--and accordingly he was also ~~interested~~ especially interested ~~in especially~~ in the earliest mental development. He had many most fascinating ideas about the ~~structures~~ dynamics of the very early years. I remember, for instance, that it was an idea of his that ~~long~~ before the oral period, ~~not long before the oral period~~ too, one should assume a period called, as he said, the intestinal phase, and he designated this to mean that the digestive apparatus was the zone for all the conflicts

Judge Hopkins was part of the study group and Dr. Sigmund had a very close working relationship with the Judge and had hoped and tried that the Judge would disseminate psychoanalytic ideas in relation to law, court procedures and so on, and a Judge Hopkins--Judge Hopkins was very interested in it and tried to issue the practice of law, to a certain extent, with psychoanalytic thoughts and ideas.

I remember also that Dr. Ernst Simmel came and was here for a short time, went to Santa Barbara--he had been a student before he began analysis--went to Santa Barbara and got into conflict with ~~[illegible]~~ Judge Kestler, I will. Simmel was a very complex character. ~~[illegible]~~ I think he was a dedicated to psychoanalysis, as you can find anybody, and his great wish and hope was that he could found a psychoanalytic sanitarium. He was particularly interested in borderline people and those who would have needed hospitalization and couldn't be treated in private practice, and he tried as long as I knew it got the funds for ~~[illegible]~~ and funds were often promised to him--quite frequently from movie people--but nobody ever came across--so that with all of his great endeavors he could never see his dearest wish, namely, ~~[illegible]~~ a psychoanalytic sanitarium, fulfilled. He had had ~~[illegible]~~ an everybody knows, in ~~[illegible]~~ and he was cheated by one of the business partners there so that the sanitarium folded up. He was not a very good business man and therefore it could happen that he would with great confidence get into business contacts and not be aware of the fact that the people might not be reliable. He was especially interested, as I said, in borderline cases and ~~[illegible]~~ socially and professionally, apparently.

Well, you could say that--and accordingly he was also immensely interested in ~~[illegible]~~ in the earliest mental development. He had many most fascinating ideas about the ~~[illegible]~~ of the very early years. I remember, for instance, that it was an idea of his that ~~[illegible]~~ before the oral period, ~~[illegible]~~ one should assume a period called, as he said, intrauterine phase, and he determined this to mean that the digestive apparatus was the zone for all the conflicts

much before the oral zone became the area of mental conflicts. He gave once a paper about that which I thought was a most brilliant paper. I don't know-- it seems to me that nobody followed his ideas up in any consistent or organized way. He always had very brilliant and very original ideas, though I don't know whether they ever were worked through to the extent that they became a integral part of psychoanalytic theory or treatment. He could do extremely--how do you say, not unconventional, much more than that--stop for a moment--I need the word. He did at times some extremely unorthodox things with his patients. But one had the feeling that they were based on, indeed, empathy and understanding for very archaic processes in a patient.

H: Could you illustrate that?

F: Let me see what I could--. Yes, I remember, I think, one situation , but I do not know at the moment whether that's Ferenczi or whether it's Simmel--but I think I remember that he said something, that he started to address himself to the patient in the role that the patient had put him in, by that having the possibility to make contact which otherwise he would not have been able to get into. That's, I think, the one example that I remember, but if one of those papers which I don't remember would be available you could see, I suppose, many of the clinical manifestations of this theory. It was one of Simmel's, I think, tragic characteristics that he could not finish organized papers on his many, many ideas that he had. I understand that there is a tremendous amount of unfinished manuscripts, so that lots of his very unorthodox, very original, and highly stimulating ideas may have been lost by that. He himself always knew that he had a great problem with that. Once he visited somewhere in the East, with somebody who had a very beautiful spot on the East coast and he remarked to that person, "This is the place where I want to write my posthumous papers," which characterizes him not only as far as insight into his own problem but as far as his sense of humor goes.

