

MAX WERTHEIMER IN AMERICA: 1933 - 1943

Part I*

Abraham S. Luchins (ASL) and Edith H. Luchins(ESL)

Arrival in America

In the wake of the Nazis' rise to power, and Max WERTHEIMER's dismissal as a "non-Aryan" from his position as Professor of Psychology at the University of Frankfurt, the WERTHEIMERS emigrated to the United States. On 7 September 1933, Max WERTHEIMER, his wife, and their children, Valentin, Michael and Lise set sail on the HMS Majestic and arrived in New York City on 13 September 1933. They were met at the Pier by Miss Clara W. MAYER, a representative of the New School for Social Research who later became its Dean. The New School had invited WERTHEIMER to join its Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science ("The University in Exile"). The WERTHEIMER family was taken to Hotel Holley that was in Greenwich Village, a center of New York City's intellectual and cultural life, known for its aura of Bohemianism. The hotel was within walking distance of the New School, which was located at 66 West 12th Street. Members of the committee of patrons of the New School toured the City with them and also tried to find suitable housing for them. The WERTHEIMERS needed a furnished home because they had left virtually everything behind in Germany, except for papers and books (FROMM 1973, 1986). They preferred to live in the suburbs (they had lived in a suburb of Frankfurt), since they believed that a City was no place to raise children. Moreover, the rental had to be within their financial means: a \$ 5000 annual salary plus a stipend from a Jewish patron of the New School assigned to help them adjust to America. After staying in Larchmont, New York for a short time, they rented a furnished onefamily home in suburban New Rochelle at 12 The Circle (The Circle, "the perfect Gestalt," as WERTHEIMER put it). (fn 1) It was to be his home until his death in 1943. A sprawling one-family house, with a porch along its front and a large lawn to its right and left, it faced a small park that was elliptical rather than circular in shape. It was an old clapboard building that desperately needed a coat of paint. Some of WERTHEIMER's visitors remarked about the house's exterior and interior drabness. However, the WERTHEIMER, Anne HORNBOSTEL (1963), and their oldest son, Valentin WERTHEIMER (1976). New Rochelle soon became a center for German refugees who worked in New York City, e.g., Richard COURANT and

* This is a sequel to previously (1982, 1985, 1986a, 1986b) published parts of a biography of Max WERTHEIMER. Part II will complete the biography. Again we thank Michael WERTHEIMER for permission to cite from letters in the WERTHEIMER Archives. We responded to our request for their recollections of him.

WERTHEIMERS were glad to be there with their children and to have escaped from Germany without harm, according to the former Mrs. WERTHEIMER, Anne HORNBOSTEL (1963), and their oldest son, Valentin WERTHEIMER (1976). New Rochelle soon became a center for German refugees who worked in New York City, e.g., Richard COURANT and Kurt FRIEDRICH, formerly of the University of Göttingen, who taught mathematics at New York University, and whose families were friendly with the WERTHEIMERS. New Rochelle was very accessible to New York City because of the reasonably priced commuter train that ran through it. WERTHEIMER took the train to Union Square (14th Street), which was only about four blocks from the New School.

WERTHEIMERS salary was within the range of salaries of full professors in universities in New York and enabled them to live fairly comfortably (V. WERTHEIMER 1976). Yet the WERTHEIMERS had to lower the standard of living to which they had been accustomed in Europe. For example, they could not afford a maid although they had had two maids in Europe. (Later an unemployed Black couple lived in their home and provided services, in turn for room and board). The WERTHEIMERS might also have noticed that professors were not honored public officials (Beamte), as they had been in Germany. The difference in status probably did not bother WERTHEIMER who had de-emphasized status in Germany, e.g., when addressed as "Herr Professor" he had been wont to say, "Herr WERTHEIMER, bitte." It seemed that the WERTHEIMERS adjusted fairly well to their new financial and social conditions and fitted in with the social atmosphere of America.

The New School for Social Research

The New School was started around the end of World War I by a group of civil libertarians, college professors and concerned laymen who desired to establish "an academic institution wholly independent of academic accreditation and degrees" (COLM 1968, p. 260). From its inception, the New School gave avantgarde scholars and academic outcasts a pulpit from which to express their ideas. Its faculty and lecturers had included the sociologist, William I. THOMAS, the socio-economic theorist, Thurston VEBLEN, the champion of American Behaviorism, John WATSON, the historian, Charles BEARD, and the social philosopher, Eduard C. LINDEMANN. It sought out leaders of the cultural, intellectual, social, and political movements as well as the leading advocates of original ideas in the social and behavioral sciences, e.g. Alfred ADLER had lectured on his psychoanalytic theories and Kurt KOFFKA had in 1929 given a series of lectures on Gestalt psychology. On its staff were liberal and radical intellectuals and artists. When HITLER rose to power, and scholars' positions became precarious, an increasing number of displaced scholars found refuge in its "University of Exile" whose faculty soon came to be known officially as the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science of the New School for Social Research.

Playing a leading role in establishing the "University in Exile" was Alvin JOHNSON, a classicist who turned to economics (JOHNSON 1952; COLM 1968). One of the founders of the New School, he had become its director in 1922. Daniel Cranford SMITH, the treasurer of the New School, who lived in a penthouse on top of its building, told ASL in 1936 how the Graduate Faculty came into existence. SMITH related that JOHNSON came to him and told him that,

due to the Nazis, some of the outstanding political and social scientists had already had to leave Germany and others were on the verge of being dismissed and perhaps even jailed (fn 2). He described the plight of one of the scholars whom he knew through being associate editor since 1929 of the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (Edwin R.A. SELIGMAN had been editor-in-chief). JOHNSON told SMITH about a plan to set up in the New School, do likewise among his wealthy friends. Apparently the plan succeeded. (fn 3)

In 1933-34 the faculty of the "University in Exile" consisted of Karl BRANDT, Arnold BRECHT, Gerhard COLM, Arthur FEILER, Edward HEIMANN, Eric von HORNBOSTEL, Hermann KANTOROWICZ, Emil LEDERER (Dean), Hans SPEIER, and Max WERTHEIMER, as well as Frieda WUNDERLICH, Max ASCOLI, Alvin JOHNSON (Director), Horace KALLEN and Rudolf LITTAUER. (KALLEN and JOHNSON were the only non-refugees). The entire faculty was housed in one room (about 30 feet by 40 feet, formerly a classroom) which was in the rear right hand corner of the floor on which was situated the library of the New School for Social Research. Each of the refugee professors had a desk in the room and shared shelf space in it. KALLEN, who had been the New School's Scholar in residence, had his own office on the same floor. The professors, with the exception of KALLEN, had no secretaries. This make-shift arrangement may have reflected the belief that it was to be a temporary refuge for the scholars. However, within two years the New School's Bulletin no longer contained the title, "University in Exile". Although the Graduate Faculty's charter (granted by the State of New York) was changed to enable it to grant degrees (Master of Social Science and Doctor of Social Sciences), its objectives were not to become just another American degree-granting institution but to provide Americans with the kind of training that used to be obtained in Germany before HITLER had "purified" the universities. The refugees helped to keep this objective in the foreground, although the material resources of the European universities were lacking.

Teaching in the Early Years in America: 1933-1935

WERTHEIMER assumed his teaching duties shortly after he arrived in the U.S. The 1933-1934 catalogue of the New School's Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science (subtitled "The University in Exile") indicates that he taught a lecture course, *Logic and Psychology*, and a seminar, *Psychological Problems* (both in German). The Spring 1934 Supplementary Announcement for the term beginning in February states that he taught (in German), a lecture course, *Gestaltpsychologie: Einführung in die Gestalttheorie; mit Demonstrationen und Experimenten aus den verschiedenen Gebieten der Psychologie*. It also indicates that he taught (in English) a seminar, *Productive Research in Psychology*. Thus, five months after arriving in this country, WERTHEIMER ventured to teach in English, and thereafter used it in every course. When he had trouble expressing himself (not infrequent in the first two years), he wrote the English word on the blackboard or used the German word and asked for its English equivalent. He was sometimes helped by George KATONA, who had worked with WERTHEIMER in Europe, and was a member of these classes. At our request, KATONA (in a letter of February 12, 1973) recalled those classes and his relationship with WERTHEIMER:

"In replying to your letter of January 28, I can tell you briefly about my connection with Max WERTHEIMER. In the mid-1920s I submitted an article to the *Psychologische Forschung* and received some six pages of handwritten comments from Max. Thereupon I met him in Berlin and worked with him on the article. Our contact in Berlin where I worked as editor was, however, rather infrequent. Then he left for Frankfurt where I did not see him at all.

I arrived in New York in the fall of 1933 and met Max at the New School the day after my arrival. Here a close friendship started, including his wife and my wife. In 1934 the KATONAs rented a house in New Rochelle close to the WERTHEIMERS. For a while we saw each other daily. I sat in the first class he ever gave in America, in 1933, teaching in German. Among those present I remember ASCH, MASLOW, ANSBACHER, the girl who later became Mrs. ANSBACHER, and Pearl GREENBERG. I worked with him when he prepared his first English course and will never forget when he said that one important word he would always spell out on the blackboard because when he pronounces the word he cannot distinguish between two important meanings which are both relevant to him, namely, whole and hole." (KATONA 1974).

Both KATONA and his wife Marian wrote to us about WERTHEIMERS struggle with the English language.

"The first two years in the U.S. may be characterized for M.W. as a constant struggle with the English language. Many things he found in the U.S. he liked from the first day on. But he believed in expressing himself exactly all the time, and this he found very difficult (in English) for quite a while. While the very first class he taught in German, it was necessary to teach in English early in 1934. One English word of importance for Gestalt theory made for particular problems. Every time he used it he turned to the blackboard and wrote 'whole' because the word 'hole' also played a role in explaining some of his problem solving experiments.

One day, when I [G.K.] drove him from the New School to New Rochelle, he told me that he made a discovery. Do you know, he said, that Americans answer when you say, 'Thank you.' They say 'You are welcome.' And what do you say in reply to this? You reply 'To be sure.' And the other person concludes the exchange by muttering 'Hm, Hm.' This is very interesting and very significant, M.W. mused." (KATONA & KATONA 1963).

In Fall 1934 WERTHEIMER taught two graduate courses. *Gestalt Psychology* was described as dealing with the principal psychological theories, especially Gestalt theory, and as 'intended primarily for psychologists, but it will also stress the implications of the Gestalt theory for teachers, physicians, psychiatrists, and will indicate the role of psychology in the various fields of science.' He also gave a graduate *Seminar in Psychology* which dealt with: "Mobs and crowds, groups, collectives. A study of facts and a comparison of theories with special emphasis on the Gestalt theory."

In the Spring term 1935, WERTHEIMER offered an open course (i.e. an adult education course not restricted to undergraduates, graduates, or post-graduates) entitled *Consequences of The Gestalt Theory of Psychology for Education and Teaching*. It was described as follows: "The pre-school child, the primary school child, the child in the higher grades. Psychological factors in good and bad instruction. The psychology of the teacher and of teaching." The number of students in the graduate courses was small; most students attended his adult education courses. Since these courses dealt with actual problems of teaching and learning, they attracted

teachers, who were required by the Board of Education to take courses for "alertness credits."

In addition to his courses, WERTHEIMER participated each year in the general seminar that was given by the entire Graduate Faculty. In 1934 it dealt with "Methods and Objectives of the Social Sciences." In 1935 the faculty seminar concerned "America and Europe: The historical background, social and political life, economic life, and spiritual life." WERTHEIMER also gave during some years joint seminars, with Gerhard COLM, Karen HORNEY, Emil LEDERER, Adolph LÖWE, Kurt RIEZLER, Hans SPEIER and Jacob MARSHAK on the methodology of the social sciences, on power, and on value.

