



## The Exclusion of Erich Fromm from the IPA

Paul Roazen

“The Exclusion of Erich Fromm from the IPA,” in: *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, New York (William Alanson White Psychoanalytic Society), Vol. 37 (2001), pp. 5-42.

Copyright © 2001 by Professor Dr. Paul Roazen, 2009 by the Estate of Paul Roazen.

The subject of psychoanalytic lineage has recently acquired a new respectability among historians in the field; although privately analysts have known and acknowledged how critical it is who has gone where and to whom for training, it is only relatively rarely that public attention has been focused on the unusually powerful impact which such training analyses can have. The special suggestive role of analytic training experiences was long ago pointed out in the course of controversial in-fighting by such differently oriented pioneers as Edward Glover<sup>1</sup> and Jacques Lacan, but it has been unusual to find the institution of training analysis itself publicly challenged. It remains too little known that historically the requirement that all analysts be themselves analyzed for purposes of training only officially got going under the auspices of the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA) in 1925, after Freud was ill with cancer and had implicitly to concede his inability personally to control the future of his movement.<sup>2</sup>

At the same time, however, that analytic lineage (family tree matters<sup>3</sup>) deserve to get full attention, it can be too easy to forget the role that books themselves play, especially for intellectuals, in spreading ideas. One might think it a truism that people not only go for treatment but respond powerfully to what they come across in print. Many of us were first attracted to psychoanalysis by reading the writings of Erich Fromm (1900-80), and this includes even such stalwart defenders of recent orthodoxy as the historian Peter Gay. Erich Fromm's powerful papers from the early 1930s were once relatively unknown, but a book of his like *Escape From Freedom*<sup>4</sup> (in

England published under the title *The Fear of Freedom*) became for years a central text in the education of social scientists. Works of Fromm's like *Man For Himself*, *Psychoanalysis and Religion*, *The Forgotten Language*, and also *The Sane Society*<sup>5</sup> formed an essential part of my generation's general education. (Fromm's most hortatory last writings, and his specifically political ones, fall I think into a different category as far as the general influence that he had; still, the book Fromm co-authored with Michael MacCoby, *Social Character in a Mexican Village*, deserves more attention.<sup>6</sup> Fromm's *The Art of Loving* has meanwhile sold millions of copies, and *To Have Or To Be?* succeeded in selling a million copies in Germany alone; *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness* was also a notable achievement.<sup>7</sup>)

Ernest Jones's biography of Freud was also formative of the psychoanalytic education of my time, as was Fromm's short and relatively neglected retort to Jones: *Sigmund Freud's Mission: An Analysis of His Personality and Influence*<sup>8</sup>. The fact that such distinguished literary critics as Lionel Trilling and Steven Marcus faithfully edited Jones's biography into a one-volume edition is only the tip of the iceberg of the specific means by which orthodox psychoanalytic thinking worked its way into being credulously accepted within the culture at large. Jones's multiple distortions are so built into his heavily documented narrative that they continue to slide by even many of the most conscientious researchers.

Let me give just one example from *Sigmund Freud's Mission* of the persuasiveness of Fromm's



reasoning. In the following passage Fromm was writing about the „secret“ Committee, made up of Karl Abraham, Jones, Otto Rank, Sandor Ferenczi, Hanns Sachs, and Max Eitingon, which was designed before World War I to safeguard the psychoanalytic „cause“ after the so-called defection of Carl G. Jung:

Who were these first most loyal disciples, the wearers of the six rings? They were urban intellectuals, with a deep yearning to be committed to an ideal, to a leader, to a movement, and yet without having any religious or political or philosophical ideal or convictions; there was neither a socialist, Zionist, Catholic nor Orthodox Jew among them. (Eitingon may have had mild Zionist sympathies.) Their religion was the Movement. The growing circle of analysts came from the same background; the vast majority were and are middle-class intellectuals, with no religious, political or philosophical interests or commitments. The great popularity of psychoanalysis in the West, and particularly in the United States, since the beginning of the thirties has undoubtedly the same social basis. Here is a middle class for whom life has lost meaning. They have no political or religious ideals, yet they are in search of a meaning, of an idea to devote themselves to, of an explanation of life which does not require faith or sacrifices, and which satisfies this need to feel part of a movement. All these needs were fulfilled by the Movement.<sup>9</sup>

These words seem to me still strikingly valid. Entirely aside from any of Fromm's other clinical and theoretical contributions, one essay of his (which originally appeared in the old *Saturday Review of Literature*) played a notable role, despite an effort to rebut it by an orthodox analyst, in helping to start the „rehabilitation“ of the historical reputations of both Ferenczi and Rank.<sup>10</sup> In fact I think that the recent renaissance in Ferenczi's clinical reputation is the one great success story in the psychoanalytic historiography with which I have been associated over the last forty years.

Yet bureaucratic struggles, as we shall see, were to limit Fromm's own historical place. By now he can be accurately described as a „forgotten intellectual,“ and the whole school of

thought once known as „neo-Freudianism“ (Fromm did not like having the term applied to himself) has been considered as a „failure“ within intellectual history<sup>11</sup>. Even while he was alive Fromm saw how peculiar and wayward a direction the history of ideas seemed to be moving in, as his rightful standing seemed to sink ever since the late 1960s. When the term „psycho-history,“ thanks largely to the initiative of the work of Erik H. Erikson, had first started to take hold in the late 1950s and early 1960s, Fromm justifiably felt somehow left out of the whole story. (Freud's own most speculative works might appeal to political philosophers, but not to most practicing social scientists.) Fromm could not understand how Erikson could proceed in ignoring Fromm's own pioneering work in this area – after all Fromm's *The Dogma of Christ*<sup>12</sup> (a text among those the Nazis banned) had originally come out as long ago as in 1930.

We now know that Erikson had explicitly discussed Fromm's *Escape From Freedom* at a meeting of the San Francisco Psychoanalytic Society in March 1943, well before Erikson's own *Childhood and Society* saw the light of day in 1950<sup>13</sup>. Erikson always proceeded more than warily about ever even citing Fromm – Erikson's own enduring concerns about his biological legitimacy helped feed his insecurities as a psychoanalyst. And so Erikson could be fearful of risking the fate of Fromm's having been excluded as a psychoanalyst, even more than the consequences of Erikson's favorably mentioning -- in his last works -- the otherwise dread name of Jung; Erikson publicly idealized Freud at the same time Erikson was moving away from orthodox thinking in an original direction.<sup>14</sup> (Fromm would remain intransigently unforgiving about Jung's work, and in good part this was related to Jung's politics in the 1930s that we will be touching on.)

Yet Erikson had himself played a subtle part in assisting in the process of Fromm's being stigmatized as a professional alien; Fromm seems to have been virtually alone in pointing out, in reading Erikson's *Young Man Luther*, the significance of the passage where Erikson refers to „sociological treatises of our time by authors from Weber to Fromm“<sup>15</sup>. The word „sociologi-



cal" was clearly meant to distance Erikson from Fromm, and the very designation of being a sociologist (rather than an analyst) Erikson had feared being used about himself by his own analyst, Anna Freud. (This was part of a tradition in which on Dec. 19, 1934, Jones had written to Anna Freud: „Like [Franz] Alexander and many others she [Karen Horney] seems to be replacing Psychoanalysis by a pseudo-sociology.“) Karl Menninger's harsh 1942 critique of Fromm's *Escape From Freedom* helped establish the party line which Erikson was dutifully following; for Menninger had maintained in a review in *The Nation*: „Erich Fromm was in Germany a distinguished sociologist. His book is written as if he considered himself a psychoanalyst.“<sup>16</sup> Otto Fenichel had also been thoroughly severe, and pointedly described his review as „psychoanalytic remarks“ on Fromm's book.<sup>17</sup> Freud had himself set the unfortunate pattern, in arguing against Alfred Adler and Jung, of polemically depriving free-thinkers, who then got categorized as „mavericks“ if not „heretics“, of the right to call themselves analysts.

Erikson continued to steer clear of the „controversial“ status of Fromm's name, even though so much of what Erikson was trying to accomplish through more positively re-naming early libidinal phases, and by bringing ethics and psychoanalysis together, had in reality been anticipated by Fromm. For *Escape From Freedom*, through Fromm's powerful concept of „social character“, really put the social environment on the map for all future analytic thinkers. By the time of *Young Man Luther* Fromm was training his own school of candidates in Mexico, a „heretical“ offense to the organizational powers-that-be within psychoanalysis that Erikson never risked duplicating. (And in New York City Fromm, once allied with Karen Horney, had notably continued to teach at the William Alanson White Institute, also outside of the IPA.) But everything Fromm had done to incorporate the social perspective within psychoanalytic thinking, including an interest in matters of identity and conformity, got swamped by the immense, if perhaps transitory, success of Erikson's own teachings.<sup>18</sup> (To be fair to psychoanalysis's intramural feuding, Marxists had their own brand of sectarianism, and Fromm had to struggle against

the criticisms of his former allies at the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research; Herbert Marcuse's ill-founded charges against Fromm and other „revisionists“ like Horney and Harry Stack Sullivan were to gain notoriety starting in the mid-1950s.)

Fromm's organizational problems within psychoanalysis, which wound up in him being finally excluded from the IPA in the early 1950s, really got their start with the coming to power of the Nazis in Germany in early 1933. It is essential to start out by providing the full specifics of Fromm's official standing as an analyst in Germany. On June 18, 1927 Fromm, who was then living in Heidelberg, delivered his first paper, as a „guest“ of the Germany Psychoanalytic Society -- the „DPG“ -- in Berlin. (The name of the old Berlin Psychoanalytic Society had been changed in 1926 to become the German Psychoanalytic Society, and it continues to be known there as the „DPG.“) Some five years earlier Fromm had received his doctorate in sociology, working under Max Weber's younger brother Alfred, at Heidelberg. It is also historically significant that in early 1927 Fromm's first wife Frieda Fromm-Reichmann had been elected an associate member of the German Society; she became a full member in 1929.

The first „sub-section“ of the German Psychoanalytic Society (DPG) was located in Frankfurt and started in October 1926; Fromm, Fromm-Reichmann, along with Clara Happel, Karl Landauer, and Heinrich Meng were listed as members. (Landauer, who had been analyzed by Freud but died in the concentration camp at Bergen-Belsen, was one of Fromm's analysts, along with Fromm-Reichmann herself, Sachs, Wilhelm Wittenberg, and Theodor Reik.) In February 1929 the South-West German Psychoanalytic Society in Frankfurt created an Institute of its own, mainly directed to giving public lectures. This Institute, with Landauer as Director, was associated with the Institute for Social Research, a Marxist group which was headed by Max Horkheimer and linked to the University of Frankfurt.

