J. Am. Psa.

Nellie L. Thompson

60/1

THE TRANSFORMATION OF PSYCHOANALYSIS IN AMERICA: EMIGRÉ ANALYSTS AND THE NEW YORK PSYCHOANALYTIC SOCIETY AND INSTITUTE, 1935–1961

Part I reviews the role of the Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration of the American Psychoanalytic Association, chaired by Lawrence Kubie and Bettina Warburg, members of the New York Psychoanalytic Society, in facilitating the immigration to the United States of scores of European analysts and candidates between 1938 and 1943. The challenges facing the committee are outlined in reports written by Kubie and Warburg. In particular, the intractable problem of how to integrate European lay analysts into the American Psychoanalytic Association was an ever present problem. Part II describes the impact emigré analysts had on the intellectual life of the New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute, and considers how the psychoanalytic work of the emigrés was influenced by their move to America. The reminiscences of two emigré analysts, Peter Neubauer and Kurt R. Eissler, on their experience of coming to the United States close the paper.

This paper was occasioned by the 2011 centenary of the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsaA) and the New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute. I wished to explore more fully how, following the *Anschluss* in Austria in 1938, APsaA undertook to rescue European analysts, and the consequences of this effort both for APsaA and for the New York Society, where many emigrés became members,

Member, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute; Curator, Archives and Special Collections, A. A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

Paper presented as the A. A. Brill Lecture, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute, December 14, 2010. Submitted for publication March 20, 2011.

DOI: 10.1177/0003065112436716

their theoretical and clinical contributions exercising a singular influence on American psychoanalysis for many years (Jeffrey 1989; Hale 1995; Makari 2009; Steiner 2000, 2011). Part I reviews the role of the Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration of APsaA, chaired by Lawrence Kubie and Bettina Warburg, members of the New York Psychoanalytic Society, in facilitating the emigration to the United States of scores of European analysts. Part II describes the impact emigré analysts had on the intellectual life of the New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute, and considers how the psychoanalytic work of emigré analysts was influenced by their move to America.

PART I: THE EMERGENCY COMMITTEE ON RELIEF AND IMMIGRATION

The mandate of the Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration (ECRI) of the American Psychoanalytic Association, established March 13, 1938, was to facilitate the immigration of Austrian analysts to the United States. Its origins may be traced to the earlier Committee on the Relations of the American Psychoanalytic Association to the International Psychoanalytical Association, formed in December 1937 by the Council on Professional Training. Franz Alexander, then APsaA president, appointed Lawrence Kubie to chair the emergency committee; its other members were Sándor Radó, Thomas French, Lewis Hill, George Daniels, and Ralph Kaufman. Briefly, its function was to study and "deal with all problems arising in connection with the migration of analysts from Europe to this country" (Kubie 1938a, p. 65). APsaA officials were especially agitated because the IPA reserved "to itself the right to grant official recognition to analysts as training analysts (instructors)" when they immigrated to the United States (Kubie 1938b, p. 62). At the time, it was envisioned that the committee would address the following issues: "the relationship of such analysts to the International, their relationship to our constituent societies of the American, their right to teach and by whom such right should be conferred, the situation of lay analysts, etc." It was envisioned that the primary functions of the committee would be to restrict and control immigration, to direct refugees into communities not already overcrowded, and to keep the teaching of analysis centered in the hands of recognized institutes (Kubie 1938a, p. 65). In establishing a committee to deal with these issues, officers of the association were responding to the fact that a growing number of European analysts were

already in the United States, among them prominent European analysts invited to direct newly established training programs in New York, Chicago, and Boston; that their numbers would continue to increase; and that efforts by individual analysts and societies to assist their European colleagues and friends were at that time uncoordinated and piecemeal.[1]

An illustrative ad hoc response is recorded in the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Directors of the New York Psychoanalytic Society on the evening of November 26, 1935, at which there was a discussion of the plight of Edith Jacobson, who had recently been arrested, and other German analysts. The issue of funds was raised by A. A. Brill, who donated $500 to augment the $500 he had earlier placed in the hands of Bertram Lewin, who was in charge of the society's funds for German analysts. Brill also drew attention to the situation of the Hungarian analyst Therese Benedek. The board decided that in order to facilitate Benedek's passage to the United States the society would offer her a paid teaching position on the institute staff.[2] The meeting concluded with Brill's motion that funds be cabled to Ernest Jones for the aid of the German analysts, Jacobson in particular. This was followed by C. P. Oberndorf 's motion that $1,000 be sent to Ernest Jones at once for this purpose (Minutes 1935). The scientific portion of the November 26 meeting highlights the growing presence of emigré analysts in American psychoanalytic societies. Karen Horney presented that evening's paper, "On the Problem of the Negative Therapeutic Reaction," and the discussants were Robert Fliess, Johan van Ophuijsen. and Dorian Feigenbaum, emigré analysts respectively from Berlin, the Netherlands, and Vienna.[3]

The *Anschluss* in Austria in March 1938 drastically changed and complicated the environment for analysts wishing to emigrate and for those wishing to aid them. Initially the Emergency Committee's mandate was to facilitate the immigration only of Austrian analysts, but this provision was

[1]The officers of APsaA were Franz Alexander (president); Lewis B. Hill (vice president); Lawrence Kubie (secretary); M. Ralph Kaufman (treasurer). Members of the Executive Council were Jacob Finesinger, Lionel Blitzten, David Levy, and Karl Menninger.

[2]Therese Benedek settled in Chicago in 1936. For details of her career see Benedek (1979) and Schmidt (2004).

[3]Robert Fliess (1895–1970), the son of Wilhelm Fliess, joined the New York Society in 1934. Johan van Ophuijsen (1882–1950), founder of the Netherlands Psychoanalytic Society, became a member in 1936. Dorian Feigenbaum (1887–1937), who had been analyzed by Otto Gross, lived briefly in Palestine before immigrating to the United States and joined the society in 1925. He was one of the founding editors of *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*.

quickly dropped and henceforth efforts were made to assist all those who contacted the committee**.** No litmus test was applied in determining which individuals would be helped; the committee made every effort to assist anyone who contacted it. The committee's work was soon hampered by fast-moving and dangerous developments in Europe, and also by domestic institutional and bureaucratic obstacles, which needlessly complicated their efforts on behalf of individuals in contact with the committee.

The resolution establishing the committee stated that its chair should be the secretary of the American Psychoanalytic Association, then Lawrence Kubie, a prominent member of the New York Society, and be composed of representatives appointed by each constituent society of the association (Resolution 1938).[4]

The resolution included the following provisions: (1) that the committee should act for all the constituent societies in "all matters pertaining to relief for psychoanalysts from abroad and their immigration to this country"; (2) that all inquiries and appeals for information and help received either by members of APsaA or by local societies should be referred to the committee, or that at least it should be notified of all such inquiries and appeals; (3) that all invitations to European psychoanalysts, or offers of help and information, should be made through the committee, or where for special reasons such help, information, or invitations were extended privately, that notice of this should be supplied to the committee in order to avoid duplication of efforts and to coordinate efforts to help; (4) that all European societies and individual analysts where they could be reached should be asked to work through the committee; (5) that the committee be empowered to issue a Bulletin of Information for prospective immigrants, advising them of the special conditions of practice in this country.

The resolution establishing the committee implored each society to begin raising funds at once. This money was to be allocated in two ways: a portion was to be deposited abroad for the relief of those who had to leave troubled areas in great haste as political refugees, and required funds to cover their living and travel expenses; and a portion was to be

[4]Boston was represented by Helene Deutsch, John Murray, and Ralph Kaufman; New York by Bertram Lewin, Sándor Radó, Monroe Meyer, George Daniels, and Lawrence Kubie; Chicago by Franz Alexander and Thomas French; Washington-Baltimore by Lewis Hill.

deposited here for the assistance of immigrants to this country, and for the guaranteeing of affidavits of support.[5]

In 1938 the American Psychoanalytic Association was a federation of four component societies (Boston, Chicago, New York, and Washington) with a total of 140 members, of whom eighteen were emigrés. The largest society was New York, with 72 members (Bulletin 1937). By 1939 two more societies, Philadelphia and Topeka, had joined, boosting the association's membership to 183, including 29 emigrés. The fact that APsaA then was a very small organization makes the success of the Emergency Committee in facilitating the emigration and resettlement of refugees an impressive achievement. But this small size may also have contributed to the panic that seized many of its members, convinced that European analysts, especially lay analysts, would overwhelm them. Strongly reinforcing this panic was the desire of many analysts to avoid having their medical status and psychoanalysis itself compromised by belonging to an organization that recognized lay analysts as fellow professionals (Wallerstein 1998; Hale 1995).