The New School had a meager library with a very small collection, mostly books for the professors' courses. There were no scientific journals in 1934 and very few psychology journals as late as 1937. However, students could use the books and journals in the reading rooms of New York University and Columbia University.

The psychology courses had to be taught under a serious handicap: no laboratory, no equipment, and no space to set up experiments. Probably because of the shortage of physical facilities, WERTHEIMER had to modify the manner in which he had taught in Europe and the elaborate experiments that had been done in perception (LEVY 1969). Partly for these reasons, and partly because of the students' interests, WERTHEIMER's courses at the New School focused less on perception and more on problems of productive thinking, learning and teaching, logic, social psychology, and personality and character. Whenever possible, he improvised demonstrations using the blackboard, paper and pencil, a piano, and a lantern projector. He also developed clever "imagination" or "thought" experiments. He urged the students to conduct experiments to test what he had said or had done in class. The work of students who accepted WERTHEIMER's challenge not only made his ideas better known but left an imprint on American psychology.

It might seem that WERTHEIMER had to make tremendous adjustments from the university settings of Berlin and Frankfurt to the informal and varied graduate and adult education setting of the New School (cf. ASH 1984). Certainly it was a remarkable adjustment, and certainly there were differences in space, facilities, language, etc. - but there were also similarities which may have helped him make the adjustment. Even in Europe, WERTHEIMER had not taught in the manner of a sedate, traditional university professor. His students at Berlin and Frankfurt (e.g., GOTTSCHALDT, FROMM, RAUSCH, and LEVY) have described his unorthodox methods of teaching that led to lively discussions that went on after class in a coffee shop or a tavern and even in his home (ARNHEIM 1943; LUCHINS & LUCHINS 1986a,b). WERTHEIMER continued these practices in the United States. WERTHEIMER had always dealt with (and tried to focus research on) social issues and philosophical problems, e.g., ethics and value, which to many psychologists were not the concern of science. As in Europe, what he taught and how he taught had attracted members of the community to his lectures. Moreover, in Frankfurt he had been associated with the Institute for Social Research and had taught joint seminars with colleagues some of whom (e.g., LEDERER, LÖWE, RIEZLER) belonged to the Graduate Faculty of the New School.

Erwin LEVY, who was WERTHEIMERS assistant in Frankfurt, responded to our request for a comparison of WERTHEIMERS teaching there and in the New School, with a detailed and illuminating account, part of which follows (May 31, 1969):

"[You] request that I reminisce about WERTHEIMERS teaching here and in Germany. I am somewhat at a disadvantage: since 1943 I have been exclusively in psychiatry and have to some extent lost the continuity of being occupied with Gestalt theory. Hence these things are quite remote by now, and my memory full of lacunas. But I shall try.

In comparing W.'s teaching in Germany and at the New School, the main impression is that the teaching in Germany took in a larger territory. This was largely due to the lack of physical facilities at the New School, which would have been needed for W.'s great course on perception. I did not know W. in Berlin; but in Frankfurt both auditoriums used for lectures and practicums were equipped with the facilities needed for experimental demonstrations. The course on perception was a very rich one. I can no longer recall it in its entirety but am fairly certain that some of the experiments shown have not been published. To give but one example: to demonstrate what WERTHEIMER called the "Urqualitäten" (primary qualities), which were whole-qualities which extended through more than one or all sensory modalities and, possibly, phylogenetically preceded their differentiation out of a common sensory matrix (cf. E.V. HORNBOSTEL's article on the Unity of the Senses [1927/1938]), he proceeded as follows:

Two projectors, each manned by an assistant, threw pictures of the identical landscape onto a screen so that the two black and white images appeared side by side. Each assistant had a thin wedge of color glass, one a light blue, the other a reddish brown. Upon W's command each simultaneously and very slowly introduced his wedge, with the thin edge leading, into the light beam at the focal point. If the experiment went well - it was not easy to do - the audience noted a change in the *mood* of the two pictures considerably earlier than the change in color; the landscape with the blue wedge began to look 'cooler', that with the brown one 'warmer', *before* the former showed a blue, and the latter, a brownish hue. (It is essential that the wedges be quite thin so that one has some leeway in pushing them through the light beam before the colors begin to show).

At the New School he could merely report on these experiments instead of showing them. I recall one seminar where he did so, which led Sol W. ASCH to say afterwards that W. reminded him of a jeweler who took one gem after another out of a jewelry box to show them, and carefully put them away again.

In addition to the big demonstration lecture on perception there was also a Praktikum in Frankfurt, which actually was a mixture between lecture and seminar with experiments performed. Students were assigned topics to report on, and there was much, at times very lively discussion.

Much experimental research was going on in the institute, mostly in the form of doctoral thesis work. During my time Erika OPPENHEIMER (1935) and KROLIK (1935) did their work, as did TURHAN with whom I worked more closely. (TURHAN's paper [1935] was written up after W. left Germany. When W. first saw it, he was somewhat unhappy because it did not bring out what to him had been the major point: the problem of *constancy* of the field of illumination. As published it looked to W. as if but still another factor in depth perception had been found; for WERTHEIMER, the constancy problem had been paramount. The appearance of depth was for him but a consequence of the tendency to maintain constancy of illumination of the field structure.

There was other work proceeding, mostly simultaneously. BECKER, SIEMSEN, HAAS,

and some others whose names I have forgotten. METZGER did his work on 'Observations on Phenomenal Identity' (1934), on the basis of which he received his faculty appointment as Privatdozent, which is something like assistant professor.

Finally there was the psychological seminar in which even beginners were at once put to work on some simple experimental problem on which they had to report, e.g., on certain optical illusions.

Both in Frankfurt and here there was a very special seminar, involving the faculty, which in Europe was called the 'Truth Seminar.' It largely dealt with discussions of famous problems in various fields of science, and with an evaluation of the methods used in dealing with them. In Frankfurt some of the participants were philosophers (TILLICH, RIEZLER), sociologists (MANNHEIM, HORKHEIMER), and a great many students. In New York this was continued in the form of the "General Seminar;" there were the economists (LEDERER, STAUDINGER, LOEWE, HEYMANN), government and law people (BRECHT, SIMONS), sociologist (SPEIER) and philosophers (RIEZLER), and others whose names I no longer recall. I recall one seminar just to give an example - which was devoted to a very searching examination and criticism of the first chapter of MARX's *Kapital* and the concept of value: in all these things W. participated, often with great passion. Because of the limitations in N.Y., the emphasis in W's courses shifted of necessity to more theoretical presentations. There were his courses on the psychology of thinking, social psychology, psychology of art; the two latter were never written up. A course on philosophy - his own - which he had done in Berlin, was not given in New York nor in Frankfurt, at least not during my time.

An innovation in N.Y. was a course he gave together with Karen HORNEY, and in which another psychoanalyst, GLUECK Sr., participated. This was not repeated, possibly because it turned out to be very difficult, because W's attitude to psychoanalysis, even in HORNEY's modification, was essentially negative. I recall one tour de force: he was going FREUD one better by giving his own interpretation of the SCHREBER case. (This was the one area in which, after his death, I had to part company; I do not feel that he was ever really open to psychoanalysis, and lacked the practical experience with it which would have been necessary to really understand. His often passionate attacks were essentially based on methodological arguments and a strong reluctance to recognize the role of sexuality as FREUD had proclaimed it. In some way, I think, he would have been such more open to later developments in psychoanalytic ego psychology, but these had begun just a few years before he died, and I do not think that he was acquainted with this work.)" (LEVY 1969).

Whether in Europe or the U.S., WERTHEIMER's courses transcended traditional intra- and inter-disciplinary boundaries, e.g., a problem of social psychology was related to psychology of personality and psychology of thinking, to philosophy, to physics, to biology, and to social and political events. To some extent the discussions in the New School were looser and more free flowing than in Europe. Perhaps this was partly due to personal and family problems described by his former wife in unpublished memoirs (HORNBOSTEL 1969), and to the cataclysmic nature of world events. It may also have reflected his reactions to the diversity of the educational and occupational backgrounds and interests of the New School students, who ranged from adults with little formal education to university Professors. According to a friend and colleague in the University of Frankfurt, WERTHEIMER "was not as concentrated or focused" as he had been in Europe (DELATOUR 1973). Yet students who came to his classes in the New School repeatedly and who spoke to him before or after class, soon began to understand what he said and appreciated his theoretical approach to the

extent of being influenced by it in their personal lives and professional work (cf. ASCH 1952, LUCHINS 1942, MASLOW 1973).

At the New School, there were varied reactions to his behavior and to what he said in class. He raised his voice, shouted and interrupted speakers and discussants. He improvised on the piano or sang a tune to illustrate a point that seemed not to be understood. He also used humorous stories and gave examples from daily life to illustrate and to clarify what he meant. He walked around in front of the room or even down the aisle, talking while he walked. Sometimes his statements were elliptical and elusive or his presentation diffused and disconnected. Students who had come for a notebook full of notes, or for a formal presentation of Gestalt theory, or for a systematic survey of an area of psychology, were disappointed. Some were annoyed and even angered by his occasional hot-headed, intemperate remarks, e.g., about psychoanalysis, which they regarded as unprofessional and overly critical. To some students, WERTHEIMER's behavior was not only nonprofessorial but bad teaching. But, other students considered him charming, gallant, considerate and a most stimulating teacher. They would agree with Austin B. WOOD of Brooklyn College who wrote:

..An hour with WERTHEIMER was an excitement, a thing of beauty and a joy forever. His examples and illustrations were so varied, so imaginative, so apt, so illuminating - you were constantly acquiring new perspectives, new insights... experience followed experience... Socrates may have been a better teacher than WERTHEIMER but I doubt it. He was a gentleman and a gentle man, too. An hour at his dinner table or an evening in his home convinced you that his heart was as big as his mind. I remember one debate we had on the basic nature of human nature and the relation of that to better methods of child rearing. Was the untutored child selfish, egotistical, anarchic, annoying? Or was he (she) generous, outgoing, warm, loving? I was a freshly minted coin of American Behaviorism, materialism, Calvinism, pessimism and I supported the first point of view. The master supported the latter. Certainly his own family seemed to have been living proof that he had been much closer to the truth than I." (WOOD, in LUCHINS & LUCHINS 1978, Vol. I, 13-15).

WERTHEIMER would come to class with research problems, and with proposals on how to solve them, as well as with descriptions of recent experiments. He would discuss them in a manner that led to the frontiers of research in nearly every field of psychology. As noted, because of the students' interests, and WERTHEIMER's interests, and the lack of facilities at the New School, the emphasis was on social psychology, personality, and productive thinking and learning.

No matter what the problem or experiment, WERTHEIMER would relate it to other areas of psychology and to other fields, as well as to problems of everyday life. Most students never had witnessed such teaching before. He challenged what was considered to be settled by raising questions and problems so that students realized that searching for the truth was more important than believing that one had found it. And he raised some issues which had never been dealt with, until recent years, in American psychology (cf. KRECH & CRUTCHFIELD 1948, MANDLER & MANDLER 1964, WERTHEIMER 1980).