Fromm, along with Landauer, Meng, and Fromm-Reichmann, was one of the original four lecturers at the Frankfurt Psychoanalytic Insti-



tute. (S. H. Fuchs, who later emigrated to England where he changed his name to Foulkes and became prominent especially in group analysis, was to be another early notable figure at the Frankfurt Psychoanalytic Institute.) Fromm gave another paper in Berlin at the German Psychoanalytic Society, where he was elected an associate member on Oct. 7, 1930. Finally Fromm was moved up to being a full member on October 8, 1932; he was fully entitled to IPA membership. Besides the study group in Frankfurt, the German Society (DPG) had ones in Leipzig, Hamburg, and later Stuttgart. Fromm had been ill with tuberculosis since 1931, and was therefore in Switzerland until the autumn of 1933<sup>19</sup>, when he moved to the United States as a lecturer at the Chicago Institute of Psychoanalysis, where Franz Alexander and Horney (both from the German Psychoanalytic Society, the DPG) had preceded him.

Once the Nazis had come to power at the end of January 1933, a well-known series of political events followed. The Reichstag Fire took place in the night of Feb. 27. A further parliamentary election was held in early March, the Nazis getting 43.9% of the vote and a bare working majority in the new Reichstag. Finally the Enabling Act was passed on March 23<sup>rd</sup>, after which the government had the dictatorial powers in its hands that we now know of as characteristic of Hitler's regime. Virtually the whole of the Frankfurt study-group promptly emigrated abroad – Marxist Jewish analysts did not need to find it hard to read the writing on the wall, although Landauer's going only as far as the Netherlands meant that he eventually got caught in the net of the Holocaust. (The Nazis had closed down the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research in March, and in April Horkheimer was formally dismissed by the University. The Frankfurt „school“ already had its money abroad; it first moved to Switzerland, then wound up linked to Columbia University in New York City, and finally returned to Frankfurt after the war in 1949.) By the time of the official IPA report of the German Psychoanalytic Society (DPG) in August 1934, twenty-four of the thirty-six full members had already left Germany. The teaching staff of the DPG's Institute had been reduced to two (Carl Müller-Braunschweig, a lay

analyst, and Karl Boehm); and the number of people attending lectures had fallen from 164 (in 1932) to 34<sup>20</sup>.

The German Psychoanalytic Society (DPG) was decimated in terms of its training abilities. Even before Hitler had come to power, Alexander (Chicago), Sandor Rado (New York), Horney (Chicago) and Sachs (Boston) had already resigned to go to the States. Among the Training-analysts who subsequently left Germany were Siegfried Bernfeld, Eitingon, Fenichel, Jenö Harnick, Reik, and Ernst Simmel. Of the old teaching staff who also departed were Steff Bornstein, Jeanne Lampl-de Groot, Wilhelm Reich, and Hugo Staub. The Training-analysts who remained included, besides Boehm and Müller-Braunschweig, Therese Benedeck, Edith Jacobson, Werner Kemper, and Edith Vowinkel-Weigert (who shortly left). But the two internationally most well-known figures of the German Society (DPG) within the IPA were clearly Boehm (who became President and Director of the Institute) and Müller-Braunschweig (who functioned as Secretary, Treasurer, as well as Director of the Training Committee).

Eitingon had been among the first to decide to leave; he had officially resigned as Abraham's successor as head of the German Society (DPG) at a General Meeting on May 6, 1933, although he did not finally emigrate to Palestine until the end of the year. Here the narrative of events gets obfuscated by Jones's characteristic narrative statecraft. He wrote, for example, of the spring of 1933 that „around that time a decree was passed that no foreigner was to function in the central executive committee of any medical society in Germany. Eitingon had Polish nationality....“<sup>21</sup> But the truth was more troubling. The Nazis had declared on April 7<sup>th</sup> that „non-Aryans“ (Jews) were ineligible, and that was decree precluding Eitingon's remaining on any governing board of the German Society (DPG). Jews had suddenly lost essential rights. (It should be notorious that a „non-Aryan“ was defined as someone with one „non-Aryan“ grandparent, and soon this was extended to anyone married to a „non-Aryan“.)

Jones was following Freud's lead in describing Eitingon as now a „foreigner,“ except that Jones had left out Freud's pointed use of „etc.“



after the word „foreigner“; for Freud had sent the following advice to Eitingon on March 21, 1933:

1. Let us assume psychoanalysis is prohibited, the [training] Institute closed by the authorities. In that case there is least of all to be said or done about it. You will then have held out until the last moment before the ship is sunk.

2. Let us assume nothing happens to the Institute, but you, as a *foreigner etc.* [my italics] are removed from the directorship. But you stay in Berlin and can go on using your influence unofficially. In this case, I think, you cannot close the Institute. True, you founded it [Freud was referring to Eitingon's money] and stayed in charge the longest, but then you handed it over to the Berlin group, to which it now belongs. You cannot do it legally, but it is also in the general interest that it remains open, so that it may survive these unfavorable times. Meanwhile, someone like Boehm, who has no particular allegiance, can carry it on. Probably it will not be much attended, either by Germans or *foreigners* [my italics], as long as the restrictions continue.

3. Again, let us assume nothing happens to the Institute, but you leave Berlin, either voluntarily or under duress. This situation leads to the same considerations as the one I have just mentioned, except that your influence vanishes, and the risk grows that opponents within such as Schultz-Hencke could take over the Institute and use it to further their plans. There is only one thing to be done about that: the Executive of the IPA disqualifies the Institute misused in this way, expelling it, as it were, until it can be absolved. But of course there must be a warning first.

What a miserable discussion!<sup>22</sup>

Jones reported that in April 1933 Freud had again warned that „any concessions made to other forms of psychotherapy [such as Schultz-Hencke's] would be followed by exclusion of the Berlin Society from the International Association....“ Jones added that that was „something that actually happened some years later,“ al-

though there seems no evidence for that proposition.<sup>23</sup> At the May 6<sup>th</sup> General Meeting the Society (DPG) would reject the proposal put forward by Boehm and Müller-Braunschweig that the Board of the Society be changed to exclude Jews. From Anna Freud's perspective, expressed in a June 1, 1933 letter to Jones, the problem was a personal one: „Of course Boehm's ambition was at the bottom of that trouble in the Berlin Society!“

But before Eitingon finally left Germany in late 1933, Eitingon (who had already, in 1929 and 1932, presided as President at two congresses of the IPA) proposed that „direct membership“ in the IPA be accorded to Clara Happel and „to any other ex-member of the German group who is for the time being unable to join any other existing group....“<sup>24</sup> Eitingon wrote that he did not think that this proposal needed „to be discussed at the Congress [scheduled for Lucerne in late August, 1934], although it does not appear in the statutes, because the question will have been settled by then. In my opinion such things can be decided by the Board itself in such unforeseen situations, in questions which because of their peculiarities do not need to become a precedent.“<sup>25</sup> (Eitingon went on to found a Psychoanalytic Society in Palestine. It is not necessary to discuss here the controversy that arose in 1988 about whether Eitingon had once been a Soviet secret agent for Joseph Stalin.<sup>26</sup>)

Although Germans early on played a numerically important role in the IPA, both before Hitler as well as after World War II, the history of psychoanalysis in Germany is rather less studied than is the case in other countries. It is known that the original Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute became a model for the subsequent training institutes, even in Vienna, that got set up. Nevertheless for Germans themselves it has been obviously terribly painful to have to look closely at what happened starting in the 1930s. But even for outsiders it is extremely emotionally difficult to follow the ins-and-outs of events which took place then. The Nazis publicly defamed psychoanalysis as an aspect of Jewish so-called parasitism within Christian culture. Freud, for example, was accused of having had a „filthy



imagination," and his teachings got reduced down to the „Asiatic ideology“ of eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die.<sup>27</sup> Larmarck's conviction about the inheritance of acquired characteristics (which Freud happened to share) got associated with characteristically Jewish thinking. Supporters of homosexuality, and the destruction of the family, were also intimately linked in Nazi propaganda to psychoanalytic thinking.

Now Wilhelm Reich, a psychoanalytic psychiatrist originally trained in Vienna who had moved to Berlin, became an obvious liability to the German Psychoanalytic Society (DPG). Reich had been a leader in, among other things, bringing together Marxism and psychoanalysis; Fromm's early work had clearly benefited from some of Reich's ideas relating individual character to „bourgeois“ social patterns. But Reich was also proposing to abolish the „patriarchal“ middle class family as a way of nipping neuroses in the bud, and he advocated the therapeutic significance of orgasmic sexual satisfaction. (Reich's important contributions to clinical technique and characterology were less obviously noteworthy, and are too often forgotten in today's psychoanalytic literature.) But after Reich's late 1920s lecturing in the Soviet Union the psychoanalytic movement seemed especially threatened there. Freud had long been unhappy with some of the implications of Reich's ideas, and Freud's 1930 *Civilization and Its Discontents* was specifically directed against Reich's sort of thinking. On Jan. 17, 1932 Freud had written to Jeanne Lampl-de Groot: „I have begun the battle against the Bolshevistic aggressors Reich, Fenichel.“<sup>28</sup> And „immediately after“ the Nazis seized power, Eitingon had „informed Reich that he might no longer enter the premises“ of the Psychoanalytic Institute, „so that in case he were arrested, this could not happen on our premises.“<sup>29</sup>

Boehm had a personal meeting with Freud in April of 1933 (Paul Federn from the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society was also present). On the issue of the Nazis' determination to remove „non-Aryan's“ from the Board of the German Society, Freud was pessimistic that there was any way of preventing psychoanalysis's being banned. But Freud did not think it made sense to

give the government any „handle“ for doing so, and therefore he agreed with changing the present Board as the government's decree required. This decision of Freud's would prove the beginning of a dangerously slippery slope. (By Oct. 2, 1933, Jones could write Anna Freud that Boehm had „saved psychoanalysis.“) According to Boehm, Freud had proposed Boehm as Eitingon's successor; Boehm's report of the interview also declared:

Before we left, Freud expressed two wishes for the leadership of the Society: firstly, that Schultz-Hencke should never be elected to the Board of our Society. I gave my word that I would never sit on a Board together with Sch.-H. And secondly, he said: „Free me of Reich.“<sup>30</sup>