Kubie's frustration over this initial panic is repeatedly documented in his correspondence and reports, which demonstrate his empathic understanding of the plight of both medical and lay emigré analysts as they sought to make new lives for themselves in America. But his indefatigable energy and sense of purpose were well suited to the task of chairing the Emergency Committee. Kubie was very ably assisted by Bettina Warburg, also a member of the New York Society, who was appointed co-chair in July 1938. In the weeks following, Kubie wrote a series of information bulletins and reports describing the committee's work to the APsaA membership, and thereafter its work can be traced in the detailed reports issued between 1938 and 1943. These, along with letters Kubie wrote to Franz Alexander, then APsaA president, and to Ernest Jones and Edward Glover in England, vividly convey the pressures and problems confronting the committee. For example, on March 19, 1938, six days after the committee was formed, Kubie reported that "trustworthy information" was now

[5]The need for funds was constant. Every report was accompanied by a request for funds, and letters of solicitation were also sent to APsaA members. In 1940 the Rockefeller Foundation made a grant of $2,000 to the Committee, but cash on hand was only $2,830.56. In a plea for funds it was noted that because the committee now had to pay for passage either in full or in part before a visa was granted, it would shortly exhaust its funds. An addendum of October 15, 1941, noted that since May the committee had received $1,233.56 and spent $3,093.87, leaving a sum of $984.71, and urgently asked for more contributions.

available on the situation in Austria. Ruth Mack Brunswick had telephoned him early that morning immediately after her arrival in Paris from Vienna, and he had been in contact with officials in the State Department. He wrote that

> information from Austria indicates the seriousness of the local situation in Vienna, with carefully organized confiscation of property, minute searching of private homes, although to date none of "our friends" have been physically harmed, although some money was seized from the Verlag. Efforts are being made to persuade Freud to leave and E. Jones is in Vienna. . . . at present no Jew is allowed to leave Austria under any circumstances, nor is it settled by the new regime—and what makes it highly unlikely that anyone will be allowed to emigrate for several weeks—what form of travel document or passport will allow one to leave.... this gives the Committee some time to take more deliberate action. The State Department is anxious to avoid any action that will hurt anyone in Austria. Their view is that anyone the regime wants to seize they will since they came to power with lists of wanted people and then systematically took them into custody. With more planning there is less danger that people will be turned back at the border or have their papers confiscated [Kubie 1938c].[6]

Two weeks later, on March 31, Kubie circulated an ominous report concerning the situation in Austria. He wrote that the situation was "if anything, more distressing than before." Only a few individuals had been allowed to leave Austria, and the emigration of Jews was a rare occurrence. When they were allowed to leave, they could take only twenty Austrian schillings with them (about $4.00), so they would be utterly destitute when they crossed the border. Kubie pleaded for more donations:

> Money must be poured into Dr. Lewin's fund at once and in the largest quantity,—to be used for goods, shelter, and travelling expenses for those who get across the border. It is immediately and urgently essential to contribute everything which we possibly can as individuals, and at the same time for every one of us to appeal to every available friend for donations, both large and small. Please send money at once to Dr. Bertram D. Lewin . . ." [Kubie 1938d].

While the committee raised thousands of dollars, Lewin believed that Bettina Warburg, a member of the Warburg banking family, had used her

[6]Kubie noted that the State Department had expressed concern about the methods used up to that time to inform the American consulate in Vienna of moneys placed on deposit here for the support of those the committee wanted to bring to the United States. Individuals who had already sent affidavits to Kubie's office were now urged to send new copies with the official approval of their society, and Kubie would then forward them on to the proper authorities in Washington.

own money to support the committee's work, but would never acknowledge she had done so (Lewin 1965).

Letter to Ernest Jones: April 26, 1938

On April 26, 1938, Kubie wrote to Ernest Jones to express thecommittee's wish that he communicate the following to colleagues who wanted to immigrate to America.[7] They should be made aware that the larger cities already had well-organized societies and institutes and were well supplied with training analysts. On the other hand, there were many cities where there was a need for psychoanalysts, and refugees would be encouraged to settle in such areas. Kubie acknowledged, however, that this would be difficult for many colleagues from Europe. He also informed Jones that the committee opposed granting membership-at-large in the IPA to anyone who planned to come to America; APsaA wanted emigrés to present their credentials and apply to one of the constituent societies. Prospective immigrants would be asked by the committee to complete a questionnaire with full data on their training, and be provided an Information Bulletin (Appendix A) to give them a clear picture of the situation they would meet were they to come to America. Kubie wrote that at the upcoming Chicago meeting of APsaA there was a plan to establish a special status of "honorary guests" for analytically trained laymen, provided they agreed not to train lay analysts in the future (Kubie 1938e).

The next day, April 27, Kubie issued an update on the committee's activities to the APsaA membership. He noted that at the time of his last report (March 31), the committee was largely concerned with securing affidavits for prospective immigrants and that in the interim a great many people had generously responded to this plea. At present it was unclear how many European colleagues would want to come to this country. To date no Austrian analysts had been allowed to leave the country, and the committee was now trying to help half a dozen analysts in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. To familiarize members with the policy being pursued by the committee, a copy of the questionnaire and the Information Bulletin was enclosed with the report (Kubie 1938f).

The Chicago Meeting: June 2–3

In early June the American Psychoanalytic Association met in Chicago, and Kubie's report, in frank language, addressed the conflicting

[7]Kubie was responding to Jones's letters of March 25 and April 7 and 14, which had been forwarded to ECRI.

attitudes and emotions that had been aroused by the anticipated emigration of so many analysts from abroad. In acknowledging that Viennese attitudes toward Americans were one source of this anxiety, he argued, at the same time, that this anxiety was unnecessary. Referring to the days and weeks following the *Anschluss,* Kubie wrote:

> For everyone this was a period of intense feeling; yet if we face the situation honestly it must be acknowledged that these feelings were not without their elements of conflict and confusion. On the one hand it was recognized that part of the Viennese community of analysts might be seriously hampered in their efforts to adapt to the American scene by the traditional isolationist policy of that group, by its old antipathy to the medical world, and by the hostility to America which had long been inculcated from many sources. . . . these considerations gave rise to certain misgivings (mounting in some instances to actual panic) as to the potential influence on psychoanalysis in this country of a large influx of European analysts en masse. We cannot pretend that the activities of this Committee have been wholly free from the confusion to which all of us have been subject. Nevertheless . . . the more panicky attitude towards the problem has been grossly unnecessary [Kubie 1938a, pp. 65–66].

Letter to Franz Alexander: July 15

On July 15 Kubie wrote a lengthy letter to Franz Alexander. He began by expressing the hope that his latest report would "alleviate some of this ridiculous panic" concerning the emigration of lay analysts from Europe. "As you know," he wrote, ". . . I wanted to see all of the senior, established European lay analysts accepted on some basis in our societies. . . . I think that quite a number of members feel that we have gone too far in our total exclusion of these lay colleagues from abroad." Referring to the Information Bulletin, Kubie expressed frustration that many of the European analysts had misunderstood it:

> among our European colleagues here and abroad the feeling is widespread that the American Psychoanalytic Association itself makes our State laws and the judicial interpretations of these laws, and that therefore we are responsible for this impasse about the lay analysts. . . . I think they suspect (in fact, I know in certain cases that this is true) that we have engineered this aggressive activity on the part of State and legal authorities in order to safeguard our own private practice. . . . I know that in certain cases the Bulletin of Information which we prepared for European analysts was looked upon as a threatening statement of our legal position.

Kubie was frustrated because he believed the Bulletin was simply meeting ECRI's obligation to inform emigrés of the conditions they would confront in the United States. But for individuals in a life-threatening

situation, seeking refuge for themselves and their families, the Bulletin's stark message describing a tangle of state laws governing the practice of medicine in the United States, and hence psychoanalysis, must have seemed harsh. Although expressed as an "expectation," the Bulletin's statement that "no immigrant, no matter what status he has had in Europe as a training analyst, will undertake to train psychoanalysts independently of one of our established training institutes" was a chilling reminder to emigrés that there was no guarantee that their status in Europe as training analysts would be recognized by APsaA institutes.

Kubie also wanted the Europeans to understand that the "resolutions which we have adopted against the *future* training of laymen were formulated and enacted before the Austrian crisis occurred. In the original formulation we were thinking only of our domestic problem, and not of the question of European laymen in the field of analysis." He acknowledged it was a serious omission to have made no reference to lay analysts who had been members of European societies for years. Although he was of the opinion that their status in America should be "planned carefully," he felt that some "more hospitable and generous arrangement" should be found rather than the current outright rejection of them. Kubie proposed that a "fresh statement of these problems" should be formulated and circulated to the membership of the American in the hope that consensus could be reached by autumn "to avoid further hurt to the feelings of our European friends." This statement should clarify the right of European immigrants to teach, whether as members or guests, and to do preparatory analyses.

Kubie also expressed his unhappiness with some of the resolutions that had been passed in Chicago concerning APsaA's relationship to the IPA. He agreed with the resolutions insofar as APsaA "must not participate in any type of international supervision" which it did not acknowledge and therefore should not participate on the Central Executive or the International Training Commission (ITC). He further agreed that APsaA institutes should choose their own faculties independent of the authority of any central agency. What Kubie did not like in "tone or content" was the resolution opposing the authority of the IPA to designate the category "membership-at-large." He was aware of all the drawbacks of such a category but thought it "folly" to ask the IPA to force these analysts out. While Kubie did not have a definitive answer to this problem, he proposed as a temporary solution maintaining the Vienna Society as an IPA entity. This would make the membership-at-large category unnecessary. No one would be thrown out of the IPA, and there would be time to find a better solution to the problem of lay analysis.