WERTHEIMERS Concern with the Social Scene and Social Actions

Concern with social justice and democracy played a central role in WERTHEIMER's life both in Germany and in America. LEVY (1969), who was WERTHEIMER's assistant in Frankfurt, wrote about WERTHEIMER's social and political views in response to our query:

"As to his social and political views, he certainly was no man of reaction or of the Right. He was an impassioned democrat with a small d. I have no idea whether he ever registered with any official party: nor do I know how he voted. I seem to remember that in his younger years he wondered whether he should go into science or politics, and he opted for science; in those years - early in the century - his inclinations may have been toward the liberal left which, in Germany of the time, was largely represented by the Social Democrats. He certainly was no friend of any form or manner of police state. Freedom and Justice were paramount - but this you know as well as I." (LEVY 1969)

WERTHEIMER had arrived in the U.S. after Congress (within 100 days of Franklin Delano ROOSEVELT's election) had enacted legislation that enabled FDR to establish administrative machinery and policies to bring about economic recovery, to give relief to the needy in rural and urban areas, as well as to reform the financial and industrial structure of the country. (fn 4) FDR's New Deal legislation and administrative policies aroused a storm of protests and harsh, vituperative attacks from the ideologues of both the Left and the Right. Some of the criticism were echoed in the New School's adult education classes. The weekly joint seminar of the entire faculty of the University in Exile often became a forum where supporters and opponents, as well as officials of the administration, discussed the New Deal's policies. Since the controversy over the New Deal raged until America declared war against Germany and Japan, FDR's domestic and foreign policies were often discussed in and out of WERTHEIMER's classes. WERTHEIMER's lectures and seminars on social psychology and Gestalt problems frequently devoted entire sessions to discussions of particular current national and international events, as well as to results of public opinion polls about how to deal with them. He tried to make the students face what was actually the case, to offer suggestions about how to deal with particular examples of the problem, and to consider the consequences of different suggested approaches to it. In this way he turned an ideological issue into a problem solving and/or research topic. There were varied reactions to what he said. Some students were vehemently against his remarks because they implied criticism of their ideology, or implied support of their opponents' ideology. Some students tolerated WERTHEIMER's remarks because they regarded them as reflecting his own ideology with which they did not agree or because they respected him as a psychologist. A few students contrasted WERTHEIMER's remarks with stylish doctrines of man that were implicit in theories of psychology and other social sciences (cf. ASCH 1952, LUCHINS & LUCHINS 1978).

In all his courses, WERTHEIMER asked what the effects would be on the social field, and on the individuals in it, of a concept, a theory, a method, or a particular study that was being discussed, just as he done in Frankfurt and Berlin (RAUSCH 1972-73). He stressed that science was a social institution and that what scientists did could have consequences for good or for bad, for a society and people. He thus challenged the belief of most seminar

members that such questions of an ethical nature had no place in science, that science was, and should remain value-free. They believed that science should not be trammled by such questions and that greater advances have resulted from science that was free from such concerns than from pre-scientific science that was value oriented and prescribed rather than described phenomena (LUCHINS & LUCHINS 1978). These clashes of viewpoints led to heated exchanges in the seminars and to passionate defense by WERTHEIMER of the belief that scientists have to be concerned with the ethical issues implied in their theories and research.

Some students initially reacted with disbelief or confusion when WERTHEIMER claimed that certain values may be related to the objective basis requirements of a system (KÖHLER 1938), since they believed that values had no objective basis and were essentially subjective. They were surprised to learn that Gestalt theory did not support cultural relativism, as some books had claimed (e.g., BROWN 1936). Some students regarded WERTHEIMER's attacks on cultural relativism as inconsistent with Gestalt psychology's stress on the role of one's frame of reference in determining what one sees and with its attack on the traditional axiom about a constant correlation between stimulus and response (cf. BROWN 1936, LUCHINS & LUCHINS 1978).

Some seminar members, perhaps because they supported a policy of non-intervention on the part of the United States, disagreed with WERTHEIMER's remarks about how to deal with the Nazis. A few of them, usually after class, would complain that WERTHEIMER was too ego-involved to be objective or that he was a war-monger. Incidentally, WERTHEIMER's friend EINSTEIN was criticized for similar reasons. Both EINSTEIN and WERTHEIMER believed that the Nazis and Fascists must be stopped even at risk of war. (fn 5)

There were even comments that Gestalt psychology's stress on the whole versus the parts was akin to the Nazis' stress on the state versus the individuals in it. Such misunderstandings profoundly upset WERTHEIMER. His reactions were described by George KATONA (1963) in response to our inquiry about his memories of WERTHEIMER. He turned to just these matters immediately after describing how the two of them had met and how generous WERTHEIMER was with his time:

Because he [WERTHEIMER] took things seriously which most of us shrugged off, his first few years in the United States were far from happy even though he was greatly attracted by many aspects of American Life. In 1934-35, some people called the German emigré group at the New School, 'war-mongers'. Because they were driven out of their own country, they were thought to be inciting America to acton against HITLER. WERTHEIMER, a most peaceful man, suffered under this misunderstanding. He also suffered greatly when some uninformed people thought they saw some relation between Gestalt theory and Nazism. 'The whole is larger than the sum of its parts' was related [by them] to the Nazi slogan of 'Gemeinnutz geht vor Eigennutz.' WERTHEIMER worked hard to explain the difference between the statment as quoted above and the other one, namely, 'The whole is different from the sum of its parts.' (KATONA 1963).

About a decade later (1974) KATONA sent us a letter which again referred to WERTHEIMER's reactions to these charges of "warmonger."

"The years 1934/35 were years of disarmament in the U.S. in which the prevailing opinion was 'let's forget the War and let's forget Europe's troubles; our economic problems and depression are bad enough.' M.W. spoke often of the New School being attacked and condemned for allegedly attempting to draw America into an anti-Nazi position and thus into war. Some critics appeared to imply that M.W. and other refugee scholars desired to change American foreign policy in their own interest. M.W. suffered under this criticism and spoke frequently of the great and difficult task of letting America know that Nazism is a great evil - even if nobody in the U.S. would have suffered under it.

The task to explain the essence of Nazism was confounded with Gestalt principles because of the Nazi slogan 'Gemeinnutz geht vor Eigennutz.' M.W. knew that some people found this principle related to the Gestalt principle 'The whole is greater than the sum of its parts.' His task was first to explain that what Gestalt theory said was only that 'The whole is different from the sum of its parts' and secondly that the Nazi slogan was a sham and did not represent an abandonment of egotistic and malevolent motives." (KATONA 1974).

Some of the arguments raised against the New School and WERTHEIMER reflected the ideologies of the Communist Party, (fn 6) of the American Student Union, and of the League Against War and Fascism. Although some of the visitors to WERTHEIMER's classes were sympathetic to the Communist Party line, they usually tolerated what WERTHEIMER had said. However, a few visitors and students wondered why certain radical instructors of New York City's colleges admired WERTHEIMER who was not a Communist but a Social Democrat. Perhaps they overlooked that WERTHEIMER was the source of many ideas and methods for these instructors' research and lectures. They might also have overlooked that WERTHEIMER often supported these instructors' applications for research grants as well as supported their students' applications to graduate schools or for assistantships. Furthermore, there were many things on which they could agree with WERTHEIMER. For example, there was nearly unanimous agreement in the seminars or lectures, when WERTHEIMER criticized racist theories. Some of the students tended to agree with his conjectures that the social fields that were created by different nations expressed different Gestalt qualities and that different nations could live peacefully together despite these differences in national character. They usually approved of the discussions that focused on a particular strike or lockout or a particular method of unionizing a factory or an industry. Despite the apparent widespread expressions of anti-Semitism and anti-Negro attitudes which were discussed in class, WERTHEIMER criticized some students' belief that Fascism and Nazism in effect existed in America. Because he directed the discussion to concrete cases, his remarks indicated to the less dogmatic students the differences between the racial policies of Germany and America. He asked for proposals of how to deal with the existing attitudes and again used concrete everyday life events, e.g., a lynching, the exclusion of Negroes from certain places. He sometimes talked about difficulties that certain American committees had in placing refugee scholars in colleges and universities because of negative attitudes toward Jews and German refugees (cf. BAUMGARTEN 1948). He asked the class for proposals of how to proceed to get people appointed to positions that tended to exclude them (fn 7). Incidentally, it was also difficult (sometime more difficult) to find positions for Jews who were not refugees. WERTHEIMER once told ASL that he could more easily place him if he were a refugee.

Since 1934, WERTHEIMER had actively cooperated with the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars. He wrote to them about scholars who had appealed for help in getting visas and/or positions. His papers contain numerous letters from colleagues in Germany. For example, the philosopher, Edmund HUSSERL (who had converted from Judaism but who was classified as a Jew by the Nazis), wrote a long, partly handwritten letter on 17 January 1935 on behalf of his son whom the Nazis had dismissed from his law professorship and cut off from contact with legal and philosophical circles. We cite from a translation (made with the assistance of Kurt BING):

"With the extensive rearrangement of the political structure of our own Reich, also the sciences - very specifically, jurisprudence and philosophy, have been placed under the norm of 'political science.'

My son (born and brought up as a Protestant Christian), as a non-Aryan could not hold his academic office. He was made professor emeritus at less than 41 years of age after he was appointed temporarily in Göttingen and finally in Frankfurt.

Indeed it is a curious world in which an old philosopher has to write such letters ... I write to you, dear colleague WERTHEIMER, with the polite request to mail this copy to some addresses with which I have some connections. But only with you I have the internal certainty that you (who have experienced it in your own life) know what it means to be separated from one's profession at the height of one's life when one derives satisfaction from one's work with the sense of one's whole being." (HUSSERL 1935)

There is another handwritten two-page letter wherein HUSSERL tells of his hopes to be Visiting Professor in Los Angeles and to have his assistant, Dorin CAIRNS, come with him. Could arrangements be made through the New School which would allow the assistant to leave Germany and come to the U.S.? A letter from CAIRNS tells of his work with HUSSERL. Completing the correspondence is a written draft (not in WERTHEIMER's handwriting but perhaps dictated by him), to the Director of the School of Philosophy of the University of Southern California in Los Angeles, stating that Dr. CAIRNS has been under consideration for a position with the Graduate Faculty of the New School and that arrangements could be made to give him a leave of absence to serve as HUSSERL's assistant should HUSSERL come to America. These plans did not materialize. HUSSERL, born in 1859, died in Freiburg in 1938.

WERTHEIMER's papers also contain correspondence about bringing to the New School, Otto SELZ, the psychologist, as well as Kurt GRELLING, the logician. Apparently SELZ died before he could emigrate. The efforts for GRELLING were too late - the Nazis moved faster. [There is evidence of footdragging by some key members of the State Department in dealing with problems involved in rescuing those who were in imminent danger of being killed by the Nazis in Germany and the rest of Europe (cf. WYMAN 1984)].

WERTHEIMER's files also contain other correspondence with refugee scholars and scientists who knew WERTHEIMER personally or professionally. It was difficult to place many of them because, as already noted, American colleges and universities were feeling the effects of the economic depression and because many schools were reluctant to hire Jews (MASLOW 1969). Most schools had no Jews on their faculties. It was believed that it would create an uncomfortable atmosphere if they hired them.

In 1938 WERTHEIMER served on the American Psychological Society's Committee on Displaced Foreign Psychologists of which Barbara BURKS was the executive secretary. The lists of displaced psychologists among WERTHEIMER's papers are sad testimony to the effects of Hitlerism, the attitudes of American psychologists, and the social atmosphere of the colleges in this country, as well as the effects of the economic depression in the USA. WERTHEIMER continued to work with Dr. BURKS. She was instrumental in arranging his trips to the West Coast, where he informed psychologists about the plight of the displaced scholars. The trips also enabled him to spread some of his ideas and work in Gestalt psychology of thinking, logic, music and, social psychology.

