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BINGHAM DAI, ADOLF STORFER, AND THE TENTATIVE BEGINNINGS OF PSYCHOANALYTIC CULTURE IN CHINA: 1935–1941

Geoffrey Blowers, Hong Kong

Analytic ideas began to circulate in China from about the second decade of the twentieth century. But it was not until the late 1930s, and then only briefly, that a psychoanalytic culture emerged due chiefly to the efforts of two men whose brief stays barely overlapped. Bingham Dai, a native of China, and graduate of St Johns University in Shanghai, received a psychoanalytic training while studying for a doctorate in sociology in Chicago. He returned in 1935 to take up a position at Peking Union Medical College, teaching medical psychology to Chinese doctors, setting up a small analytic training group and seeing patients. He left in 1939 for America because of the intensification of the Sino–Japanese war, bringing his program to a close. Paradoxically, war brought Freud’s publisher, Adolf Storfer, to China in 1939 to escape anti-Semitic Vienna. Establishing himself in Shanghai, Storfer set about publishing Gelbe Post, a periodical written for the German-speaking expatriate community, the aim of which was to explore connections between Asian cultures, psychoanalysis and linguistics. However, he came under the scrutiny of the Japanese authorities and left in 1941 for Australia where he died three years later.

Both men, in situ, had shown a sensitivity to Chinese culture, which contributed to the success of their efforts to foster psychoanalytic awareness in their respective communities. Exile brought these to a close. This paper looks in detail at these events and considers the relative historiographical fate of the two men.

An earlier version of this paper was read at the Ninth International Meeting of the International Association for the History of Psychoanalysis, ‘Psychoanalysts in exile: elements of a history’, held in Barcelona, 24–27 July 2002.
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Return of the Graduate

When Bingham Dai (Dai Bingyeung) (1899–1996), the first and fledgling trained Chinese lay analyst, returned to his home country in 1935 to begin teaching medical psychology to doctors in Peking, he was making a great leap forward for psychotherapeutic culture in China. Psychoanalytic ideas – mainly Freud’s – had been loosely circulating for nearly two decades in the wake of the May Fourth Movement (stemming from 1919) which had ushered in a strong desire for widespread social change amongst China’s legions of students. Several of those students, educated abroad, had stumbled across Freud either in his own works or in the growing body of secondary literature, and translations into Chinese were already under way. For most of them his work served political rather than psychotherapeutic ends. Much of the writing of this period concentrated on Freud’s theory of sublimation as a healthy outlet for unsuitable desires which could then be put in the service of others (Blowers 1997a, 1997b; Zhang 1992). There was no psychoanalytic practice per se, and the four medical schools in China teaching psychiatry were more inclined to see reforms for the care of the mentally ill aligned to the sub-fields of physical medicine and neurology. Yet there were also calls from reformers for child guidance clinics under medical supervision, the training of psychiatric social workers and for postgraduate courses in psychotherapy. One of these reformers was Fanny Halpern, who had trained in Vienna under Julius Wagner-Jauregg and Alfred Adler. However she was not psychoanalytically inclined. In a report submitted in 1935, she accorded psychoanalytic training low priority, given the more pressing need to improve general psychiatric facilities. She also thought it should be left to physicians in private practice to administer, as and when, with the later possibility of setting up psychotherapy clinics and postgraduate medical training (Halpern 1935; Westbrook 1950). Halpern had taken a position at the National Medical College in Shanghai in 1933 succeeding Richard Lyman, a graduate of Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, who had gone to Peking Union Medical College (PUMC). It was Lyman who had invited Dai to teach under the neurology and psychiatry section of the College, and to offer courses in psychology and psychotherapy to Chinese doctors.

