

serp 4. The Relationship Between Sennel & Fenichel

bulletin of the los angeles psychoanalytic society  
institute for psychoanalysis

Ralph M. Obler, M. D., Editor

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*\*

Volume 2, Number 3  
July, 1965

STAFF

H. Michael Rosow, M. D.  
Donald G. Siegel, M. D.  
Carl Sugar, M. D.  
James T. Thickstun, M. D.  
Heiman Van Dam, M. D.  
Robert Zaitlin, M. D.

SOCIETY OFFICERS - 1965-1966:

Maimon Leavitt, M. D., President  
Norman B. Atkins, M. D., Vice-President  
Melvin Mandel, M. D., Secretary  
Seymour E. Bird, M. D., Treasurer  
Samuel Futterman, M. D., Executive  
Councilor  
Samuel J. Sperling, M. D., Alternate  
Councilor

EDITOR'S COMMENT:

Inside the pages of the Bulletin, figuratively and literally, in the heart of it, is another of Al Kandelin's contributions to the documentation of the history of the psychoanalytic movement in Southern California and, in particular, of our Society.

To understand the present, one must be familiar with the past, a task to which we all are dedicated in our daily work with patients. This is no less true regarding an appreciation of the current state of our organization; and through such understanding, more constructive and orderly growth can take place.

There is, moreover, another premium to the work being done by Dr. Kandelin and his Committee for the History of the Society. This is evident in Jim Thickstun's report from San Diego describing the salutary impact of this Committee on their infant psychoanalytic group. This material serves as a stimulus for identity cohesiveness and integration. We can all take sustenance from our roots!

INSTITUTE OFFICERS - 1965-1966:

Jack A. Vatz, M. D., Director  
Maimon Leavitt, M. D., Secretary  
Seymour Pastron, M. D., Treasurer  
Henry Lihn, M. D., Dean of the Training  
School  
Arthur Ourieff, M. D., Director, Psycho-  
analytic Clinic  
Jack S. Abrams, M. D., Assistant Director,  
Psychoanalytic Clinic  
Hilda S. Rollman-Branch, M. D., Director,  
Extension Division  
Alfred Goldberg, M. D., Director, Research  
Division

MEMBERSHIP ACTIVITIES:

On March 29, 1965, Leo Rangell presented the opening address of the Lecture Series to Residents and Practicing Psychiatrists, Extension Division of the Los Angeles Institute for Psychoanalysis: "For the Psychiatrist: What Role Psychoanalysis." On May 15, 1965, as Guest Speaker, he delivered an address on "The Crises of Maturity" at the Institute for Social Workers of the Extension Division of the

Los Angeles Institute for Psychoanalysis. He also participated in a Symposium on Extrasensory Perception - "Extrasensory Perception - Fact or Fantasy" at the Medical Extension Division and UCLA School of Medicine, delivering an address, "Man Facing the Unknown - Some Reflections by a Psychoanalyst," on June 5, 1965.

\*\*\*\*\*

Rudolf Ekstein will read a paper in Amsterdam at the International Congress on "Psychotic Acting-Out: Royal Road or Primrose Path." His articles, "Working Through and Termination of Psychoanalysis" and "Historical Comments on Language Development and Psychoanalysis," have recently appeared in the Journal of The American Psychoanalytic Association. He also had two articles which appeared in the Spring issue of the Reiss-Davis Clinic Bulletin on Psychoanalysis and Education.

\*\*\*\*\*

Rocco Motto and Rudolf Ekstein wrote a paper, "Psychoanalysis and Education: A Reappraisal," which appeared in the Psychoanalytic Review, April, 1965.

