

Dr. Eleanor Galenson

June 13, 2003

It was way back at the beginning of the new Albert Einstein College of Medicine that I met her. I was working there on a part time basis as chairman of the Child Psychiatry Residency Program. Margaret had just begun getting her research together. I worked with her on the research program and also with Sybille Escalona. Margaret was very interested because few people at that time were working with young children. I told her about Escalona and that she was working on early thought processes in young children.

My connection with Margaret was a non-working type. At that time the New York Psychoanalytic was a hot bed of all kinds of controversy. I was a member of it, but my work was with hospitals. The New York Psychoanalytic had a philosophy that if you worked outside of analysis you weren't an analyst, and were blackballed. Margaret was blackballed, and she never got over it. When she had written a number of papers, she was permitted to teach there one year, and then had to teach elsewhere. She was not happy about it, and it meant creating a group of her own in Philadelphia. She knew that her work was never really considered analytic. There is still an issue about this. It has never been worked out. There were a number of analysts, Elizabeth Geleerd, Anna-Marie Weil, Peter Neubauer, Marianne Kris, all of whom were involved with children. At several meetings they got together to propose to the institute that there be some arrangement there to study child development.

Margaret had already begun to do her work but had not yet set up her research project. These people would get together and teach the candidates. The only thing that is now taught about early development at the New York Psychoanalytic Society only became a reality a few years ago. When I finished working at Mt Sinai, they closed down the research nursery there. I had some money a donor had given me, and only five years ago established a child

developmental center. I don't think she ever forgave the group that had come over from Vienna that gathered at the New York Psychoanalytic Society. She felt that there was this terrible old prejudice that somehow had carried over from Europe to here. Over the year as she was doing her work, I began working with Herman Roiphe. We were studying the second year of life. Herman had worked with Mahler on her research project. and came to grief in a discussion with her in an argument about one child. There was something he said about that child Margaret did not agree with. He and I were working on the early genital phase, 16-18 months. Mahler was also gathering data on that specific time. For a period of over ten years, our children were showing us the way. After her book with Pine and Bergman had been sent to the printer she went over her data and found something new. in it. At the end of the second year they noticed a low mood in the girls at the same time were seeing all kinds of odd things in the girls. As we talked about it it became evident that most of our data took place in the bathroom. We had designed our research setup for the bathroom for the children alone, while Mahler's design had the mothers and children sharing a bathroom.. As they approached the second half of the first year they gathered in there playing with the toilet and exploring potty chairs. It was clear that what had gone on at home with these children we now were seeing in the bathroom.

Although she said to me in our frequent talks that she did agree with our observations, I have to say that she didn't like Herman Roiphe, because he had left her. She was very interested in our material. My experience with Margaret was very positive. It went on for a long time. I was married at the time and she wasn't. She was very lonely. We spent many evenings together and talked. Everyone who knew her would tell you about her moods. She was really hungry for companionship. I got to know her in a different way. She told me about her mother and sister, with a kind of bitterness. I had had similar experiences with my mother and father. We talked

about how this left an imprint on people forever. It was very interesting. She was characterized by a great deal of loneliness.

Justin Call and I started a group called the Infant Society. Dan Stern and a lot of wonderful infant researchers were in it. Justin and I arranged an evening in Portugal for Margaret to present her film and her work. It was a marvelous occasion. All the people she valued were there. In a setting like this there was no one more brilliant than Margaret. We were taking movies. Justin wanted to interview her. She was really fearful of being interviewed without support. Margaret never knew how much she would reveal, how much she could trust the interviewer. She refused to be interviewed without me, which gives you a feel for the hunger she had for support.

