

Memoir

Frederick Wyatt

University of Michigan Regents' Proceedings 388 – June, 1979

Frederick Wyatt is a distinguished member of that group of European scholars and scientists, which invigorated and to some considerable degree transformed American academic and intellectual life. His contributions to psychology and to this University are so many and so various that one can mention only the highlights.

He was born in Vienna in 1911, attended the University of Vienna, where he received his Ph.D. degree in 1936, in psychology, philosophy, and literature. That breadth of interest continued into his later career, since he has made contributions to all of those disciplines. He also received psychoanalytic training, first in Vienna, then later in Boston, after his arrival in this country in 1939.

Before coming to Michigan, he was on the staff of a number of universities, including Ohio State, Harvard, Simmons, MIT, Clark (as Associate Professor), and Boston University. In addition he was a psychologist at a number of hospitals, and served as Chief Psychologist at the prestigious McLean Hospital in the period from 1944 to 1948. Michigan was fortunate enough to attract him in 1952, when he became Director of the Psychological Clinic, and a member of the Department of Psychology. He is largely responsible for the shaping of the Clinic, which is widely acknowledged to be the leading training institution of its type in the world.

His contributions to his profession, through service and writing, are literally too numerous to describe adequately. He has written over a hundred articles and reviews. He was elected Fellow of the American Psychological Association, of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, and of the Society for Projective Technique. He has been a member of the Norwegian, Michigan, and German Psychoanalytic Associations. He was President of the Division of Esthetics of the American Psychological Association, and President of the Society for Projective Techniques. He has also held a number of research fellowships, from Russell Sage, from the Ford Foundation, and was Fulbright Professor on three separate occasions. He has been an editor or consulting editor for five scholarly journals, and has in particular served the University through his connection with

Comparative Studies in Society and History, and the Michigan Quarterly Review, as well as serving as chairman of the editorial committee of the University of Michigan Press. The positions mentioned above represent only about one third of those that could be adduced; and yet even a full documentation of his achievements would not quite capture the extraordinary versatility of his interests. He has written extensively on psychotherapy, on projective testing, and on clinical problems in general, as one might expect; but he has also written on education, on philosophical topics, on the family, on issues of social change, on aesthetics, on history, and on other topics as well. His versatility, his originality, and his depth of observation have made him an inspiration to his many students and colleagues, in psychology and in other areas as well.

The Regents honor this distinguished scholar by naming him Professor Emeritus of Psychology.

Interview with Professor Frederick Wyatt, 8/17/89 by Frederic J. Levine, Ph.D., who had been his student at the University of Michigan Psychological Clinic, and Yonna S. Levine

Interview Transcript: Professor Frederick Wyatt, August 17, 1989

(Note: This interview was conducted outdoors, in the Black Forest of southern Germany near Professor Wyatt's current home city of Freiburg im Bresgau., Prior to the interview, Dr. Levine told Prof. Wyatt about his personal experiences in applying for and receiving training within the American Psychoanalytic Association, as a CORST Waiver recipient. The interview was part of a study of the controversy over non-medical analytic training in America, that contributed to two publications.:

Levine, F.J. (2003). The Forbidden Quest and The Slippery Slope: Roots of Authoritarianism in Psychoanalysis. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 51S(Supplement):203-245.

Levine, F.J. (1990) *Le Research and special training program* (Cursus de "Recherche et formation speciale"): Contribution a une histoire de la place des non-medecins dans l'Association psychanalytique Americaine, (The "Research and Special Training" program: Toward a history of non-medical participation in the American Psychoanalytic Association.) *Revue Internationale d'Histoire de la Psychanalyse*, 3, 359-377.)

F.L.: What I was interested in was whatever you could tell me about your experiences and information about the American's relationship with non-medical analysts, your feelings about it, and whatever....

F.W.: Well, I have written some about it in a recent book on Freud in Exile and I have something about psychoanalysis in exiles published by Yale University Press. My own experiences were rather aggravating, and embittered me for a long time. I still have a touchy feeling with regard to medical power. As your story indicates, your own experiences, it comes back again and again; and there is something in medical education and in medical selection which probably makes it very hard for these guys to live on equal footing with anybody else. So my resentment has an enormous realistic base, and yet I must say I am often a bit ...ahhh.. ashamed of myself, because I have too clearly the feeling that I am simply still hurt very badly. The story in short is this: I started psychoanalytic training in Vienna, and this must have been about 1934, I think 1934. And I had a fellowship from the Institute with the idea that I should do applied psychoanalysis, which in a way I wound up doing since one of my major hobbies is psychoanalysis applied to literature and history; and what name I have is probably most connected with this. But they at that time thought, "Well, this was an intellectualizing young man ...and... the best thing would be if we put him on as some kind of a connecting link between the humanities and"--I was at that time interested in what in German is called cultural morphology, that is, shape and structure of cultures. This would now be between history and cultural anthropology according to present faculties, the present system of American universities; or History of Ideas...