He had a very enjoyable sense of humor. I can tell you one story, for instance, when Otto and I moved into the house on Wilcox, he said to my husband, "I don't like that at all. Your living there will take away from me all of my walk-in customers." There's another little anecdote which is characteristic of Simmel's humor which I remember. We visited him once in Santa Barbara. We were all three in the car, driving, and all of a sudden my husband stopped the car very abruptly because a pedestrian was walking in front of the car; and Simmel said to him,"What are you stopping for?" and my husband said, "Well, didn't you see that there was somebody going?" whereupon Simmel said, "What, for one person?" And of course we all laughed about it. We have to interrupt again---

H: Yes----(obscured)----Oh, there are many things. You've mentioned several times your husband. You know there are many, many people who did not know him, and he is a person of great interest to everyone. It would be very interesting, you know, to hear you talk some about him.

F: Well, you know, I could of course talk about him for hours, days, weeks on end. Now, let me pick out things that are interesting to the history of psychoanalysis. Before he came here I remember he stopped over in Topeka to give a paper there and was invited by Dr. Menninger for dinner, and they had chicken, and he was eating the chicken with knife and fork as you do in Europe. Whereupon Menninger shouted not to be so finicky and not to behave in such an artificial way in America--one picks the chicken up with the fingers and eats them that way, which gave my husband a very funny feeling that he was reprimanded for the manners he had learned in Europe. He was also reprimanded by Menninger and by other people at that time that he, coming to this country, should behave modestly and should not be so definite about his opinion as far as psychoanalysis goes, to which he responded, "I am very much in favor of my being modest and not making myself an authority on matters of behavior in this country. But I do not think that this holds true for me being an analyst. There I feel myself entitled to put down my ideas

He had a very enjoyable sense of humor. I can tell you one story, for instance, when Otto and I moved into the house on Wilcox, he said to my husband, "I don't like that at all. You will take away from me all of my walkers and entertainers." There's another candidate which is characteristic of Freud's humor which I remember. We visited him once in Santa Barbara. He was there in the car, driving, and all of a sudden he stopped the car very abruptly because a pedestrian was walking in front of the car; and Freud said to Mrs. "What are you stopping here for?" and my husband said, "Well, didn't you see that there was somebody going?" "Yes, I did," said Freud, for one reason, and of course we all laughed about it. We have to interrupt again---

Yes---(pause)---Oh, there are many things. You've mentioned several times your husband. You know there are many people who did not know him and he is a person of great interest to everyone. It would be very interesting, you know, to hear you talk some about him.

Well, you know, I could of course talk about him for hours, days, weeks on end. Now, I mean, he put things that are interesting to the history of psychoanalysis. Before he could remember be stopped over in Topeka to give a paper there and was invited by Dr. Menninger for dinner, and they had chicken and he was eating the chicken with knife and fork as you do in Europe. Whereupon Menninger shouted -- he seems to be an Indian and not to believe in such an artificial way in America--you pick the chicken up with the fingers and eats them that way. He gave my husband a very funny feeling that he was reprimanded for the manners he had learned in Europe. He was also reprimanded by Menninger and by other people at that time for coming to this country should behave modestly and should not to so definite in his opinion as far as psychoanalysis goes. I can't tell you to which he responded. I remember much in favor of my being modest and not making myself an authority on matters of behavior in this country. But I do not think that this holds true for me being an analyst. There I feel myself entitled to put down my ideas