Now Reich was a long-standing personal and ideological irritant to Freud. In 1932 Freud had been as blunt as he ever was in his old age about a „dissenter,“ without giving any of them any more publicity by mentioning their names. So he described what he called the „secessionist“ movements in the history of psychoanalysis, which had seized hold of only a fragment of the truth; Freud then listed „selecting the instinct for mastery“ [meaning Adler], for instance, or ethical conflict [Jung], or the mother [Rank], or genitality [Reich]....“<sup>31</sup> By March 1933 Freud told Reich that the contract between Reich and Freud's publishing firm in Vienna for a book on character analysis had been cancelled.<sup>32</sup> In the summer of 1933 Ernst Simmel would propose that Reich no longer be listed as a member of the German Society (DPG). Evidently Eitingon agreed in principle, but wanted the decision for the „purge“ of Reich to be postponed until after Eitingon had resigned from the Society.<sup>33</sup> Reich was practicing then in Copenhagen, but it would not have been unique to have analysts listed as members of more than one analytical group. (In his *Sigmund Freud's Mission* Fromm had italicized one word in a significant 1919 letter of Freud's to Jones: „Your intention to *purge* the London Society of the Jungian members is excellent.“<sup>34</sup>)

On August 1<sup>st</sup>, 1934 Müller-Braunschweig, Secretary of the German Society (GPG), accordingly



wrote Reich :

Circumstances seem to require the elimination of your name from the register of the German Psychoanalytic Society. I would greatly appreciate it if you would regard our request with understanding, relegating to the background any possible personal feelings in the interest of our psychoanalytic cause in Germany and expressing your agreement with this step. As a scholar and author you are too well known to the international world of psychoanalysis for this omission to cause you the slightest harm, as it might, for example, affect a newcomer in the field. Furthermore, the whole problem will be academic once the Scandinavian group is recognized at the Congress, thus assuring your inclusion in future membership lists of this new group.<sup>35</sup>

Reich was having serious professional and political troubles practicing in Denmark; although an analytic student of Reich's wrote to Freud for help, Freud „acknowledged Reich's stature as an analyst but stated that his political ideology interfered with his scientific work. He refused to join...[an] appeal to the Minister of Justice.“ Once Reich settled temporarily in Sweden the police authorities were also suspicious of him; his permit to be there was revoked. Although someone like the great Polish anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski, then living in England, sent a letter supporting Reich in his troubles, Freud himself remained negative, and wrote only: „I cannot join your protest in the affair of Dr. Wilhelm Reich.“<sup>36</sup>

Reich protested to Anna Freud (then IPA Secretary) against what became the engineering of his expulsion from the IPA; she in turn referred Reich to Jones, the incoming President. Behind the scenes Jones had been campaigning against Reich; in May 1933 he had written Anna Freud: „My own opinion is that Reich should come to a definite conclusion about which is more important to him, psychoanalysis or politics.“ And the next month Reich was described by Jones in a letter as one of the trouble-making „madmen“ in psychoanalysis.<sup>37</sup> Reich (as a „guest“) was allowed to present a paper at the Lucerne Congress on Aug. 31, 1934, which was perfunctorily

written up in the official proceedings; but Jones would not allow Reich to participate in the business meeting. Reich's name never got listed as either a member of the Danish-Norwegian Psychoanalytic Society nor the Finnish-Swedish Psychoanalytic Society; the two groups were „separated officially“ in order to keep the Swedish group „out of Reich's hands.“<sup>38</sup> Although the Norwegian group offered membership to Reich, „after long deliberation Reich decided to stay outside the psychoanalytic organizations entirely.“<sup>39</sup> (Reich had unhappy experiences, around the same time, staying in Marxists groups too.)

Yet Jones only reported of the IPA Congress in Lucerne that this was the „occasion that Wilhelm Reich resigned from the Association. Freud had thought highly of him in his early days, but Reich's political fanaticism had led to both personal and scientific estrangement.“<sup>40</sup> It is, however, fairer to conclude that at Lucerne Reich did not resign, but that he „had very definitely been in effect *expelled* from the International Psychoanalytic Association.“<sup>41</sup>

This discussion about Reich may seem a digression, but I think it bears directly on Boehm's report of his meeting with Freud in Vienna in the spring of 1933 and how Müller-Braunschweig as well as Jones, and much later Ruth Eissler (in behalf of the IPA), would deal with Fromm. In Vienna (1933) Freud had asked Boehm not only to „free him“ of Reich, but to steer clear of Harald Schultz-Hencke within the DPG. Now Schultz-Hencke had been analyzed in Berlin (like Reich) by Rado, but had early on started to criticize Freud's libido theory. In 1927-28 he had taught at the German Psychoanalytic Society (DPG), but was „banned from teaching because of his criticism of the sexual theory and on account of his interest in making Adler's individual psychology and Jung's theories compatible with his concept of psychoanalysis.“<sup>42</sup> Any sort of rapprochement with Adler and Jung was always seen by Freud as fundamentally impermissible, and those two names of pre-World War I „renegades“ are still capable of sounding unacceptable within orthodox psychoanalytic circles. Groups can be held together by their so-called enemies, and Freud was insistent on the validity of the myths he built up about the dan-



ger of heretics in psychoanalysis.

Schultz-Hencke was prolific as an author, and successful as a speaker and organizer.<sup>43</sup> But in those days Freud made it known that he was adamantly opposed to the idea of a psychoanalyst making what Freud saw as concessions toward the ideas of Adler or Jung. In writing to Eitingon Freud had referred to Schultz-Hencke as an „opponent within“ psychoanalysis, and threatened disqualifying and expelling the DPG if Schultz-Hencke were to play a governing role in the Institute. Otto Fenichel and Schultz-Hencke had led a seminar at the DPG where Schultz-Hencke had supposedly „often presented deviating views which led to vehement arguments.“<sup>44</sup> „Deviation“ was another word for heresy. When Freud saw Boehm, I believe Schultz-Hencke was truly almost an equal danger (in Freud’s eyes) to Reich. And then in 1934 Schultz-Hencke would help found an organization with the aim of „teaching a psychotherapy in conformity with the National Socialist ideology.“<sup>45</sup>

One reliable observer has maintained of Schultz-Hencke that „in his political views he was no National Socialist, and did possess personal courage.“ Schultz-Hencke was trying „to develop a universal, generally intelligible terminology,“<sup>46</sup> and this would also be in keeping with what became Nazi objectives within Germany. Schultz-Hencke was evidently advocating shorter forms of treatment, and he has been criticized for „the rhetorical concession to Nazi aims“ by an „opportunistic paen to the human ‘fitness’ produced by psychoanalytic treatment.“<sup>47</sup> Yet some like Karen Horney in 1939 acknowledged „the influence of Harald Schultz-Hencke and Wilhelm Reich, analysts whom she knew from her days in Berlin.“<sup>48</sup> In 1945 Horney wrote about the significance of „a character neurosis“:

Actually, Freud’s great pioneering work increasingly converged on this concept – though his genetic approach did not allow him to arrive at its explicit formulation. But others who have continued and developed Freud’s work – notably Franz Alexander, Otto Rank, Wilhelm Reich, and Harald Schultz-Hencke – have defined it more clearly.<sup>49</sup>

Although differentiating her own ideas from

those others who had „continued and developed Freud’s work,“ at various points in her various writings she referred with approval specifically to Schultz-Hencke’s ideas.<sup>50</sup>

Horney knew how German analysts under Hitler were already moving toward being inclusive when it came to Adler and Jung, and that this could be viewed as the path of „saving“ the practice of psychotherapy and psychoanalysis. Now Schultz-Hencke had already been punished after 1927-28, within the DPG, for his beliefs. But IPA bureaucratic concessions about organizational structures excluding Jews seem to me as striking as any possible ideological ones, for in the long run it might prove highly desirable to move away from phobias about the ideas of Adler and Jung; the exclusion of Jews from the Board of the German Society (DPG) was, as we have seen, considered acceptable by Freud, although a direct and compromising response to immediate political pressure.

Jung’s own role in Central Europe in the 1930s has tarred his own future historical standing, since he was outspoken after the Nazis came to power in identifying various flaws in Freud’s thinking with his Jewish origins<sup>51</sup>. These public stands of Jung would justifiably be considered sins of his, whereas the behind-the-scenes maneuvering of someone like Jones (or Freud and the IPA itself) would remain harder to detect. Collaboration with totalitarianism, or authoritarianism for that matter, can take place under many different guises. The lord-mayor of Hamburg was eloquent about the dangers of expediency in the face of Hitlerism when he addressed the 34<sup>th</sup> IPA Congress in 1985: „Every step rational and yet in a false direction. Here a compromise with individuals, there with substance; always in the vain hope of preserving the whole – which had ceased to exist....In most cases freedom is lost in tiny steps.“<sup>52</sup>

As we shall see, I do not think that the IPA comes out of this story looking heroic, and Freud had to know more of what was going on than most have been willing to admit. (Jones’s writing to Anna Freud about problems in the DPG sometimes gave Freud what is now known as plausible deniability.) For someone like Fromm and his colleagues in Frankfurt, emigration (never an easy lot) from Germany turned





out to be more straight-forward than the alternative of being a fellow-traveller with the Nazis or committing domestic treason.

Starting in 1933 Jung had chosen a form of opportunism which someone like Reich was quick publicly to denounce; also Fromm's friend the analyst Gustav Bally in print criticized Jung then. For the German Society for Psychotherapy (founded in 1926) got reorganized under the Nazis, and Jung became President of the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy, and editor of its journal. (Jones wrote how „in June, 1933 the German Society for Psychotherapy had come under Nazi control“ and he claimed that it „masqueraded under the aegis of an 'International German Medical Society for Psychotherapy,' which in turn was 'readjusted' in terms of the 'German National Revolution.'“<sup>53</sup> But in later years Jung defended what he had done on the grounds that he had been acting to protect the profession, and the Jews who practiced it, from needless suffering. As Jung argued, „the cast out Jewish doctors“ were able „to become immediate members of the International Society....“<sup>54</sup> (Jones, following Eitington's original idea, would work out a similar arrangement for Fromm and others within the IPA.) At the same time Jung -- like Jones -- did help many Jewish refugees from Germany to establish themselves abroad.