\*\*\*\*\*

At the Spring Meeting of The American Psychoanalytic Association in New York City, our members participated extensively in the scientific program. Charles Tidd chaired a discussion group on "Teaching Psychoanalytic Concepts to Medical Students." Heiman Van Dam participated in a panel on "The Concept of Trauma." Ralph Greenson delivered an address, "That Impossible Profession," at the Plenary Session. Carel Van der Heide participated in a panel on "The Manifest Content of the Dream." Lawrence Friedman chaired a discussion group on "Psychoanalysis and the Law" and participated in a panel, "The Special Types of Resistance in Training Analysis." Robert Stoller delivered a paper on "Female (vs Male) Transvestism," Maurice Walsh gave his paper "On the Perceptual Scanning and Filter Screening Functions of the Ego," and Max Hayman delivered a paper: "Drugs and the Psychoanalyst." Leo Rangell chaired a panel and presented a paper, "The Concept of Trauma."

\*\*\*\*\*

Adio A. Freeman has accepted an appointment on the Medical Advisory Council of the Air Force Association. He is one of five M. D.'s in the United States serving in this role. In May he attended the first Council meeting in Washington, D.C. Accompanying him was Mrs. Freeman, with whom visits to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were enjoyed prior to returning home to Los Angeles.

\*\*\*\*\*

On April 9, 1965, Leonard Gilman appeared on the TV program, "The Intelligent Parent."

\*\*\*\*\*

Allen Enelow gave a paper: "Modern Concepts of Counselling" at the Association of Western Hospitals, in Seattle, Washington, on April 28, 1965. On May 9, 1965, he delivered a paper on "The Natural History of a Postgraduate Course in Psychiatry" to the Third Regional Workshop on Psychiatry and Medical Practice in Boston, Massachusetts.

STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION IN PSYCHOANALYSIS -  
an abstract of an address to the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society by David Beres, M. D., January 21, 1965

-----  
Robert Zaitlin, M. D., Reporter  
-----

Dr. Beres feels that the useful concept of structure is given too special a dignity in our employing the term "structural theory." (Freud never defined the structural theory as such. Dr. Beres feels we would do better to speak of "the functional theory of psychoanalysis.") Unfortunately it has given rise too easily to seeing analytic structures as more than the conceptual formulations they were intended to be. Analysts, as others, are susceptible to the regressive pulls toward the concrete; and this appears in our tendency to reify our concepts.

Significant analytic contributors (Freud included) in their writings fall prey to reifying. Gill, for example, appears in his description of the id to conceive of it as a vessel "containing" various contents, making of the "id abstraction"

a concrete entity. Rapaport, he feels, has often succeeded only in giving spurious clarity to Freud's concepts by his concrete and finite appearing formulas where arrows and complicated language are substituted for Freud's abstractions.

For Freud function was always in the foreground. The components of psychic structure were almost invariably described in terms of their functions. A psychology which is concerned with adaptation, as Hartmann has elaborated, must study the organism in terms of "how?" and "to what end?" even if this opens it to accusations of being teleological.

Beres would not give up our structural theory but would emphasize how much it is dependent upon organization of functions. A greater emphasis on function has the value of hewing closer to analytic clinical observation and avoids more successfully the swamps of the unverifiable.

Dr. Ekstein mingled his praise for this theoretical paper with praise for its being rooted in clinical experience. He pleaded that we discard neither a structural nor a functional view but that we acknowledge each to be as inseparable as the two sides of a coin.

Reifying concepts has the danger of ossifying theory and could well interfere with progress. As with all persons' never-ending search for objects, reifications may be a reflection of analysts' wishes to get back to Freud.

That which furnishes clarity is what we must seek. It would be well not to too easily discard all old theory (topography, for example) when in certain areas new theory proves more useful.

Dr. Sperling takes strong exception to Beres's indictment of Gill as conceiving of structure too rigidly and fixedly. Gill's view is basically from the vantage point of an id-ego continuum.

Beres in depriving the id of any content

leaves it a truncated concept. He is also forced to employ somatic concepts such as "need" to avoid any "wish" content in the id. Gill does not require such a purified id; rather he allows some fantasy, some wish, and some organization, accounting for these not as in id or in ego but as part of an id-ego continuum.