in a very definite and very--what should one call--forthright way." That was one of his characteristics that all the people who knew him knew, of course, that not only was he extremely forthright, but he could be--what word should I use---- stating facts and truths in a way that offended other people and at times made enemies by that, which didn't bother him in the least because for him there was no other way to do it. "Facts are facts and what is correct is correct and I don't care whether somebody takes offense at that or not." He was as much admired as he was feared because of that attitude. But more, I would say, admired than feared, because he had a way of clarity, of lucidity, of being able to get at the heart of a matter like nobody whom I have known since. I remember for instance that Dr. and Mrs. Markovitz, who lived at that time in Riverside where he was stationed, came to the Society meetings just for the sake of hearing my husband's discussions. They couldn't have been here on time for the papers but they always managed to be here on time for the discussion, because that's what they enjoyed so much and were so impressed with that they didn't mind driving all the way from Riverside into Los Angeles. As blunt and direct as he was in criticizing somebody or pointing out mistakes without being concerned whether that was in any way hurtful for the person, as much was he willing and ready without any offense on his part to take critiscism. I remember one evening in Prague where he presented the paper on "The Misapprehended Oracle" and Dr. Bibring, Dr. Edward Bibring from Vienna, was present and Dr. Bibring at the end showed him that he had left out one very essential viewpoint; whereupon my husband was extremely pleased that somebody added some essential point to what he had written about which made the paper so much better, and he didn't the slightest feel a resentment or a personal attack in that critiscism but rather was thankful to somebody who added something to what he had thought about. For him the idea was who puts down the facts and who investigates and who makes the research about the science doesn't matter. That it is done in the right way--that matters. The person is of no meaning in that.

H: I would imagine that these qualities had something to do with the kind of leadership that he displayed in the Society.

F: Certainly. Certainly that has a lot to do with it, because he was absolutely unflinching in his pursuing the essential matters of psychoanalysis, and no personal issues ever entered into this. There was another quality, since you talk about leadership. He was at all times willing and ready to read any manuscript that anybody sent him, to make his comments, to give helpful suggestions, to provide somebody with bibliographies, to discuss as long as somebody wanted what ideas somebody had, how to write about it, how to pursue it. That never felt any kind of burden for him, he got the greatest stimulation from it and he in turn gave out a great amount of stimulation, which, by the way brings me to one very essential point about him. When I mention bibliography, he knew the psychoanalytic literature, as one can see from the Theory of Neurosis, in a way that seems to be practically impossible for one person, because he knew it not only completely, but he knew so many things; he could tell you in particular, and as far as Freud was concerned, what volume, what page, either in the beginning or the middle or the last paragraph you could find what you were looking for. He had a visual memory--that visual memory?--no--photographic--he had a photographic memory. He had a memory altogether which everybody who knew him marvelled about, which is part of his, was part of his ability to know, to quote, to write so much about what he did. He very much deplored the fact that people don't read much and always helped them to the right bibliographies or the right papers to read about.

H: This may be a slanted question, but I'd be interested in your reaction to it. I would imagine that these things that you're describing about him which made him very important to the scientific spirit and cohesiveness of the Society and the whole movement here locally, I imagine that his passing left an enormous void, and that it has been difficult for anyone to assume this kind of leadership following him.

F: I think you are absolutely right. I find myself often thinking and even saying

I would imagine that these qualities had something to do with the kind of leadership that he displayed in the society.

Certainly. Or maybe that had a lot to do with it, because he was constantly unlimbering in his pursuing the essential matters of psychoanalysis, and no personal issues ever entered into this. There was another quality, since you talk about leadership. He was at all times willing and ready to read any manuscript that anybody sent him, to make his comments, to give helpful suggestions, to provide somebody with bibliographies, to discuss as a long as somebody wanted what ideas somebody had, how to carry it about it, how to pursue it. That never left any kind of burden for him. He got the greatest stimulation from it and he in turn gave out a great amount of stimulation, which, by the way brings me to very essential point about him. When I mention bibliography, he knew the psychoanalytic literature, as one can see from the Theory of Neurosis, in every that seems to be practically impossible for one person. Because he knew it not only [illegible] but he knew so many things he could tell you in particular and as far as was concerned, what volume, what page, either in the beginning or the middle or the last paragraph you could find what he was talking [illegible]. He had a visual memory--that visual memory--photographic--he had kind a monographic memory. He had a memory alone for which everybody who knew him marvelled about, which is part of his disappearance of his ability to know, to quote, to write so much about what he did. He very much appreciated the fact that people don't read much and always helped them to the right bibliographies or the right papers to read about.