Dai was an obvious choice for PUMC, the most prestigious and best financed teaching hospital in China. At the time of his application he had finished his doctoral thesis in sociology at the University of Chicago and been selected for a year long seminar on culture and personality in 1932 at Yale under the sponsorship of the Rockefeller Foundation. The seminar was led by the anthropologist, Edward Sapir, and the sociologist and psychoanalyst, John Dollard. Their intention was to have a dozen foreign students in anthropology and sociology who would return to study the impact of culture on personality in their own countries and ‘provide an empirical baseline for interdisciplinary personality study’ (Darnell 1990, p. 332). Dai
was later to claim that it was Dollard’s introduction of the psychoanalytic approach that influenced his decision to undergo an analysis himself. The opportunity to do this came after one of the guest lecturers, Harry Stack Sullivan, invited Dai to his New York office to learn more about interviewing techniques. Sullivan arranged for Dai to have an analysis at the Chicago Institute and he was trained by Leon Saul who at the time was being supervised by Karen Horney. Dai thus became the first Chinese psychoanalytically trained psychotherapist. Both Sullivan and Horney had shunned the orthodoxy of Freud to develop their own ideas on psychosocial development which was to play a big part in shaping Dai’s own ideas on psychotherapy. When Dai returned to Peking, he worked at sensitizing the doctors to forms of therapy based on a system of thought which departed from the Freudian frame of reference. Like his mentors, instead of seeing personality problems solely in terms of intrapsychic tensions, he sought to understand them in their social cultural contexts. But this orientation, while it owed much to Sullivan’s influence, had its origins for Dai in an earlier series of intellectual encounters.

**Earlier Influences**

While Dai’s training as a neo-Freudian analyst might appear to have occurred serendipitously, he was already moving towards a broader, more eclectic view of psychological problem-solving before he ever considered furthering his education in America. Coming from a family which had converted to Christianity when he was a child, Dai had shown an academic interest in divinity at high school and obtained a scholarship to St Johns College School of Theology in 1920. He read a number of subjects in philosophy, psychology, sociology and religion, the language of instruction being English. A good scholar, he became impatient for the latest knowledge in each subject and lamented the fact that, as a missionary institution, the college’s ‘primary purpose was not to introduce Western science to China but to bring students under the influence of Christianity and to make converts out of them’ (Dai 1932). This insight was to turn Dai away from the more authoritarian practices of the college and he began to get interested in other schools of religious and philosophical thought. He read the *Bhagavad-Gita* and the poet Rabindranath Tagore’s books, but the work which had the most profound effect on him at this time was Liang Shu Ming’s *Eastern and Western Cultures and their Philosophies* published in 1922. Liang, a former Buddhist scholar who had turned to Confucianism, was a staunch conservative cultural critic in a period of cultural reform. His book, a best-seller, spoke of the need to identify, cultivate and protect the essence of Chinese culture from the onslaught of newly imported Western scientific ideas. This was not in itself a new concern. In the final decade of the Qing dynasty prior to the formation of the Republic, there had been many calls for modernization based upon the *ti-yung* principle – the understanding derived from the juxtaposing of two
Chinese characters, \textit{ti} [‘essence’] and \textit{yung} [‘utility’] signifying an emphasis on adherence to traditional Chinese learning as a foundation, while using Western learning for practical and technical development. This had led to a flood of translations of Western knowledge into China but there were concerns in some quarters that this learning could threaten traditional values which were seen to be unique to the culture and to be protected at all costs. Although many references to national essence were vague, and there were differences about how best to preserve it, there was general agreement amongst scholars, poets and educators that it signified a return to Confucian ethical values, most notably the principle that, in the flux of life, all elements are bound together harmoniously and are best expressed in the concept of \textit{jen} (benevolence). Reacting against the ‘modern condition’, it was Liang’s view that learning based solely on Western science would foster the critically rational mind, which would in turn threaten all values by critical devaluation. The solution to this was that learning should proceed in contexts in which not only intellectual but moral improvement might be achieved (Alitto 1976).

Liang’s chance to put these ideas to the test came in 1922 when he conducted a small ‘commune-cum-academy’ (Alitto 1986, p. 136) in Shantung province in which students and teachers lived together and kept watch on each other’s moral failings, very much in the spirit of the early sages, Confucius, Mencius and their followers. The students were encouraged in this by the use of diaries to record their thoughts and by giving free expression to their feelings as well as voicing their difficulties with understanding the materials. It was into this historically brief experiment (it was to last only a few years) that Dai came as a young teacher after graduation from St Johns. He had already begun an impromptu counselling of students at one school in Tientsin he briefly taught in but, after his move to Shantung, he quickly adopted the more systematized practices set up by Liang. Where he departed from Liang’s position was in the latter’s insistence that these experiments in living education should be conducted according to the strict dictates of a Confucian ideology, something which, after his St Johns’ experience, Dai was reluctant to follow. While accepting it was perfectly legitimate to emphasize filial piety and brotherly respect, the best policy, he felt, was to acquaint students with different schools of philosophy and allow them to form their own judgements. Although he left this venture in 1925 due to illness, he remained convinced by his methods of dealing with students’ problems and of the need for a philosophical framework in which to work with them.