Beres's conceptions have sharper definition but do not contribute to the problems of origin and development of hierarchical structures. Dr. Sperling cautions against our putting aside conceptual frameworks that are of great value. It is necessary to keep in mind that structure and function are integrally related.

Dr. Hacker pointed to the interrelatedness of structure and function. Both are metaphorical, and we cannot live lacking either one. If we see a river, we must see its structured aspects, recognizing also that it is a moving, dynamic accumulation of functions.

Dr. Walsh applauded Dr. Beres for calling us back to reality. We too easily construct and reify theory as though it represents observable data when in fact it represents our speculations.

Dr. Leavitt pointed out that our scientific conceptualizations of structure are not that different from those of other disciplines. A physical scientist defining a wall would of necessity have to present it as a collection of the relatively stable functions of individual atoms. It is useful, valuable, and necessary for us to conceive of the ego as a theoretical structure also compounded of relatively stable functions.

Dr. Rangell pointed to the danger both of too much anthropomorphising and its opposite, too much theory without an appropriate degree of reification. A river defined in terms of its functions does exist as a structure, though it is better thought of as "time abiding" rather than as fixed. Dr. Rangell favors the use of models carefully drawn. He criticized

authors who fail to distinguish in their writings those reports which reflect their theorizing and those that report clinical observation.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIMMEL AND FENICHEL - Albert Kandelin, M. D., Chairman, Committee for the History of the Society

In 1920 Simmel was one of the founders of the Berlin Institute and was among its leaders in the decade that followed. It was a decade of great achievements, finally shattered by the political Dark Age of Naziism. A distinguished roster of analysts were instructors in the Institute, including Alexander, Bernfeld, Helene Deutsch, Karen Horney, Rado, Roheim, Theodore Reik, Hanns Sachs, and others. It was in 1926 that a very young Fenichel joined this group (in May, 1926, he gave his first seminar), the beginning of an illustrious career as an analytic teacher.

Almost to a man the analysts fled Germany, among them Simmel and Fenichel. Simmel came to Los Angeles in 1934; Fenichel arrived in 1938 after periods in Oslo and Prague. In their Los Angeles period again they worked together, advancing the organization of psychoanalysis. With contrasting personalities, an age difference, different methods and interests, some have asked how well did they get along. A majority opinion of our pioneer members favors the idea they complemented one another; a few feel the harmony was less than perfect. Here I shall report a few items from Simmel's correspondence which are interesting and illuminate the state of their relationship.

After its founding in 1938, the Topeka Society was the seat of authority over psychoanalytic activities in the West; and in the subsequent "Topeka Period" there was much letter writing by Simmel with Menninger, Knight, Lewy, and other Topeka officers concerning California affairs. Some training commenced in the later thirties, at first loosely organized; and on December 26, 1940, Simmel wrote:

"I propose the following, the Topeka Society should appoint a teaching staff for the training of candidates in California. This staff to consist of Simmel, Tidd, Fenichel, and Deri in Los Angeles and Bernfeld and Kasanin in San Francisco." ". . . until now the load of training has rested entirely upon Fenichel's broad shoulders and my narrow ones. Four candidates are in training analysis with Fenichel, one with me." An earlier letter of October 28, 1940, is interesting, ". . . the impression I leave the field too much to Fenichel . . . to some degree I do this intentionally - since I invited Fenichel to come to Los Angeles, as we needed a teacher in psychoanalysis. I had no objection against Fenichel's expanding tendencies in teaching activities, seminars and so forth, since he is equipped for this, and it saves me time. On the other hand he does nothing without my permission . . . it is true that Fenichel's attitude is not always tactful so that he sometimes gives the impression that he has to carry the burden of the scientific work because he is best able to do it. On several occasions, when I noticed such tendencies, you may be sure I took the opportunity to discuss this with him privately, explaining energetically his misconceptions concerning my attitudes toward him." Or on one occasion ". . . Fenichel's only trouble is that he is so sure he knows all about psychoanalysis, in theory and practice. It is difficult for him to understand that cooperation is not possible without a certain amount of subordination . . . I left no doubt in his mind that this subordination to me is necessary as long as I am the representative of the Topeka Training Committee." Topeka called for periodic reports about the California activities, and Menninger would complain about what appeared to be Fenichel's indifference or casual attitudes toward organizational details; and in this context Simmel aimed to placate ruffled feelings and make promise of greater discipline.