To jump ahead a bit, in 1936 the Nazis then picked a psychiatrist distant-cousin of Hermann Göring's, Dr. Matthias H. Göring, who had since 1933 headed the German Society for Psychotherapy, as Jung's co-editor. (Jung resigned in 1940). Matthias Göring had been analyzed by an Adlerian, Leonard Seif; Göring was to play a central part in the history of psychoanalysis under Hitler since in 1938 his new Institute would completely absorb the old German Psychoanalytic Society (GPG) as a special subsection. It is worth remembering that in November 1933 Jung had written of Matthias Göring: he „is a very amiable and reasonable man, so I have the best hopes for our cooperation.“<sup>55</sup> On October 2, 1933 Jones had written to Anna Freud that he thought better of the actions of Boehm and Müller-Braunschweig now: „Schultz-Hencke, whom they do not regard as sufficiently reliable in his psychoanalytic work for this purpose, has

unfortunately been given a permanent position as representing psychoanalysis“ on a new commission of the Government conducted by „a psychotherapist named Göring...who is a cousin of the famous addict.“ And later Jones wrote to Anna about Göring on July 20, 1936: „It was easy to get on excellent terms with Göring, who is a very sympathetic personality. We can easily bend him our way, but unfortunately so can other people.“

Even more striking I think is Jones's 1957 judgment that he found Matthias Göring „a fairly amiable and amenable person....“ Jones wrote with a qualification about Göring: „it turned out later [after 1936] that he was not in a position to fulfill the promises he made me about the degree of freedom that was to be allowed the psychoanalytic group [within Göring's Institute].“ Jones (like Jung) was continuing to put psychoanalysis ahead of politics, and he wrote in 1957 of Göring's being disappointing: „No doubt in the meantime the Jewish origins of psychoanalysis had been fully explained to him.“<sup>56</sup> But that explanation of Jones's was implausible; for not only was Matthias Göring a committed Nazi party member, but he would make Hitler's *Mein Kampf* required reading at Göring's Institute. Göring went to his death in 1945 defending Berlin against the advance of the Allied forces.

To get finally to the specifics of what happened to Fromm in connection with the IPA, while he was already in the States Müller-Braunschweig was on January 10<sup>th</sup>, 1935 writing Fromm about the various dues he still owed to the German Psychoanalytic Society. (It was tendentious for Jones to have maintained in his biography of Freud about the date 1934: „This year saw the flight of the remaining analysts from Germany and the 'liquidation' of psychoanalysis in Germany.“<sup>57</sup> Consciously or not Jones knew there was plenty to be covered up after 1934.) It took awhile for the Jan. 10, 1935 letter to get forwarded to Fromm's correct address in America. Müller-Braunschweig explained exactly what proportion of those dues of each member were owed in turn by the German Society (DPG) to the IPA, and Müller-Braunschweig made it an „ultimatum“ to Fromm to pay the accumulated



dues of 211 Marks before March 1<sup>st</sup>.<sup>58</sup> Fromm offered, due to straightened circumstances, to pay by installments.

Then on March 3, 1936, Fromm sent Müller-Braunschweig a stiff letter:

I am extremely sorry that I have up to now not been able to send you as promised the last installment of my debt. I am now in a position to do this, and would have sent the check within a few days had I not heard from various quarters that the German Psychoanalytic Society [DGP] had excluded its Jewish members. That you should have done this without even telling me about it (quite apart from the justification of this step, about which I do not want to speak here) seems to me so incredible that I am first asking you to enlighten me as to whether this rumor corresponds to the facts.<sup>59</sup>

Müller-Braunschweig wrote back to Fromm on March 21<sup>st</sup>, explaining that the Jewish members of the German Society – at a meeting with Jones in the Chair -- had voted to resign in the late fall of 1935. And also Müller-Braunschweig on the 22<sup>nd</sup> wrote to Jones rather helplessly:

I am sorry to have to approach you over so unpleasant an affair. As far as I remember, when you kindly visited us in Berlin, you undertook to see that the Jewish members of the German Society [DPG] living abroad should be informed by the Central Executive [of the IPA] of the voluntary decision of the Jewish members living in Germany to resign from the Society, and that at the same time they should either be helped to transfer to another group or should be offered free-floating membership,

A few days ago I had the enclosed letter from Dr. Fromm, which is very disturbing for us, as it raises the doubt whether you have informed all the Jewish members abroad and asked them to resign, as I recall we discussed.

It is so important for us here that everything should be clearly and unambiguously communicated to all concerned, and that everyone should know that nobody is excluded, but that

it is expected that all Jewish members will resign; and that they will suffer no disadvantage if they transfer to other groups or take up free floating membership...<sup>60</sup>

Two outside events had taken place in the fall of 1935 which are directly relevant here. First, in September the infamous Nuremberg Laws were enacted by a special session of the Reichstag: Germans of Jewish blood lost their citizenship, marriages between Germans and Jews were forbidden, and Jews could no longer employ „Aryan“ servants. And entirely aside from this formal heightening of Nazi anti-Semitism, making it harder for Jews and „Aryans“ to be in social contact, in October a Berlin Training Analyst, Edith Jacobson, was arrested by the Gestapo. She had belonged to some sort of underground resistance group, but had somehow tried to dump at a public Berlin lake a trunk-full of anti-Nazi literature.<sup>61</sup> One would have thought that a pretty inept way of getting rid of subversive material, since a fireplace or a stove would have been more secure. Anyway, the international analysts were alarmed about the consequences for the woman as well as the German Society; Jones's efforts to help her stopped after an „urgent telegram“<sup>62</sup> from Boehm. (She was sentenced to two years in prison.) Already Jones had been also „quite critical of what he described as ‘ultra-Jewish’ attitudes on the part of some of the analysts.“<sup>63</sup>

It is worth nothing that earlier on July 28, 1934 Jones had written to Boehm before the Lucerne Congress:

I will ask you to keep this letter strictly confidential except to Dr. Müller-Braunschweig. It is to prepare you for difficulties you may have to encounter at the Congress.

You are not likely to know the strength of the storm of indignation and opposition which is at present agitating certain circles, especially among the exiles from Germany. This may easily take the form of a personal vote of censure against yourself or even a resolution to exclude the German Society [DPG] from the International Association. You will know that I myself regard these emotions and ultra-Jewish attitude very un-



sympathetically, and it is plain to me that you and your colleagues are being made a dumping ground for much emotion and resentment which belongs elsewhere and has been displaced in your direction. My only concern is for the good of Psychoanalysis itself, and I shall defend the view, which I confidently hold, that your actions have been actuated only by the same motive.<sup>64</sup>

On Nov. 21, 1935 Boehm telephoned Jones that the DGP was „in a serious crisis and its dissolution was imminent.“<sup>65</sup> Fenichel ineffectually protested on Nov. 26, 1935 that the DPG was caving in to the Nazis, for example replacing Freud's photograph with one of Hitler.<sup>66</sup> (Jones had written to Anna Freud on Nov. 11<sup>th</sup>: „I prefer Psychoanalysis to be practiced by Gentiles in Germany than not at all.“ Anna Freud had thought that „from a factual standpoint“<sup>67</sup> she thought Fenichel was correct.) After thinking about Boehm's Nov. 21<sup>st</sup>, telephone call, Jones sent a „brief telegram informing Boehm of a delay in his visit“; Jones had „sanctioned that the Jews voluntarily resign.“ Then Jones went himself to Berlin where he presided at the Dec. 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the DPG. Both Boehm and Edith Jacobson's supporters thought that the difficulties of the DPG came mainly from the new Nuremberg Laws.<sup>68</sup>

The issue arose of whether to dissolve the DPG, and/or to sever the affiliation with the IPA. Since 1933 there had been demands coming from the Nazis that the Jewish analysts resign, and by December 1935 „if the Jewish analysts did not resign, it was possible that the DPG would be dissolved.“<sup>69</sup> A new member like Eva Rosenfeld took what I consider an attractive position among the Jewish members themselves: „In her view the colleagues were in a predicament, which inwardly she could only reject, where they could not resign voluntarily because too high a degree of masochism would be involved, as though they had voluntarily to become their own executioners.“<sup>70</sup> As the historian and analyst Peter Loewenberg has recently so well put it,

Freud was clearly more interested in preserving the organization and presence of psychoanalysis in the Third Reich than he was

in the dignity and self-esteem of his Jewish colleagues or in the conditions that are necessary for psychoanalysis to function as a clinical therapy...It is painful and mortifying to read the record of how the leaders of an honored institution, in order to save the organization and promote the careers of the new successors to leadership, humiliated and cast out a large majority of its members to accommodate to a totalitarian state. That a „scientific,“ or for that matter a „humanistic,“ society would exclude qualified members for ethnic, racial, religious, or other extrinsic grounds for the sake of the existence of the institution, defies the autonomy of science from political ideology and the morality of valuing individuals which is the humane liberal essence of psychoanalysis itself.<sup>71</sup>

Jones was to claim, in writing to Anna Freud on Dec. 2, 1935, that he had been opposed to „expelling the Jews.“ Jones also told Anna in general what Jones thought: „Müller-Braunschweig is busy coquetting with the idea of combining a philosophy of Psychoanalysis with a quasi-theological conception of National-Socialist ideology, and you can imagine that this is a very busy occupation. No doubt he will proceed further along these lines, and he is definitely anti-semitic, which Boehm is certainly not.“<sup>72</sup> (The Dutch IPA official van Ophuijsen had on Sept. 21, 1933 written Jones that both Boehm and Müller Braunschweig were confirmed Nazis.<sup>73</sup>) Jones thought that Schultz-Hencke „curiously enough, is often on the right side.“<sup>74</sup> Boehm reported that Schultz-Hencke had proposed that „the Society [DPG] should leave the IPA and dissolve, while each one of us should secretly remain a member of the IPA, and carry on his or her psychoanalytic practice in secret.“<sup>75</sup>

But Boehm, like Müller-Braunschweig and completely at odds with what Jones had written Anna Freud, insisted that Jones was in favor of the Jews leaving the Society; evidently Jones had also telegraphed Therese Benedeck, who had been a leader against the idea of having the Jews exclude themselves: „Urgently advise voluntary resignation.“<sup>76</sup> (The Dutch analysts would later, under similar circumstances, choose



instead to all resign in protest.) Still, Boehm was sufficiently in good graces within the IPA for him to spend three hours in 1937 describing the situation of psychoanalysis in Germany before a small group of Viennese analysts.

On March 26, 1936 Jones had written to Fromm, in response to the letter of Fromm's that Müller-Branschweig had sent:

Dr. Müller-Branschweig forwarded to me your letter of complaint considering the resignation of the Jewish members. It is not literally true that they have been excluded..., but after a considerable discussion in Berlin between them and their colleagues, a discussion at which I also was present, they subsequently decided it would be in everyone's interest for them to send in their resignation. It was plain to me that there was no alternative, and indeed I may tell you that I am daily expecting to hear the whole German-Society itself being dissolved.