In a much later work, in which he articulated the similarities in his psychotherapeutic approach with his religious background, Dai drew the example from the Zen concept of selflessness to delineate a primary goal of psychotherapy: ‘in the sense of being involved in an ongoing task or an interpersonal relationship without being fettered by compulsive egoistic concerns – [selflessness] is not just a religious or philosophical ideal, but also a practical goal for psychotherapy’ (Dai 1973).
In Peking

In a reference Edward Sapir wrote for Dai, he claimed Dai’s training at Yale had emphasized the importance of ‘cultural patterns upon personal behaviour’ and made him ‘more than usually sensitive to the reality of significant personal differences’. His subsequent analytical training had also fed this interest and he was quick to adopt Saul’s ‘special way [of describing] the emotional forces in the mind, especially the feelings generated by the childhood emotional pattern’. Personality, for Dai, was an organized collection ‘of desires and attitudes, conscious and unconscious, centred around the individual’s basic conception of himself’, the problems of which were rooted in ‘social adjustment’ seen as a two-way process of adjusting to the needs of the personality and those of society at large (Dai 1939). For Chinese mental patients in particular, the social situations were a reflection of the ills from which the country was suffering, amongst which he listed: loss of family members, sexual tensions brought about through concubinage and pre-marital sexual difficulties (Dai 1941).

Lyman had been sufficiently impressed by Dai to give him a free hand. For his first year Dai was on a Rockefeller grant1 but from 1936 until he left China three years later he was an assistant professor. During this period he ‘saw patients, trained the residents and staff in psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapy, and gave supervised psychotherapy at the Peking Municipal Psychopathic Hospital’ (Dai 1979). He also selected a small group of doctors and gave each of them a 10-month period of training in self-knowledge – ‘similar to the personal analysis in a psychoanalytic institute, but not quite the same’ (letter to Bolton, 11 April 1986). There was some talk of forming a psychoanalytic association. However, following the outbreak of the Sino–Japanese war and the incursion of Japanese troops from Manchuria into Peking, Dai decided to return to America. He obtained a position at Fiske University but in 1943 joined Lyman, who had also returned from China, in the psychiatry department at Duke University where he was to remain for the next 26 years until his retirement, offering a short-term training therapy for psychiatric residents every year. He died in North Carolina in 1996, having made only two brief trips back to China; one in 1945 on war-related work,2 the other in October of 1982 at the invitation of the Chinese government to lecture on psychotherapy.

1. The Foundation also underwrote the finances of the College through its China Medical Board.

2. Although Dai, along with Richard Lyman, was in China in the summer of 1945 assessing the need for neuropsychiatric services within China’s National Health Administration, he was also working for the OSS in Kunming. This was probably connected to the work that Henry Murray was doing at the time, assessing the abilities of Chinese paratroopers for ‘combat, sabotage and intelligence reports behind Japanese lines’ (Robinson 1992).
Dai had sought nothing less than a new orientation to health and disease. He lamented both the attitude of many of his own country’s doctors towards those with no known organic basis for their plight, and the inability of modern medicine, even as practised in the West, to liberate itself from its older traditions. He espoused a combination of psychoanalysis with sociology and had no difficulty justifying this approach. Where Freud, in the cultural context of his time, found it important to help a patient resolve his intrapsychic conflicts over instinctual impulses, ‘Chinese clinicians in their cultural environment, emphasiz[e] interpersonal relations, [and] find it more urgent to help their patients tackle the problems of being human’ (letter to Lowinger, 27 December 1986). Dai fully intended to incorporate his personality and culture model into the training of future psychiatrists. But this plan was curtailed in China and only taken up on his reluctant return to foreign soil (Vivian Dai, personal communication). Over the next 30 years he continued along these theoretical lines well beyond the point at which they were considered fashionable.