F.L.: Does this mean that they took you with this notion of focusing on something, as an exception? [i.e., to medical admissions requirement?]

F.W.: No, no, no. The Viennese were quite prepared to have me graduate as a psychoanalyst. I was going to be trained as a psychoanalyst, but I was given the fellowship..

F.L.: Money?

F.W.: It wasn't money, but I was trained for very little money and I paid very little for it: and that was, the fellowship. and the idea was that I would later on--and that was not by any means demeaning, it was a kind of, "Well, this guy shows some signs of maybe being interested in something, amounting to something, so we'll help him along. And we have applied psychoanalysis," which Freud was very much interested in, very much concerned with. As to my own history, a number of incidents moved me then to become more of a clinical psychoanalyst and to discover what gifts I may have had in that respect: that I can observe reasonably well, and that I can listen patiently to other people and so on. Whatever goes into it. But that turned up a little accidentally. It was more kind of unexpected. As I say, I was a very intellectualizing young man, and not surprising.

F.L. No, I am surprised. You are not stuffy, you never were.

F.W.: Well, I have changed a lot. You got me already at middle age. But I surely was then, and flamboyant. Given to intellectual pursuits exclusively--literature and philosophy. But they liked that in a way because it made me a little more broadminded than the medical people are. Anyway, one of the reasons was my own experience in philosophy, which was my main field. The subject in which I wrote my dissertation incidentally: On the history of the concept of development of the concept of the unconscious since Immanuel Kant. It's never been published, but it was in a way a good study. Something that has pursued me all my life that some of the best things I have written I haven't published. So, what else? Then, of course, the second and equally commanding experience was the war. But let me say something about philosophy. The man with whom I studied philosophy and who influenced me all my life, because his epistemology, epistemology correlates very well with psychoanalysis. It gives psychoanalysis a kind of background that it doesn't have anywhere else. He was a man who was one of the regius professors in Vienna and after his death in '48 or '49, something like that, he was more or less forgotten, and he is now being rediscovered as one of the major philosophers of that era. It is the opposite of things like Heidegger, it is a very scientific, very critical, very cautious, sensible analytic philosophy. Not positivistic but in the same vein, of a highly realistic critical grasp of reality.

F.L.: What was his name?

F.W.: Reininger. And he always said that you shouldn't study philosophy all by itself. You should always have a second field. So for some time, I thought whether I should go into physics or mathematics. I was fairly good at mathematics and thought I could do that, but I didn't have any particularly burning interest in physics and I was in a much more burning way interested in literature and philosophy. Maybe history. So in the end, I didn't do that and I went to one of the clinics which, again, was in connection with

meeting my first wife, the woman whom I later on married, and the mother of my daughter whom we talked of before. And that was a clinic for speech therapy. So my first clinical job was psychologist in a speech clinic, and that gave me a nevertheless a vivid impression of the neurotic problems of people, even though they were limited to one particular field. I hope this is not going too far for you.

F.L.: No, it's great.

F.W.: So. There was some kind of reality, and it set me in motion to do clinical work. So, suddenly I found myself a clinician. At first this man who employed me as a psychologist hired me as somebody who should do research, which in a way I did, but most of the time really I just learned how to be with people, be with children, and so on; and do various speech therapeutic things, and also begin tentatively doing psychotherapy--some sort of psychotherapy. Then, I had fallen in a nest of future psychoanalysts of some fame; and that was Bruno Bettelheim and Fritz Redl, who were friends, and Redl was a friend of mine since my adolescence. So, I moved among people suddenly who all were dedicated to psychoanalysis and very enthusiastic psychoanalysts, so I very quickly fell in with that. I did a short period of interest in Adlerian psychology, because Gertie, my first wife had, was acquainted with Adlerian people. She was a Social Democrat and the Adlerians were all on the Social Democratic side, or most of them. However, I very quickly found out that this was piffle, and children's tales, and so I very quickly got out of it. I didn't have any institutional connections but I went to some meetings and I talked to people but I didn't find it satisfactory and so I joined psychoanalysis; and the person who first got me into it was Richard Sterba of the Detroit Psychoanalytic Institute.