The idea of any imminent dissolution might sound dramatic but was one of Jones's rhetorical fabrications; he went on to Fromm:

As regards the question of communicating with you you will doubtless understand that it is far from easy to write from Berlin. There also appears to be a misunderstanding in the matter for which I am more to blame than Dr. Müller-Braunschweig. They assumed that I would notify the Germany [sic] members living abroad, whereas this was not quite clear in my mind. I notified those in England and evidently thought this would suffice. You are the only other member in this category, and I had thought that you were now a member of the New York Society.

But A. A. Brill was in regular contact with Jones about any new members of the New York group from abroad, and Jones would have heard from Brill any such news. Lay analysts like Fromm were frowned upon all over American psychoanalysis. Nevertheless, Jones added: „If there is any difficulty in the way of your being accepted there [in New York], then I can offer you the direct 'Nansen' membership of the International Association. Will you be good

enough to notify me about this.“<sup>77</sup> („The 'Nansen' membership was established similar to the 'Nansen' passport for political refugees that F. Nansen introduced for Russian refugees without citizenship.“<sup>78</sup>

Because of a postal error Fromm said he did not hear of Jones's March letter for a couple of months; Fromm then indicated:

Since there is no alternative, I accept the fact of giving up my membership in the German Psychoanalytic Society. Though I am in close connection with the Washington-Baltimore Psychoanalytic Society where I gave a course of lectures last year, it would be against their principles to accept a non-physician as a member, and I would rather not press the matter. This being the case, I would prefer to become a „Nansen“ member of the International Association and would be very grateful to you if you would take the necessary steps to arrange it.

(In April Fromm had sent Müller-Braunschweig a check for \$50., or 124 Marks.) In June Jones confirmed Fromm's standing as a direct member of the IPA, and hoped he would come to the forthcoming Congress in Marienbad. Fromm indicated he would not be able to attend the Congress, but was grateful for Jones's writing and wondered to whom he should send his membership fee. (No correspondence exists further on this point, and I am assuming that no agreed-upon fees for such direct members existed. In any event it is striking that Fromm, who for the sake of privacy destroyed so much of his correspondence, still saved these letters between himself and Jones, Müller-Braunschweig, and, as we shall see, Eissler.)

The DPG went on existing; as a result of a July 1936 agreement between Jones, Brill, Boehm, Müller-Braunschweig, and M. H. Göring, the DPG (still part of the IPA) became part of the newly established so-called Göring Institute. The DPG celebrated Freud's 80<sup>th</sup> birthday, but no Jews were allowed.<sup>79</sup> But the DGP, founded originally by Abraham in 1910, finally dissolved in November 1938; Jones first offered its members „direct membership“ in the IPA, but Boehm rejected that proposal. The death-knell of the DPG, as it had become „Wor-



king group A“ of the Göring Institute, had really come only with Müller-Braunschweig’s trip to Vienna after the Nazis marched in on March 12, 1938. (Working group B was Schultz-Hencke’s neo-analysts, and Working group C meant the Jungians.)

Once the Nazis had seized the Vienna Psychoanalytic Association, its Clinic, and Freud’s Press, his eldest son Martin – in charge then of Freud’s finances – telegraphed for help to Müller-Braunschweig in Berlin. (Once again Jones disguised in his Freud biography the extent of the IPA’s having initiated this cooperation by writing only that „Müller-Braunschweig, accompanied by a Nazi Commissar, arrived from Berlin with the purpose of liquidating the psychoanalytic situation.“<sup>80</sup>) The idea evidently was to hand over to Müller-Braunschweig, and through him to the DGP, whatever assets that the analysts in Vienna then had. It seems to me scarcely self-respecting for Freud and the Vienna Psychoanalytic Association to be turning their official selves over to the Aryanized German Society, as they appealed to Müller-Braunschweig to come to Vienna.

But then Freud’s all authoritarian political leanings in the last decade of his life in Vienna have gone unrecognized, although at the time it was heart-breaking to his politically idealistic followers from America who knew what was happening in Vienna. Ruth Mack Brunswick wept over Freud’s politics, and Freud’s analysis of her husband Mark was interrupted because of Freud’s having „betrayed“ the local socialists. „Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss had already, in the early part of 1934, put down a Marxist revolt in Vienna by suspending Parliament and bombarding the huge socialist housing project in the city until it surrendered.“<sup>81</sup> Yet Martin Freud strikingly hung Dollfuss picture in the office of Freud’s psychoanalytic Press. Further, Freud’s attempts to flatter Mussolini (who had been a protector of Austrian independence) and no doubt also to help psychoanalysis in Italy, does not withstand scrutiny.<sup>82</sup> Freud’s decision to remain in Vienna so long got all sorts of people into hot water, since they felt they could not leave earlier without appearing to desert a sinking ship. (Four of his sisters later perished in Nazi concentration camps.)

Jones had come to the city right after the occupation of Austria, and he took part in the deliberations by which Müller-Braunschweig accepted in behalf of the DGP becoming trustee for the Vienna Psychoanalytic Association. There were too few non-Jewish analysts in Vienna for the project to succeed; therefore Jones had wanted the Gentile Richard Sterba to stay in Austria. Anna Freud got questioned about finances by the Gestapo after her brother Martin had left incriminating documentary evidence about money abroad; she then showed them a letter to her from Müller-Branschweig, and the Gestapo also questioned Müller-Branschweig.<sup>83</sup> Evidently Müller-Braunschweig (along with many others who had acted to protect Freud) may have been some help to the Freuds in getting permission to leave Austria (Freud left Vienna on June 4, 1938.)

But the attempt at an Aryanized Vienna analytic group proved a fiasco, and the Press, the Psychoanalytic Association, and the Clinic were liquidated on Sept. 1, 1938. Meanwhile Müller-Braunschweig’s reputation was tarnished back in Berlin; his letter to Anna Freud had consoled her, and advocated the future autonomy of the Vienna Institute from both National Socialism and the Göring Institute.<sup>84</sup> This was the occasion when the DPG also was dissolved. Not until the end of September 1938 did the Nazis revoke the licenses of all Jewish physicians and attorneys, almost three years after the Jewish analysts had themselves resigned from the DPG.

The activities of the Göring Institute, and what role the analysts there played, is an entirely separate story. We have been told that it could be „a refuge for most.“<sup>85</sup> All the records of the Institute got destroyed in fighting at the end of the war. We do know now, however, that Müller-Branschweig passed along to Fascist authorities, in code, the names of Jewish members of the Italian Psychoanalytic Society.<sup>86</sup> He declined to join the Nazi Party, which would have saved him from being prohibited from teaching and publishing; he was not allowed to enter the Göring Institute, and Boehm could not conduct training analyses. But Müller-Branschweig did remain „responsible for lecture organization even after 1938“<sup>87</sup>; he continued his private practice. And Boehm, who had ear-



lier opposed the Nazi approach to homosexuality --“sterilization, hormone treatment, operations, prison, concentration camps and the death penalty“<sup>88</sup> -- by December 1944 had come to agree with these practices. The issue of complicity in mass murder comes up, since soldiers with „battle fatigue“ were to be exterminated too. It might go without saying that it was illegal to treat Jews at the Göring Institute; patients who were found to be untreatable were bound to wind up in the Nazi euthanasia program, and put to death. The fact that one German member of Working-group A – John Rittmeister, a Communist who had once been a student of Jung’s – was guillotined for treason in 1943 does not do much to brighten a terribly shabby episode in Western history.

According to a malignant irony, the Nazis were convinced that „mental disorder within the master race could not be genetic or essentially organic,“ and therefore thought applied depth psychology had a special role to play in the Third Reich.<sup>89</sup> I think that true psychotherapy itself was destroyed under the Nazis. The Göring Institute’s success in giving help to the Luftwaffe and promoting the war effort itself besmirches the whole tradition of so-called German psychotherapy. All of us should be wary of the implications of any system of ideas which ever aims to „harmonize“ the individual and the social order. Anyone who tries to argue that psychoanalysis was „preserved through the departure of the Jewish analysts and by the cover of the Göring name“<sup>90</sup> has missed the boat. Jones might have thought he had tried to „save“ psychoanalysis in Germany, but by the end of the war he acknowledged the failure of such a project. (But his rationalizations in the form of the narrative he constructed in his Freud biography are harder to detect than Jung’s own forms of apology.) To the extent that German culture once presented some of the best parts of the Western tradition, the tale of „psychotherapy“ under the Third Reich has to be more ethically worrisome to me than the various abuses of psychiatry under the old Soviet regime.

Some of the worst aspects of this story remain to be told. For even though Jones had years earlier written to Anna Freud that Müller-

Branschweig was anti-Semitic, in the end Müller-Braunschweig (who went to a Jungian analyst after World War II) successfully led the post-World War II German group back into the IPA. Although Freud liked to castigate those who led „secessions“ in the history of psychoanalysis, it has always been considered acceptable for a group to secede in the guise of psychoanalytic orthodoxy. Müller-Braunschweig was able to thrive as a leader within the IPA; orthodoxy was a „way of dissociating himself from the Nazi past.“<sup>91</sup> Freud, as we have seen, had been adamantly against Schultz-Hencke and the ideas he represented. (I suspect that Schultz-Hencke’s use of the term „neo-analysis“ may have later put Fromm off any such designation for his own point of view.) After the DPG with Müller-Braunschweig as President was reconstituted following the end of the war in 1945, the question then arose of its affiliation with the IPA.

Müller-Braunschweig was able to emphasize that Schultz-Hencke’s view was that „the theories of psychoanalysis, particularly the libido theory, ...[were] essentially antiquated and out of date.“<sup>92</sup> By May 1946 Anna Freud would be writing Müller-Braunschweig: „I have always been very sorry that your visit to Vienna and your relationship with me in 1938 had such unhappy consequences for you. You know that was not my intention.“<sup>93</sup> Psychoanalytic orthodoxy has always been blood thicker than political water. During the early 1930s a patient in training with Anna Freud, Esther Menaker, indicated that she was troubled by there being „so many splinter movements: Jung, Adler, Rank. If you are all searching for the truth about human personality, why can’t you work together?“ Anna Freud „replied without hesitation“: „Nothing is as important to us as the psychoanalytic movement.“<sup>94</sup>

By December 1947 Anna Freud would be, as acting IPA Treasurer, also writing to Müller-Braunschweig to „attend to the question of the payment of arrears of annual subscriptions since 1939....“<sup>95</sup> And that year, Anna Freud, as IPA Secretary, listed the DPG’s activities as of 1945-1947 within the *Bulletin* of the IPA.