This may be a slanted a question, but I'd be interested in your reaction to it. I would imagine that these things that you're describing about him which made him very important to the scientific spirit and cohesiveness of the Society and the whole movement were, locally, I imagine that his passing left an enormous void and that it has been difficult for anyone to assume this kind of leadership following him. I think you are absolutely right. I find myself often thinking and even saying

to people who have asked me, what would Fenichel have said or how would he react to this or that, I always find myself thinking, "Gee, I wish you would have been there." Because it's even hard to describe and it's certainly impossible to duplicate a personality of that kind with this kind of influence that he had on everybody: ~~With~~ this kind of bringing out the most creative in people, the most interested, the most willing to work, to go into matters. He set an example that had an infectious influence on all the people who came into contact with him. Another man who passed away------ever so much inappropriately, had some of the same qualities, and that was David Rapaport. David Rapaport, like my husband, would be willing to respond to any and every manuscript or idea, written or orally--thoroughly be concerned with it, answer written or personally, much longer than you would ever expect, ~~inginxx~~ bringing out points that he hadn't even thought about, suggesting literature, suggesting changes, suggesting elaborating on it, or changing content or changing organization, endlessly, without ever refusing anybody who asked for his advice or his help. That was a very similar attitude. By the way the two met in Topeka and immediately hit it off and struck a relationship which, had my husband lived longer, I am sure would have been one of the most fruitful professional interchanges there has been in _____.

(Interruption to change tapes)

~~H: This is the second reel of the interview with Dr. Hanna Fenichel on February 16, 1963.~~

F: Should I go on?

H: Yes, please.

F: There are many anecdotes to be told, some which I think characterize his personality more than others. There is one I can think about which I think characterizes my husband very much, about his--in his way of working. Let me tell you how for the most part he used to write a paper. We had had dinner, and I would do the dishes. He would get up and say, "Look, while you do the dishes and there is so much clutter, I write down my paper; by the time you'll be through I'll come and read it to you. And in about half an hour later he came with a sheet of paper on which there were little paragraphs, four, five, under each paragraph two or three lines, and he elaborated on these two or three lines, by that reading the complete paper to me,

to people who have asked me what would Fenichel have said or how would he react to this or that. I always find myself thinking, "Oh, I wish you would have been there, because it's very hard to describe and it's certainly impossible to duplicate a personality of that kind with this kind of influence that he had on everybody."

This kind of winnowing out the a most creative in people, the most interested, the most willing to work, to go into matters. He set an example that had a tremendous influence on all the people who came into contact with him. Another man who praised every------so much inappropriately had some of the same qualities and that was David Rapaport. David Rapaport, like my husband, would be willing to respond to any and every manuscript or idea, written or orally--thoroughly be concerned with it, answer written or personally, much longer than you would ever expect, trying to help and point things out. He didn't even thought about, suggesting literature, suggesting changes, suggesting elaborating on it, or changing content or changing organization, endlessly, without ever refusing anybody who asked for his advice or help. That was a very similar attitude by the way the two met in Topeka and immediately hit it off and struck a relationship which, had my husband lived longer, I am sure would have been one of the most fruitful professional interchanges there has been in

(Interruption to change tapes)

~~This is the second reel of the interview with Dr. Emma Fenichel on February 16, 1973.~~

M: Should I go on.

F: Yes, please.

F: There are many anecdotes to be told, some which I think characterize his personality more than others. There is one I can think about which I think characterizes my husband very much, about his--in his way of working. Let me tell you now for the most part he used to write a paper. He had had dinner, and I would do the dishes. I would get up and say, "Look, while you do the dishes and there is so much clutter, I write down a paper by the time you'll be through I'll come and read it to you." And in about half an hour later he came with a sheet of paper on which there were little paragraphs, four, five, under each paragraph two or three lines, and he elaborated on those two or three lines, by that reading the complete paper to me,