Enter Storfer

On 31 December 1938, a few months prior to Dai’s leaving China, another exiled associate of psychoanalysis, Adolf Josef Storfer (1888–1944) arrived. Who was Storfer, Inge Scholz-Strasser in her article about him rhetorically asks, and ventures an answer: ‘journalist, writer, newspaper editor, member of the Psychoanalytical Association [of] Vienna, head of a publishing firm, publisher, emigrant, [and] knob maker’ (Scholz-Strasser 1989/90, p. 26). Born in Eastern Europe, Storfer first came to Freud’s attention when he sent him an article in 1910, which Freud subsequently published, entitled ‘On the special importance of patricide’ while working as a reporter on the Züricher Tagesanzeiger. He moved to Vienna in 1913 and began regularly attending meetings of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Association. At the start of World War I, he enlisted as an officer in the Austrian army but was invalided out two years later when, according to Scholz-Strasser, he probably went into analysis with Freud. In 1921 he began working as Otto Rank’s assistant for the International Psycho-Analytical Publishing House in Vienna and in 1925 took over its management. He was something of a polymath, having studied philosophy, psychology, and comparative linguistics for two semesters in Klausenburg before moving to Zurich to study law, and threw himself into it with enthusiasm. Amongst the many periodicals he oversaw, he co-edited Imago, edited the journal Die psychoanalytische Bewegung [The Psychoanalytic Movement], and the Almanach der Psychoanalyse, to both of which he also contributed articles and reviews. He was always looking to publish works related to psychoanalytic ideas. On the occasion of Freud’s seventieth

3. Now Cluj in Romania.
birthday in 1926, he published a luxury edition of the *Collected Works*. However, he was seemingly not in possession of a sound business mind and during his tenure the company was frequently in financial difficulties over which he eventually resigned in 1932, severing his personal relationship with Freud in the process.

Until his exile in 1938 he supported himself as a journalist on the *Frankfurter Zeitung* and as a freelance writer, bringing out two ‘etymological dictionaries’ – *Wörter und ihre Schicksale* [Words and their Destinies] published in 1935, and *Im Dickicht der Sprache* [In the Maze of the Language] in 1937, both of which have recently been republished to critical acclaim (Storfer 2000a, 2000b). During this period he remained on cordial terms with many in the Vienna Psychoanalytic movement, including Paul and Ernst Federn, Edith and Richard Sterba, Siegfried Bernfeld and Fritz Wittels. These would continue to be his correspondents after his emigration.

Like many of his colleagues he tried desperately to get to the USA. Fritz Wittels and A.A. Brill tried to help him. However, at that time there was a 10-year entry ban for certain emigrants, for example, those born in Romania like Storfer (Mühlleitner 1992). Instead he headed for Shanghai, a destination for many Austrian and German Jews caught in similar circumstances, which was the only place in the world at that time which allowed Jews in without having to go through tedious entry formalities and without waiting for times of up to a couple of months. Until August 1939 when the Japanese authorities in charge of the harbour imposed restrictions on European Jewish migrants, no travel document or visa was needed. A ticket for a boat passage was sufficient. This made it possible for many thousands of Jews, estimated at 18,000 between 1933 and 1947, from Austria, Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania, all German speakers, to obtain a safe haven (Scholz-Strasser 1989).

Shanghai was effectively separated into three areas: the Chinese city, the International Settlement (British and American) and the French Concession. The city was governed by a municipal council consisting of Europeans, Americans and Chinese. Storfer like most of the immigrants settled in Hongkew which was under Japanese control. He was housed with others in accommodation financed by a relief fund set up by the Shanghai-based businessman Paul Komor. Known as the Komor-Komitee, its main task was to provide accommodation in one of the homes for the arriving refugees. Through private donations, wealthy Jewish families such as the Sassoons, the Kadoories, and the Abrahams put large amounts of money at the committee’s disposal. Financial support for this relief organization from abroad was mainly provided by the ‘American Joint Distribution Committee’ or ‘Joint’ for short.

Storfer, finding himself in competition for any kind of work with many others, decided to go into publishing. Just five months after his arrival, *Gelbe*
Post appeared under his editorship in its first six issues as a fortnightly magazine.

Published in German for the local expatriate community it had contributions from several refugees who had been respected intellectual figures in Germany, amongst others, the journalists Julius Kaim and Bruno Kroker, the latter also edited the magazines, The China Journal and The Far Eastern Engineer, the sinologist Willy Tonn, who especially distinguished himself with translations and retellings of Chinese writings, and Lothar Brieger, a well-known art historian. The contents of its first few issues set the tone of much of what was to follow. They included a mixture of high-quality articles on psychoanalysis, a series on copper, silver and paper money in China, reports on cultural events in Shanghai, reviews of plays, films and books, linguistic surveys, excerpts from Storfer’s books, essays by Sigmund Freud not to mention news updates for emigrants such as the lists of steamers arriving from Europe. Storfer also relied on contributions from overseas contributors and was keen to make psychoanalysis a central part of the journal (letter to Siegfried Bernfeld, 31 March 1939). He obtained articles on psychoanalytical pioneers in Japan and Palestine,4 the interpretation of a dream in an eleventh-century Japanese novel,5 and a 1927 essay on the psychoanalysis of Chinese characters.6 Storfer insisted on rounding up this article with some examples of Freud’s own handwriting.