Kubie closed his letter to Alexander with the suggestion that one way to help lay colleagues in this country "to a better and more secure status in the psychiatric community" would be to get them elected to the Orthopsychiatric Society, which accepted lay members. Another way to help immigrants adjust to their new home was suggested to him by what occurred following the APsaA meeting in San Francisco. He noted that Siegfried Bernfeld and Bernard Berliner had more work there than they could handle, and that interest in analysis was booming along the West Coast. This suggested to Kubie that when immigrants were settled in a community, a series of meetings and public lectures should be organized at which they could speak and present short papers. This would create further interest in analysis and help build their new practices. "If this is done tactfully and with care, I think it might assist greatly in launching our friends in their new homes." As Kubie was planning to attend the 1938 IPA Congress in Paris, he asked Alexander to respond to his ideas so he could take them abroad with him or send them over were he unable to attend (Kubie 1938g). In reply, Alexander admitted that he saw no satisfactory solution to the "official status" of the "significant" lay analysts who had recently come to the United States and those who would soon follow. Further, since APsaA had become a strictly medical organization, it would be quite impossible to accord them the status they deserved. He frankly acknowledged that neither he nor Kubie was in any position to change the general attitude of the majority of the membership. Alexander expressed agreement with Kubie's view that something should be done about this situation and hoped the matter could be reconsidered in the future (Alexander 1938).

Letter to Ernest Jones: July 19

On July 19 Kubie wrote to Ernest Jones saying he would be unable to attend the Paris Congress, but was anxious to assure him that the fact there would be no official APsaA representation at the Congress did not imply a "separationist" spirit in the American societies. He quickly turned to the problem of the emigré lay analysts:

> About one matter I feel very badly,—and that is the inhospitality of the formal action of our American societies towards the older established lay-analysts from abroad. This formal inhospitality is not a true measure of our spirit or feelings towards them personally or scientifically. It is rather a measure of the wave of

> anxiety, which afflicted part of our membership when they envisaged a huge influx of countless hordes of Continental lay-analysts in the American scene. They imagined them training many more lay-analysts. They foresaw our entire relationship to the American medical world disrupted. They saw, or thought they saw, the possibility of blanket action against analysis as a whole resulting from this [Kubie1938h].

The problem of how European lay analysts would be treated by membership continued to complicate APsaA's relationship with the IPA. This is clearly illustrated in a letter that Edward Glover, secretary of the IPA subcommittee on relations with APsaA, wrote to Kubie in December 1938. Glover was responding to Kubie's letter of July 11 and his July 19 letter to Jones. Unable to attend the Paris Congress, Kubie had sent a number of documents to the IPA that had been read at the business meeting there. Glover observed that the membership had responded with much indignation at their tone and content. While Glover was critical of some of the procedural actions of APsaA, he struck a conciliatory tone and hoped that some common ground could be found between the two groups. But the intractable problem of how to treat lay analysts remained unresolved. Glover pointed out that it was only the emergency arising from the expulsion of Jewish members from the German Society that had prompted the IPA to designate them "members at large." He noted that the IPA urged the emigrés to join their local societies as soon as possible and had resisted bestowing at-large status on members of the recently dissolved Vienna, Prague, and Italian societies. Glover appealed for a resolution of this problem, which involved only a few lay analysts, in the interest of maintaining and strengthening the institutional cohesion of the psychoanalytic movement:

> all properly trained analysts should be united together under the aegis of a single and comprehensive association. . . . If it once became customary for genuinely trained and competent psycho-analysts to practise outside the framework of the International Association it would, in our opinion, seriously impair our prestige and would open the doors to endless confusion and muddle. . . . We cannot believe that you would expect us to expel such analysts from our ranks, the only motive for which would be their political misfortune . . . [Glover 1938].

ECRI Report: November 22, 1938

In this report Kubie emphasized, perhaps for the benefit of analysts worried about the influx of emigrés, that the committee had made every effort to impress on European colleagues the need to scatter themselves

throughout the country. Though the Europeans acknowledged the wisdom of this strategy in principle, many found it difficult to actually undertake such moves. Kubie described their plight sympathetically:

> At the same time this subjects them to grave additional emotional strain; and it is important for us to assist them in their readjustment by not pushing them too rapidly towards this difficult step. Further, the émigrés also need to spend some weeks or months in New York because it is the port of entry and the place where they find friends and compatriots to lessen their sense of loneliness and isolation from familiar surroundings. Also, it is possible not only to take the New York State Board Examinations promptly, but in addition the New York State license through reciprocity agreements gives émigrés entree to a large number of other states. And informal, inexpensive tutoring groups have formed in New York, which facilitate studying for the exam. Finally, for many who have been tragically disturbed by the uprooting and the enforced transplantation of their lives, immediate further migration becomes psychologically and emotionally impossible, arousing great anxiety and depression and endangering the ultimate happy adjustment to this new environment. For such émigrés it is important to give them time to catch their breath before urging on them their duty to scatter throughout the land [Kubie and Warburg 1938].

This report also notes that the committee's policy toward assisting European analysts varied according to the country where they were currently residing. For example, although a decision was taken not to bring psychoanalysts from England except under special circumstances, the committee sent $4,000 to the British Society to assist with the work being done in the nursery shelters and to help certain analysts who, because of war restrictions, could no longer support themselves. The committee was also trying to help analysts in Holland, Germany, and Hungary, where many urgently needed affidavits, moral guarantees, and passage money in order to secure visa and transit permits to ports of exit.

ECRI Report: May 7–9, 1939

This report, written by Bettina Warburg, detailed how the Emergency Committee was now working in close cooperation with the Committee for the Placement of Foreign Physicians. A central registry for all European physicians had been organized, along with advisory boards for each medical specialty. The function of the boards was to evaluate the "personal and scientific qualifications of every refugee" physician seeking a position through their assistance (Warburg 1976). Warburg herself interviewed the majority of psychoanalysts and psychiatrists entering the United States through New York. Coincident with this report, Kubie resigned as co-chair

of the committee, though remaining actively involved in its work. Warburg took over the committee's work in the United States, while Kubie dealt with immigration visas and letters to consulates. He was also heavily involved in finding hospital positions for many refugees through his numerous contacts throughout the country (Warburg 1939). In Warburg's 1941 report she noted that an unwelcome obstacle had been created by the State Department, which on July 1 had passed new immigration regulations that temporarily voided the visas of emigrés who, prepared to leave Europe, had already booked their passage. The new regulations called for two affidavits for each individual, instead of one. In addition, a third form, dealing with the factual data pertaining to the prospective immigrant, now had to be signed by a person in the United States who personally knew the emigré.[8] The State Department had also determined that a family of three to four would have to be guaranteed an income of $5,000 a year. Thus, anyone signing an affidavit was undertaking to provide this amount if needed. The committee also had to pay for an emigré's passage, and for that of family members, before a visa would be granted.

The committee's efforts had also been rendered more difficult by the worsening situation in Europe. Months of work had been required to secure the release of some individuals from concentration camps or to obtain exit permits and transit visas merely to reach a port from which to embark. Warburg's report concluded, "This work of your Committee has met with innumerable setbacks which have been heart-breaking to those still abroad whose hopes were repeatedly kindled and extinguished." The committee's work was essentially suspended in 1943 because of the war in Europe.

Final Report

In 1948 Bettina Warburg wrote a final report on ECRI's work, which provided information on the 254 individuals with whom it had been in contact.[9] Individuals were grouped according to the nature of their

[8]In light of the new requirements, the committee had explored the possibility of assisting individuals by detouring them to Cuba, but the money required for transatlantic passage to Cuba made this option too expensive.

[9]In March 1948 Warburg wrote to Robert Bak, a Hungarian analyst and member of the New York Society, who was in charge of a committee to help Hungarian analysts and individuals. She informed him that she had closed ECRI's bank account and that individuals who were still repaying loans made to them by the committee were directed to remit payment to him. For example, David Rapaport had an outstanding obligation of $737.52 and had been directed to send his payments to Bak's committee. See Mészáros (2010) for the history of the Hungarian Psychoanalytic Society before, during, and after World War II.

contact and the assistance rendered them. The four groups were persons in the U.S. assisted financially (51); persons outside the U.S. assisted financially (14); persons in the U.S. in contact with the committee (134); and persons who requested affidavits (55). These individuals included not only analysts, but candidates, medical students, psychologists, social workers, teachers, lay analysts, family members of analysts, and nonanalyst physicians. Appendix B provides examples of the range of individuals assisted by ECRI. Their individual circumstances, sketched in a few graphic sentences, allow the reader to sense how precarious and insecure their lives were at the moment they appealed for help, and the complexities of providing them assistance.