[B. began to attend WERTHEIMER's seminars whenever she had the time and brought the seminars up to date on problems of differential and developmental psychology. She presented her work on the intelligence of identical twins who were reared apart and on PIAGET's conception of the development of moral judgment and of the number concept (cf. PIAGET 1932, 1941, and LUCHINS & LUCHINS 1970, 1978).]

WERTHEIMER must have been pleased to help to obtain a visa and a position in the USA for Paul FRANKLE, his life-long friend from his hometown, Prague. However, it was not possible to bring another friend, Julius KLEIN, to the USA because he died of tuberculosis before the arrangements could be made. One may wonder how WERTHEIMER felt when Alois METZEL, his childhood friend from Kamenice, wrote to him that he was in the USA and appealed to him for help to get a position. Around 1940, WERTHEIMER was contacted by the HIAS (Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society) about sponsoring his cousins who had applied for visas to the USA. WERTHEIMER replied that he was not able to do this and gave them the addresses of cousins who lived in Long Island City, New York, and Milwaukee, Wisconsin. He must have been relieved to hear that the cousins had migrated to South Africa and to Australia. WERTHEIMER's refusal to help them may have been one of the reasons for their not answering our requests for information for WERTHEIMER's biography. They, and other members of the extended family, may have been hurt by his response to HIAS. They may not have known that although he was Wilhelm WERTHEIMER's heir, he had not been able to take money out of Czechoslovakia and that his estate in Prague had been confiscated because the taxes were not paid by his lawyer and friend, Julius KLEIN, whose wife used the rent money to finance the trip to America of a group of dancers. Neither did they know about his personal problems and that the financial means and social status in America of professors were not as high as in Europe.

KATONA, in his letter to us (1974), recalled WERTHEIMER's activities on behalf of refugees.

"M.W. also found time always to help students and especially refugee scholars. Even if he felt under great pressure to finish some of his own work - which occurred often because he found time always short (once he asked me 'how do you find time to have every day?') - a question by a student or colleague may induce him to write two or three pages, in small script, if he thought that this would help the other person. The expressed need of a refugee scholar led him to interrupt everything he was doing and phone for hours in search of someone who may provide help." (KATONA 1974).

WERTHEIMER's papers contain evidence that he had a few ties with the Jewish community. For example, his papers contain letters from the Menorah Society and the Downtown Talmud Torah. He served as one of the sponsors of the latter's 50th anniversary. There are notes and letters that indicate that he spoke at the reception for Dr. Hugo BERGMANN, the Rector of the University of Jerusalem, who was visiting the USA. In this speech WERTHEIMER talked approvingly about the Jewish conception of heaven as a place where one studied Torah. There also are notes about Maimonides' description of the degrees of charity, which seem to have been written in ASCH's handwriting. Incidentally, WERTHEIMER once told his colleague, Hans STAUDINGER, that his parents (Wilhelm and Rosa WERTHEIMER) were pious and observant Jews. Moreover, a dentist in New Rochelle told his daughter that a famous refugee psychologist who was born in Prague had come to their synagogue. There are other letters among his papers which show that he sometimes responded to requests from the community at large to sponsor and to participate in its health, welfare and educational programs, that he was not an ivy towered scholar, but was sensitive and responsive to the social field in which he lived.

**Papers Published in America:
On Truth, Ethics, and Democracy and Freedom**

WERTHEIMER's concerns with truth, justice, freedom, and democracy were heightened by the world situation. They were reflected not only in his teaching, and his work on behalf of refugees, but also in his writings in America. His first publication in this country was an article in 1934, "On Truth," for the first number of the journal, *Social Research*, which was established by the Graduate Faculty. It was followed by a paper in the same journal in 1935, "On some Problems in the Theory of Ethics." These articles prompted Barbara BURKS to give WERTHEIMER her reactions to them (1936):

"The first paper is, in a sense, the dignified prelude; the second, the symphony itself. The theme is one which I can accept in the main... and I think that you [WERTHEIMER] have beautifully clarified the relation of action to a situation - those which are blind, those which violate, and those appropriate to the structure. And you have epitomized the position gorgeously in the writing (1935, p. 360): 'Whether a particular instance of real behavior is a case of one or the other of these three classes is a matter for which my seeing or failing to see, my subjective evaluation is irrelevant. Whether I evaluate it positively or negatively does not change by an iota the issue [as to] which quality of the three is present in the situation, what role behavior really plays, what kind of part it is in the situation. This point must be understood first of all. If someone in a real situation fails to see it, and perhaps acts accordingly, then he has not a different thesis but is blind to the main issue'.

The question left in my mind is this - and perhaps you would be willing to help me find an answer. Are there not situations in which appropriateness of action is utterly dependent upon values that do vary according to time, geographical location and personal individual differences? If such there are, one may speculate as to whether they must be viewed as having a qualitatively different structure. An example: a young person who loves to live and dreads to die, is found by his doctor to have an incurable disease which will take his life within a year. Is it now ethical or appropriate to tell this young person of

his condition, thus maximizing the truth value, minimizing another kind of value" (BURKS 1936).

Questions such as BURKS' were among those raised in the seminar. Some seminar members and visitors could understand and appreciate what WERTHEIMER meant by structural requirements when they were illustrated in his lectures on productive thinking and perception, or on music and art, but they had difficulty in seeing what he meant by "demand qualities" in social life. To some his position seemed to be mystical, mentalistic, romantic, tender-minded, antiempiristic, or speculative. There were objections to what WERTHEIMER said about truth and ethics that were based on various theoretical viewpoints, e.g., logical positivism, cultural relativism, psychoanalysis, behaviorism, or associationistic learning theories. WERTHEIMER's lectures centered on particular examples and problems, and explored their nooks and crannies. In so doing, he gave new insights into some of the practical and theoretical issues involved. Yet he eschewed beginning with broad theories or generalities. He believed that to approach the topic this way might lead to neglect of the concrete living reality of the specific examples and problems under discussion.

WERTHEIMER contributed an essay, "On the Concept of Democracy," for a collection edited by ASCOLI and LEHMANN (1937). Three years later he wrote, "A Story of Three Days" for *Freedom: Its Meaning*, edited by ANSHEN (1940). Thus, his earliest - and essentially only - articles in America dealt with truth, ethics, democracy and freedom.

These papers have rarely been cited by psychologists. They have been cited by a few political scientists (e.g., BRECHT 1970) and philosophers (e.g., EDEL 1955). More recently, WERTHEIMER's treatment of truth was discussed by a mathematician (ASENJO 1980). When we sent the other aforementioned papers to him for comments, his reactions were as follows:

"Max WERTHEIMER had both a superb theoretical mind and an affinity for the concrete, an exceptional combination. He did not hesitate to deal with problems that pure theoreticians deem intractable. Current scientific thinking eschews the unique, the individual as such, as well as the key issues of truth, justice, good, and evil. The ancient Greeks never thought of science in this way. In fact, this generality-prone attitude is relatively recent, and WERTHEIMER had no use for it at all. He sustained a healthy perspectivism in the area of ethics, saying that an 'evaluation may be true for me, for another person not true. The evaluation depends on the relation to the subject, [on] his subjective feeling, which is entirely external to and arbitrary with respect to the object.' (1935, p. 359) A given situation is intrinsic to an individual's ethical act, and feelings are intrinsic to his rational endeavor. I may mention that it has been customary to look upon logical thinking as an entirely intellectual field, necessarily separated from feeling, attitudes, tendencies... Logical operations, logical proceedings, have a great deal to do with feelings, attitudes, real behavior; they include them.' (1935, p. 363)

WERTHEIMER knew how to begin complicated theoretical investigations with very everyday concrete examples. He let the concrete reveal the abstract. This led him to a realistic and at the same time theoretically far-reaching assessment of democracy as a social system. WERTHEIMER's democracy consists of more than simple deference to the role of the majority: it specifically includes free and open discussion. From the standpoint of logic it is not the *content* of the majority principle

which is truly democratic, but only its *function* as the technical means to the real goal of more just decisions.' (1937, p. 274). For WERTHEIMER, democracy implies the existence of a free atmosphere, an atmosphere conducive to what Ortega y GASSET called the 'spirit of understanding' that is the indispensable condition for harmonious social life. According to WERTHEIMER, 'the real essence of democracy seems to be not a form of government, a sum of institutions, etc., but a certain real attitude in life, behavior of a certain kind, not only in state matters but generally in relations between men.' (1937, p. 280). Democracy requires an atmosphere of freedom, but freedom is often obscured by theorists of all kinds. 'A Story of Three Days' is a wonderful parable that shows how sociologists, psychologists, and philosophers explain away freedom, and how even so the idea of freedom remains, and remains paramount. In the story the various determinists overlook the behavioral transitions during which liberty flourishes: 'Are there not tendencies in men and in children to be kind, to deal sincerely, justly, with the other fellow? Are these nothing but internalized rules on the basis of compulsion and of fear?' (1940, p. 567) 'Freedom is a Gestalt quality of attitude, of behavior, of a man's thinking, of his actions.' (1940, p. 569) This endearing position of WERTHEIMER's preserves alive the idea of a humanistic science, of a science made by men for men." (ASENJO 1981).

WERTHEIMER At Home

WERTHEIMER's home was open to all who wanted to talk with him. Students and faculty members were delighted by an invitation to visit his home where they would discuss Gestalt psychology, their experimental results or research plans, and their personal plans and problems. Sometimes a student's answer to a question, a remark during class, or in an after-class discussion resulted in an invitation to New Rochelle to discuss the matter further. His former students and refugee scholars were frequent guests.

Rudolf ARNHEIM, who was WERTHEIMER's doctoral student in Berlin, wrote "Remembering Max WERTHEIMER" in which he compared the houses in Berlin and New Rochelle:

"In my memory, the house in New Rochelle near New York fuses with the very similar suburban home in Karlshorst near Berlin, to which I journeyed every week or so in the middle twenties while working with WERTHEIMER on my dissertation. His three children were born in those years: Valentin, who was to spend his professional life as a labor lawyer, and Michael and Lise, now successful psychologists in their own right. While I served as their occasional babysitter in those days, I advanced to the companion of the teenagers after the family had moved to America where we met again" (1984, p. 8).

The first-time guest tended to be taken aback at the sight of WERTHEIMER's home study. Marian KATONA (1963) offered a graphic description of it - "papers everywhere" - in response to our request that she and her husband, who had known WERTHEIMER in Berlin, share what they best remembered about WERTHEIMER in America. She followed that memory of WERTHEIMER's study with a description of him shopping for his children.

Recollections by George and Marian KATONA of Twelve the Circle, New Rochelle, in the years 1933-1936.

"When one entered M.W.'s room on the second floor, the first and most enduring impression was - papers everywhere. After a while the visitor discovered that there was even a bed in the room, but it was covered

with papers which were also stacked on several small tables, chairs, and odd pieces of furniture. There was a long, wooden board full with papers of different shapes and size in the room.

M.W. related that before going to sleep he always put an empty sheet of paper on his night table. Several times during the night he used to wake up and make notes about ideas that came to him.

Nobody was permitted to enter the room when M.W. was not there. This applied to the children and to the maid as well. Mrs. W. was rather upset because the room could never be cleaned. But the danger of misplacing some papers was too great.

Most of the notes were in Gabelsberger shorthand. M.W.'s shorthand was neat and orderly, well learned in his father's commercial school in Prague. But the Gabelsberger system was little known outside of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy. Therefore it was very difficult to decipher W.'s notes after his death."