Thus in occasional lesser matters Fenichel was criticized by Simmel, but an atmosphere of mutual respect and loyalty seems

to have prevailed for the most part. Nowhere can I find evidence of serious differences between the two; Simmel appeared genuinely appreciative and dependent upon the enormous capacities of Fenichel. In turn one gets the impression Fenichel was content with the distribution of labor, leaving administration and office holding to Simmel while he was more exclusively devoted to teaching, writing, and research.

In spite of their age difference, the deaths of these two are proximate. Fenichel in 1946 and Simmel in 1947. Lewy and others have commented on the impact of this double loss for the Los Angeles psychoanalytic movement. Divisive and disruptive forces gained great momentum with the loss of the two strong leaders, and a split in the analytic group followed in 1950, with the subsequent formation of a second psychoanalytic society. If one or both had lived, it is possible the controversy and dissention could have been endured and worked through and the split avoided.

Neither ever qualified for the California medical license; Fenichel died during an internship year taken with the aim of preparing to take the state examination. His devotion to analysis led him to this undertaking; he wanted to avoid any consideration of being a second-class citizen on the American psychoanalytic scene. Earlier Simmel had some problems with the State Board; briefly, analysis was under scrutiny and its status and relationship to medical practice was debated. Simmel was confident a well-qualified analyst, medical or layman, licensed or not, would never be interfered with; and subsequent events confirmed this.

Further details about the lives of the two analysts who are the most prominent in California's analytic history can be obtained from the obituary notices which appeared in the journals; another source is the reminiscences of our pioneer members as collected in the oral-history program. Dr. William Horowitz has collected interesting material about Fenichel and

has composed a significant biographical sketch. Recently I met and interviewed Mrs. Alice Simmel, the first wife; and she was able to tell many significant facts of his earlier German period. Material about Simmel and Fenichel will appear in the book, Psychoanalytic Pioneer, edited by Dr. Grotjahn. Bertram Lewin wrote an appraisal of Fenichel's career which appears as a foreword in the first volume of the Fenichel Collected Papers.

SAN DIEGO NEWS - James Thickstun, M. D.

The weekend of June 12<sup>1965</sup> will be remembered for some time in La Jolla, and the memories will all be pleasant. That was the weekend the History Committee of the Society invaded the Southland, and the members of the San Diego Psychoanalytic Study Group have rarely had such an enjoyable and informative time. We are deeply grateful to Dr. and Mrs. David Brunswick, Dr. Hanna Fenichel, Dr. and Mrs. Albert Kandelin, Dr. and Mrs. Ernst Lewy, Mrs. Margrit Munk, and Dr. William Horowitz for making the long trek from Los Angeles in our behalf. Dr. Kandelin deserves further thanks for organizing the program and for his own presentation. Dr. Brunswick and Dr. Horowitz also gave formal papers, and the discussion was general and active. Mr. and Mrs. E. M. Lippett not only participated in the Saturday night meeting but gave a dinner party on Friday night for those who had arrived early for the full weekend (almost everyone). The scientific meeting was on Saturday night at the home of your correspondent. Sunday morning brunch at the home of Dr. and Mrs. Allan Rosenblatt closed out the festivities and left time for the long drive home. I think I can safely say that for all of us down here it was not simply interesting, entertaining, and informative to hear about the early days of psychoanalysis in Southern California but it was also a moving experience that makes one feel closer to his roots in psychoanalysis and to people who, by their significant contributions to psychoanalysis, have played a

very personal part in the history of each of us. To find that a number of those who are themselves part of that history were willing to offer their time and energy in this way, is heartening to a small, new group. We need this and appreciate it. Thank you!