and when he was through next day he would dictate it to the secretary and that was all there was to it. So that the writing of the paper took him, let's say, about half an hour to an hour. I asked him once how come that this can be done that quickly and he said, "Oh, the paper is long before ready in my head. I just have to write it down from my head on the paper." This was one reason why he rarely worked long in the evening. He had a secretary once a week and that secretary had no easy job because the dictation went in a rapid pace. He rarely ever had to change anything he wanted to say. He had a short outline for his papers, there were points one to ten, twelve, fifteen and he dictated the letters point after point, the first one to point one with what he had to say, came the next, came the third, came the fourth, etc. These sheets of papers were prepared notes for the letters, so there was a line, let's say a letter to Dr. Bibring, and then he elaborated on that one line which made the letter, and so on all through until he had all his points done. That was regularly one evening per week, then there were I would say at least two evenings per week with meetings or lectures. There were certainly one or two evenings a week which were devoted for social activities. Weekends were always devoted to driving somewhere out to the country. We went to so many places that I think during the years he lived I got to know more about ~~California, what~~ the state of California ~~and places~~ than most people who lived here for many years. He worked with an unbelievable speed and precision.

H: Your comments about his writing letters and papers, you know, reminds me of the organization of his book. Was that written here?

F: The book was written here, ~~in fact (that's a little book) that I have to add to it.~~ He had published before in German and it was translated, two volumes about the theory of neurosis, one general and one special, and he was asked to prepare a second edition. His response to that was that he would rather write a new book than a second edition, and that was then The Theory of Neurosis into which very much of the two first volumes had been incorporated but also which, as ~~everybody~~

and when he was through next day he would dictate it to the secretary and that was all there was to it. So that the writing of the paper took him, let's say, about half an hour to an hour. I asked him once how come that this can be done that quickly and he said, "Oh, the paper is long before ready in my head. I just have to write it down from my head on the paper." This was one reason why he rarely worked long in the evening. He had a secretary once a week and that secretary had no easy job because the dictation went in a rapid tempo. He rarely ever had to change anything he wanted to say. He had a secretary for his papers. There were points one to ten, twelve, fifteen and he dictated the letters point after point. The first one to ten, one with what he had to say, and the next came the third, came the fourth. These sheets of papers were prepared notes for the letters, so there was line, let's say a letter to Dr. Einstein and then he elaborated on that one line which made the letter, and so on all through until he had all his points done. That was regularly one evening per week, then there were I would say at least two evenings per week with meetings or lectures. There were certainly one or two evenings a week which were devoted for social activities. Weekends were always devoted to our driving somewhere out to the country. We went to so many places [illegible] the time I lived I got to know more about the state of California than most people who lived here for many years. He worked with an unbelievable speed and precision.

E: Your comments about his writing letters and papers, you know, reminds me of the organization of his book. Was that written here?

F: The book was written here. It was [illegible] published before in German and it was translated, two volumes about the theory of new rate, one general and one special, and he was asked to prepare a second edition. His response to that was that he would rather write a new book than a second edition, and that was then The Theory of Relativity into which very much of the Theory of Gravitation volumes had been incorporated but also which, as

everybody knows who knows the two volumes, has been very much changed in many parts and therefore much has been added. For quite some years---~~(obscured)~~. (interruption)

H: We were talking about the theory of neurosis and you were describing how there had been a question that had come up.

F: Now, a few years ago the problem came up to prepare a second edition of the Theory-- ~~(obscured)~~ a new edition, mainly to incorporate the new developments in psychoanalysis and to bring the bibliography up to date. This has been impossible, with all of my attempts. I have written to everybody about whom I knew or thought that he would be interested or would like to take that on, but nobody thought that they possibly could do such a tremendous job as that would be so that at this point it is at a standstill, and I am very uncertain that there could ever be found anybody who would be willing and capable to take that job on. At the time David Rapaport had told me that as he would be through with his own most urgent publications, he might approach that problem and he certainly would have been the one to do it. But this took longer, his own work took longer than he had expected to and then the tragic thing of his death made the whole thing impossible. So what will happen or whether anything ever could be done about that, I wouldn't know. Nevertheless it seems that this is still a textbook that most everybody who has anything to do with medical psychiatry or clinical treatment reads the book, it is still very much in demand the way it is. (Interruption)