The environment in which the Emergency Committee carried out its work was multifaceted. On the international stage it worked to assist a wide range of individuals in European countries increasingly engulfed by war, a situation where arranging and paying for passage and obtaining visas was time-consuming and difficult. Nationally, it helped emigrés negotiate medical licensing requirements and to obtain jobs and new homes. Organizationally, Kubie's reports and letters document the frustration he encountered in having to deal with the anxiety of American analysts over the immigration of the Europeans, a situation further complicated by the intractable problem of how to deal with lay analysts. So while the Emergency Committee, in a very difficult environment, did successfully rescue many European analysts, APsaA's failure to recognize lay analysts, with a few notable exceptions, as colleagues cast a dark shadow over the committee's humanitarian achievement. The issue of recognizing and training lay analysts would continue to vex and divide American psychoanalysts, and embittered many lay analysts then and in the years ahead. It led to the creation, as Kubie had predicted, of training institutes outside the association.[10]

Since the New York Society was the largest psychoanalytic society in the United States during this period, it is very likely that some of its members succumbed to what Kubie called the "ridiculous panic" over the emigration of European analysts, both medical and lay. But the society can also take pride in the fact that many of its members warmly welcomed the emigrés who became their colleagues and, further, that two of its members, Lawrence Kubie and Bettina Warburg, were pivotal actors in the success of ECRI's work.

[10]See Wallerstein's exhaustive account (1998) of the history of lay analysis and the 1988 settlement of the lawsuit brought by four psychologists against APsaA and the IPA for restraint of trade.

PART II: THE ROLE OF EMIGRÉS IN THE NEW YORK PSYCHOANALYTIC SOCIETY AND INSTITUTE

Emigré analysts had an enormous and long-lasting impact on the educational and intellectual life of the New York Psychoanalytic Society. The career of Ernst Kris, however, illustrates how the move to the United States also affected the psychoanalytic work of the emigrés. In 1937 the society had 71 members, of whom five were emigrés, and was the largest psychoanalytic society in the U.S. (Bulletin 1937).[11] A decade later, in 1948, its membership was 152, with 51, a full third, being emigrés. Half a century ago, in 1961, as the New York Society observed its fiftieth anniversary, all the officers of the institute were emigrés (president, Annie Reich; vice-president, Annemarie Weil; secretary, Nicholas Young; treasurer, Dora Hartmann), as were the chair of the Education Committee (Robert Bak) and nine of the committee's seventeen members.

Half the emigrés (26 of 51) were originally members of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society. Thus, New York became the home of slightly more than half of the forty-eight members of the Vienna Society who came to the United States. Although the emigré members of the New York Society are often referred to as the "Viennese," this is misleading, as ten of them were from the Hungarian Psychoanalytic Society (including Bak, Margaret Mahler, and George Gerö) and nine from the Berlin group (including Edith Jacobson, Sándor Radó, and Henry Lowenfeld).[12] In other words, the psychoanalytic cultures of the three leading European psychoanalytic centers, Berlin, Budapest, and Vienna, all made their influence felt within the New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

Many of the emigrés quickly became training analysts. The 1948 catalog listed forty-five training analysts, of whom twenty were emigrés, five of whom also sat on the Education Committee (Heinz Hartmann, Edith Jacobson, Marianne Kris, Rudolph Loewenstein, and Hermann Nunberg.) It is notable that when Hartmann and Kris were elected to membership in 1943, they were simultaneously voted onto the Education

[11]The five emigrés were Sándor Radó, Karen Horney, Robert Fliess, Margaret Ribble, and Bela Mittelman. Three earlier emigrés, Sandor Lorand, Dorian Feigenbaum, and Fritz Wittels, are counted as non-emigré members in 1937 because they came to the United States in the mid-1920s.

[12]Generally, emigré analysts became members of the New York Society roughly two years after their arrival in America, a reflection of the fact that they had to obtain a state medical license before they could join. But they attended meetings of the society as guests, and several were invited to teach in the Extension Division before becoming members.

Committee. Hartmann also became the first director of the Treatment Center. In all, emigrés accounted for over half (20 of 36) of the institute's teaching faculty.

The emigrés belonged to a generation trained in the 1920s and 1930s during a period when Freud made his final contributions, including *Beyond the Pleasure Principle, Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego, The Ego and the Id,* "Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety," and *New Introductory Lectures.* These momentous theoretical developments presented this generation of analysts with new avenues for investigation, and the exciting possibility that their contributions could significantly advance and consolidate psychoanalytic theory and technique. The men and women of this generation felt themselves to be participants in a fateful intellectual revolution with far-reaching implications not only for understanding the mind, development, and behavior, but also for politics, pedagogy, and culture (Thompson 2008).

The Second World War disrupted these developments, but the postwar years witnessed a resurgence of creative work by analysts on both sides of the Atlantic. They turned their attention to investigations of infant psychic development, the etiology of schizophrenia, the treatment of borderline or severely ill patients, the nature of transference, the role of countertransference in therapy, the place of affects in theory, and the role of aggression in ego development and object relations. Emigré analysts, along with the leading figures in New York (e.g., Bertram Lewin, Lawrence Kubie, and Phyllis Greenacre), richly contributed to postwar psychoanalysis and to the intellectual life of the society through their papers on these topics.

The intellectual virtues of their writings, and their nuanced theoretical complexity, clinical richness, and even modesty, have nearly been lost sight of today. This is a regrettable state of affairs (for a partial corrective, see Thompson 2011). In saying this I am mindful that they could, and did, write with confident assertion and were committed to certain theoretical premises, but this should not blind us to the fact that their contributions today remain worthy of close reading. Their writings conceptualized ego development and object relations within a maturational framework that paid close attention to the infant and young child's relationship with the mother and the role of the body in the emergence and vicissitudes of object relations, ego development, and aggression.

These analysts were as preoccupied by the developmental emergence of object relations as they were with delineating the ego, its functions,

apparatuses, and defenses. As Ernst Kris noted on several occasions, it is impossible to consider infant psychic development without also paying close attention to object relations. The immigration of child analysts and the dissemination of child and adolescent analysis in the United States served to reinforce an already deepening interest in infancy, early childhood, and latency, evident in the numerous papers and panel discussions on these topics at APsaA meetings in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s (Thompson 2009).

There is no doubt that the strength and prestige of child and adolescent training at the New York Institute was due to the influx of emigré women child analysts trained in Berlin and Vienna: Berta Bornstein, Marianne Kris, Elisabeth Geleerd, Ruth Eissler, and Margaret Mahler. Bornstein arrived in New York from Prague in 1938 and was soon invited to teach a course in the Extension Division on the child technique of Anna Freud and Melanie Klein. The course, however, was not given, due to the animosity toward lay analysts of some members of the society. David Levy, the child psychiatrist who taught the course on the psychopathology of childhood, objected vociferously to nonmedical analysts teaching at the institute. At a special meeting of the society held September 17, 1939, Levy stated that if "Dr. [*sic*] Bornstein" were asked to lecture he wished to resign (Minutes 1939). On April 28, 1942, he did, in fact, resign and left with Radó, George Daniels, and Abram Kardiner to form an institute at Columbia. That fall Bornstein began teaching at the New York Institute.

Discussants at Scientific Meetings

Beyond their roles as teachers, training analysts, and contributors to the psychoanalytic literature, emigré analysts made another singular contribution to the intellectual life of the New York Psychoanalytic Society that is much less frequently remarked on, and unknown to many: their role as discussants of papers presented at scientific meetings. In the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s it was not unusual for a paper to be commented on by three to six members, and occasionally a paper elicited eight or nine responses.[13] These commentaries, sometimes spontaneous and on other occasions prepared, reveal a psychoanalytic milieu in which members engaged in a lively exchange of views, disagreed with one another,

[13]There were nine discussants for Jacob Arlow's "The Structure of the *Déjá Vu* Experience" (April 10, 1956) and for Charles Fisher's "A Study of the Preliminary Stages of the Construction of Dreams and Images" (June 12, 1956).

shared clinical experiences, admitted uncertainty about the significance of clinical findings, acknowledged the value of the findings of colleagues they did not otherwise agree with, and often prefaced their remarks by acknowledging how much remained to be understood. Scientific meetings were lively and intellectually engaging precisely because the participants were committed and eager to clarify and conceptualize a wide range of demanding theoretical and clinical issues. When a paper succeeded in doing so, discussions were often unusually animated and further enriched the paper that had been presented.

Notably active discussants among the emigré analysts in the years 1941 to 1961 included Edith Jacobson (28 papers), Ernst Kris (31), and Heinz Hartmann (67). Their discussions, as well as those of other leading figures such as Lewin, Kubie, Greenacre, and Bak, illustrate not only responses to new theoretical ideas and clinical findings, but also the development of their own thinking. Not all of these discussions survive, and not all are of equal interest or significance. Indeed in 1948 Hartmann wrote to Jacob Arlow to say that his remarks on Kubie's contribution to a symposium on instincts were not worth preserving: "please do throw them in one of the waste-paper baskets of which the Institute unfortunately has not a sufficient number" (Hartmann 1948).