At this time in Portugal when we had a reception for her, she was the center of the whole thing. She saw Peter Bloom and Eric Erickson in another part of the room. "Why is it that they don't come over and congratulate me?" she asked. There was a sort of a little girl quality about her. Margaret was afraid to travel alone, and was traveling with a young companion, a college girl. She got into terrible arguments with this young girl. Every morning she would call me and say, "Do you know what she said to me!" There was always a yearning for acceptance about her. The New York Psychoanalytic Association was a terrible place. It was full of jealousy, and did awful things to people. My own situation there was a little better than Margaret's because I was affiliated with hospitals. At that time work with young children was looked down upon. It is hard to understand why child analysis is taught but not child development. There is still only one course in it. It is unbelievable, because all the work is coming from there. Neuroanalysis is having its second meeting in New York in an attempt to bring to bring the two fields closer together. One of the problems is that the neuroscientists study the adult brain, but they don't

know much about child development. The analytic field is not interested in or knowledgeable about infant research.

Margaret left no money to psychoanalysis, because to get a child analysis program going required a certain amount of shenanigans. It is a mystery as to why it is still not an integral part of psychoanalytic work. We have debated as to why. It may be that a lot of analysts have not themselves been able to get into that period of their lives. It may be that attitude was brought from Vienna. Even Anna Freud did not for many years establish a child development program. They were only interested in children with the ability to express themselves in language.

Margaret was always fighting against non-acceptance, she was always tense.

It was Selma who was the heart of the Philadelphia analytic program. Margaret found in her a mama.

Margaret was divorced and then remarried the same man. She had a man friend toward the end of her life, and was in Provincetown with him. He was a European she kind of commanded. She had a problem with men. In every project there was always one young man who became her co-worker. She was very jealous and wanted them to be entirely devoted to her. John McDevitt was one of them. I never heard him say a bad word about anyone. He somehow was able to live with her demand. He really valued her as she deserved. This was not an ordinary woman. One of the problems was that others didn't appreciate her. I was a pediatrician and shared the feeling that bodily feelings were very important. She had a wonderful, unique feel for what a child experiences.

The only other person I knew with that gift was Sybille Escalona. She could pick up a baby and would know what the baby was experiencing.

Towards the end of her life Margaret had an advisory board that consisted of many of her

colleagues, the people who worked with her,. At one of the meetings, Dan Stern had attacked her idea of symbiosis. In many ways his understanding of children and their mothers is amazing, but I don't think he ever got the feel of the very early infant-mother relationship. The body was never important or interesting to him. I think that is one of the reasons he attacked the symbiotic period.

They finally agreed to disagree. Out of this came Mahler's getting together a bunch of people to be her research consultants. There would be a meeting once a month, in which the ongoing work was discussed. I don't remember the subject of the evening, but at one meeting Margaret got very upset and angry at the person who was talking. She got up and left the room, saying, "I'm finished!" She walked out and left the apartment. I knew her well enough to go back and talk with her. The person I was talking about wanted to do movies, and publicity. Margaret had no tolerance for people who weren't really interested in the work and wanted to come in on her notoriety. In a few minutes she calmed down and returned. She began to talk as if nothing had happened. It was this variability that got her into trouble. The rest of us knew better than to talk out loud.

She was also a very curious woman,

As far as personal friendship, you couldn't depend on Margaret to keep the same frame of mind for very long. She criticized Anni Bergman, and made it very difficult and embarrassing for her. Perhaps the people who did not have to depend on her and could take her for what she was could get past the criticism. They would ask, "How do you know this?" Of course she knew it.

My sons talk about how fiery a character she was, and how she couldn't abide fools,. They also knew John McDevitt well, and would laugh at how she had him in tow.

She had been a beautiful woman, and all her life she dressed very well. She and I often had a good time because we enjoyed shopping together and dressing up. We got along very well because I didn't work with her or see her daily. We met socially. Margaret would tell me things that were painful to her. We shared our feelings about the New York Psychoanalytic Association. Justin Call made a film about her. In the film she talked about problems she had with her mother. She was a jealous person, the envy was there for her competitors. I was younger, and by then she was an established person. I don't think that I was a competitor. I never felt like a competitor. I don't think she dared not to treat me well. I was a professor. She never became a professor, and was not in the academic world. I had my own research up there, our own nurseries. A lot of my work consisted of training young residents in the hospital. She didn't have that. I think she would have been a lot happier if she had been able to work in an academic situation.

Milton Rosenbaum was the head of my department. All the residents worked in our nursery, they were observers. The New York Psychoanalytic Association didn't do that.