H: Well, I wonder if we can spend just the last few minutes today maybe changing the subject a little bit. I wonder if we can try to focus on ~~kind of~~ a different kind of topic. Can you help recreate for us some of the flavor of the interaction of the different personalities, in our Society, either before the Split or after the Split, to give some understanding, you know, of how the various people interacted as you saw it, as you remember it.

You know, I would like to make a general remark about that. As is of course to be expected, as long as the group was small, the interaction was much closer, much

[illegible] (Interruption)

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] (Interruption)

[illegible]

more intimate, there was much more exchange of thoughts on a very close basis going on, and as the Society grew, the contact became looser except that one either formed or maintained certain more close contacts personally. But you know that it always is a drawback of any kind of enlargement in any organization, that with the gaining of a larger area of work, influence, spreading of ideas, you lose something of the very much more fruitful and stimulating contact of those who started out and were in a small group, and that much has happened, of course, in the development of the Los Angeles Society. I don't know how I would characterize the interaction between the people. Right off hand I don't think that much occurs to me. The best I could do is to maybe tell you what I know about my husband's contacts with the people, because this was something that happened while we were together. As I said before, his contact for the most part was one of being a leader and I would say a mentor. He had exchange with many people, but I think his exchange was more with the people from Europe than those who were here; at least as long as he was living there was not too much time to build up that close contact--some were there, but his correspondence was very rich and very --how do you call that--voluminous with all the colleagues from Europe. His students were very stimulating to him and to be a teacher meant very much to him; and I remember that at the time when Greenson, Reider, Newhouse, Sperling, who else belonged to that, were in training with him they called themselves the Fenichel boys, and that indicated that among them they had a very close working relationship and much contact as far as their psychoanalytic ideas, their clinical interest and so on went.

H: These were his analysands?

F: His candidates in training or re-analysis of former training. That created a very special and close bond between them.

H: Do you think this nucleus has in some ways persisted through the years?

F: This has persisted to a certain extent between a few people, but it has loosened

as it always does when organizations grow and the membership increases to a great extent. Meetings of course also take on a very different x characteristic when they are either in small groups or later on in large groups.

H: You know, it would be very illuminating and very helpful in understanding what has gone on and what goes on now to have some feeling about the interaction of specific personalities in the history of our Society.

F: You know, that's a point I don't think I can say off hand very much about. I would have to think of the different people; how, with whom they interact particularly, who has much stimulation for whom, who has----other people who have drifted apart, who are those who work--prefer to work by themselves, who are those who get together. You know it seems to me that in all organizations, from the beginning where there is a small group of people, then comes the expansion of that group with which the close contact of the small group is more or less lost, and then out of the large group, again, in another way, crystallize smaller groups of people who get together for work and for stimulating each other, which I think is happening right now or in the last couple of years. I understand--as far as I understand, this is something that happens very often in organizations; that what is lost by the expansion is later on recreated by the formation of new little groups out of the large organization. I would have to think about the situation, for instance, before the Split and after the Split; certainly before the Split there was a growing getting apart of the members, especially in the Education Committee because of different ideas as far as principles and the main leading ideas in psychoanalysis go. After the split, the group that I belonged to of course felt much more belonging together than ~~as long as~~ the other members who did not share the same viewpoints had been----but as far as single individuals go, how they interact with each other, that's something I really wouldn't be able to tell you off the cuff. I would have to think through of the individual members and how they relate to which other individual members; whether they relate or how they relate, I couldn't say

[illegible]

that to you now, but if I think about it a little, I might have some kind of ideas about it.