Several discussions by Hartmann complicate the conventional view that he dismissively criticized Melanie Klein's contributions. The first is an example of what may be characterized as the acknowledgment of compatibilities with the work of a colleague with whom one otherwise disagrees. For example, when Elizabeth Zetzel, at the invitation of Edith Jacobson, gave a paper on Klein in 1955, Hartmann was a discussant. Although, not surprisingly, he was critical of her theorizing, he also acknowledged compatibilities between her ideas and his own work with Kris and Loewenstein. When he discussed Bak's 1958 paper, "Questions regarding the Changing Concepts in the Theory of Psychoanalytic Etiology," he described his own thinking on the role of aggression in etiology and commented, "It is true what Dr. Bak said, that aggression has to be very seriously viewed from the point of view of the danger to the objects. I have the same opinion and I will not say whether this is Kleinian, but I mention that this theory emphasizes one of the true merits of her work. That is, the protection of the object against aggression" (Hartmann 1958).

Edith Jacobson's discussions of Annie Reich's "Some Clinical Aspects of the Pathologyof Narcissistic Object Choice in Women" (1952) and Phyllis Greenacre's "Special Problems of Early Female Development"

(1950) are of interest because they illustrate the ways in which analysts' theoretical orientation influences the weight they assign to different factors in a girl's development. Jacobson's comments, and the papers themselves, are also evidence of the different approaches analysts took to thinking about female development and its impact on adult behavior.

In "Special Problems," presented February 14, 1950, Greenacre considers women in whom pathological difficulties have cast a shadow over their sexual development. Jacobson's response, though appreciative, highlighted their different approaches to thinking about female development. Jacobson, interested in the role of castration conflict in female superego development, conceptualized the relationship between the clitoris and the vagina in terms of the masturbation fantasies and guilt that invariably accompany the girl's castration conflict. Greenacre, by contrast, ever attentive to the dynamic, intimate relationship between physical maturation and psychological states, takes as her point of departure the wide variation in the nature of the relationship between clitoris and vagina that may obtain in women. She finds a link between this patterning and the woman's mature sexual response and concludes that it may also exercise a "deep, sometimes decisive effect on her character and even sometimes on her intellectual functioning."

Reich's paper, a richly detailed delineation of how an impoverished infantile relationship with the mother, ego ideal and superego identifications, and castration trauma may result in pathological forms of narcissistic object choice in women, argues that developmentally the ego ideal precedes the superego, the former being characterized as "based upon the desire to cling in some form or another to a denial of the ego's limitations, to regain infantile omnipotence by identifying with the idealized parent." While Jacobson praised her old friend's paper as a "beautiful and clear presentation," she did not find Reich's characterization of the superego and ego ideal convincing, and asserted that her own clinical experience did not support the idea that the ego ideal arises before the superego. Jacobson's response to both these papers vividly highlights how analysts' clinical experience and theoretical orientation influence their response to their colleagues' work. The other two discussants of this paper, Ernst Kris and Phyllis Greenacre, also expressed discomfort with Reich's definition of the ego ideal. Here we have an example of analysts struggling with an ill-defined concept not yet integrated into analytic theory.

Ernst Kris's discussions are compelling because he often absorbed and responded to new theoretical developments from a psychoanalytic

perspective that reached back to Vienna in the 1920s, and reflected his own deep knowledge of Freud's work. For example, in 1951 Jacobson presented her paper "Psychoanalytic Theory of Affects." One of her conclusions was that the ego learns to not only tolerate but even enjoy the mounting tension that accompanies discharge of an affect. Kris began his remarks by observing that after reading her paper he was "for quite some time under the pressure of a *déjà heure* [*sic*] phenomenon. . ."; "today at seven o'clock," he elaborated, "I found where, in 1927, at the Innsbruck Congress, Dr. Helene Deutsch presented a paper on contentedness, happiness and ecstasy, in which she comes to a very similar conclusion to Jacobson" (Kris 1951a). Kris added the observation that the ability to modulate or delay discharge may account for individuals "whose affective experiences are rich in nuances."

Kris's analytic scholarship is also evident in his discussion of Greenacre's 1953 "A Contribution to the Study of Fetishism." His remarks address not fetishism itself but Greenacre's observations on the phallic importance of seeing, and of vision in relation to the mother. Kris announced that Greenacre had a predecessor for some of her formulations, a source she couldn't have read. Kris goes on:

> In a manuscript of Freud's dated 1895, of which the translation by Strachey has just reached me now . . . we read: "Let us suppose that the object represented by perception is similar to the percipient subject himself, that is to say, a fellow human being. The theoretical interest taken in it is then further explained by the fact that an object *of a similar kind* has once been the subject's first need satisfying object (and also his first hostile object) as well as his sole assisting force." I note that here Freud already quite clearly indicates the fact that the love object, the mother, is also the target of aggression, thus stating the basic ambivalence which was implied in Dr. Greenacre's paper. . . . Dr. Greenacre's thought is close indeed to Freud's. She too stresses that one's own face . . . and genitalia are not normally seen. Freud has not himself followed this trend of thought. It is only within the more detailed study of the pre-genital development, such as Dr. Greenacre has presented today, that these thoughts from Freud's earliest psychoanalytic thinking begin to assume a new clinical relevance [Kris 1953].

Ernst Kris

Although Kris had enjoyed a distinguished career as an art historian and psychoanalyst before arriving in New York, once here his work as a psychoanalyst took on dimensions that embraced a myriad of activities: founding and editing *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child;* longitudinal

research studies at the Yale Child Study Center; advocacy for the importance of research on infant and child development for advancing psychoanalytic theory and technique; research on the creative process in young children; and directing the Gifted Adolescent Project at the New York Society. It is striking that the new direction his work took is so little remarked (Thompson 2011). Today it is not his research on young children that is usually noted in descriptions of his psychoanalytic contributions, but rather his collaboration with Hartmann and Loewenstein and his papers on art and psychoanalysis, including his concept of "regression in the service of the ego."

Psychoanalytic Study of the Child

Kris, Hartmann, and Anna Freud were the founding editors of *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child,* which began publication in 1945. Kris's letters to Anna Freud describe his vision for the annual and disclose that during its first decade he was the driving force in shaping its content. In a letter dated July 18, 1944, he is frank about his intention to impose rigorous standards for papers and the urgent need to publish abstracts of current literature and book reviews: "Whatever people may say about orthodoxy it is essential to clean up rubbish. One can do so politely, and, most of all, one must do it with fairness. A good review may do more in the long run than a good article" (Kris 1944).

Nearly a year later, in a letter to Anna Freud, Kris discussed plans for the second volume. He invited her to write an introductory paper on object relations in the first year of life, as this was a "matter in which Kleinians tend to establish a monopoly." But Kris also sought to be inclusive and wondered whether it would be advisable to invite Susan Isaacs to represent the Kleinian point of view. Whether the invitation was extended is not known, but Isaacs's health seriously declined in early 1946 and she died in 1948.

Beyond the rigorous standards Kris sought in the annual's pages, its creation met a crucial need for many analysts in the aftermath of the dissolution of the European psychoanalytic community, the geographic dispersal of its members, the Controversial Discussions in the British Psychoanalytical Society (see King and Steiner 1991), and Anna Freud's decision to establish the Hampstead Clinic outside its confines. For emigré analysts in the United States and London, and like-minded American and British colleagues, the annual was a venue where they could continue

to consider and develop Freud's last revisionary psychoanalytic contributions in clinical and theoretical papers devoted to child analysis and developmental research studies of infants and young children.

Its creation was also, I believe, an act of restitution, an effort to recreate a sense of continuity with an irretrievably lost psychoanalytic community for its editors, contributors, and readers. It was a "transitional space" (Winnicott 1953) where the expansion and transformation of the theoretical and clinical legacy of pre-war psychoanalysis was undertaken and sustained by a sense of connection with this lost community. The power of this nostalgic longing was expressed at several meetings in the 1950s in which analysts identified with the annual's work came together and voiced pleasure that, even if for only a few hours, the spirit and atmosphere of the past would be once again enjoyed (Thompson in press).[14]

CONCLUSION

Forced into exile, in traumatic circumstances, emigré analysts brought to their new societies an identity rooted in the social and intellectual experience of becoming analysts in the 1920s and 1930s, often nurtured by a personal relationship with Freud himself, which engendered in many a resolve to defend and extend his discoveries. As Greenacre noted, this legacy had both positive and negative consequences. On the positive side, ego psychology had contributed to the evolution of psychoanalysis. But reflecting on the reasons for the minimization of the technique of reconstruction in clinical work, she posited that there was a connection between this diminution and the intellectual and psychological responses

[14]Kris (1951b) opened a meeting in New York attended by Anna Freud by saying, "It is hoped that the spirit of the old can be revived here for a few short hours" (p. 9; see also Kris 1954). Kris's editorship of *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* and his participation in the Yale Child Study Center greatly enriched his work. Had he remained in Vienna or London, he might well have continued his involvement in the study and observation of young children. But it seems unlikely that resources like those at the Yale Child Study Center (pediatricians, nursery teachers, psychologists, social workers, and child analysts, as well as extensive records documenting children's development from birth onward) would have been available to him. In this respect, the single most important consequence for Kris of his immigration to America was that it afforded him the opportunity to study and observe young children. The papers he wrote as a result are a testament to how intellectually absorbing he found this work.

of emigrés, their forced passage from Europe, and Freud's death. The prolonged period of mourning for a lost leader was accompanied by an "increased clinging to those metapsychological perspectives which had been his last gift before the war had forced emigration. At the same time that there was an apparent expansion in the intellectual framework of analysis, there was a somewhat reactionary tightening in the teaching of technique. The precise interpretation began to take the place of reconstructive interest" (Greenacre 1980, p. 39). In short, Greenacre points out that progress in theory had an adverse impact on technique.