Guess what! We're growing. By the time you read this Dr. Orr will be amongst us, which is not new. New, however, is the news that Dr. Keith Bryant, a child analyst from Topeka, will be moving here to practice in the late summer or early fall. Visiting here the first of August will be Dr. and Mrs. Phillip Barrata. Dr. Barrata is toward the end of the road (training, that is) in Philadelphia and is seriously considering moving here early next year.

Sometime this fall we hope to have library and office space in one of the medical buildings in La Jolla where Dr. Hicks is now practicing. Dr. Bryant, Dr. Mazzanti, and I expect to move into this building; and we hope that Dr. Orr will do so too. Hardly Bedford and Roxbury, but it's a place to call home.

Have a nice summer. But a parting thought. What would be so bad about meeting on Friday nights instead of Thursday? From this end of the line it would make quite a difference. There is no flight back after the meetings on Thursday night, and driving back that lousy Freeway, getting home about 1 a.m., and working the next day is rough. There's a late flight back Friday nights, if we were so inclined; and if not, we could stay over for a weekend of debauchery in the Big City. Be kind to us. We're still growing.

#### SOCIETY AUXILIARY - Vee Motto:

Your Auxiliary to the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society netted more than \$800 at the May champagne musicale! As their last official act, the 1964-65 Executive Board decided to delve deep into the Auxiliary's treasury and augment the group donation to the Psychoanalytic Clinic. Consequently

a check for \$1000 was presented to Clinic Director, Dr. Henry Lihn, during the June installation meeting at the Beverly Hills Hotel. Other Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society "delegates" to this luncheon event included Dr. Jack Abrams, Assistant Clinic Director and an official representative from the Society to the Auxiliary, and Dr. Sam Sperling, past-President of the Society.

Dr. Maimon Leavitt, Society Vice-President, served as installing officer for the newly elected Executive Board. Officers for the 1965-66 year include Mmes. Samuel Sperling, President; George Leventhal, Vice-President; Heiman Van Dam, Corresponding Secretary; Maurice Walsh, Recording Secretary; Justin Call, Treasurer. Members-at-Large are Mmes. Michael Dunn and Maimon Leavitt. Miss Ruth Short, Special Community Organization Consultant to the California State Department of Mental Health addressed the luncheon group on "The Woman's Role in Mental Health."

Monthly Auxiliary programs during the past year have featured these speakers from the various divisions of the Institute and Society: Drs. Leo Rangell, Jack Vatz, Hilda Rollman-Branch, and Henry Lihn. Interest in the state and local elections brought a League of Women Voters' representative and Los Angeles Board of Education candidates to the October and April meetings. Special events during the year included the Christmas Holidays' cocktail-buffet at Reiss-Davis Child Study Center and one fund-raising event--the May champagne musicale. In addition to the \$1000 check for the Psychoanalytic Clinic, small donations were made to other community organizations.

To date the Auxiliary's financial audit has been completed. The 1965-66 Executive Board has met and effected the transfer of officers' records, and plans are already under way for the coming year's activities.

Faint, illegible text at the top of the page, possibly a header or introductory paragraph.

Second block of faint, illegible text, appearing to be a main body paragraph.

Third block of faint, illegible text, continuing the main body of the document.

Fourth block of faint, illegible text at the bottom of the page, possibly a conclusion or footer.

Faint, illegible text in the top right column, possibly a header or introductory paragraph.

Second block of faint, illegible text in the top right column, appearing to be a main body paragraph.

Third block of faint, illegible text in the top right column, continuing the main body of the document.

Fourth block of faint, illegible text in the top right column at the bottom of the page, possibly a conclusion or footer.

CONGRESO DE PSICOANALITICO PANAMERICANO  
SEGUNDO - Samuel Futterman, M. D.