F.L.: Bettelheim's analyst

F.W.: Yeah, Bettelheim's analyst. Richard Sterba is now past 90, has written a very nice biography in English about the early years of the Vienna Institute. He is only about ... 13 or 14 years older than I am myself, and yet he belongs entirely to a different generation analytically speaking. It makes an enormous difference. So .. my generation are people like Rudy Ekstein. Rudy Ekstein and I met when we went to the University together. He also studied philosophy, as a matter of fact. And he was not as far along in analysis as I was; I think I was at that time more in than he was but he was beginning to get into it too. So these two factors moved me: On the one hand, the feeling philosophy alone, and things written in books alone won't do. I had a desire to have more contact with life and therefore went to a clinic, got myself into, as a psychologist. There were no systematized clinical psychologists, the whole thing didn't exist, you know. All this was kind of very free wheeling. And then the enormous experience of the war and of the whole catastrophe that had happened, and it gave me very much the feeling that this was no time to think about the morphology of culture; but to think about surviving, maintaining a little bit of what mankind stood for. And in addition I had the problem of everybody who was in this mess, any intelligent and somewhat learned person: How could it happen? How did it become possible? How could such a thing really be? In that respect, the question has never quite left me, and a lot of things which I have done later on, studies on anti-semitism, and now ... things I have been engaged in for the last 20 years. Studies on ideology, as a defense mechanism. Ideology-what does ideology do for the psychological system, for the

psyche? They really come from that experience. Also an abiding dislike of any kind of totalitarian system, be it on the right or be it on the left. First, I had to put up with rightist fascist systems, or National Socialist systems. Later on, it turned out that Stalinism was just as bad, organized Communism and real socialism were just as bad and as dangerous. So I feel very critical about all of that, which in Germany has, since I have been living here, has caused me a lot of enmity, because when I came most intellectual people were fairly near to socialism and Marxism and so on, so they didn't like my critical attitude toward it. In the meantime things have turned, and the jig is up and they have learned what this is worth. As somebody said in Times Literary Supplement, "The only place where Marxism is applied is in American graduate schools," and this is perfectly true. Surely it's not in any Communist country. Maybe in South America, and maybe in countries of the third world where it is used by dictatorial cliques, but otherwise it is away and gone. But in America there is still a certain amount of it. Occasionally, there is even some guy who writes letters in Contemporary Psychology or the American Psychologist expressing the beauties of Marxism, neo-Marxism and the Frankfurt School. There are some people who, I know Americans who are very involved in that.

F.L.: I've never seen this.

F.W.: Oh, yes, I can quote you chapter and verse. I had arguments with one of them in San Francisco where he is active. Well, back to the story: So, even though the Viennese situation was also essentially directed by physicians, so there was a certain amount of lively antagonism against non-medical people; still Freud's will and Freud's conviction were strong enough that they didn't dare to exclude non-medical people. He had made it clear enough what he thought about that, and...

F.L.: Let me interrupt if I may. I just saw a letter, an old letter sent by Milton Wexler to the Journal of the American, citing a letter of Freud's in which he made the point that he never assigned [as patients] to non-medical people anyone in whom there was any risk of physical illness. It sounded as though Freud was, even himself, only partially accepting of non-medical analysis.

F.W.: Well, the way he talked about it and the way he treated people--there are a number, Bernfeld and so on, was very popular with him, even though he was an avowed Marxist. Somehow the Freuds liked him, and he was a kind of welcome person in their house. So I don't have the feeling that the old man was serious about that, and he always explained that he became a physician only by accident. He didn't feel very much identified, particularly not with the experimental side. But there was much of the neurologism and the neurological materialism of the 19th and the beginning 20th century, and this is quite clear. I would say, my guess would be, that Freud kept people away from dangerous cases because he had made the experience once with Theodor Reik. Reik was in deep trouble: A cantankerous, probably paranoical patient accused him of mismanagement, and the medics who were opposed to psychoanalysis made as much fuss out of it, they tried to gain as much from this as they possibly could. So, my guess would be that Freud was careful not to have this repeated again. I think he was too much convinced of psychogenetic origins of almost anything. More than I would be nowadays. More hereditary ideas, would be a little more biologicistic than he was. But I don't know of Milton's letter. I know the man quite well. Is he alive still?

F.L.: He is still alive.

F.W.: You know his daughter was with us.

F.L.: I know, I know the story. His daughter is now very famous, for her work on

F.W.: For multiple sclerosis, MS?