Many emigrés experienced profound feelings of dislocation after arriving in the United States, symbolized by the necessity of learning how to express themselves and practice psychoanalysis in a new language. They often noted that being able to express themselves fluently, to converse, was highly valued in the cultural milieu they had left behind; the sudden experience of not being able to do so was difficult. Bettina Warburg (1976) offered the striking observation, however, that many emigrés were able to reconcile themselves to their new environment by geography: "An interesting finding from the psychoanalytic point of view was the importance of landscape in the need to establish a home resembling that of the native country as closely as possible. Individuals readily accepted locations in far-away places, given that they were provided with the desired mountains and seascapes" (p. 2).

But many emigrés also freely acknowledged that coming to America afforded them professional opportunities and experiences that most likely would have been closed to them in Europe. The testimony of two emigrés, Peter Neubauer and Kurt Eissler, illustrates these themes. Neubauer (1986) is especially interesting for his comments about "uprootedness." In reflecting on his passage to America he observed that

> when I look at my experience and I hear the term "uprootedness," and if "uprootedness" refers to leaving one's own country, my immediate response is, "But I *was* uprooted. In Austria, in the home in which I grew up." The uprootedness was not a geographic one. The uprootedness was one of not belonging since my childhood to the larger group. . . . I did not feel uprooted leaving Vienna. I felt rather to be on the road of searching new possibilities. . . . When I arrived in the United States after Switzerland and after Austria and after the uprootedness and not belonging, I had an extraordinary sense of relief, of a country which accepted me in a totally different sense than I had experienced in my childhood in Austria, in Switzerland—an openness of "Come we want you" [emphasis added].

Eissler's comments (1984) reflect the intense emotions that many emigrés experienced on their arrival in New York.

> When we came to this country, it was in 1938, we found here in the United States everything we were looking for in Austria and could not find it there. . . . It would have been impossible to take a critical attitude and to continue the opposition in which we lived in Austria, because Roosevelt was the great hope. . . . So that the immigrant analysts stopped their revolutionary attitude. It's clear it would have been self-destructive, if they would have continued that attitude. There was only one reaction possible, of gratitude, of greatest gratitude, to Roosevelt and to the country in which you were accepted with such friendliness and had an opportunity to survive. You can imagine what impression it was when you came from Austria, where, for the last few weeks you did not know whether you would survive or not, when you entered the New York harbor and saw south Manhattan. An unforgettable moment which carried you on, and never made you forget how much you owed to Roosevelt and the United States in that fateful year.

APPENDIX A: BULLETIN OF INFORMATION TO BE SUPPLIED ONLY TO PSYCHOANALYSTS WHO DESIRE TO EMIGRATE TO THE U.S.A.

1. The practice of psychoanalysis in the treatment of adults has been defined legally as the practice of medicine wherever this question has been raised in any law court in this country. Under the Constitution of the United States, however, many legal decisions apply only to the States in which the decision has been given. Although the question has not as yet been subjected to legal testing throughout the country, there can be little doubt that the same decision will ultimately be reached in every State. Therefore any psychoanalyst who wishes to settle in this country must realize that in practicing psychoanalysis he will be practicing medicine and he will have to subject himself to the conditions under which medicine can legally be practiced in the community in which he lives. These conditions are described below.

The situation with regard to the practice of child-analysis is not yet clear. There is some possibility that the analysis of children will not be looked upon exclusively as the practice of medicine—but that it may be looked upon also as part of the general field of pedagogy. Therefore child analysis may be a field in which properly trained laymen can function without violation of the law. Discreet efforts are being made to clarify this situation at present; but nothing final can be said about it as yet.

It must be clearly understood, however, that the practice of psychoanalysis on adults without a medical license and a medical degree is a violation of the law for which severe penalties have sometimes been imposed.

2. It is necessary therefore to take legal steps to secure a license for the practice of medicine before practicing psychoanalysis. Licenses to practice medicine are issued by the State of the United States in which one resides. At present, however, there are twenty-one individual States in the United States in which it is either legally, or for practical reasons, impossible for a foreigner to secure a license to practice medicine. These States are: Arkansas, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, and Vermont. In some of these States this is because one must become a citizen before one can take the examinations, which would take six years. In others, it is because one must obtain a degree from an American medical school before one can take the examination. In others, it is because one must take one year's internship in an approved hospital before taking the examination. In four States of those listed (namely, Illinois, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Vermont), the only obstacle to taking the examination is the requirement that the applicant must spend one year in a hospital. Where such a position is obtainable, this of course is not an insurmountable barrier; and although it delays the securing of a license by one year, these four States can be added to the list of available States as possible *future* homes. It may also be borne in mind for future use that it is sometimes possible to secure a license in a State where one of those restrictions exist, —and that after practicing in that State for some time (usually a few years are required), it may be possible to have one's license transferred by special arrangement to a nearby State where the original restrictions are more difficult. Obviously, however, this offers no immediate solution to our problem. Therefore, the States in which foreigners may take examinations *immediately* are: Alaska, Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

And in addition, after a one-year internship, Illinois, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Vermont become available.

3. In every State in which foreigners are permitted at all to take the examinations for a medical license, it is now necessary for the applicant (no matter how eminent he has been, and no matter how many years he has been practicing in his own country) to pass the written examination which is required of graduates of American medical schools. This examination must be taken in English. All of these legal facts mean that in order to become established in the practice of psychoanalysis a newcomer may have to be dependent in no small part upon the support which others are able to provide, for some time.

4. Selection of a home in this country: It is important to bear in mind that there are a few large communities in which active centers for the training of psychoanalysts now exist, and in which large bodies of students are already being trained; so that in some of these the field has already become overcrowded. Therefore the newcomers must be prepared to go to other communities where there is a growing demand for well-trained psychoanalysts, but where neither the medical profession nor the lay-public is well informed as yet as to what the practice of psychoanalysis means. Here the newcomer will of necessity have to be prepared to face a certain amount of isolation and loneliness. This is all the more true because psychoanalytic practice, like all other medical practice, is affected seriously at present by the severe economic depression which is felt everywhere.

5. In these difficulties our colleagues from abroad can expect that this Committee will assist them to the best of its ability with advice and with financial support where possible. On the other hand, it is expected that the people to whom help is extended will be ready to pledge themselves to cooperate with us in the following ways:

(a) First that they will be ready to go to communities in which openings are prepared for them, and to look upon their relationship to these communities as real obligations. It is important that they should be prepared to remain there for some years, even though the situation may in some ways be difficult. (Unless special conditions arise which the Committee agrees would make an immediate change wise and necessary.) This point is stressed because in the past we have had many experiences in which immigrants to this country have made quick and sudden changes in their plans, have sometimes abandoned analyses already begun, and have failed to live up to promises made to physicians and to the community where they have settled. Where this happens, it leaves the community deeply disturbed, and it makes it almost impossible to place any other analyst in that community for a long time to come.

(b) Furthermore, it is expected that all immigrants will present their credentials to some one of the constituent societies of the American Psychoanalytic Association, applying for membership in that Society, and abiding by all of the regulations of that Society.

(c) It is particularly expected that no immigrant, no matter what status he has had in Europe as a training analyst, will undertake to train psychoanalysts independently of one of our established training institutes. In America all training in psychoanalysis is recognized as a function exclusively of those training institutes, which are recognized by the American Psychoanalytic Association. We are particularly insistent that this regulation be adhered to by all of our colleagues as they come to settle in this country.

(d) The teaching of psychoanalysis is not the practice of psychoanalysis; and just as laymen may teach in medical schools, so laymen may teach in psychoanalytic institutes provided they are adequately prepared. For those incoming analysts, therefore, who have had sufficient training and experience to be entitled to the rank of Instructor in a recognized training institute, it may be possible to arrange for them to do some preparatory (didactic) analyses even before they have a license to practice. Where this is possible, it will lessen the economic struggle considerably. Even where such analysts are living in a city at some distance from the Institute, it may be possible for them to arrange to function as a part of the teaching staff of that Institute, training carefully chosen students under the auspices and under the regulations of the Institute with which they are affiliated.

6. We hope to be able to grant to well-trained laymen the status of "Honorary Guests" in our Societies. Laymen, however, who expect support from our Committee must agree not to practice psychoanalysis, but to do other work to which we will try to assist them. As explained above, however, it is probable that in the case of child-analysts, work can be done in close contact with and under the supervision of physicians, or under the aegis of some educational institutions. Lay child-analysts must not, however, train laymen for child-analysis without the express permission of the societies of which they are guests.