"Shopping was viewed by M.W. as a major project which consumed much time. But the growing children often required some items of clothing, and careful plans had to be made before going shopping. Three times a year, when the birthdays of the children approached, M.W. undertook an expedition to buy presents for all three children: when one child had his or her birthday, the others had to receive gifts as well. The decision what to buy was very difficult - not only because the present had to be inexpensive but also because it had to fit the needs and the personality of the child. I accompanied M.W. several times. He stood in front of the counter of the 5 & 10 cents store with paper and pencil in his hand, deep in thought, attempting to solve the difficult problems of what to buy. His appearance was striking; children were attracted by him, liked him immediately, stared at his unusual hat and [cape] and followed him in the store."

"(That M.W. was a most devoted father is well known. His children had the right to interrupt him any time anywhere. They were encouraged to ask questions, which were always answered seriously and in detail. Telling a child 'don't bother me' or 'I don't have time now' was out of the question.)" (KATONA & KATONA 1963).

When a new son, Peter, was born in the U.S., WERTHEIMER was devoted to him. ASL recalls many a visit when WERTHEIMER would interrupt their conversation in the study to comfort the baby.

Some of the New School students talked about his home's harmonious social atmosphere, the devotion of the WERTHEIMERS to each other and to the children. They described the discussions with the children that WERTHEIMER would start during lunch or supper. It all seemed to them to be related to Gestalt theory or to problems or experiments that had been discussed in the seminars. They also recalled that when they were invited by WERTHEIMER to play chess or checkers, he did not play to win. Instead he helped them correct their moves in order to make a more interesting game. Some students described how he played with the children. Nearly everybody spoke of his improvising on the piano both at home and school. It seemed to be a perfect family and an ideal situation. But those who knew the WERTHEIMERS well were aware that there were marital difficulties that threatened the marriage. (FRIEDRICHS 1982, URZIDIL 1983).

Association With Columbia University

In 1934-1935, in addition to his classes at the New School, WERTHEIMER was a visiting professor at Columbia University. A.T. POFFENBERGER of Columbia's Psychology Department wrote on March 22, 1934 to Alvin JOHNSON to confirm engaging WERTHEIMER for a series of lectures during the coming academic year and to ask if the New School faculty would approve the arrangement. On April 12, 1934, POFFENBERGER wrote to WERTHEIMER:

"Your course is going to appear in the Psychology announcement as follows: 'Psychology E201 - *Main Problems in Gestalt Theory*. 3 points Winter Session. Dr. WERTHEIMER, Thursday, 2:10 - 4. This course will deal with the main problems of Gestalt psychology in relation to other psychological theories. There will be lectures, experiments, demonstrations, and discussion.'

The stipend for this course will be \$500, as arranged in our conversation of today."

Austin B. WOOD (1970), a former student of TOLMAN's at Berkeley, who was studying with WOODWORTH, recalled that there were only a few students in WERTHEIMER's class at Columbia. This is not surprising since WERTHEIMER was not well known there, probably less well known than KÖHLER (1929) and KOFFKA (1935). WOOD was so inspired by WERTHEIMER that he began to attend his New School lectures. Another Columbia University student who later came to the New School was Solomon B. ASCH, who had worked for a PhD under GARRETT at Columbia and who was doing research in personality and prestige suggestion with Otto KLINEBERG; he had intended to study with SCHILDER before he became interested in Gestalt psychology.

WERTHEIMER played a more active role at Columbia than was suggested by his teaching one course. He accepted an invitation to speak to the Columbia University Psychology Club (4 May, the topic being "On Some Problems in Gestalt Psychology.") He was invited by Franz BOAS of Columbia University's Anthropology Department, to attend a meeting on 11 April 1934 of the Committee on Racial Questions. Apparently a long-time relationship was established as shown by BOAS' invitation to WERTHEIMER to attend a meeting of the committee on 12 January 1940. The meetings were held in Columbia University's Faculty Club which WERTHEIMER had joined as a regular member (letter of November 1934).

His activities extended to Columbia University's Teachers College. On 22 May 1934, at Teachers College, he gave a paper, "On the Psychology of Productive Thinking," with an informal dinner afterwards for a few friends at the home of R.B. RAUP. In the Spring of 1935 he again spoke of Teachers College, This time on the "radix of the personality, ... the future course of development of psychology, [and] the contribution of Gestalt Psychology to learning".

WERTHEIMER interacted with faculty and students at Columbia University proper and at Teachers College. He was consulted on research problems by faculty and students and was an examiner on doctoral committees. He worked in this capacity, e.g. for Mildred FOCHT, who had a major interest in philosophy and wrote a dissertation on the philosophy of Gestalt psychology. Her letters to WERTHEIMER in September and November 1934 thank him for reading and criticizing her translations of two of his articles in *Untersuchungen*

zur *Lehre von der Gestalt*, which she revised in accordance with his comments, and included in her thesis along with a translation of KÖHLER's *Die physischen Gestalten*. WERTHEIMER was invited to her oral examination on 1 April 1935, and received a printed copy of the dissertation in September 1935, for which he thanked her, and asked if she could send a copy to KÖHLER and to KOFFKA.

On 29 April 1935, he was invited to serve on the examining committees of two doctoral students. He advised Saul B. SELLS who compared the "atmosphere effect" in syllogistic reasoning of bright and dull subjects. Letters from SELLS to WERTHEIMER in 1934 through 1936, which have the latter's pencilled notes or drawings on them, discuss this work and their appointments to meet about it. WERTHEIMER discussed the atmosphere effect in his seminars, suggested some variations, and asked for crucial experiments to decide among alternative explanations. Alexander MINTZ, KOFFKA's erstwhile assistant, tried out some of these experimental variations in City College and found support for WERTHEIMER's thesis that the atmosphere effect may be influenced by the contents of the statements and by subjects' attitudes and assumptions.

On 13 December 1935, SELLS wrote that the seminar in physiological psychology under POFFENBERGER was discussing the physiological hypotheses of Gestalt psychology and would be very grateful if WERTHEIMER could attend the next meeting to answer the many questions they would like to ask. WERTHEIMER replied on 16 December 1935:

"I am extremely sorry that I cannot arrange to attend the seminar on December 19th due to a previous engagement. Perhaps you will be so kind as to send me some of the questions you would like to have me answer and I will endeavor to do so by mail".

It would be interesting to have the questions and WERTHEIMER's answers concerning the physiological hypotheses of Gestalt psychology.

SELLS continued to discuss the problem of the atmosphere effect with WERTHEIMER. He invited WERTHEIMER to come to a seminar presentation on 24 March 1936 when he would be making a final report on his experiments to the faculty. There was also some talk about his application for a National Research Fellowship.

SELLS also wrote about a discussion group organized by students to consider problems in motivation. At the previous meeting, Clark L. HULL, who asked that his regards be conveyed to WERTHEIMER, had come from New Haven to present his viewpoint, which had led a stimulating discussion. At the next meeting, George HARTMANN, a faculty member of C.U. Teachers College, was to lead the discussion on "problems of Gestalt Psychology in motivation. We would be very grateful if you could attend this meeting-dinner at 6:30 p.m." The meeting date was to be set at WERTHEIMER's convenience. It might have been at this meeting that WERTHEIMER spoke about the concept of the radix. There is also correspondence in the files suggestive of a meeting between WERTHEIMER and HARTMANN, who was sympathetic to Gestalt psychology. Incidentally, during 1935-6, when ASL was at Teachers College, Hadley CANTRIL was the only one of his professors who mentioned hearing WERTHEIMER's lectures or referred to his work.

On the suggestion of WOODWORTH, the sponsor of their research, other Columbia students turned to WERTHEIMER for advice. On 8 February 1937, Gustave GILBERT wrote to WERTHEIMER about his PhD thesis, "A Relativity Theory of Sensation," which "will naturally be closely related to Gestalt and Dynamic Psychology," and raised questions about changes in the appearance of the Phi phenomenon under different conditions. There is a postscript: "Thank you for your kind letter about the pictures I sent you, which were taken at the APA meeting." On 31 January 1939, Jesse ORLANSKY wrote about a project on the visual apprehension of apparent motion which would become a doctoral dissertation problem if it were accepted in the seminar at which he would soon present a preliminary report. WERTHEIMER penned a reply, "Many thanks for the kind invitation. I would love to come." Also in the file are letters from WERTHEIMER to WOODWORTH in 1938 and 1942 concerning their respective books. (WERTHEIMER 1945; WOODWORTH 1938). Thus there was a long and continuing relationship between WERTHEIMER and Columbia University and its professors and students.

Teaching in the Intermediate Years: 1936-1938

In 1936-37, the catalogue of the Graduate Faculty of the New School bulletin described a new offering, "ADVANCED RESEARCH - Members of the Faculty direct and supervise projects of advanced research undertaken by holders of the Doctor's degree or those having a record of equivalent scientific achievement." Even before it was announced, WERTHEIMER had directed and supervised research. For the first time in the U.S., WERTHEIMER offered a graduate course called, "LOGIC AND SCIENTIFIC METHOD" - A survey of the real achievements and the productive problems of logic... The great theories, their results and their shortcomings, classical logic, inductive logic, revolutionary development; the logic of pragmatism, of phenomenology, etc., logistics, metalogics, Gestalt logic. Logic will be treated with respect to the function it performs in life and in productive scientific work."

In the Fall term WERTHEIMER also taught an open course, "*Psychology of Thinking*." In addition, he participated in the joint seminar on Methodology in the Social Sciences, and also gave a lecture, "*What the Gestalt theory means for the Social Sciences*" in the course, "*Common Problems in the Social Sciences*." He also participated in the year-long General Seminar. This very heavy program was lightened somewhat in the Spring term when he taught a graduate seminar in psychology and an open course in Gestalt Psychology.

In 1937-38 he taught a year-long course on the main problems and achievements of modern psychology. In the Fall term he taught a graduate seminar in psychology and an open course in social psychology. "*Theory of Productive Thinking*" in the spring term of 1938 explored examples that formed the nucleus of the book that he had in progress. He was on leave of absence in the Fall term of 1938 (with Kurt KOFFKA as his replacement) to work on the book. But we shall see in Part II of this report that with his usual insistence on the right word or phrase, he was still putting the finishing touches on the manuscript when he died suddenly on 12 October 1943. His only book, *Productive Thinking*, was published posthumously (WERTHEIMER 1945).

Speaking Engagements Throughout The USA

Within a year of WERTHEIMER's arrival, he was invited to lecture at American universities. Unlike his reluctance in 1928-1929 to come to the U.S. to be a visiting professor at Cornell University's School of Education or Harvard University, now he eagerly accepted such an arrangement. But, of course, now he did not have to cross an ocean to come to a foreign country. And the extra money may have been important in view of his economic status. American psychologists who knew of his work invited him to their universities to lecture, e.g., BORING, FERNBERGER, HELSON, OGDEN and PRATT. To defray expenses, they sometimes made arrangements for WERTHEIMER to visit nearby academic institutions. Possibly his colleagues encouraged him to accept these invitations since they provided opportunities to make better known his views, Gestalt psychology, and the New School. At the same time he spread news of the plight of the refugees and sought to get positions for them and for his students. The speaking engagements gave him first hand opportunities to see American psychology in action and to bring back reports of ongoing research to the New School.

In 1934 WERTHEIMER spoke in a Princeton University seminar on Gestalt psychology of music and art. That same year he was invited to give three lectures on race and culture to Swarthmore College's Institute on race relations. Incidentally, in 1941 WERTHEIMER tried to get an appointment at Swarthmore for a refugee Danish psychologist, David KATZ. But Robert MacLEOD (1941), Chairman of the Department of Psychology, wrote to WERTHEIMER that KATZ was as safe in Sweden as he would be in the USA.