F.L.: Not MS. What is it? Huntington's chorea.

F.W.: Chorea.

F.L.: Her mother died of Huntington's chorea.

F.W.: That's a possibility.

F.L.: And she was afraid she had the gene and ...

F.W.: I knew her quite well.

Yonna Levine: She has been written up many times in the states in the newspapers about her work. She is working with some South American community where it has been in certain families and she is doing a longitudinal study of these families.

F.W.: A study on that. I haven't seen her for a very long time but I was quite friendly with her.

F.L.: She was at the Clinic, wasn't she?

F.W.: Of course.

F.L.: Her father, this letter was from the early 1940's. I came across it. Her father now is a strange man, he works ...

F.W.: He always was.

F.L.: He, was the analyst for a movie producer and then he went and co-wrote a movie with the producer saying that something like, analysis is only analysis, but reality [i.e., realistic support] is also a good thing.

F.W.: It is a little bit in, Greenson had a tendency, perhaps not as strongly. He and Greenson worked together a lot. The funny thing is that Milton though a really interesting person, a very elegant man is a very cool cookie.

F.L.: Cool Cookie.

F.W.: Yes, he is not a person that you have contact with very easily. It is superficial. Pleasant, reasonable, nice, well intended but is not a person for close contacts. I sometimes had the feeling this also had something to do with the family story. What the two girls did afterwards. When Wexler was with us, were you were at the Clinic at that time?

F.L.: I was before her.

F.W.: She was about, she must have been around '68, '67 or '68.

F.L.: I had graduated by then.

F.W.: By that time. I remember one time we had a Clinic dance, and it was some kind of an hour of truth, and I told her about--she spoke a little for the '68 movement, which I had been very sympathetic to in the beginning, and then got disenchanted with and angry about; and I told her what that meant to a teacher.

F.L.: What is the '68 movement? Oh, the student rebellion, sure.

F.W.: I am using a German term. You just refer to the year. And they usually don't know that the whole thing started with the free speech movement in Berkeley, and there was an entirely different reason, different problems, and then it got mixed up with the Vietnam War, which is again a very different kettle of fish. It was highly necessary to do something about the war and then we had our rebellion. Anyway, so my history: Then when I came to the United States, rather to my surprise, I was faced with a great deal of rejection.

F.L.: Had you finished training by then or you were in the middle?

F.W.: I had finished training in the sense that ... well, you know training wasn't as clearly defined at that time. I had not done any supervised analytic work, and I did it then in Boston with [Hanns] Sachs. That was my first supervised work, Sachs and the Bibrings. And ... Sachs was very supportive, and is probably by all odds the person who, the one teacher whom I owe most. There are several others to whom I owe a lot, but Sachs I would. ... You know he wrote the book on Freud, Master and Friend, and I always thought I should write a paper about him and I toyed with the idea of editing some of his papers in German because they were written in English. They are still quite interesting, quite good, mostly on applied psychoanalysis. And I also wanted to write a dedication: "Sachs, master and friend," because he did, really for about 5 or 6 years, supervised me and as a rule didn't charge anything for it. He was very generous. I learned a lot from him. He was much more of a teacher and supervisor than an analyst. He was a bit too Apollonian, too Olympian for an analyst. There weren't any great transference crises. It was much more discovering the unconscious and having pleasant intellectual conversations. People who were in analysis with him as a rule were not so well analyzed as you would like to have it. But as a teacher, as an intellectual, as a friend, he was superb. and...

F.L.: What year did you come over?

F.W.: I came to the United States late in '38. I spent about half a year in New York. Around May or something like that, I, May '39, I went to Ohio State University where I had a job, until the end of the academic term in 1940. Then, a little later we moved to Boston, where Gertrude, my wife, had a job. I had entered into some correspondence with Harry Murray, because I was kind of on my own inventing fantasy tests, and suddenly discovered that Murray was doing already something of the same kind. So I wrote to him, and he was very pleased about that and invited me to come. Then he got some money, and a year later, about '41--'38 I arrived, '39 I went to Ohio State, '40 we moved to Boston--sometime in '41 probably fairly early in the year, maybe the beginning of the Summer term, or Spring term, at Harvard, I became research associate at the Psychological Clinic. Stayed there for the next three years, and for the next 12 years in one way or another was connected with Harvard University, and that was my great postgraduate education and I really learned psychology and a lot of other things. It was

very ... because the training in psychology at the University of Vienna that I had received was by no means as significant or exemplary or complete, so there was a lot of things that I had to learn. Also the ones that I didn't particularly like or get identified with like learning theory or experimental research, I learned about it, and in that respect the Psychological Clinic at Harvard University at that time was a hotbed of gifted people. There was hardly anybody who didn't, with one or two exceptions, all the others have made out famously. Brewster Smith, Robert Holt.