According to the then 19-year-old Fred Fields, a typesetter from Germany who worked unpaid for Storfer, he was:

a brilliant man, very particular about proper writing . . . I learned from him to be very attentive to the beauty of the language, cut down on the words in articles, and try to be as open minded and honest as you can be. He had a very good grounding, was a real gentleman, and very proud to have worked for Freud. (interview with Paul Rosdy, December 1998)

But he could also be demanding, even stubborn at times, by refusing to yield to financial problems and his colleagues’ warnings to publish a less sophisticated paper (Rosdy 1999).

Storfer once again found himself heading an enterprise which reflected the wide range of his own intellectual interests. What is noteworthy is how, having had no initial intention of living in China, he had quickly come to make aspects of that country’s high culture so central to the renaissance of his publishing. From the time of his arrival he had noted, along with many other recent refugees, that there was little or no mixing between them and


the Shanghai-based European, British and Russian upper classes. Instead, he tried to make contact with the Chinese intelligentsia seeing them as the group with whom he shared an identity, rather than with other Westerners, as he makes clear in a letter to his friend Fritz Wittels:

I have the impression that there is intellectual life only among the Chinese. The local Europeans and Americans are mostly nothing but money-makers, and quite unscrupulous ones, as can be imagined in this city without masters and without roots. Besides money, they are only interested in sports, gossip about the local society, and in chic life. A hairdresser enjoys definitely a better reputation and has more chances of making a living than, for example, a professor of the Sorbonne. (Reichmayr 1987)

While articles by Chinese intellectuals appeared regularly in *Gelbe Post*, they all appear to have been reprinted from other sources, leaving open the question of whether he was ever successful at establishing direct contact with any of them at all. But, *Gelbe Post* nonetheless served as an ‘important source showing the intellectual communication between the cultures at that time’ (Rosdy 1999). Unfortunately, things were not to last. Storfer fell ill with malaria that summer, which put a temporary halt to the *Gelbe Post*’s appearance. It resumed in November 1939 as a weekly then twice weekly periodical; its costs escalated and Storfer sought financial help from abroad which was slow in coming as he indicated in his letters to Bettina Warburg (22 September 1939) and Fritz Wittels (July 1941). The money finally arrived from New York but by the summer of 1940, following a heart attack suffered through the extra shifts he put in trying to compete for circulation with his rivals, he sold out to his main competitor, Ossi Lewin, the publisher of the more financially successful and Komor-Komitee-backed *Shanghai Jewish Chronicle*, who immediately cancelled the circulation. Lewin gained the upper hand in the lucrative if small emigrant publication market by obtaining sole rights to the mailing lists which were continuously issued by the Komor-Komitee and which listed the mail received by the numerous relief organizations destined for the emigrants. These lists contained vital information for surviving and were extremely important to each emigrant. Lewin widened his readership by this publishing monopoly and was the only publisher who could establish a circle of subscribers to his paper (Seywald 1989, cited in Scholz-Strasser 1989/90).

Storfer managed to get a job as an editor and news reader with the British Information Service. Emigrants said that they listened to his voice in the German-speaking programme of the British radio channel. It was thanks to this job that he was able to escape from Shanghai. Shortly after Pearl Harbour (8 December 1941) a British ship evacuated him first to Manila and then to Melbourne, Australia. In his obituary, Josef Kalmer wrote that

7. These letters, together with that written to Siegfried Bernfeld on 31 March 1939, are all reproduced in Rosdy (1999).
Storfer found work in a sawmill before dying of lymph gland cancer in a Melbourne hospital on 2 December 1944 (Rosdy 1999). He was, according to Wittels:

one of the last bon vivants of Vienna. . . . His was the Viennese personality: a serious worker, to his friends a regular fellow. It was Storfer’s tragedy that he, who represented this type so well, had to perish with the type. (Wittels 1945, p. 235)

**Dai and Storfer: Historiographical Fate**

The departure of both Dai and Storfer from China under the threat of further Japanese incursions ended their activities (and influence) there. Each had been something of a one-man operation. Both, while in China, had shown a sensitivity to Chinese culture which had contributed to the success of their attempts to foster psychoanalytic awareness in their respective communities. Dai’s contributions also demonstrate how the practical needs for psychoanalytic intervention were first seen in educational rather than clinical contexts as students and doctors were the first to be analysed, not medical patients. Also, and perhaps significantly, he believed that the neo-Freudian orientation gelled better with the Confucian imperatives he felt were more characteristic of the populations into which he came in contact.

