



---

Hogenson\_G\_B\_2003

## **Review Roazen, P., *The exclusion of Erich Fromm from the IPA***

George B. Hogenson

Source: *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, Vol. 48 (No. 1, 2003), pp. 127-130.

Paul Roazen's contributions to the historiography of psychoanalysis are well known, characterized as they are by meticulous documentary research and a willingness to confront where necessary the shadow side of Freud's 'movement'. The present paper is a case in point for, the dry title notwithstanding, Roazen has here pieced together an overview of the machiavellian machinations - no milder words are appropriate - that swirled around the German psychoanalytic community at the time of the Nazi rise to power and during the immediate post-war years. Erich Fromm's post-war misadventures with the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA) are thus a device for opening a window into a complex and disturbing pattern of manipulation which, beginning with Freud himself and carried on by Ernest Jones and others, used the rise of the Nazis to pursue vendettas and purges within the still largely Jewish psychoanalytic movement.

Needless to say, familiarity with the relationships established between the psychoanalytic movement and the National Socialists has important consequences for our understanding of the period generally, but also for the ways in which we think about Jung's engagement with Nazism. While the famous photograph of Jung standing beside Dr. Matthias H. Göring, who had been put in charge of German psychology by the Nazis, is often cited by Jung's critics as a touchstone of his 'collaboration' with the Nazi tyranny, we now have Jones writing to Anna Freud, in July of 1936, that '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' (p. 19).

After the war, Jung argued that his association with the Nazis was in the interest of protecting psychology and psychoanalysis from the Nazi threat. His major claim in this regard was his introduction of a form of general membership in the International General Medical Society of Psychotherapy, which allowed Jewish therapists to retain some institutional affiliation after they were expelled from their German societies. On its face, Jones was engaged in a similar effort, establishing an at large membership in the International Psychoanalytic Association and seeking ways to insure the survival of the German Psychoanalytic Society (DPG) in the face of the Nazi takeover. Jung, of course, had at least one ulterior motive, which is now well documented, of pursuing a vendetta against Freud and his close associates who had spent the twenty years since the break demonizing Jung as an unscientific woolly-headed mystic. As Roazen makes clear, nothing in the behaviour of the psychoanalysts at the same time can reduce Jung's culpability, but, in their pursuit of their own ulterior motives, their behaviour does allow us to see the extent to which the rise of the Nazis opened the door to the shadow side of any-



---

one who did not engage in outright resistance. In the case of psychoanalysis it was Freud's own authoritarian tendencies that provided the motive force behind an effort to 'purge' any deviationists from the 'movement'. Erich Fromm, along with Wilhelm Reich and the now less well-known Herald Schultz-Hencke, became prime targets for this exclusionary effort.

Drawing on his own previous work on Freud's relations with Italian Fascism (Roazen 1991) and the just published work of Goggin and Goggin (Goggin & Goggin 2001), Roazen provides a telling anecdote regarding Freud's authoritarian leanings in the 1930 s. The Chancellor of Austria, Engelbert Dollfuss, had put down a Marxist revolt in Vienna by suspending parliament and bombarding a huge socialist housing project in the city, following which Martin, Freud's son, 'strikingly hung a picture of Dollfuss in the office of Freud's psychoanalytic press' (p. 26). 'Freud's authoritarian political leanings', Roazen comments, have 'generally gone unrecognized, although at the time it was heartbreaking 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 "betrayal" of the local socialists' (ibid.).

This is the environment within which Erich Fromm found himself in the 1930 s. Fromm had made his first presentation to the German Psychoanalytic Society as a guest in 1927, having studied sociology under Max Weber's younger brother Alfred at the University of Heidelberg (p. 9). Fromm's training as a sociologist would eventually be used against him by such varied psychoanalysts as Karl Menninger and Erik Erikson, who would refer to Fromm as a sociologist rather than as an analyst, when expediency demanded that they distanced themselves from his 'revisionist' ideas - this despite the fact that by 1932 Fromm had been made a full member of the DPG and was thereby eligible for full membership in the IPA. Over the next two years the great exodus of Jewish intellectuals was to commence due to the rise of the Nazis. Fromm was not actually part of the exodus because he had left Germany somewhat earlier. Nevertheless, he soon found himself in the same expatriate position as the others and began searching for a new home as an analyst.

In Germany, meanwhile, the Nazi Aryanization laws were coming into effect. Max Eitingon was compelled to resign as Abraham's successor at the head of the DPG. Jones later recounted some of the events of 1933 in what Roazen characterizes as his 'obfuscatory manner', writing in his biography of Freud that the Polish Eitingon resigned because 'no foreigner was to function in the central executive committee of any medical society' (p. 11). By framing the issue in this manner, Jones ignored the fact that far more stringent prohibitions, and the ones eventually relevant to the removal of the Jewish members of the Society, involved the exclusion of Jews altogether, and not just from executive committees. Why would Jones be so elliptical about this turn of events?