F.L.: Holt was there then?

F.W.: Of course, Holt did his dissertation ...

F.L.: I thought he was the next generation. I didn't realize that.

F.W.: No, no, no. That was already the second Clinic project. One had gone before. You know The Exploration of Personality, the book Murray wrote, is based on the earlier thing; but Bob White was kind of Assistant Director. Harry was an endless stimulation. He died last year, you know that.

F.L.: Who died?

F.W.: Murray. About 91 or something like that. And I was in contact with him until practically his death. I visited his wife this year when I was in Boston. Greatly enjoyed seeing her again.

[Tape was stopped at this point for a while.]

F.W.: One was Anna Freud, the other one was Willie Hoffer and the third one was Paul Federn. I've written a little about that in the past.

[Tape was stopped again at this point.]

F.L.: You were talking about Boston, the Boston people.

F.W.: When I arrived in Boston, I had a number of friends because the Austrian and Germans, the German-speaking colony stuck together, so a number of life-long friends like Lucy Jessner [?] who was, died in Washington, D.C. about 5 or 6 years ago in high old age. But also I was friends with the Bibrings, and with the Deutches, and so I had a kind of an entree to the Association, also through Sachs. But the Boston Association was at that time full of stuffed prigs, I would say, and was one of the more conservative ones; whereas Chicago was always kind of progressive and forward-looking, Boston was one that was only a little less bad than New York. New York was more pretentiously cantankerous and arrogant but Boston had ...

F.L.: You had spent a couple of years though, outside of Boston, in Ohio, or ...

F.W.: Yes, in Ohio I didn't have any contact and there was no contact there

F.L.: You didn't know at that time what Boston was going to be like?

F.W.: No, and also we went to Boston for entirely different reasons, because Gertrude had a job there in Boston. We had some ideas that this would be a nice place, whereas Columbus, Ohio was at that time a Midwestern city of the worst kind. Highly isolated from intellectual life, although fairly big, fairly sizeable and rich, but it was a very poor place to be, so was Ohio State University. Coming to Boston, I learned soon that they

would accept me for training but only as a class B candidate. And that I was too proud for and didn't have any desire.

F.L.: What was Class B?

F.W.: Class B was a research psychoanalyst.

F.L.: Full training, though, control cases?

F.W.: You can do, I think, one or two cases, the necessary cases, but then you have to sign a rescript in which you promise that you will not do psychoanalytic treatment.

F.L.: Did people do that? Did some people take it?

F.W.: Oh yeah. Sure. There were some at that time there were

[First side of tape ends at this point.]

F.W.: O.K., where were we?

F.L.: You said there were some people who did that ...

F.W.: Yeah, one's name was Bob Young and the other one was Walter Langer. Walter Langer was the younger brother of a famous historian at Harvard.

F.L.: And they signed this business?

F.W.: No, they were active analysts, but they had been admitted just at the time or a little before the time when the rule was enforced more strictly that non-medical people shouldn't get any training.

F.L.: Did anybody then, to your knowledge, go ahead and get the training as a Class B candidate, sign the thing and then adhere to it or not adhere to it?

F.W.: That was fairly often, was done fairly often and it was something that I quite seriously considered--that, if they force such rules upon you, you may yield to force but may not have to keep promises. But one that, I didn't like that idea it didn't seem to me very honest, and in addition it hurt my pride, and I didn't want to be an analyst on the sly, but an official one. So, for a long time, I attended meetings and was quite active in the Association's discussions and so on, but was at the same time still one of the outside attending people, partly because after some time I had clinical jobs which made it sensible that I would participate in such things, and also I had the backing of some of the leading analysts. But the whole thing was a very very awkward situation.

F.L.: And you went about getting supervision from Sachs during this time?

F.W.: I was getting supervision, and quite good one so I learned a lot. So I got in a way unofficial training, and I did my first analysis under Sachs' regular supervision.

F.L.: Did he get criticized for that?

F.W.: He didn't give a damn for such things because he was the naughty boy in such respects, and he had continuously fights with them about it. He was too well known and too close to the royal line, so to say, he was one of the Apostles so they didn't quite dare touch him.

F.L.: They didn't say anything at all, then?