However, subsequent scholarly research on these two pioneering émigrés has been very unevenly focused. Apart from a selection of his writings compiled by one of his former students, shortly after his death (Atkins 1997), little has been written on Dai’s contribution. Perhaps because of his all too brief stay in China there is no writing in Chinese I have been able to find which mentions his activities. He is listed amongst the staff in the English history of PUMC (Ferguson 1970) but the lengthier one written in Chinese (Deng 1987), which takes the story beyond the formation of the People’s Republic of China, neglects him. Throughout his long life, both at Duke University and in retirement, his published works were varied and widely published in sociology journals and regularly in *Voices*, the journal of the American Academy of Psychotherapists. Storfer, on the other hand, has shown up in many accounts and the first seven issues of his *Gelbe Post* have recently been reprinted (Storfer 1999). His China experiences have not only been the subject of several scholarly books, papers and monographs upon which I have drawn here, but he has been the subject of a recent documentary film on the wartime Shanghai Jews. *Port of Last Resort (Zuflucht in Shanghai)*, 9

---

8. Most recently the cultural critic, Lung-Kee Sun (Sun Longji) in his book, *The Chinese National Character: From Nationhood to Individuality* refers to Dai as Harry Stack Sullivan’s ‘disciple’ (misspelling his name in the process) but seems not to make much of his contribution as his book focuses on what foreigners rather than the Chinese themselves thought psychologically and anthropologically about China in the twentieth century.

co-directed by Joan Grossman and Paul Rosdy, utilizes not only rare 16mm and 8mm home movies, but also Storfer’s letters in voice-over on the soundtrack to ‘craft scenes that literally take the viewer back in time’,10 and thus contributes to a growing war-time émigré nostalgia.

Whether Storfer’s Gelbe Post is seen as ‘a monument of the intellectual resistance against the Third Reich’, as Rosdy claims (1999, p. 7) or, less loftily, as another instance of its owner’s ambitions for quality publishing, motivated in this instance by the need for economic survival, which, nonetheless, reflected the blend of his intellectual vision, it did provide, albeit for a brief moment, a forum for the weaving of psychoanalytic orthodoxy into the fabric of China’s cultural uniqueness.

Both Dai and Storfer had anticipated the difficulties for their continuing work under the Japanese presence, but, in the wake of Japan’s defeat, neither foresaw the onset of China’s civil war, nor its ideological turn to Russia in the immediate aftermath of the formation of the People’s Republic where psychoanalysis was not to be revived for another 40 years.
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ABSTRACT

This paper looks at the work of two figures who, while marginal to theoretical developments within the history of psychoanalysis, each briefly played an important role in the dissemination of analytical ideas in China, contributing to an early psychoanalytic culture there. Bingham Dai, a native of China, while studying for a PhD in sociology at Chicago, received instruction from Harry Stack Sullivan and a psychoanalytic training under Karen Horney's supervision. However, the neo-Freudian outlook with which this experience imbued him had its roots in an earlier encounter with his experiments in personality education first conducted on students in a Tientsin high school, and later in Shantung under the direction of the conservative Confucian scholar and reformer, Liang Shu Ming. These experiences convinced him that a less orthodox psychoanalytic perspective was what Chinese patients with psychological problems required. He returned in 1935 to teach medical psychology to doctors at Peking Union Medical College, taking a few into analysis and treating some patients. However, the Sino–Japanese war brought these activities to a close and he left in 1939, just a few months after the former Freud publisher and Viennese émigré, Adolf Storfer, arrived. Storfer set about publishing Gelbe Post, a German language periodical replete with articles on psychoanalysis, linguistics and Chinese culture. But limited finances, severe competition from a rival publisher, plus his own ill health, forced him to abandon this in spite of the support offered him through the many contributors in the international psychoanalytic community whose articles he published. The paper concludes by considering the relative historiographic fate of the men upon whom subsequent scholarship has been very unevenly focused.