When the DPG tried to be re-admitted to the IPA at the Zurich Congress in 1949, Jones in the



Chair held that years of „amalgamating different forms of psychotherapy – Jung, Adler, Freud, Neo-Analysis“ had had their ill effect, but that Müller-Braunschweig had remained one of the „true, real, genuine analysts.“<sup>96</sup> Provisional acceptance of the Germans was therefore in order. The English analyst John Rickman, although supposedly working in behalf of the British government, had turned over to the IPA analysts in London a report which described Müller-Braunschweig's „incompetence as an analyst and his Nazis leanings.“<sup>97</sup>

Following the Zurich Congress there were some unpleasant exchanges between Müller-Braunschweig and Schultz-Hencke; Müller-Braunschweig thought that Schultz-Hencke was merely giving „the impression that you are a psychoanalyst.“ Schultz-Hencke protested that Müller-Braunschweig had misquoted him, giving the audience in Zurich „a catastrophic picture of my heresy.“ Schultz-Hencke maintained:

You, and others from one side,...think that you can break the gentleman's agreement which has held up to now...If you go on asserting that I have abandoned 90% of psychoanalysis, I shall have to tell you most vehemently that younger psychoanalysts will find this opinion simply ridiculous...if we are going to talk numbers...my findings confirm 75% of the empirical discoveries of psychoanalysis, to which Freud attached decisive importance. I only criticize a metaphorical and theoretical superstructure which in addition, as Freud himself has explained, is partly hypothetical. I criticize the attempt, made in the spirit of the 90s, of naïve libido-energetic theory – again of a speculative nature. I think I am as completely justified in describing myself as a psychoanalyst as I ever was, at any rate exactly as the Americans in question call themselves Neo-Psychoanalysts.

Müller-Braunschweig found this letter of Schultz-Hencke's was „bristling with slanders, misrepresentations and insults.“ To Müller-Braunschweig „your view of metapsychology as an unnecessary and outdated set of hypotheses“ meant that Schultz-Hencke „held a different theory of the Unconscious from Freud's.“<sup>98</sup> Müller-Braunschweig held a minority position within the DGP, and it will be remembered that Schultz-Hencke had been allowed to continue

training candidates during the war. As a result of Müller-Braunschweig's tactical position, he and five others (one now known to have been a Nazi party member) organized a new German Psychoanalytic Association – (the „DPV“), which alone secured admission to the IPA at the Amsterdam Congress in 1951. As the Goggins have recently observed: „By supporting the admission of the DPV into the IPA, the leadership of the world psychoanalytic community had chosen to place theoretical orthodoxy as a more significant factor in readmission than the Nazification of the members being admitted.“<sup>99</sup>

In the meantime Fromm, living in Mexico since 1950, discovered that he had somehow been dropped from being a direct member of the IPA. (Throughout the difficult conditions of World War II not even the general membership roster was maintained any longer in the *Bulletin* appearing in *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*.) In 1952 the sole direct member listed was Dr. Werner Kemper, who had cooperated with Boehm in supporting the „extermination of both homosexuals and soldiers experiencing 'battle fatigue.'“ Kemper was to be a significant source of disinformation about what had happened to psychoanalysis under the Nazis.<sup>100</sup> (He had also analyzed M. H. Göring's wife.) Further, Kemper had written on eugenics laws in Germany. Jones had evidently encouraged Kemper to go to Brazil, where Kemper got involved, before returning to Germany, in accusations of sanctioning torture.<sup>101</sup>

On May 28<sup>th</sup>, 1953 Fromm wrote to Ruth S. Eissler, IPA Secretary, % of the Institute of Psychoanalysis in London: Jones was by then Honorary President of the IPA.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would be kind enough to inform me on the following question: I have been a member-at-large of the International Psychoanalytic Association since about 1934, when I had to resign from the German Psychoanalytic Association [sic]. I find that my name does not appear any more on the [IPA] Association's list of members-at-large, although I never resigned, nor was I ever notified of a termination of my membership. Could you be kind enough to let me know what my status as a member is?



This letter bore an uncanny similarity to Fromm's equally poignant letter to Müller-Braunschweig in 1936.

Ruth Eissler replied from New York City on June 11<sup>th</sup>, 1953:

I have received your letter of May 28<sup>th</sup>.

Since 1946, the American Psychoanalytic Association [APA] is the only component Society of the International Psychoanalytic Association in this country.

As of 1946 the earlier automatic membership in the APA of people in various branch groups was replaced by a special routine requiring APA acknowledgement before prescribed analysts of branch societies automatically became members of the APA; lay analysts had a special hurdle in America.

Ruth Eissler's letter went on:

Membership in the I.P.A. depends on membership in a Component Society of the I.P.A. You are listed as a member of the Washington Psychoanalytic Society, which is not in itself a Component Society of the I.P.A. but is an Affiliate Society of the American. The old German Psychoanalytic Society no longer exists.

That was not true, and Ruth Eissler had to know it since the DPG's „provisional“ 1949 IPA admission had not been extended in 1951. And the DPG (still outside the IPA) functions in the year 2000. Or was she also meaning to say that the DPG no longer existed as far the IPA was concerned? Such thinking would have been in keeping with the old prejudice that to be outside the IPA was to render one not an analyst. Eissler continued:

A new Society was organized under the Chairmanship of Dr. Carl Müller-Braunschweig [DPV]....

Membership-at-Large in the I.P.A. may be acquired in exceptional cases, by those who were previously members of a Component Society of the I.P.A. A number of lay analysts in this country, who are not members of the American Psychoanalytic Association but who reapplied for membership in the I.P.A. were willing to be

screened by the Joint Screening Committee of the International and the American Associations. This Committee was established at the Congress at Amsterdam [1951] in order to help in the appraisal of foreign lay analysts for reinstatement of their membership in the I.P.A. It consists of three ex officio members: The President of the American Psychoanalytic Association; the Chairman of the Board on Professional Standards of the American Psychoanalytic Association; and a member of the Central Executive of the International Psychoanalytic Association who is a member of the American Psychoanalytic Association.

At present applications for reinstatement should be sent to me, as Chairman of the Joint Screening Committee, and should include a detailed curriculum vitae, including present activities.

I hope that this give you the information which you requested.

Fromm replied on June 29<sup>th</sup>:

Thank you very much for your answer to my letter.

I take it that if I want to continue my status as a member-at-large of the International Psychoanalytic Association, I would have to present the application for re-instatement. Before I make a decision, I would very much like to understand the situation a little better, and I would greatly appreciate it if you could enlighten me on the question of what is meant by a „screening“ of previous members-at-large. Does it mean that it is considered that they lost their status as members-at-large, and that the screening amounts practically to a new application for membership? Or if not, according to what principles is such a screening carried out? Would, for instance, the fact that my psychoanalytic views do not correspond to the views of the majority be one of the factors to be taken into consideration at the screening, and a reason for denial of membership?

I have to confess even to an ignorance concerning the principles governing the American Psychoanalytic Association with regard to the acceptance of members. Is





there any rule that as a matter of principle the American Association excludes all non-medical analysts?

Hoping that I am not imposing on your time too much by raising these questions, and thanking you for the trouble you might take in answering them,

Sincerely yours,

Ruth Eissler wrote back on July 27<sup>th</sup>, 1953; she had said as yet absolutely nothing about Fromm's many books, articles, or other well-known contributions to psychoanalysis. Nor could she possibly readily admit the truth that some lay analysts had been accepted as members of the American Psychoanalytic Association. The resolution at the Amsterdam Congress bearing on direct members had sounded like it was supposed to facilitate lay analysts, especially in America, becoming „direct“ members of the IPA. Although „the status of Members-at-Large“ was supposed to be granted after „careful evaluation of their qualifications,“ no hint was raised that this process could mean disqualifying people already accepted as direct members.<sup>102</sup>

Eissler continued in her earlier bureaucratic vein:

I am sorry that my answer to your letter of June 29<sup>th</sup> was delayed; however, the preparations of the 18<sup>th</sup> International Psychoanalytic Congress kept me quite busy.

In answer to your questions: At the 17<sup>th</sup> International Psychoanalytic Congress in Amsterdam, 1951 [where Müller-Braunschweig's new group -- the DPV -- won admittance], the Joint Screening Committee of the I.P.A. and the A.P.A. was established for the purpose of giving those lay analysts in North America who are not members of the A.P.A., and who had lost membership in the I.P.A. through the change of statutes of the International, the opportunity to be reinstated to membership. The American Psychoanalytic Association does not recognize lay analysts as members except those who had been members before 1939. All those lay analysts who used to be members at large in the I.P.A. and reside in North America have to reapply for membership through the Joint

Screening Committee. Most of the former lay-members at large have done so. The reinstatement depends on the recommendation of the committee, which consists of three ex-officio members; the President of the American Psychoanalytic Association; the Chairman of the Board of Standards of the American Psychoanalytic Association, and a member of the Central Executive of the I.P.A., who is also a member of the A.P.A.

After repeating her earlier legalisms, Ruth Eissler then put in a zinger of a paragraph:

I am, of course, not in the position of anticipating the recommendations of the Joint Screening Committee. Personally, though, I would assume that anyone who does not stand on the basic principles of psychoanalysis would anyway not be greatly interested in becoming a member of the International Psychoanalytic Association.

Fromm answered her one more time on August 26<sup>th</sup>, and evidently that was the end of their correspondence:

Thank you very much for your informative letter of July 27<sup>th</sup>.

I appreciate your comment that personally you assume that anyone who does not stand on the basic principles of psychoanalysis would not be interested in becoming a member of the International Psychoanalytic Association. I am sure you realize that the main issue is just what we mean by „basic principles“ of psychoanalysis. I consider myself as sharing these principles, but the question is, how broadly or how narrowly the International Psychoanalytic Association interprets them. It is also not quite the question of wanting to become a member of the International Psychoanalytic Association, but rather, of the reasons for being dropped from membership.

I shall give some more thought to the problem, and shall let you know in case I want to reopen the issue.

The logic of her argument might just as well imply that anyone who applied would automa-



tically be accepted, but Fromm knew she was not saying that. Clearly he wanted to remain – not „become“ – an IPA member. One might naively have thought she would be interested in bringing in his Mexican group to the IPA. But I doubt that Ruth Eissler would have responded the way she did entirely on her own hook; it remains to be seen, for example, whether the then IPA President, Heinz Hartmann, also living in New York City, or anyone in London, took part behind-the-scenes in this series of letters.