F.W.: But they did. Of course. They did chide and rant, and so on. He paid no great attention to it, but unfortunately he had angina pectoris and died soon afterwards. He died somewhere in, it must have been '47, '48, something like that. I would have to check on it. So I had a very good supervision for the analysis. Much too difficult one, I must say. I think about it, with a depressive suicidal lady, with whom I however did reasonably, who improved reasonably well. And I still had the same bitter experience, and one of the reasons I liked to go to Michigan was because I was offered an independent clinical job. In the meantime, I had already had a chief psychologist position in several places. I had made a career. I leave that out because that's an extra story, but it had something to do with it. So when I arrived at Michigan, Michigan [i.e., The Michigan Psychoanalytic Institute] was in the throes of a split. Because Ives Hendrick was really the one who had accused the Sterbas that they were promoting lay analysis. And Mrs. Sterba was a lay analyst. She had a doctorate, I think, in musicology, and was a very good analyst as a matter of fact. And Sterba fought back, and finally the whole thing, they had to yield and what happened is that the Association broke up into two groups. I don't know whether they have realigned in the meantime or not.

F.L.: I'd like to ask a question about that. You may not know, but I asked some people about this because this is part of the history of lay analysis in America, and people said, well the Sterbas did other things: They were also accepting money for seminars which they were not supposed to be doing. That there were other things besides the lay analysis business.

F.W.: That I doubt very much. Dishonesty and mercenary behavior sounds unlikely. What they did is they were a little too uppity in ruling the roost as the two analysts from abroad, from the cradle.

F.L.: And also there was Fritz Redl who was there, wasn't he?

F.W.: Yes, but much less active. Fritz was never, I mean he was a member of the Association from Vienna days, so he was accepted there but he never did anything. He stayed with his group on delinquency problems. I don't think he has ever done an analysis in his life.

F.L.: So it was entirely on the lay analysis business that they ... ?

F.W.: I think it was a vindictive, hateful campaign which Ives Hendrick, whom I knew fairly well, had undertaken.

F.L.: Where was he from?

F.W.: Boston.

F.L.: The other story I heard was that Bartemeier, who was in Detroit, had a political problem with the Sterbas.

F.W.: That's quite possible.

F.L.: That Mrs. Sterba had made some recommendation about Bartemeier's child who had a neurological problem and Bartemeier took offense at that.

F.W.: I think ... I seem to remember that there were some rumors to that Bartemeier had the unenviable reputation of being one of the analysts who remained a faithful Catholic. Leo Bartemeier. So I would still agree with Fenichel's position ... it seems very hard for me to imagine. I know of this guy in Boston ...

F.L.: Meissner

F.W.: Meissner. Who is a very able analyst.

F.L.: Is he? I don't know.

F.W.: Yeah. I was told ... some people from the Clinic whom I am in contract with in Boston did supervision with him. Said it was very good. A little impersonal, a little removed, detached, but ... He kind of lives on kind of a split in him, one part is Jesuit and the other one is analyst and somehow he manages to unite them. He is not the only one. There are several other religious analysts.

F.L.: There is an analyst with a Hassidic outfit, I understand, someplace.

F.W.: There are several Catholic ones, there may well be some Protestant ones and of course there are several Marxist ones.

F.L.: Fenichel was one of them, wasn't he?

F.W.: No, Fenichel was a Marxist at that time but he didn't get the two things mixed up. He was very careful about that. Bernfeld was a little more explicitly Marxist, and also wrote a lot of stuff about which Fenichel did not. Bernfeld did have an extensive writing in which he tried to combine Marxism and psychoanalysis.

F.L.: And Waelder was explicitly antiMarxist.

F.W.: Waelder was very critical of Marxism. Which I would still say his book on politics and so on has been much neglected in Germany because it doesn't fit into their particular business; but I would still think it's an excellent critical book.

F.L.: So, you were saying, when I interrupted, you arrived in Michigan at the time of the split.

F.W.: At time of the-- The split had just happened, so there was much contact with the Detroit Psychoanalytic outfit, and for a long time I really, I would say three-quarter consciously realized the idea that what I needed for what I wanted to do was the backing of a big university. That I had. And when there was an attack on the Clinic, it was rebuffed.

F.L.: Attack by whom?

F.W.: By the then chief psychiatrist at the Department of Psychiatry, Waggoner.

F.L.: Oh, I know Waggoner, yes.