One wonders whether KÖHLER, who taught at Swarthmore College, attended WERTHEIMER's lectures there. When KÖHLER lectured at the New School, WERTHEIMER did not attend. He told ASL, who kept him company outside the lecture hall, that he was absent at KÖHLER's request. KÖHLER, who did not want to be interrupted by his friend, had made an agreement with WERTHEIMER to stay away from his lectures.

In the Spring of 1934 WERTHEIMER was invited to address New York University's Philosophical Faculty on Gestalt Problems in Logic. He spoke again at NYU in 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938 on social psychology, thinking, and the research in which he was engaged at the time. It is of interest that WERTHEIMER did not say anything about these visits to ASL who attended NYU from 1937 to 1939. WERTHEIMER acted as if he knew nothing about and no one at NYU. Judging from the reactions of ASL's Thesis Committee at NYU they did know about WERTHEIMER (cf. LUCHINS & LUCHINS 1970, Vol. III, Chapter 1).

In 1935 WERTHEIMER gave a talk, "Principles of Perception and Learning," at Yale University. At that time he also attended a dinner in honor of Yale's president, James R. ANGELL, who was a psychologist. WERTHEIMER and Clark L. HULL engaged in a discussion of a question raised by HULL's request for a formal, logico-deductive formulation of Gestalt theory of perception and learning. Correspondence between them shows that they continued to discuss the issue and throws light on WERTHEIMER's reactions to HULL's requests. The correspondence delineates some of the criticisms

that WERTHEIMER raised in his New School lecture about HULL's miniature system and about his report, "Mind, Mechanism and Adaptive Behavior" (1937). This report was the basis of HULL's presidential address to the American Psychological Association in 1936. Prior to the APA convention, Hull had asked WERTHEIMER to comment on a draft of the report that both he and KATONA read critically. Although HULL acknowledged WERTHEIMER's comments in a footnote to the 1937 paper, apparently he was not influenced to revise the report (WERTHEIMER 1936).

In 1939 WERTHEIMER spoke to Yale's Department of Psychology on the Einstellung effect in learning by repetition, (ASL's PhD thesis, LUCHINS 1939). HULL pointed out that the subjects who used the often repeated method had solved the problems even though they thereby overlooked a simpler, shorter method of solution. In the heat of the exchange, HULL said that WERTHEIMER was mixing up ethics with science. WERTHEIMER must have been upset by the reception of the research report because that night he telephoned ASL, which he had never done before, to repeat HULL's argument. ASL pointed out that Problem 9, the experimental problem, was frequently not solved, because it was not solvable by the often repeated method. ASL has since wondered why WERTHEIMER, who had supervised ASL's research from the beginning, was not able to counter HULL's argument. (Incidentally, in 1952, when ASL first met Carl HOVLAND, then Chairman of Yale's Department of Psychology, HOVLAND asked, when they talked about WERTHEIMER, "Did he often take his belt off and play with it during a discussion?" ASL had seen him do this only in 1936 at a New School seminar on methodology of the social sciences when he disagreed with what Max Ascoli was saying.) In September 1939, WERTHEIMER gave a talk at Brown University, "Experimental Analysis of Mentality," in which he talked about the Einstellung experiments that ASL was conducting under WERTHEIMER's supervision. (LUCHINS 1939, 1942, LUCHINS & LUCHINS 1959).

WERTHEIMER gave a colloquium on the psychology of thinking at Brown University. When he was taken on a tour of the laboratories, he saw rats being submitted to electric shock and asked Professor HUNTER what effect it had on the "personality" of the rats. Similarly, when he visited Yale University, he saw some of the work that MILLER and DOLLARD (1941) were doing on social learning and wondered why the rats were kept in isolation, "prisoners" between the learning trials. He characterized the work as "the learning of prisoners." When he returned to the New School, he spent several lectures critically discussing experiments such as those that he had seen at Brown and Yale. He conjectured that such learning and conditioning experiments tended to produce neurotic, "unnatural" behavior (cf. LIDDEL 1944, MAIER 1937, 1939, 1940, 1949). He contrasted such "prison" situations with "natural" free conditions (cf. HEBB 1949, 1951) and hypothesized differences in learning behavior. Some of the students considered WERTHEIMER to be a mystic and a romantic because of his conjectures about the effects of experimental conditions and captivity on the laboratory animal, and because he seemed to imply that the animal had "personality" or "character." Experimental support has since been found for WERTHEIMER's conjectures. What seemed to be outlandish assertions, at that time, has become part of the general knowledge of contemporary psychologists.

WERTHEIMER also spoke at Harvard University, where Edwin G. BORING had invited him in 1929 to be a visiting professor. BORING sent him a draft of his paper on consciousness. The interchange resulted in suggestions from WERTHEIMER that BORING apparently took seriously, even though he published the paper before he could deal with most of WERTHEIMER's criticisms. There was also a long correspondence between them over KOHLER's psychophysiological isomorphism. The correspondence was echoed in the New School's seminars, where WERTHEIMER discussed the differences between his and KOHLER's concepts of isomorphism. Judging from letters in WERTHEIMER's file and from BORING's writings, the misunderstanding remained even after a special meeting with BORING (BORING 1950, pp. 681-683, LUCHINS & LUCHINS 1970).

In 1936 WERTHEIMER spoke on the psychology of thinking to the Psychology Society of the City College. One of its faculty members was Alexander MINTZ, who had studied in Berlin, who had been KOFFKA's research assistant at Smith College, and who regularly attended WERTHEIMER's classes at the New School.

In 1937 and again in 1938 WERTHEIMER was invited to speak at Brooklyn College on productive thinking. It was after these talks that Brooklyn College faculty and students visited WERTHEIMER's New School classes more frequently. Some were impressed by what they heard and become advocates of Gestalt psychology.

In May 1937 WERTHEIMER gave a talk, "On Some Problems in Social Psychology" at the University of Pennsylvania, where he visited S.W. FERNBERGER. He was invited to speak at Bucknell University in the Fall of 1937.

In 1938 WERTHEIMER spoke in a seminar at Rutgers University. While there, he tried to get an appointment for von LAUENSTEIN, his and KÖHLER's former student at the University of Berlin. He also spoke in Bryn Mawr College on the theory of transpositions, in which Harry HELSON was interested. WERTHEIMER stayed for the weekend and met, at Sunday dinner, Donald K. ADAMS of Duke University, his former student in Berlin.

In 1938 Irving LORGE of Columbia University's Teachers College arranged for WERTHEIMER to give a paper on the psychology of thinking to the Psychology Section of the New York Academy of Science. WERTHEIMER also attended annual meetings of the Eastern Psychological Association.

WERTHEIMER did not restrict himself to academe, as can be seen from some of the letters among his papers. In 1933 he participated in the third Annual Herald Tribune Conference on Current Problems. In 1934 he testified on "personal injustice in Germany" before the Commission on 'Law and the State of Civil Liberties in Germany'. In 1934 he participated in a dinner Symposium of the Jewish Club in New York City on the topic, "Why Are Jews Called Radicals?" Thereafter he was often invited to speak to this organization.

High school teachers who attended WERTHEIMER's New School classes invited him to address their colleagues. In 1934 he spoke to the faculty of Seward Park High School in Manhattan. In 1935 he spoke to the faculty of Boys High School in Brooklyn. That same year he gave a lecture to the Mental Hygiene Committee of the High School

Teachers Association (which met in Newton High School in Elmhurst, Long Island). He also participated in a conference arranged by New York's General Education Board on the study of personality in light of the contributions of Gestalt theory.

Upon the suggestion of John DEWEY, radio station WEVD's University of the Air in 1935 featured a panel discussion on "The Race Between Education and Anarchy." Other participants besides WERTHEIMER included Professors CHILDS, COHEN, EDMAND, HOOK, HORNE, KALLEN, KILPATRICK, MARTIN, MONTAGNE, OVERSTREET, RANDALL, and SCHNEIDER.

WERTHEIMER's speaking engagements also took him beyond the East Coast and the Mid-Atlantic States. In the Spring of 1937, Professor CONKLIN of Indiana University arranged for WERTHEIMER to speak there and at other mid-western schools, including the Universities of Wisconsin and Michigan. He met psychologists who had attended KOFFKA's classes in 1928 at the University of Wisconsin or who had been WHEELER's students at the University of Kansas. At the University of Michigan he met his former student at the University of Berlin, N.F.R. MAIER, and saw his new research on learning and reasoning in mice and animals, as well as on experimental neuroses (1939, 1940, 1949). He met with W.B. PILLSBURY and they discussed their theories of learning. When WERTHEIMER returned to the New School, the seminar members were given a survey of the research and theories he had encountered.

WERTHEIMER's travels also took him to the West Coast. During a trip in 1939, arranged by Barbara BURKS of the 'Committee to Place Refugee Scholars', he visited Oregon State College in Corvallis, the University of Oregon in Eugene, and the University of Washington in Seattle, speaking on the psychology of thinking and other topics. He talked about thinking and learning to the Teachers Institute of Los Angeles and to the school teachers of Pasadena as well as San Francisco. He lectured at Scripps, Pomona and Claremont. He also talked at the University of California at Berkeley, where he met TOLMAN.

On the West coast he found much more discontent with HULL's and THORNDYKE's theories than on the East Coast. He was so impressed by the research of TOLMAN and MUENZINGER and their students that he devoted many seminar hours to discussing their concepts and experiments. The students thereby got a view of the major controversies in learning and drive reduction.

WERTHEIMER also lectured at the University of Utah (in Salt Lake City), the University of Iowa, and the University of Minnesota. Thus by 1939 WERTHEIMER and his ideas about thinking, learning, and teaching had become quite widely known in the U.S. from coast to coast.

Because of the personal ties he made on these trips, he was able to enlist the help of distinguished psychologists in placing refugees who needed employment. He also had opportunities to recommend his students for fellowships. WERTHEIMER was no longer just the name of a Gestalt psychologist but had gained a national reputation as an inspiring teacher and a humanitarian.