Perhaps now it makes more sense how Fromm could legitimately defend himself against Marcuse-like charges that he was some sort of conformist. He had, for example, been risking his standing in the Washington Psychoanalytic Society by carrying on training not authorized by the APA. In 1971 he wrote protesting to Martin Jay, a historian, the whole line of Marcuse's thinking that held that Fromm had ever given up essential Freudianism. Fromm argued that he considered Jay's manuscript's thesis „a very drastic statement only possible from the standpoint of orthodox Freudianism.“<sup>103</sup> Fromm was also unknowingly echoing Schultz-Hencke against Müller-Braunschweig, although politically Fromm was unlike them untarnished by any collaborative politics. Like Lacan in France Fromm had to protest: „I have never wanted to found a school of my own.“

I was removed by the International Psychoanalytic Association from membership in this Association to which I had belonged, and am still a member of the Washington Psychoanalytic Association, which is Freudian. I have always criticized the Freudian orthodoxy and the bureaucratic methods of the Freudian international organization, but my whole theoretical work is based on what I consider Freud's most important findings, with the exception of his metapsychological findings. (This, incidentally, is the reverse of Marcuse's position, who bases his thinking entirely on Freud's metapsychology and ignores completely his clinical findings, that is to say, the unconscious, character, resistance, etc.)<sup>104</sup>

Marcuse and his allies at the Frankfurt school had become unconsciously authoritarian in identifying with the powers-that-be in orthodox psychoanalytic thinking.

Fromm had obviously been deeply hurt at his 1953 ostracism from the IPA, and he would have been entitled to have been both resentful and offended in his pride. (The IPA continues today to have „direct“ members, but none has ever matched Fromm's own singular contributions.) Fromm was unlike Reich in that he did not publicize his being persecuted. If Fromm had been a better bureaucratic infighter, he might have known the character of Müller-Braunschweig's crew that had just been accepted as the DPV at the IPA, and Fromm could have disputed Ruth Eissler's contention that the DPG no longer existed.

Book-writing was probably a better way of Fromm's proceeding. It would be in the spirit of the ideals of the 18<sup>th</sup> century Enlightenment to believe that concepts are more important than analytic lineage, or a family tree. Fromm had a genuinely radical spirit within psychoanalysis, which has been ignored by the partisans in behalf of Marcuse's point of view.

It had to complicate Fromm's position that he did not share Schultz-Hencke's „neo-Freudianism,“ and Fromm distanced himself ideologically from Adler and Jung as well – they are the arch-heretics in IPA reasoning, but Fromm was still somehow caught in that tradition of thought. Fromm's own struggle was unlike theirs, because it could not be considered in any way as a personal problem that he had had with Freud. In 1961, after Schultz-Hencke's death, Fromm would join with the DPG and other non-IPA groups (like the White Institute) to set up the International Federation of Psychoanalytic Societies.

Marcuse's idea that Fromm was a conformist is repudiated by this whole tale of the steps in his exclusion from the IPA. Fromm could readily acknowledge having given up his orthodox psychoanalytic views after about ten years of clinical practicing, and he was – unlike most others – willing to stand alone. That he sometimes had allies like Horney, Clara Thompson, and Harry Stack Sullivan, as well as others, should not detract from the singularity of Fromm's achievement. The unique success of Fromm's books meant that he could appeal over the heads of the IPA leaders. And in challenging Jones about Ferenczi (and Rank), as well



as in writing *Sigmund Freud's Mission*, Fromm at least settled a score there. (According to Fromm's literary executor, Rainer Funk, Fromm felt uncomfortable enough about a critique he had published of Rank in the late 1930s so as not to want to have it reprinted.<sup>105</sup>)

And then the future rewarded Fromm in an unexpected way. As we saw, he had been able to be cut out of the IPA because he was not, as a lay analyst, entitled to be a member of the American Psychoanalytic Association, at that time the only constituent body of the IPA in America. Yet for years he had been prominently associated with the White Institute, and it would be members from that group who in the 1980s would play a substantial role in successfully launching a restraint-of-trade anti-trust law-suit against the training restrictions of the IPA and the American Psychoanalytic Institute.<sup>106</sup> Ironically, Ruth Eissler's husband Kurt had in 1965 written a long book defending non-medical analysis.<sup>107</sup> With all the examples of accommodation, adaptation, cowardice, and opportunism in the course of recounting how Fromm came to be dropped from the IPA, he himself comes across thoroughly self-respecting.

It is hard to see how Fromm could have done other in 1936 than to accept Jones's offer of becoming a „direct“ IPA member; but having done so he was left, as a lay analyst in America, in an exposed position. In hindsight it should be a truism that what an IPA President grants can just as easily be taken away, even by the Secretary. Fromm was not, as when the DPG excluded its Jewish members in late 1935, even informed after the fact of what had happened to his status as a direct member. Meanwhile it will be up to the reader to evaluate whether Ruth Eissler's edict was right that Fromm had become at odds with the „basic principles“ of psychoanalysis.

A more important matter may be the general problem of how human beings accommodate themselves in social crises. For those of us who have never had to live through the experiences of such trying times as in Central Europe during the 1930s and the War itself, it is tempting to suppose that human beings might have behaved with more honor in the face of Nazi tyranny, rather than to engage in so many varie-

ties of Machiavellianism. After all, analysts were almost uniquely equipped to practice their profession abroad. On the other hand, all of us are inevitably enmeshed in the life of the ideologies of our times. We today merely have to deal with charges associated with „political correctness“, as opposed to the question of whether neo-Freudianism could be considered fascistic. Still, as clear-sighted a view of the past as possible still seems to me desirable, and in keeping with Fromm's teachings.

It has to be striking that the story of Fromm's exclusion from the IPA, with all its ramifications, has so far remained untold. It is not easy to follow things when someone as talented as Jones was capable of getting narrative rabbits out of a hat. For example, in the Paris Congress in 1938 he had maintained:

The German Society continues to live a somewhat delicate existence. The new German Institute for Psychological Research and Psychotherapy [the Göring Institute], of which the Psychoanalytic Society is a separate department, was founded in May, 1936. The department has enjoyed considerable autonomy, many candidates have been trained and the total membership list increased.

And Jones reported that as of November 1938 the German Psychoanalytic Society (DPG), transformed into Working Group A, had resigned its membership of the IPA.<sup>108</sup> Unless one had followed the whole story with closest scrutiny, it would be impossible to understand what had actually happened. By 1957 Jones could, as we have seen, make the somersault of authoritatively writing in his Freud biography that psychoanalysis in German had been „liquidated“ as of 1934. And it has taken almost fifty years Jones wrote those words to untangle the trickery behind his reasoning.

Freud was himself a great writer, and enduringly important enough as a thinker for us to be able to understand how his flaws could be partly those of the times. When he died in London in 1939, he was eighty-three years old; I believe that he partly stayed in Vienna because of the doctors familiar with his case, and in London his health went downhill rapidly. He does not need any more of our mythologizing, and his life can sustain the closest scrutiny. We have



been told of a meeting that Freud had with Boehm in November 1936; Freud had ended the meeting with an admonition to Boehm which was „in a reality a tactful indirect condemnation. He said: ‘You may make all kinds of sacrifices, but you are not to make any concessions.’“<sup>109</sup> Old World charm should not ever take us in; Freud and the IPA had already made abundant concessions, and would continue to do so, even though we in the New World can be gullible in mistaking hypocrisy for the truth. A central theme in Henry James’s novels was how European manners and American sincerity keep colliding with one another.

Even when we try to admit all the faults we are apt to have in North America, it does not mean that one need turn a blind eye to the dubious means it took, under the guidance of Freud, Jones, and others, for the IPA to become the powerful institution it was to become. Luckily Fromm’s own form of resistance did not have to take the tragic shape of Rittmeister’s in Germany during the war. The choice is not, as Jones would have had it, between psychoanalysis and politics, but what the proper relationship should be between those inevitably different sorts of inquiries.

#### Notes

1. Paul Roazen, *Oedipus in Britain: Edward Glover and the Struggle Over Klein* (New York, Other Press, 2000).
2. Paul Roazen, „The Problem of Silence: Training Analyses,“ forthcoming
3. Ernst Falzeder, „Family Tree Matters,“ *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, Vol. 43 (1998), pp. 127-54, and Ernst Falzeder, „The Threads of Psychoanalytic Filiations or Psychoanalysis Taking Effect,“ in *100 Years of Psychoanalysis, Contributions to the History of Psychoanalysis*, ed. Andre Haynal & Ernst Falzeder (Geneva, Cahiers Psychiatriques Genevois, Special Issue, 1994), pp. 169-94.
4. See, for example, Erich Fromm, „The Method and Function of an Analytic Social Psychology“ and „Psychoanalytic Characterology and Its Relevance for Social Psychology,“ in *The Crisis of Psychoanalysis* (N.Y., Holt Rinehart, 1970), as well as a 1935 paper; Erich Fromm, „The Social Background of Psychoanalytic Therapy,“ translated by Caroline Newton (New York Public Li-

- brary); *Escape From Freedom* (New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1941). See Paul Roazen, „Fromm’s *Escape From Freedom* and His Standing Today,“ *International Forum for Psychoanalysis*, in press.
5. Erich Fromm, *Man For Himself: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics* (New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1947), Erich Fromm, *Psychoanalysis and Religion* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1950), Erich Fromm, *The Forgotten Language: An Introduction to the Understanding of Dreams, Fairy Tales and Myths* (New York, Grove Press, 1957), Erich Fromm, *The Sane Society* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1956).
6. Erich Fromm and Michael Maccoby, *Social Character in a Mexican Village: A Sociopschoanalytic Study* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall, 1970; new edition, with an Introduction by Michael Maccoby, New Brunswick, N.J., Transaction, 1996).
7. Erich Fromm, *The Art of Loving* ((London, George Allen & Unwin, 1957), Erich Fromm, *To Have Or To Be?* (New York, Harper & Row, 1976), and Erich Fromm, *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness* (New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973).
8. Ernest Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, Vols. 1-3 (New York, Basic Books, 1953-57), Erich Fromm, *Sigmund Freud’s Mission: An Analysis of His Personality and Influence* (New York, Harper & Brothers, 1959).
9. Fromm, *Sigmund Freud’s Mission*, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-06.
10. Erich Fromm, „Psychoanalysis – Science or Party Line,“ reprinted in *The Dogma of Christ and Other Essays on Religion, Psychology and Culture* (New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963), pp. 131-44.
11. Neil McLaughlin, „How to Become a Forgotten Intellectual: Intellectual Movements and the Rise and Fall of Erich Fromm,“ *Sociological Forum*, Vol. 13 (1998), pp. 215-48; Neil McLaughlin, „Why Do Schools of Thought Fail? Neo-Freudianism as a Case Study in the Sociology of Knowledge,“ *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 34 (1998), pp. 113-34. See also Daniel Burston, *The Legacy of Erich Fromm* (Cambridge, Mass.. Harvard University Press, 1991).
12. See Erich Fromm, „The Dogma of Christ,“ in *The Dogma of Christ*, *op. cit.*
13. Lawrence J. Friedman, *Identity’s Architect: A Biography of Erik H. Erikson* (New York, Scribner, 1999), p. 162. Erik H. Erikson, *Childhood and Society* (New York, Norton, 1950).
14. See Paul Roazen, *Erik H. Erikson: the Power and*