H: I have a personal interest, I don't know how widely this is shared by others, but I wonder if you have any feelings, whether you sense certain traditions, say, or characteristics of our present Society, whether you see origins of this in what went on before; whether there are things--characteristics of our group now that you can see the roots of in the past.

F: I think you would have to be a little more specific, Dr. Horowitz, I don't know what you mean by that. What, for instance, characteristics that might have been there and are still there or are no more there. What are you referring to?

H: Well, I'm not sure myself--I was really wondering if there are certain outstanding, say, traits of our organization that you can see the development of through the years.

F: What do you mean by traits? You mean organizational traits or do you mean scientific issues that have been pursued and are no more pursued or what do you mean?

H: Yes, I think this might include scientific areas of interest, it might include attitudes that the organization has, it might include characterstics that set our group off from other ones.

F: I wouldn't know. See, I can't say one thing about our organization, but I do not think that this has anything specifically to do with the Los Angeles Society; that increasingly more administrative issues have developed in our Society, which before, as long as it was small, scarcely existed. Where there was not much of a formal administration, where things were done according to the need at the moment, the rules and regulations were by far not as specifically formulated as they are now, and certainly the administrative part of the organization takes up very much of time that before could be spent on scientific issues.

That is all I can say. Still there are always, of course, within an organization, those people for whom administrative issues stay to the foreground and for others for whom they are to be neglected, are uninteresting or even undesirable.

H: Yes. I think I can think of an example that illustrates what I am asking.

F: That's good.

H: We were originally sponsored by Topeka and one can still see to this day our close tie to Topeka. Many members have received their training there and come here and we are on very congenial terms still--one can see the influence yet. Do you have the feeling that you can see in other ways influences of particular people or events that still show themselves now in our functioning?

F: I know what you mean, but----you gave a good example to compare with Topeka; I don't see that there exists anything of that sort here. I have always been in some kind of a puzzling situation to understand why and how the people who once were at Topeka seem to have carried along with them some kind of a bond between them that lasts far longer than their relations--direct relationship to the Topeka situation. I don't see anything here--off hand I don't see anything on that--of that kind here. I don't know--I would imagine that part of the Topeka situation has to do with the fact that outside of Menninger's there wasn't any stimulating area--that everything that was stimulating happened within the Topeka Society. It was kind of an oasis in a desert, if I may say so. As I said before, I have been puzzled why people have that contact with each other long after they have left Topeka. There must have been something that gave them what they needed there in the situation whereas outside there was nothing; and I don't know whether I could make the comparison, whether it isn't too harsh, but I sometimes have the feeling that they lived together in an oasis where all around there is a desert. Other than that I wouldn't know how to explain this------ (Interruption)

H: You were describing a puzzling degree of cohesiveness that seems to have developed in

that group-----

F: Yes, those circumstances which are not the same circumstances, I think, in other cities, certainly not here because the outside stimulation is present here which in my fantasy didn't exist in Topeka. I may be wrong. There may be very different factors, but this is the way I explain it to myself--not knowing any more than I do know.

H: But you are acquainted with organizations in other cities in this country and in the past in Europe--would you have any comments to make about the whole question of leadership and stimulation--internal stimulation and cohesiveness in our Society as it has developed say over, you know, the past 15 years?

F: Even there I could only give you an example to the contrary--the opposite. There was a great closeness and cohesiveness in Prague, but let's not forget that this was a very unusual situation. Most of the people in Prague, I would say nine-tenths of them, were refugees, which of course creates a very different situation than if the people are native of the country and have their contacts within the country, whereas they always were guests in a host country. That makes for a much closer relationship that way. Besides, the people there were, I think, with very few exceptions, experienced and highly capable analysts at the time that they came there. They were not newcomers, the were not young students but they had all left a situation where they had already been working and active and very successful for quite some years. But that there would be anything that I could say similar in our situation, I really don't know. So, I'll be willing to talk to you some other time.

H: All right, let's do that. Let's look over this material and then we can talk again. This has been very, very helpful and I want to thank you.

F: You're very welcome, it was a pleasure.