The American Psychoanalytic Association in collaboration with the Co-ordinating Committee of Psychoanalytic Organizations of Latin America is at present in the process of organizing the Second Pan-American Congress for Psychoanalysis, which will take place during the first week of August of 1966 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Tentatively there will be workshops in Rio De Janeiro, Brazil, to follow this meeting, and possibly other locales in South America, to facilitate professional acquaintance with our Latin-American colleagues. Please keep this date in mind; and as more definite travel plans are formulated, you will be notified.

PROJECT HEAD-START - Mrs. Margrit Munk:

The Center for Early Education (School for Nursery Years) has been chosen to take part in the government's Anti-Poverty Program. Head-Start is a local-action program, planned by the Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D. C., to provide an enriched pre-school experience for children of limited opportunity who will enter kindergarten for the first time in the fall of 1965. CEE hopes to enrich the lives of over 800 deprived children for an 8 week period, beginning July 6, through August 27.

The Center will have 54 Child Development Centers composed of groups of 15 children, their parents, three professional workers and several volunteers. Parent education is considered a vital part of the over-all approach.

Volunteers are urgently needed. Both professionals and non-professionals (wives and teenagers) should contact CEE at 651-0545.

CEE received a separate grant to train 75 Head-Start Directors in an intensive six-day program during the last week in July.

CHILD ANALYSIS STUDY GROUP - Heiman Van Dam, M. D:

Soon after the graduation of the first group of trainees in our Child Analysis Training Program, the need for a post-graduate continuous activity became apparent. Under the guidance of Margarete Ruben, the Child Analysis Study Group was formed. From its very beginning the emphasis has been on scientific advancement in the field of child analysis. Its main activities have consisted of discussions of important contributions to the literature and research of specific topics of interest to our group such as the psychoanalytic understanding of childrens' play and the current concepts about the role of the transference in child analysis. Also we have been fortunate to have had presentation of original papers by members of our own group and by child analysts from out of town.

Attendance has been restricted to graduates and trainees of our Child Analysis Training Program. It was felt that a relatively homogeneous and small group would further our purposes. The study group has met since about 1957 almost continuously. Meetings are held six to eight times per year. Since about 1963 our meetings have benefitted from the inclusion of the local graduates of the Hampstead Child-Therapy course. At present we have about 25 members. The more recent meetings are usually held at the home of, and chaired by, Dr. Miriam Williams.

In May of this year, after The American Psychoanalytic Association defeated the proposal to establish a section on child analysis, a new and independent organization was formed, called the American Association for Child Analysis. Its membership will be composed of graduates of training programs in child analysis of the various Institutes and of graduates of the Hampstead and Cleveland Child Therapy Training Centers. It is the intention of this new Association to have regional as well as national scientific meetings



pertaining to child analysis. Because the purposes and composition of our Study Group are so identical to this new organization, it will come as no surprise that our members unanimously decided to offer to become a local affiliate of this new organization. This offer may be acted upon next December.

THE CANDIDATES' CORNER -

Edwin Kleinman, M. D.:

We had an enjoyable party in May with the candidates of the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute at the Bel-Air Hotel. It was well-attended, but we were outnumbered two-to-one. The party was handled very nicely by Fed Kurth, who has arranged some interesting affairs for us this past year.

We offer our thanks to some of the candidates who have offered their homes for parties; we thank Jose Amador, Malcolm Hoffs, and Paul Purchard for being such gracious hosts.

Congratulations to Bernard Hellinger who was elected President of the Medical Staff at the Westwood Hospital and to Gerry Nemeth upon his graduation from the Institute during the past quarter.

The new officers for the Candidates' Association for the year 1965-66 are:

President: Andrew Patterson

Vice-President: King Mendelsohn

Secretary-Treasurer: David Bender

Our thanks to the outgoing officers: Jose Amador, Fred Kurth, and Edwin Kleinman.