F.W.: Waggoner ran an attack, and he had not considered in his wild mood that you do not fight your own team. And so the vice president in charge of academic affairs descended upon him like thunder, and said, "well, I am a jurist, [unclear, truck sounds obscure some of this] I am a law man, if you want to have any charges please make them legal and so on." And when word got around all faculties united behind the Clinic.

It was great fun at that time, you know. People in English lit, and in Geography said "we are not going to have such a thing."

Yonna Levine: Because you were a non-medical person running the Clinic?

F.W.: It was not only because about me but about the Clinic in general. Doing psychotherapy without the licensure of psychiatry.

F.L.: This was about when, the '50s sometime?

F.W.: It must have been relatively early. It had to do with a case that Harold Rausch treated.

F.L.: Oh, he was a student then?

F.W.: No, no. He was assistant chief, he was my second lieutenant at that time. And he got in trouble with somebody and quite unjustifiably. A disagreeable, a cantankerous soul, the type of paranoiac borderline person who is litigious. You know always gets in litigation.

F.L.: Like Reik's case, the same kind of thing.

F.W.: The same type of a person. Reik's one may have been openly cantankerous. This one was a meek person who nevertheless somehow managed to find support. Well, let's leave that out. So for a long time, I come to the conclusion, for a long time I didn't do a thing, and was proud of the Clinic, and tried to develop and teach and go on, as much good psychoanalysis. And I must say I found a number of very helpful people. I had the good fortune of having mostly very good associates and mostly very good students. So, much later in the game, I had more contacts with the Detroit Institute-- was kind of told, why didn't I register as an Associate Member, no, an Affiliate Member, and that I became very quickly. And toward the end of my stay they were already assigning me things.

F.L.: They began to invite you to register?

F.W.: Invite me to, and then when I had been in discussions and they saw that I was able to contribute something, it was a very warm and friendly relationship. They were very nice to me.

F.L.: So, they never gave you any problem, all those people?

F.W.: No. At that time the fuss was over. This was 15 years after the split, you know, and peace had settled in. They were quite interested in intelligent people. They recognized very clearly that the psychologists there could contribute something. It was a kind of a friendly association. Not extremely, there weren't many very bright, brilliant people in it. There were some but not many. So it didn't have a brilliant record of publication and contribution but it was a friendly place.

F.L.: Nathan Segel was very good, I think.

F.W.: Yeah, a lot of people were quite. Segel was one of the best. A very good analyst but several others were quite respectable people. So they also had little prejudice and they began to kind of groom me for becoming a training analyst, doing training, and

trying to get me into ... they would have had to work it through at that time with the American which was absolutely hell.

F.L.: You still were only an affiliate member of some kind?

F.W.: An affiliate, so they had to make me first a full member, and then they had to find out whether I could become a training analyst and so on. I had published a lot in the meantime so that was known, too.

F.L.: 1970, something?

F.W.: This must have been in the '70s, yes, and I at that time, so if I waited another few years, I am reasonably certain I would have made the same career that I somewhat more quickly did in Germany. One of the reasons, as I told you before was that I wanted to devote more of my life to straight psychoanalysis, and to the life of a psychoanalytic institute. Which I did in the last 15 years and I am glad I did it, and now I have had it. And were I younger, or had I another life to live I would again move to something else. But that is a different story.

F.L.: What would you do?

F.W.: Oh, I think I would be interested in a kind of collective practice with a lot of talk and conversation. So, that is, an institute but without the troubles of an institute.

F.L.: Like the Clinic.

F.W.: Yes, something like that. With little administration, and with the possibly largest degree of exclusion of the hierarchical, and the jealousies and rivalries that mar psychoanalytic institutes. So I'd try to make a kind of a community of people who talk a lot to each other and exchange ideas and so on.

F.L.: You never had any conflict with the Detroit people or the Michigan people?

F.W.: On the contrary. The longer I was at the Clinic, the more respected the Clinic became, the more it was a factor in psychoanalytic psychology.

F.L.: I know that Ira Miller used to say that the University had a first rate department of psychology and a tenth rate department of psychiatry and that gave it a lot of problems.

F.W.: It wasn't always quite that bad but it was never more than second rate, and it was often less than that. That is true.

F.L.: You mentioned to me the first time we talked about this, that you thought that Sachs' personality had some impact on the Boston situation. That he may have created some of the problem about non-medical analysis by being too pushy.