The evidence that Roazen marshals points in only one direction. In order to preserve the psychoanalytic movement in Germany it became necessary to hand control over to the non-Jewish members of the Society. Leadership therefore fell to the psychoanalytically orthodox Carl Müller-Braunschweig and Felix Boehm, despite their willingness to collaborate with the Nazis at every turn. Freud willingly endorsed such a reorganization as an expedient of the times, insisting only that psychoanalytic deviationists like Schultz-Hencke (a Gentile with a Jew-



ish wife, and therefore himself officially subject to the anti-Jewish restrictions) be denied any leadership role. Should any such individual take over leadership in the German Society, Freud wrote to Jones, the Society was to be expelled from the IAP IPA until it could be 'absolved' (p. 11).

Fromm meanwhile had made his way to the United States, and was trying, as were many other émigrés, to scrape together a living. Given the turbulence of the times this was no easy task, and Fromm found himself in straitened circumstances. In the midst of his difficulties Müller-Braunschweig initiated, in early 1935, a correspondence demanding that Fromm paid up his dues to the Society. Following a tense exchange, Fromm undertook to pay by instalments. Later that year, under pressure from the Nazis, all the remaining Jewish members of the Society were encouraged to 'resign voluntarily' in the interest of preserving the society. Analyst Eva Rosenfeld remarked that this request involved 'too high a degree of masochism' equivalent to being asked that they 'had voluntarily to become their own executioners' (p. 23). Roazen cites the historian and analyst Peter Loewenberg's observation that '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' (ibid.). Despite his absence from Germany, Fromm now found himself caught up in the efforts of Freud and Jones to purify the psychoanalytic movement at all costs.

Other dissident or revisionist analysts were also the targets of these organizational stratagems, most notably Wilhelm Reich. Fromm, however, was able to secure what he thought would be a 'Nansen' membership - after the 'Nansen passport' introduced by the Norwegian explorer and diplomat for otherwise undocumented refugees - in the IAP IPA. In Fromm's mind this at large membership should have secured his position within the IAP IPA for the duration of his time in the United States. However, after the war events took another course. At the end of the war, the fact that Müller-Braunschweig had, in the words of Jones, remained one of the 'true, real, genuine analysts' (p. 29) in Germany allowed him to remain at the head of the German Society despite his deep Nazi affiliations. In this regard, Roazen cites the work of the Goggins who observe:

By supporting the admission of the DPV (German Psychoanalytic Association) 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. The revisionist Schultz-Hencke became the 'designated sole Nazi collaborator' in the words of Antonovsky, and as such, the 'displacement object of their common guilt.' (p. 31)

Fromm, now under attack by Karl Menninger as a dangerous revisionist, suddenly found that he had inexplicably been 'dropped from being a direct member of the IPA'. In fact, the only direct member on the IPA list was one Dr. Werner Kemper, who had written in support of the Nazi eugenic laws and helped formulate the Wehrmacht regulations that effectively condemned to death soldiers experiencing battle fatigue. After the war, Jones recommended that Kemper move to Brazil (p. 31). Fromm, therefore, initiated a new correspondence with Ruth Eissler, who had recently become secretary of the IPA.



Eissler's replies to Fromm, on this and subsequent occasions, present a study in cant and dissimulation. In essence, her argument boils down to the following line of logic: If Fromm had been a member at large beginning in 1934, as he claimed, he was no longer a member at large because he was not on the list. Not being on the list, he had to apply for readmission. Since he now lived at least part time in the United States - the rest of the time being spent in Mexico - he would have to abide by the rules of the American Psychoanalytic Association (APA) regarding admission. Admission to the APA entailed a complex vetting process that placed particularly onerous obstacles in the way of a 'lay analyst' like Fromm. Eissler never took up Fromm's publications or his long association with the psychoanalytic movement. Having dragged the correspondence out with assorted legalities, Eissler finally remarked that she 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' (p. 34).

At this point Fromm capitulated, remarking only that what precisely the 'basic principles' of psychoanalysis were taken to be was a point of some dispute.

Fromm abandoned his efforts to rejoin the psychoanalytic establishment, but he continued to produce the important works that established his reputation as an observer of the human condition. As Roazen notes, by the 1960s it was more often by way of Fromm's writings than by any other course that young college students made their first acquaintance with psychoanalysis. Indeed the extent to which Fromm's influence had settled into the culture, at least in the United States, was marked for me personally, when, in 1966, as a senior in high school, I received a copy of his book *The Art of Loving* (Fromm 1957) as a prize in an extemporaneous speech contest. But the official world of psychoanalysis was closed to him, and he remained a more or less solitary investigator until his death in 1980. Roazen's tell-tale is one of shabby opportunism on the part of a group of men and women who liked to think of themselves as paragons of integrity, possessed of unique insight into the shortcomings and difficulties of conscious life and human motivation. Our understanding of the Nazi era continues to evolve and unfold, and Roazen here gives us an important overview of what was happening in the world of Freud's 'movement'. In the end, we can see how empty the claim really is, voiced by Franz Alexander in 1966 and repeated in various forms ever since, that Jung 'lacked Freud's uncompromising moral fortitude' (p. 18).

## References

- Fromm, E. (1957). *The Art of Loving*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Goggin, J. E. & Goggin, E. B. (2001). *Death of a 'Jewish Science': Psychoanalysis in the Third Reich*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
- Roazen, P. (1991). 'Psychoanalytic ethics: Freud, Mussolini and Edoardo Weiss'. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 27.