7. The securing of visas and affidavits: In order to secure permission to come to this country to live permanently, it is necessary for a foreigner to secure a visa at the nearest consular office. Under the existing law, the Consul is not permitted to give this visa unless the prospective immigrant can give evidence that he has money enough to live for a sufficient length

of time to get established independently in this country. If he has not money, or if the country which he is leaving will not permit him to bring money with him, he must have an affidavit issued by someone in this country. This affidavit is a promise to support the incoming individual, and not allow him to ever become a public charge. Naturally such affidavits can be given only by people of means. The government requires that evidence be given of the income of the guarantors, and in certain cases requires that money or securities be placed on deposit. The specific requirements vary with the number of dependents in the family of the foreigner who is coming over, with the likelihood of his getting work in his particular profession, etc. Naturally friends and relatives of incoming foreigners are more ready to give such affidavits than are strangers. Nevertheless, it is sometimes possible to secure such affidavits from generous-minded strangers. In order to do so, however, we need the fullest possible information on the individual who wants to come to this country. For this reason, in addition to its usefulness in helping to secure positions for our colleagues from abroad, we are enclosing a questionnaire which we would like to have filled out in full by every individual who wants to come to America.

Curriculum Vitae

1. Name, address, age.
2. Place of birth—citizenship—how and when acquired.
3. If married, name, address, age, place of birth and citizenship of husband or wife.
4. If married, the occupation of the wife or husband.
5. Number of dependents—names, ages, married or single.
6. Degree of command of English and other language.
7. General education: (Complete record of school, university, and scientific training where studies were carried out, dates, under what particular outstanding teachers any special training was received, all degrees received—where and when).
8. Medical training: Medical school record, record of all types of hospital experience both general and psychiatric, out-patient clinic experience, etc. with dates and places.
9. Academic ranks held—teaching positions, lectureships, etc.
10. Psychoanalytic training: Preparatory analysis, where and when and by whom, duration; in what Psychoanalytic Institute studies were pursued (with details); under whom supervised work was conducted, etc.
11. If applicant has been a teacher in any psychoanalytic institute,—what teaching has been conducted, what courses given, what supervisory work has been carried on, etc.

12. List of most important scientific publications or publications in any academic or intellectual field.
13. Full data on all types of special experience or training in non-analytic fields, which might lead to opportunities for teaching or other work. With regard to this, it is important to give as full details as possible.
14. Send this information to: [Kubie, at the ECRI's address].

APPENDIX B

Individuals in the United States Assisted Financially

Baum, Dr. Helmut. A German psychiatrist, who had had his didactic analysis in Switzerland. In May 1938, Dr. Philip Sarasin, President of the Swiss Psychoanalytic Society, wrote to Dr. Kubie asking whether the Emergency Committee could assist Dr. Baum to come to this country from Switzerland as a position was open for him at the Hillside Hospital. The Emergency Committee got an affidavit for Dr. Baum from one of the members of the Board of Hillside Hospital. Following this there was a great deal of correspondence with the State Department in Washington and with the Swiss consulate.

In March 1939, Dr. Baum arrived in New York. He remained at Hillside Hospital until February 1940. Prior to his going to the Mitchell Sanitarium in Peoria, Illinois, the Emergency Committee made efforts to secure positions for him at a number of hospitals. He succeeded in getting a job at the Mitchell Sanitarium, where he remained from 1940 to 1942 (?). In 1942–43 (?) Dr. Baum completed his internship in a Peoria hospital, so that he could take his Illinois State Board Examinations.

During 1940–41 the Emergency Committee was able to assist in the support of Dr. Baum's parents in Germany through someone who had a blocked mark account there. RMK 150 were sent monthly. This did not pass through the books of the Committee. The Committee also tried to assist Dr. Baum in his arrangements to bring his parents to the United States.

The last contact with Dr. Baum was in November 1943. He expected to go into the army.

Breuer, Dr. Josef. Viennese physician (a grandson of Dr. Josef Breuer). In May 1938, he wrote to the Committee, asking whether it would be possible to secure an affidavit to come to the United States for futher medical training, since he already had an M.D. degree. The Committee secured an affidavit for him.

In October 1938, after his arrival, he was given $35.00, which he was not asked to repay.

Gerö, Dr. George. In March 1938, Dr. Smith Ely Jelliffe was asked to send Dr. Gerö an affidavit. Dr. Gerö was then in Copenhagen and upon receipt of the affidavit he informed the Emergency Committee that it would not be of much use to him since he is Hungarian and the Hungarian quota was filled for the next two years. He was therefore anxious to obtain a non-quota visum as a teacher. The Emergency Committee made innumerable efforts to find a teaching position for him.

The New York Psychoanalytic Institute sent Dr. Gerö an invitation to teach there, but this was not accepted by the American Consul in Denmark since it had not been approved by the Department of Labor. The Committee carried on an extensive correspondence to try to bring pressure to bear upon the State Department to classify Dr. Gerö as a non-quota immigrant, since it was doubtful how long he would be permitted to remain in Denmark. Meanwhile Dr. Gerö began teaching at the Psychiatric Clinic of the University of Copenhagen, thus fulfilling the requirement for a non-quota immigrant to have taught for two consecutive years prior to emigration. The Emergency Committee continued its efforts to find a teaching position for him in an approved university or college.

In August 1940, the Committee finally obtained a position for Dr. Gerö to teach psychology and German at the New Mexico State College of Agriculture and Mechanic[al] Arts. It was necessary to deposit $4,000 to cover the salary for two years. The Emergency Committee was able to borrow $2,000 and secured an additional $2,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation. Dr. Gerö was then granted his non-quota visum, in August.

On January 1, 1941, he arrived in San Francisco, via Japan, and proceeded to State College. He was unsatisfied there and moved to Tucson, Arizona, where he remained until June 1943, when he came to New York. On his departure from State College, $833.33 (the unused portion of his salary) were refunded to the Committee.

In addition to the tuition for one year which the Emergency Committee raised for Dr. Gerö, he was sent $1,000 for traveling expenses from Denmark to the United States. Of the total loaned to him, he repaid $900.00 to the Emergency Committee by the time it ceased functioning in March 1948. Dr. Gerö will begin to repay the balance to the Committee Aiding Hungarian Analysts after January 1949. The record of these payments will be found in Dr. Robert Bak's accounts for that committee, of which he is the treasurer.

Hartmann, Heinz. Viennese psychoanalyst arrived in January 1941. The Emergency Committee communicated with the State Department to expedite matters in connection with the immigration of Dr. Hartmann and his family. The Committee also made it possible for the Bank Street School to establish a scholarship fund called the Hartmann Scholarship Fund, and to invite Dr. Hartmann to come to the school on contract, the fund to be used as salary. For this purpose the Emergency Committee found a special contributor who loaned the necessary $4,500.00. Subsequently $2,000.00 were refunded to the donor, the remainder was made a contribution to the Committee.

Individuals outside the United States Assisted Financially

Sadger, Dr. Isidor. Viennese psychoanalyst. During 1939–40 Dr. Sadger, who remained in Vienna, was sent $85.00. [Sadger had resigned from the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society in 1933 amid a controversy surrounding his memoir about Freud. He was deported to the Theresisenstadt ghetto in 1942, where he died. For details about his psychoanalytic career and his memoir, see May (2003) and Thompson, Schröter, and May (2006)].

Storfer, Dr. A. J. Psychoanalyst in Shanghai. During 1939–40 he was sent $600.00. [Storfer was the director of the Verlag during the period 1925–1932, and oversaw the publication of Freud's *Gesammelte Schriften.* He fled to Shanghai in 1938 and died in Australia in 1944 (see Scholz-Strasser 2005)].

Zarubova, Mrs. Anna. Viennese (?) analytically trained teacher. In 1939 the Emergency Committee gave Dr. Annie Reich $250.00 in Mrs. Zarubova's behalf. She was able to get to Italy, then to San[to] Domingo, pending entry into the United States in 1945(?). She is a nursery school teacher in a settlement house in New York City.

Persons in the United States in Contact with the Committee

Adelberg, Hilde. Viennese analyzed teacher. In 1942 she was interviewed and referred to the Family Welfare Association of America to discuss the possibility of getting a social work scholarship. She subsequently obtained her degree from Smith College and joined the staff of the Jewish Board of Guardians.

Baumgarten, Mrs. Lydia. French lay analyst, sister of Dr. Rudolph Loewenstein, analyzed by the Princess Marie Bonaparte, trained by

Drs. Lowtsky, Kalischer and Feibel. Arrived in March 1941. She was interviewed in May 1941 and the suggestion was made that she take a camp or school job where she might teach French, in order to familiarize herself with American children. She is doing child analysis in New York.

Fenichel, Dr. Otto. Viennese psychoanalyst, member of the Vienna, Berlin, Oslo and Topeka Psychoanalytic Societies. Arrived in 1938, on the invitation of the Los Angeles Study Group. Dr. Fenichel was active in trying to assist his European colleagues to emigrate and was in contact with the Emergency Committee prior to his own emigration from Prague. He was particularly helpful to the Committee in evaluating those who appealed for help.