I don't know why Margaret left Columbia. She was there only a short time. There was no other place in New York City for her to go. In the annals of psychoanalysis, it is nothing to be proud of. Even today, there is only one thing in it devoted to Margaret Mahler. Anni Bergman is going to present a paper. I always felt it was a mistake to have a separate group.

In Anna Freud's center, the child and mother were separated. The therapists became substitute parents, and the important parent-child relationship was minimized. I talked to Margaret a lot. She saw children in consultation, in child analysis. She was wonderful with the children. I don't know about how she was with the parents.

If you yearn for a child, if you haven't had that experience, it is a very sad thing. Infant

research was a substitute for Margaret, and she knew it. She was a very provocative lady. She said what she thought. There are so many people in the analytic world who do not. The analysts lived in a small world, and hospital people didn't. Many analysts have a hard time communicating with the real world. Margaret came up through medicine, and the experience of having been in contact with the sick child's body was a very important training for us. We saw the kind of anxiety of kids who were incubated, restrained, and pinned down. We saw what happened to them, the effect of body disturbance. We backed each other up, because of bodily experiences. Once we had three babies with meningitis, and only had enough penicillin for one child. We had to stand there and watch a child die. This kind of experience is not replaceable. I was a resident three years before the end of the war. I was at Mt. Sinai, I got out of medical school in 1940. If you went into child psychiatry at that time, you could go through adult psychiatry or pediatrics, as I did.

At the Yale Child Study Center, where the Krisses, and Al Solnit were, a lot of work there had to do with children with organic diseases. It's hard to give people a feel for it, if they haven't had the experience. There is a group here interested in body images. Pat Nachman and I do a lot of talking in this group because so much has to do with this early body experience.

Margaret and I got along well because I was not dependent on her. I didn't need her. There was another thing about her which made my relationship with her easier. My first husband died when I was 40, and I had two children, 9 and 11. I had already begun to work. In a way she didn't have anything to be jealous of. Then I remarried a few years later. He was a very tolerant man. He wasn't in the analytic world. She was very nice to him, but distant.

She was envious of the people who had power. The group from Vienna had power and dictated what went on in the analytic world. Elizabeth Geelerd came from Holland, and had gone

to Vienna and went to Topeka. She came to New York and married Lowenstein. Her entry to that group was through him. Brenner said, "Her (?) work is based on fantasies." He thought child analysis was a nice thing, but didn't understand it or want it.

Sam Guttman was an analyst who practiced in New Jersey. It happened that he was my second husband briefly. He was out there with a woman who had a great deal of money and started an organization called CAPS, to which top brains were invited. Money for it came from this woman. Lowenstein was in it, but Geelerd was not invited. The weekend she killed herself he was at this meeting. He was involved with women, and very demanding. They had two daughters who were impossible people, and she was really living with a man whose feelings were elsewhere. She was depressed, and I knew it. We spent time together and talked of many things, and our sons were friends. Her mother had died when she was quite young.

I have many of the same feelings Margaret had about people. That's what made Mahler's work so extraordinary. She spent hours looking at normal children, which child analysts never did. It was not part of analytic training. It still isn't. We tried for many years to get an observational nursery, we had the money, knew people who would support it, but they weren't interested. Geelerd was in the center of our group.

Margaret never liked Licia, but I knew that this kind of woman who was beautiful, had a child, married to Rudy Lowenstein, pulled the hackles in Margaret. She was very envious of Licia, who was married to this famous man and was very beautiful. Many analysts wouldn't have cared, but Margaret was a very feminine woman and it made her life far more difficult. There are a lot of people in the analytic world who don't know much about female psychology. Margaret knew what it was to want to be with a man and have a child. Licia gave a paper a week before she died which Margaret ripped to shreds. Geelerd was not a person who spent time

watching babies; her ideas came from children she saw in treatment. When you spend hours and hours watching children in hospitals, you feel differently about their psychology. Perhaps Margaret's jealousy made her attack Licia's paper so severely. But Geelerd's suicide had nothing to do with Margaret. People don't kill themselves because their paper is criticized.

I'm 86.