- Limits of a Vision* (N.Y., The Free Press, 1976; Northvale, N.J., Aronson, 1997).
15. Erik H. Erikson, *Young Man Luther: A Study in Psychoanalysis and History* (New York, Norton, 1958), p. 239.
  16. Karl Menninger, „Loneliness in the Modern World,” *The Nation*, Vol. 154 (March 14, 1942), p. 317.
  17. Otto Fenichel, „Psychoanalytic Remarks on Fromm’s Book *Escape From Freedom*,” in *The Collected Papers of Otto Fenichel*, second series (N.Y., Norton, 1954), Ch. 19, pp. 260-77; see also Otto Fenichel, *119 Rundbriefe*, Vol. 2 (Frankfurt, Stroemfeld, 1998), ed Elke Mühleitner & Johannes Reichmayr, pp. 1559-89.
  18. See Paul Roazen, „Book Review of *Ideas and Identities: the Life and Work of Erik H. Erikson*,” ed. Wallerstein & Goldberger, *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, Summer 2000.
  19. Rainer Funk, *Erich Fromm: His Life and Ideas*, translated by Ian Portman and Manuela Kunkel (New York, Continuum, 2000), pp. 74-77.
  20. Karen Brecht, Volker Friedrich, Ludger Hermanns, Isidor Kaminer, Dierk Juelich (editors), „*Here Life Goes On In a Most Peculiar Way...*,” translated by Christine Trollope (London, Kellner-Goethe Institute, 1993), p. 72.
  21. Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 3, *op. cit.*, p. 182.
  22. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 112.
  23. Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 3, *op. cit.*, p. 183.
  24. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 83.
  25. *Ibid.*
  26. See Paul Roazen, *Meeting Freud’s Family* (Amherst, University of Massachusetts Press, 1993), p. 80.
  27. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 101.
  28. I am indebted here to Han Israels.
  29. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 118.
  30. *Ibid.*, p. 119.
  31. „New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis,” *Standard Edition*, Vol. 22, p. 144.
  32. *Reich Speaks of Freud: Wilhelm Reich Discusses His Work and His Relationship with Sigmund Freud* (New York, Noonday Press, 1968), p. 159.
  33. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 121.
  34. Fromm, *Sigmund Freud’s Mission*, *op. cit.*, p. 65. See also *The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Ernest Jones 1908-1939*, ed. R. Andrew Paskauskas (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1993), p. 335.
  35. *Reich Speaks of Freud*, *op. cit.*, p. 189.
  36. Myron Sharaf, *Fury on Earth: A Biography of Wilhelm Reich* (New York, St. Martin’s Press, 1983), p. 185.
  37. Paul Roazen, *Freud and His Followers* (New York, Knopf, 1975; reprinted, New York, Da Capo, 1992), pp. 370, 503-06.
  38. Ilse Ollendorf Reich, *Wilhelm Reich: A Personal Biography* (N.Y., St. Martin’s, 1969), p. 31.
  39. *Ibid.*, p. 31
  40. Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 3, *op. cit.*, p. 191.
  41. Ilse Reich, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
  42. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 172.
  43. See Henri F. Ellenberger, *The Discovery of the Unconscious* (New York, Basic Books, 1970), pp. 640-41.
  44. Quoted in James E. Goggin and Eileen Brockman Goggin, *From the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute to the Göring Institute: The Metamorphosis of Psychoanalysis During the Third Reich and Beyond* (manuscript), p. 87.
  45. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 172.
  46. Käthe Drager, „Psychoanalysis in Hitler’s Germany,” *American Imago*, Vol. 29 (1972), pp. 199-214.
  47. Geoffrey Cocks, „Book Review,” *Psychohistory Review*, Vol. 24 (1996), p. 211.
  48. Bernard J. Paris, *Karen Horney: A Psychoanalytist’s Search for Self-Understanding* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1994), p. 118.
  49. Karen Horney, *Our Inner Conflicts: A Constructive Theory of Neurosis* (New York, Norton, 1945), p. 11.
  50. Karen Horney, *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1937), p. 38; Karen Horney, *New Ways in Psychoanalysis* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1939), p. 95; Karen Horney, *Neurosis and Human Growth: The Struggle Toward Self-Realization* (New York, Norton, 1950), p. 369; Karen Horney, *Feminine Psychology*, ed. Harold Kelman (New York, Norton, 1967), p. 228.
  51. Paul Roazen, „Jung and Anti-Semitism,” in *Lingering Shadows*, ed. Aryah Maidenbaum (Boston, Shambhala, 1991), pp.211-21.
  52. Quoted in Fritz Stern, „Fink Shrinks,” *The New York Review of Books* (Dec. 19, 1985), p. 48, n.3.
  53. Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 3, *op. cit.*, p. 186.
  54. Roazen, *Freud and His Followers*, *op. cit.*, p. 293.
  55. Geoffrey Cocks, *Psychotherapy in the Third Reich* (N.Y., Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 127.
  56. Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 3, *op. cit.*, p. 187.
  57. *Ibid.*, p. 185.
  58. Rainer Funk, „Erich Fromm’s Role in the Foundation of the IFPS,” *Fromm Forum* (International



- Erich Fromm Society), Vol. 3 (1999), p. 22.
59. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 139.
  60. *Ibid.*
  61. *Ibid.*, p. 126; Goggin, *op. cit.*, p. 151.
  62. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 126.
  63. Goggin, *op. cit.*, p. 90.
  64. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 78.
  65. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 126.
  66. *Ibid.*, p. 181.
  67. Goggin, *op. cit.*, p. 152.
  68. Goggin, *op. cit.*, p. 154; Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 129.
  69. Goggin, *op. cit.*, p. 133.
  70. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 137.
  71. Peter J. Loewenberg, „Foreward,“ Geoffrey Cocks, *Treating Mind and Body: Essays in the History of Science, Professions, and Society Under Extreme Conditions* (New Brunswick, N.J., Transaction, 1998), pp.ix-x.
  72. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 134.
  73. Goggin, *op. cit.*, p. 149.
  74. Brecht, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-31.
  75. *Ibid.*, p. 134.
  76. *Ibid.*, p. 136.
  77. *Ibid.*, p. 138. I am indebted to Rainer Funk for having allowed me to make copies from his Fromm Archives of the correspondence between Müller-Braunschweig and Fromm, the letters between Jones and Fromm, and the later exchanges between Ruth Eissler and Fromm.
  78. Funk, *op. cit.*, p.23.
  79. Goggin, *op. cit.*, p. 163.
  80. Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 3, *op. cit.*, p. 221.
  81. Goggin, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
  82. See Paul Roazen, „Psychoanalytic Ethics: Freud, Mussolini, and Edoardo Weiss,“ *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, October 1991.
  83. Goggin, *op. cit.*, p. 213.
  84. *Ibid.*, p. 205.
  85. Drager, *op. cit.*, p. 212. See also, Rose Spiegel, Gerard Chrzanowski, Arthur Feiner, „On Psychoanalysis in the Third Reich,“ *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, Vol. 11 (1975), pp. 477-510; Feiner, „Psychoanalysis During the Nazis,“ *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, Vol. 13 (1985), pp. 537-45; Rose Spiegel, „Survival, Psychoanalysis and the Third Reich,“ *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, Vol. 13 (1985), pp. 521-36.
  86. Goggin, *op. cit.*, p. 221.
  87. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 154.
  88. *Ibid.*, p. 168.
  89. Cocks, *Psychotherapy in the Third Reich*, *op. cit.*, p. 12. See Paul Roazen, *Encountering Freud: the Politics and Histories of Psychoanalysis* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1990), pp. 34-37.
  90. Cocks, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
  91. Goggin, *op. cit.*, p. 224.
  92. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 199.
  93. *Ibid.*, p. 201.
  94. Esther Menaker, *Appointment in Vienna* (New York, St. Martin's Press, 1989), p. 40. Reprinted as *Misplaced Loyalties* (New Brunswick, N.J., Transaction, 1995).
  95. Brecht, *op. cit.*, p. 217.
  96. *Ibid.*, p. 202.
  97. Goggin, *op. cit.*, p. 262.
  98. Brecht, *op. cit.*, pp.204-207.
  99. Goggin, *op. cit.*, p. 265.
  100. *Ibid.*, pp. 192, 305.
  101. Helena Besserman Vianna, *Politique de la Psychoanalyse Face à la Dictature et à la Torture* (Paris, Harmattan, 1999).
  102. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, Vol. 33 (1952), p. 256.
  103. Erich Fromm, in Michael Kessler/Rainer Funk, *Erich Fromm und die Frankfurter Schule*, Francke Verlag, 1991, p. 251. See Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950* (Boston, Little Brown, 1973).
  104. Fromm, *Ibid.*, p. 151.
  105. Erich Fromm, „The Social Philosophy of ‘Will Therapy,‘“ *Psychiatry*, Vol. 2 (1939), pp. 229-237.
  106. Robert S. Wallerstein, *Lay Analysis: Life Inside the Controversy* (New York, The Analytic Press, 1998).
  107. Kurt R. Eissler, *Medical Orthodoxy and the Future of Psychoanalysis* (New York, International Universities Press, 1965).
  108. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, Vol. 20 (1939), p. 123.
  109. Richard F. Sterba, *Reminiscences of a Viennese Psychoanalyst* (Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1982), pp. 157.

Copyright © 2001 by Professor Dr. Paul Roazen, 2009 by the Estate of Paul Roazen.