Footnotes

fn 1 The house at 12 The Circle in New Rochelle had been rented for the summer of 1933 by Dr. and Mrs. Gustav BUCKY. He was an X-ray specialist with a world-wide reputation as an authority in medical photography, who had left Germany when Hitler rose to power. His wife, Frida Sarsen BUCKY, was a skilled pianist and music composer. They were close friends of Albert EINSTEIN, who often stayed at their home in New York City when he came in from Princeton, or visited them in Saranac Lake during the summer. EINSTEIN's letters to WERTHEIMER (LUCHINS & LUCHINS 1979) mention that he sailed with BUCKY and showed him two puzzles or "brain teasers" sent by WERTHEIMER, both of which stymied BUCKY while only one "fooled" EINSTEIN. In view of their friendship, it is possible that EINSTEIN helped WERTHEIMER find the house. While they were waiting for the BUCKYs to move out, the WERTHEIMER lived in a small hotel, Hotel Davon, in Larchmont. According to Mrs. HORNBOSTEL, "Mrs. BUCKY was nice to us ... when [we moved] we found in the refrigerator a roasted chicken." Incidentally, the WERTHEIMER family visited both EINSTEIN and the BUCKYs. In the summer of 1934, WERTHEIMER wrote (in German) to EINSTEIN: "I enclose thanks for the wonderful days at Watch Hill, R.I. I send greetings to all the BUCKYs, to the spinach-mushroomcook (H.D.!) [Helen DURAS, EINSTEIN's secretary], to the mathem. sailor. My children enjoyed very much Mrs. BUCKY's chocolate and thank [her] very much for it."

fn 2 It is of interest to compare varied reactions to Hitler's policy by German scholars and other intellectuals. In 1930 there was held, in Paris, a meeting of economists including Hjalmar SCHACHT, president of the Reichsbank, to determine whether Germany could pay reparations. SCHACHT asserted that Germany would not pay unless her colonies were returned to her. The physicist Leo SZILARD concluded, as other did, that things would get worse in Germany and withdrew his money from the German bank and deposited it in a Swiss Bank. In 1932 after a trip to the USA, SZILARD returned to Berlin, where he was a Privatdozent but was so sure that things would get worse, that he lived in the Faculty Club of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute and kept his suitcase packed so that he could leave if the need arose. However, some of his friends just did not grasp what was going on, e.g., Michael POLYANI, the director of the Institute's division of physical chemistry, was optimistic (as was Wilhelm STERN in Hamburg and Richard COURANT in Göttingen) because of their conviction that German culture would not allow rough stuff. But SZILARD realized that the Nazis would get into power because there was no resistance to them and because many people who were in power and who were in the position to protest, felt that it was useless to oppose them, that opposition would only lead to their own loss of influence. After the Reichstag fire on 27 February 1933, SZILARD went to his friend POLYANI and told him that he believed that the Secretary of the Interior had arranged the fire. POLYANI would not believe it. He refused to go to the University of Manchester which had offered him a visiting professorship. He turned it down on the grounds that his wife did not want to leave. SZILARD left for Vienna before the beginning of April on an empty train, but a later train on the same day, which was crowded, was inspected by the Nazis at the border. In Vienna he found fellow German intellectuals who, when he spoke to them, would not believe his pessimistic point of view. He

argued that committees should be organized to get out of Germany those scholars who would be forced out of their positions by the Nazis. He met there with Jacob MARSHAB, professor of economics at Heidelberg (who later was on the Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research), and a wealthy economist, SCHLESINGER. He also met with Sir William BEVERIDGE, an economist from the London School of Economics who promised to return to England to set up a refugee committee because he had learned about dismissals that had already taken place and wanted to do something for these scholars. When SZILARD arrived in London he got in touch with BEVERIDGE and they set up the Academic (Assistance) Council. At that time there was also functioning a Jewish committee that was raising funds to make available one or two year fellowships for scholars.

fn 3 The New School was on a piece of land on which there once stood Daniel Cranford SMITH's former home as well as two other houses. SMITH bought the other houses and donated all the land to the New School. The New School building had a small theatre on the ground floor, a dance studio in the basement and art studios on the top floor, as well as a modest library, a few large lecture halls, and classrooms of various sizes. The Graduate Faculty used the large rooms for lectures and the smaller rooms for seminars. It is not known whether JOHNSON's meeting with SMITH was before or after JOHNSON had had a luncheon discussion in Columbia University's Faculty Club, at the end of May 1933, with Franz BOAS, John DEWEY and Wesley MITCHEL. They had met to discuss the situation in Germany and had just read the Manchester Guardian's list of 196 professors whom Hitler had dismissed. They planned to help them, as well as others, by setting up a Faculty Fellowship Fund which would be used to place some of the professors in Columbia University. They also had discussed plans which would be nationwide in scope. Did they plan to follow the example of England's Academic Assistance Council that had been established in England or Zürich's Notgemeinschaft Deutsche Wissenschaftler im Ausland? Was one of their plans to set up a University in Exile? Was Alvin JOHNSON approached at this time or later about the ROCKEFELLER Foundation's plan to bring one hundred scholars to the U.S.A.? It might have been this plan that WERTHEIMER had in mind when he wrote to EINSTEIN about the JOHNSON-ROCKEFELLER Committee.

fn 4 When WERTHEIMER came to the USA, a social revolution was taking place. The social and political fields had become unstructured by the depression which in part was due to agricultural and industrial over extension, to labor-saving machines, capital surpluses, imprudent extension of credit, the decline of international trade, and political unrest throughout the world, particularly in Europe.

On March 4, 1933, Franklin D. ROOSEVELT (FDR) won a landslide election. The Democratic Party's landslide brought into existence Democratic House of Representatives and Senate. When FDR took office he closed all the banks and called a special session of Congress for 9 March 1932. When it met, Congress passed the Emergency Banking Act, which was signed before the day was over. In the next 100 days it passed legislation to bring relief to the impoverished, to bring about business recovery and business reform, trade agreements, railroad coordination, etc. (the so-called New Deal). The changes that the New Deal had introduced aroused strong and vehement opposition. They were called inflationary, socialistic, and bureaucratic. These measures were written by FDR's

advisors, the so-called Brain Trust, who were professors at Columbia University, e.g., R. MORLEY focused on public law, R.W. TUGWELL focused on economics and A.A. BERLE focused on corporation law. They drafted laws allegedly without the help of congressional committees. These laws radically changed the federal government's role in the economy. Incidentally, many of the New Deal's reforms were not essentially new; similar laws had been in existence for over fifty years in many European countries. But, they represented a new ideology for America, which had been the home of rugged individualism. The New Deal had actually steered a middle course between the ideologies of the extreme left (e.g., Communism) and the extreme right (e.g., Fascism) and preserved the American democratic way of life. But, it was bitterly attacked from both the Left and Right. The Conservatives denounced it as communistic and socialistic, warning that it would destroy free enterprise, capitalism, liberalism and individualism. The socialists and Communists accused it of using palliatives when radical reforms were necessary.

FDR was denounced as a dictator and a traitor to his class. ROOSEVELT was not a dictator nor was he destroying the democratic processes, e.g., the American courts had not been put under control of the administration. The Supreme Court later declared some of FDR's laws to be unconstitutional. When ROOSEVELT then attempted to increase the size of the Supreme Court so that he could put liberals on it, he was thwarted by members of his own party, and even by some liberals. Thus, the concept of what was legal and just was not changed to fit the needs of the party.

When the New School's Graduate Faculty (the University in Exile) opened for students in the Fall of 1933, the country was still deep in the Depression; the New Deal had only slightly stopped the downward trend. There was political turmoil; the New Deal was being blamed for holding up recovery with its dictatorial governmental regulations. There were many protests by the unemployed, and an epidemic of strikes and Lockouts amidst the rumors that America would become a fascist or socialist state. WERTHEIMER and the other refugee professors may have been anxious, but they generally believed that FDR and his reformers were committed to democratic ideals and values. Since many of them were former Social Democrats, they regarded the New Deal's reforms as consistent with their political philosophy. WERTHEIMER might have compared what FDR had done in the first 100 days, with Hitler's first 100 days as Chancellor. If he did so, he would have seen that there were vast differences between the revolutions that were occurring in the USA and Germany.

WERTHEIMER might also have noticed that despite the rise of anti-Semitism, Jews had not been legally deprived of civil rights, property or jobs by the New Deal's or government's reorganization. Nor was one's citizenship revoked because one was a member of a race or a political Party that the New Dealers did not like. WERTHEIMER, as well as some of the refugees in the New School, were puzzled by the equating of FDR to Hitler and his coup d'état. The New Deal's opponents were not suppressed, jailed or murdered. Instead, they were allowed to wage campaigns in order to weaken FDR's power by electing their people to Congress, by challenging the New Deal's legislation in the courts, and by campaigning to try to defeat him in 1938. Nor did FDR single out any one class or nationality, religion or race to be treated as the Jews and liberals were treated in Germany (GEUTER 1983, HEIDEN 1939, Leo BAECK Institute Yearbook 1983, 1984, WARBURG 1939).

fn 5 During WERTHEIMER's early years in the U.S., Americans as a whole were fearful of getting involved in another war. "At least until 1940 the American people were clearly opposed to any more ventures into foreign entanglements." (BALDWIN 1952, p. 700). Americans who favored all aid to Hitler's victims short of war were viewed with suspicion as "interventionists" and those who were willing to risk war to stop the Nazis were dismissed as "warmongers." When applied to refugees, the terms conveyed the additional opprobrium that foreigners, especially Germans, should not tell the U.S. how to handle its foreign policy.

fn 6 The high water mark of Communism in America was in the 1930's. There were estimates that between 100 000 and 200 000 people had been members, but that there were never more than 25 000 members at one time, because more left the party than were recruited. However, its clout could be felt in many parts of the USA, and it played a dominant role in the Bonus March and the Hunger March to Washington, DC in the early days of the depression as well as in the Popular Front, the Democratic Front against Fascism the Worker's Alliance, and the WPA Teachers Union. During the years when the party line encouraged and permitted cooperation with liberals and leftist organizations, the Communists played a prominent role in these organizations. Communists even infiltrated Minnesota's Farm Labor Party and certain big city blocks in the Democratic Party, as well as gained control of some CIO Labor Unions. In addition, Marxist thinking had an important impact on American intellectuals, actors, artists and writers. School and college teachers as well as other professional people, e.g., Edmund WILSON, Malcolm COWLEY, John Don PASSOS and Granville HICKS were alleged to be party members. Many actors, artists and writers, as well as intellectuals who did not join the party were receptive to its propaganda and its proposed solutions to the economic crisis of the nation, because of the successes and spread of Fascism and Nazism. A stylistic slogan was: "Communism is the Americanism of the twentieth century." However, the heyday of American Communism terminated in the 1940's, partly perhaps because it closely followed STALIN's policies and was intolerant of deviations from it. Some of the USSR's policies, e.g., during the Spanish Civil War, the non-intervention pact with HITLER, and the invasion of Poland and Finland, turned some followers of the party and some of its members into violent anti-Communists (cf. KLEHR 1983).

fn 7 There were few positions available in all fields because of the economic depression. After the 1936 election, the government tried to help the unemployed by creating jobs in the public and private sectors. Incidentally, unions and professional organizations, as well as many liberals, radicals and conservatives, feared the influx of refugees. Therefore, they did not advocate and even blocked certain proposals to relax the immigration laws, even though more people had been leaving than coming into the country. Those refugees who were admitted considered themselves tremendously lucky and looked with dismay on the turning back of ships with refugees who sought refuge in the U.S.A. (cf. L.B.I. Yearbook 1984). Placement was hindered by the attitudes toward Jews and refugees, and by the erroneous belief that the New School faculty was composed exclusively of refugees who were Jews and radicals. Because of the deleterious effects of this belief, the Graduate Faculty planned ways to inform the public that the faculty was composed of Christians as well as Jews and that they were not all refugees or radicals or Communists. The image of the

professors as radical may have been fostered by the New School's history and by the fact that some of its lecturers had been advocating radical economic, political and social ideas as well as avant-garde ideas in drama and art. Also, there were a few pro-Communist teachers on its adult education faculty. It is of interest to compare the situation at the New School with a somewhat parallel situation that had existed at the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research (JAY 1973).

Summary

Shortly after arriving in America on 13 September 1933, the WERTHEIMER family was settled in a rented house at 12 The Circle ("The perfect Gestalt") in New Rochelle. That Fall he was teaching his first course (in German) at the New School for Social Research, which had invited him to be a professor in its "University in Exile." Early in 1934, and thereafter, he taught in English, despite the struggle to find just the right words with which to express his thoughts. He always spelled out the word "whole" when he pronounced it, to be sure that it was distinguished from the word "hole", since both had important meanings relevant to him.

WERTHEIMER's courses and his methods of teaching at the New School are described by students who also were familiar with his teaching in Europe. They contrast the rather meager library, demonstration and research facilities then available at the New School with the resources in Berlin and Frankfurt, and they tell how WERTHEIMER attempted to cope with those limitations. They also describe vividly his home study, his hospitality, and his devotion to his children.