Persons Who Requested Affidavits

Andratschke, Dr. Berta. Czechoslovakian "specialist" in nervous and mental diseases. In 1939 she was in Scotland, having left Czechoslovakia on the day the Germans entered.

Bornstein, Dr. Steff. Viennese child analyst. In 1938 an affidavit was sent to her, but she died before she could use it.

Ermers, Max. Viennese lecturer on art.

Frensdorff, Mrs. Anne. German worked with children. Recommended by Dr. Sandor Rado.

Friedman, Dr. Otto. Czechoslovakian translator of Freud's works. Compiled a psychoanalytic and psychological dictionary.

Gansel, Iren. Hungarian analyst, teacher of psychopathic children.

Gyomroi, Edith. Hungarian analyzed teacher. Had emigrated to Ceylon and wanted to come to the United States.

Hermann, Dr. Hanns Heinz. Czechoslovakian medical student.

Jacobi, Dr. Erich H. German, instructor in neurology and psychiatry.

Neuwalder, Dr. Herbert. Viennese general practitioner. Request came from Dr. Else Pappenheim.

Ruben, Margarete. Viennese lay analyst.

Schnitzler, Dr. Julius. German surgeon. The Emergency Committee wrote to the State Department on his behalf.

Servadio, Emilio. Italian lay analyst.

Stern, Prof. Felix. German professor, worked on encephalitis, sent an affidavit through the Emergency Committee.

Wallenberg, Dr. Adolf. German brain surgeon.

Weiss, Julia. Viennese office worker at the Verlag. Anna Freud asked the Emergency Committee to try and secure affidavits for her.

Wertheim, Mrs. Hertha. Viennese analytically trained pedagogue.

REFERENCES

ALEXANDER, F. (1938). Unpublished letter to Lawrence Kubie, July 21. Archives, American Psychoanalytic Association, Oskar Diethelm Library, Weill Cornell Medical College.

BENEDEK, T.G. (1979). A psychoanalytic career begins: Therese F. Benedek, M.D.—a documentary biography. *Annual of Psychoanalysis* 7:3–15.

BULLETIN (1937). *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 18:498–499.

EISSLER, K. (1984). Panel: Politics and analysis in Vienna before 1938, Part I. Oral History Workshop 21, Archives, American Psychoanalytic Association, Oskar Diethelm Library, Weill Cornell Medical College.

GLOVER, E. (1938). Unpublished letter to Lawrence Kubie. Archives, American Psychoanalytic Association, Oskar Diethelm Library, Weill Cornell Medical College.

GREENACRE, P. (1980). A historical sketch of the use and disuse of reconstruction. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* 35:35–40.

HALE, N.G., JR. (1995). *The Rise and Crisis of Psychoanalysis in the United States: Freud and the Americans, 1917–1985.* New York: Oxford University Press.

HARTMANN, H. (1948). Archives, A.A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

HARTMANN, H. (1955). Discussion of Elizabeth Zetzel, "An approach to the relation between concept and content in psychoanalytic theory: With special reference to the work of Melanie Klein and her followers." Archives, A.A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

HARTMANN, H. (1958). Discussion of Robert Bak's "Questions regarding the changing concepts in the theory of psychoanalytic etiology." Archives, A.A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

JACOBSON, E. (1950). Discussion of Phyllis Greenacre's "Special problems in early female development." Archives, A.A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

JACOBSON, E. (1952). Discussion of Annie Reich's "Some clinical aspects of the pathology of narcissistic object choice in women." Archives, A.A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

JEFFREY, W. (1989). After the Anschluss: The Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration of the American Psychoanalytic Association. *The American Psychoanalyst* 23:2/3.

KING, P., & STEINER, R. (1991). *The Freud-Klein Controversies 1941–45.* London: Tavistock/Routledge.

KRIS, E. (1944). The papers of Ernst Kris. Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

KRIS, E. (1951a). Discussion of Edith Jacobson's "Psychoanalytic theory of affects." Archives, A.A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

KRIS, E. (1951b). Opening remarks on psychoanalytic child psychology. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* 6:9–17.

KRIS, E. (1953). Discussion of Phyllis Greenacre's "A contribution to the study of fetishism." Archives, A.A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

KRIS, E. (1954). Problems of infantile neurosis: A discussion. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* 9:16–71.

KUBIE, L. (1938a). Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration: Report to the Council on Professional Training and to the General Session of the American Psychoanalytic Association, Chicago, June 2–3, 1938. *Bulletin of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 1–3, 1937–1940.

KUBIE, L. (1938b). Report of the Special Committee on the Relations of the American Psychoanalytic Association to the International Psychoanalytical Association. *Bulletin of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 1–3, 1937–1940.

KUBIE, L. (1938c). The Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration of the American Psychoanalytic Association, March 19, 1938. Archives, A.A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

KUBIE, L. (1938d). Report of the Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration of the American Psychoanalytic Association, March 31,1938. Archives, A.A, Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

KUBIE, L. (1938e). Unpublished letter to Ernest Jones. Archives, A.A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

KUBIE, L. (1938f). Report of the Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration of the American Psychoanalytic Association, April 27. Archives, A.A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

KUBIE, L. (1938g). Unpublished letter to Franz Alexander. Archives, American Psychoanalytic Association. Oskar Diethelm Library, Weill Cornell Medical College.

KUBIE, L. (1938h). Unpublished letter to Ernest Jones. Archives, American Psychoanalytic Association, Oskar Diethelm Library. Weill Cornell Medical College.

KUBIE, L., & WARBURG, B. (1938). Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration. Archives, A.A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

KUBIE, L. (1941). Report of the Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration of the American Psychoanalytic Association, May 1940–May 1941. Archives, A.A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalyatic Society and Institute.

LEWIN, B. (1965). Letter to Laura Fermi. Papers of Bertram D. Lewin, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

MÉSZÁROS, J. (2010). Progress and persecution in the psychoanalytic heartland: Antisemitism, communism and the fate of Hungarian psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 20:600–622.

MINUTES (1935). New York Psychoanalytic Society, November 26, 1935. Archives, A.A. Brill Library. New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

MINUTES (1939). New York Psychoanalytic Society, September 17. Archives, A.A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

NEUBAUER, P. (1986). Panel: The experience of migration. Oral History Workshop 25, Archives, American Psychoanalytic Association, Oskar Diethelm Library, Weill Cornell Medical College.

RESOLUTION (1938). Archives, A.A. Brill Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

SCHMIDT, E. (2004). Therese Benedek: Shaping psychoanalysis from within. *Annual of Psychoanalysis* 32:217–231.

SCHOLZ-STRASSER, I. (2005). Adolf Josef Storfer (1888–1944). In *International Dictionary of Psychoanalysis,* ed. A. de Mijolla. 3 vols. New York: Thomson-Gale, 3:1661–1662.

STEINER, R. (2000). *"It Is a New Kind of Diaspora": Explorations in the Sociopolitical and Cultural Context of Psychoanalysis.* London: Karnac Books.

STEINER, R. (2011). "In all questions, my interest is not in the individual people but in the analytic movement as a whole. It will be hard enough here in Europe in the times to come to keep it going. After all we are just a handful of people who really have that in mind. . . ." *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 92:505–591.

THOMPSON, N.L. (2008). A measure of agreement: An exploration of the relationship of D.W. Winnicott and Phyllis Greenacre. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 77:251–281.

THOMPSON, N. (2009). Review of *The Vienna Psychoanalytic Society,* ed. Andrea Bronner. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 57:767–772.

THOMPSON, N.L. (2011). Ernst Kris: Objects of memory. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 59:1009–1022.

THOMPSON, N.L. (in press). Ernst Kris in America. In '*Im Dienste des Ich'—Ernst Kris heute*, ed. T. Haarmann, S. Krüger & T. Röske. Vienna: Böhlau Verlag.

THOMPSON, N.L., SCHRÖTER, M., & MAY, U. (2006). Saved from oblivion: Comments on the English edition of Isidor Sadger's *Recollecting Freud. Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 75:277–291.

WALLERSTEIN, R. (1998). *Lay Analysis: Life inside the Controversy.* Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.

WARBURG, B. (1940). Report to the Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration of the American Psychoanalytic Association, May 1939–May 1940. Archives, A.A. Library, New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute.

WARBURG, B. (1948). Summary of the work of the Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 1938–1948. Archives, American Psychoanalytic Association, Oskar Diethelm Library, Weill Cornell Medical College.

WARBURG, B. (1976). Summary of the work of the Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration of the American Psychoanalytic Association written for the Research Foundation for Jewish Immigration. Archives, American Psychoanalytic Association. Oskar Diethelm Library, Weill Cornell Medical College.

WINNICOTT, D.W. (1953). Transitional objects and transitional phenomena: A study of the first not-me possession. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 34:89–97.

520 West 114th Street, #21
New York NY 10025-7815
E-mail: Nelliet100@aol.com