F.W.: Yes. He kind of provoked them in a way. If somebody would have been a little more diplomatic, and less impatient and maybe he was also, you know, he was in a unique situation. He was one of the seven ringbearers, one of the people close to Freud and one of the immediate successor generation. And didn't want to have anybody tell him what psychoanalysis should be like. He thought he knew it. And he did in a way. But he was at times impatient and perhaps provocative and unwise. There was also too much of a kind of an artist in him. He was on the one hand an extremely loyal psychoanalyst, very much dedicated to the cause, to the whole thing, to

Freud. At the same time, he was an intellectual having turned psychoanalyst. He was not a clinician primarily, although he had a vast experience.

F.L.: Why wouldn't a person like him have made a big issue about this then, when they ... you had had training in Vienna and when you came there they said "no". He was a member of the Boston Institute.

F.W.: He probably tried, but [inaudible due to truck sounds]. He didn't have that much power. Another thing that certainly added to it is the rivalry, the silent rivalry between the Europeans and the non-Europeans. Later on when larger numbers of people came, and distributed themselves over the United States, there was a fairly notifiable, fairly observable trend of xenophobia. I remember, what's his name, the one who also did some ethnological work with Cora Dubois, Kardiner. Kardiner used to say, I remember that from conversations with him, he said, well we called them the Beiunzers [spelling?]. Beiunzer is "back home" approximately in German, the Beiunzers, because they always say "back home, of course this was much better." So they were the back homers, you know. And that was not completely undeserved, because as all immigrants, people had to fight their unsureness, their own insecurity and perhaps their guilt feelings over having lost one place in life and having to gain another one in the new country. Nevertheless, there also, there was also a lot of right, the Vienna Institute at its best was, of course, much more psychoanalytic, much more genuine, and much more intellectual than most of the training places were before.

F.L.: Were there other people like you who had been part way through the training and who came over?

F.W.: Yes, I met, In the course of time, I met a whole lot of people whom I hadn't known. I mean, Ekstein I had already known in Vienna.

F.L.: But he finished his training somehow or other, didn't he?

F.W.: I think he finished it in the States.

F.L.: In Topeka. I guess he went to Topeka.

F.W.: Yes, he went to Topeka. But I know with whom he had been in analysis in Vienna, but that was only for a relatively short time.

F.L.: You had your analysis in Vienna?

F.W.: In Vienna. But then I did another year, a little more than a year in Boston. But that was for personal reasons. My first marriage ended.

F.L.: With a physician. With an M.D.?

F.W.: Yes, but a person who was quite uncantankerous and reasonable about that. A guy by the name of Ludwig. He has died, a number of years ago.

F.L.: You must have been, you must have thought -- you were coming over, and you were going to resume your training. You were going to resume what you were ...

F.W.: Sure. Continue in, just in the regular, and complete it. So instead of it I got it on the ears very quickly that I wasn't suitable; and this reminded me too much: "If you are Jewish, you are bad." And you have no choice, it is not a question that you are person

first. And the same was true where if you are not a medical person you can not do psychoanalysis. And I must say that, since they had lived--American psychoanalysis--for quite a number of years, practically without lay people, they became extremely so kind of unrealistic about their own position. The whole thing was really a kind of a big narcissistic trip.

F.L.: They thought that they were the best in the world.

F.W.: The best in the world and the cat's meow, and that there was no question, and that only physicians who were able to. And the reasons that in my life I have heard about why physicians were necessarily better analysts, or the only analysts, are so ... so stupid, you know, so silly.

F.L.: Thank you.

[Tape is stopped at this point, with interview completed, and then resumed for the following addition:]

F.W.: I was on the staff of the Massachusetts Medical School, and the chief psychiatrist was not exactly a friend of lay people but then on the other hand he liked me. And at one time he said: "Look, I mean, why don't you study medicine? We're going to support you, we're going to do this and this and this and this."

F.L.: They would have helped you out.

F.W.: Have helped me out with money, with all kind of facilitations, and so on. Not just get me through, and end the whole thing well, gain me for their fold, as they thought. I discussed it with Sachs and Sachs was very calm about it and unjudgemental. But he said "I don't see any reason why ... There is nothing in medicine. What would you do?" And I didn't have any desire, you know, medicine didn't interest me in that respect. Or, if I would have studied medicine, then I would have become an internist.

F.L.: Yes, that's how I felt about it too.

F.W.: I would learn a lot of physiology and biochemistry and so on and do that really well. And I don't need the damn thing. If I have to treat asthma, I need a good internist with whom I can discuss things, and he takes over the physical side, the somatic side, and I take the other one. I think that I am grateful, because I would have gotten myself into something that I didn't really want to learn, and it would have been a complicated, unhappy story.