Central in WERTHEIMER's life in the U.S. were his concerns with truth, social justice, and democracy, which form the themes of the only papers he published there. He served actively on committees to place displaced scholars, a task whose difficulty was compounded by the depressed economic situation. Moreover, the social atmosphere in colleges and universities was tinged with sentiments against Jews and refugees, which were also reflected in negative attitudes toward the New School.

WERTHEIMER taught a course at Columbia University and formed a close association with its professors and graduate students. His visits and speaking engagements to schools throughout the United States gave him opportunities to attempt to place refugees, to observe and report ongoing research to his students, and to make his ideas and Gestalt psychology better known from coast to coast.

References

- ARNHEIM, R. (1943) Max WERTHEIMER: 1880-1943. Presented at the Memorial for Max WERTHEIMER at the New School for Social Research, New York City, on November 10, 1943. In: A.S. LUCHINS & E.H. LUCHINS (1978), Vol. II, 11-13.
- ARNHEIM, R. (1984) Remembering Max WERTHEIMER. *History of Psychology Newsletter*, xvi, 1, 7-9. Published by Division 26 of the American Psychological Association.

- ASENJO, F.G. (1980) Truth, antinomycity, and mental processes. Proceedings of the Paris Conference on "La Verité."
- ASENJO, F.G. (1981) Personal communications: Comments on WERTHEIMER's papers.
- ASCH, S. (1952) Social psychology. Englewood Cliffs. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- ASH, M.G. (1984) Max WERTHEIMER: In memoriam. History of Psychology Newsletter, XVI, 1, 1-7. Published by Division 26 of the American Psychological Association.
- BALDWIN, L.D. (1952) The stream of American history. New York: American Book Company.
- BAUMGARTEN, F. (1948) German psychologists and recent events. Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 43, 452-465.
- BORING, E.G. (1950) A history of experimental psychology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts (2nd ed.)
- BRECHT, A. (1970) The political education of Arnold BRECHT: An Autobiography, 1884-1970. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- BROWN, J.F. (1936) Psychology and the social order. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- BURKS, B. (1936) Correspondence in WERTHEIMER Archives.
- Catalogues (1933-1943). The Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research. 66 West 12th St., New York.
- COLS, G. (1968) Alvin JOHNSON. In D. SILLS (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 8, 260-262. New York. Macmillan & Free Press.
- DELATOUR, G.S. (1973) Personal communications.
- EDEL, A. (1955) Ethical judgment. New York: Free Press.
- FOCHT, M. (1934-1935) Correspondence in WERTHEIMER Archives.
- FRIEDRICH, N. (1982) Personal communications.
- FROMM, E. (1973, 1986) Personal communications.
- GEUTER, U. (1983) "Gleichschaltung" von oben? Universitätspolitische Strategien und Verhaltensweisen in der Psychologie während des Nationalsozialismus. Bericht aus dem Archiv für Geschichte der Psychologie, Heidelberg.
- GILBERT, G. (1937) Correspondence in WERTHEIMER Archives.
- GOTTSCHALDT, K. (1982-83) Personal communications.
- HEBB, D.O. (1949) Organization of behavior. New York: John Wiley. HEBB, D.O. (1951) The role of neurological ideas in psychology. Journal of Personality, 1951, 20, 39-55.
- HEIDEN, K. (1939) The new inquisition. Translated b H. Norden.
- HORNBOSTEL, A. (1963, 1968, 1974) Personal communications and interviews.
- HORNBOSTEL, A. (1969) Unpublished memoirs of the former Mrs. Max WERTHEIMER. In: The Archives of Psychology, Akron, Ohio.
- HORNBOSTEL, E.M. (1927) The unity of senses. Psyche, 7, 83-89. (Translated from the German by E. KOFFKA and W. VINTON), Reprinted in W.D. ELLIS (Ed.) (1938) A source book of Gestalt psychology. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- HULL, C.L. (1937) Mind, mechanism, and adaptive behavior. Psychological Review, 44, 1-32. Presidential address in 1936 to the American Psychological Association.
- HULL, D.L. (1943) Principles of behavior. New York: D. AppletonCentury.
- HUSSERL, E. (1935) Correspondence in WERTHEIMER Archives.
- JAY, M. (1973) The dialectical imagination: A history of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950. Foreword by M. HORKHEIMER. Boston: Little Row.

- JOHNSON, A. (1952) *Pioneer's progress: An autobiography*. New York: Viking.
Paperbook edition (1960) University of Nebraska Press.
- KATONA, G.K. (1974) Personal communications.
- KATONA, G.K. & KATONA, M.K. (1963) Personal communications.
- KLEHR, H. (1983) *The heyday of American Communism*. New York: Basic Books.
- KOFFKA, K. (1935) *Principles of Gestalt psychology*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- KÖHLER, W. (1929) *Gestalt psychology*. New York: Liveright.
- KÖHLER, W. (1938) *The place of value in a world of facts*. New York: Liveright.
- KRECH, D., & CRUTCHFIELD, R.S. (1948) *Theory and problems of social psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- KROLIK, W. (1935) Über Erfahrungswirkungen beim Bewegungssehen. *Psychologische Forschung*, 20.
- LEO BAECK INSTITUTE (L.B.I.) Yearbook XXVIII (1983). *Jewry in the Third Reich II*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- LEO BAECK INSTITUTE (L.B.I.) Yearbook XXIX (1984). *Enlightenment and acculturation; Persecution under the Nazi Regime*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- LEVINGER, E.E. (1949) *Albert EINSTEIN*. New York: Julian Messner.
- LEVY, E. (1969, 1973) Personal communications.
- LIDDELL, H.S. (1944) Conditioned reflex method and experimental neurosis. In: HUNT, J. McV. (Ed.) *Personality and the Behavior Disorders*. New York: Ronald Press, Vol. 1, 389-412.
- LUCHINS, A.S. (1939) *The effect of Einstellung in learning by repetition*. Doctoral Dissertation, New York University: Abstract, New York University Bureau of Publication.
- LUCHINS, A.S. (1942) Mechanization in problem solving: The effect of Einstellung. *Psychological Monographs*, 54, 6, whole No. 248.
- LUCHINS, A.S. & LUCHINS, E.H. (1970) Rigidity of behavior: A variational approach to the effect of Einstellung. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Books.
- LUCHINS, A.S. & LUCHINS, E.H. (1970) WERTHEIMER's seminars revisited: Problem solving and thinking. Vols. I, II & III. New York: SUNY-Albany Faculty-Student Association.
- LUCHINS, A.S. & LUCHINS, E.H. (1978) Revisiting WERTHEIMER's seminars. Vol. I: Value, social influences, and power. Vol. II: Problems in social psychology. Cranbury, New Jersey: Associated University Presses.
- LUCHINS, A.S. & LUCHINS, E.H. (1979) Introduction to the EINSTEIN-WERTHEIMER correspondence. *Methodology and Science*, 12, 165-201. (Special Einstein Edition).
- LUCHINS, A.S. & LUCHINS, E.H. (1982) An introduction to the origins of WERTHEIMER's Gestalt psychology. *Gestalt Theory* 4, 145-171.
- LUCHINS, A.S. & LUCHINS, E.H. (1985) Max WERTHEIMER: His life and work during 1912-1919. *Gestalt Theory*, 7, 3-28.
- LUCHINS, A.S. & LUCHINS, E.H. (1986a) Max WERTHEIMER: 1919-1929. *Gestalt Theory*, 8, 4-30.
- LUCHINS, A.S. & LUCHINS, E.H. (1986b) WERTHEIMER in Frankfurt. *Gestalt Theory*, 8, 204-224.
- MACLEOD, R. (1941) Correspondence in WERTHEIMER Archives.
- MAIER, N.R.F. (1937) Reasoning in rats and human beings. *Psychological Review*, 44, 365-378.
- MAIER, N.R.F. (1939) *Studies of abnormal behavior in the rat*. New York: Harper.
- MAIER, N.R.F. (1940) The behavior mechanisms concerned with problem solving. *Psychological Review*, 47, 43-48.
- MAIER, N.R.F. (1949) *Frustration*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- MANDLER, J.M. & MANDLER, G. (1964) *Thinking: From Association to Gestalt*. New York: John Wiley.
- MASLOW, A. (1969) Unpublished comments an J. & G. MANDLER (1969) *The diaspora of experimental psychology: The Gestaltists and others. Perspectives in American History, 2*, 371-419. In: *The Archives of Psychology*, Akron, Ohio.
- MASLOW, A. (1973) Personal communications.
- METZGER, W. (1934) *Beobachtungen über phänomenale Identität. Psychologische Forschung 19*, 1-60.
- MILLER, N.E. & DOLLARD, J. (1941) *Social learning and imitation*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- OPPENHEIMER, E. (1935) *Optische Versuche über Ruhe und Bewegung. Psychologische Forschung, 20*, 1-46.
- OPPENHEIM, G. & OPPENHEIM, P. (1978) Personal communications and interviews.
- ORLANSKY, J. (1939) Correspondence in WERTHEIMER Archives.
- PIAGET, J. (1932) *The moral judgment of the child*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner.
- PIAGET, J. (1941) *The child's conception of number*. New York: Norton.
- POFFENBERGER, A.T. (1934) Correspondence in the WERTHEIMER Archives.
- RAUSCH, E. (1972-73) Personal communications.
- RUSTOW, D. (1978) Personal communications.
- SELLS, S.H. (1934-1936) Correspondence in WERTHEIMER Archives.
- TURHAN, M. (1935) *Über räumliche Wirkungen von Helligkeitsgefällen. Psychologische Forschung, 21*.
- URZIDIL, G. (1978) Personal communications.
- WERTHEIMER, M. (1934) *On truth. Social Research, 1*, 135-146.
- WERTHEIMER, M. (1935) *On some problems in the theory of ethics. Social Research, 2*, 353-367.
- WERTHEIMER, M. (1936) *Lectures at the new School for Social Research*.
- WERTHEIMER, M. (1937) *On the concept of democracy*. In: M. ASCOLI & F. LEHMANN (Eds.) *Political and economic democracy*. New York: Norton.
- WERTHEIMER, M. (1940) *A story of three days*. In: R.N. ANSHEN (Ed.) *Freedom: Its meaning*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- WERTHEIMER, M. (1945) *Productive thinking*. New York: Harper.
Translated into Japanese by Tatsuro YATABE and published in Tokyo by Iwanami Genai SOSHO, 1952. Translated into German by Wolfgang METZGER and published in Frankfurt/Main by Waldemar KRAMER, 1957. Enlarged edition, edited by Michael WERTHEIMER, New York: Harper, 1959.
- WERTHEIMER, Michael (1980) *Max WERTHEIMER: Gestalt prophet. Gestalt Theory, 2*, 3-17.
- WERTHEIMER, V. (1963, 1976) Personal communications.
- WOOD, A.B. (1970) Personal communications.
- WOOD, A.B. (1978) *Max WERTHEIMER: Recollections of a master teacher*. In: A.S. LUCHINS & E.H. LUCHINS (1978) *Vol. 1*, 1315.
- WOODWORTH, R.S. (1938) *Experimental psychology*. New York: Henry Holt.
- WYMAN, D.S. (1984) *The abandonment of the jews: America and the Holocaust 1941-1945*. New York: Pantheon.
- Yearbook of National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (1980).

Anschrift der Verfasser:

Edith H. Luchins, Abraham S. Luchins
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York 12 180