1986
c.2
Gen

THE REPRESSION OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

Otto Fenichel and the Political Freudians

RUSSELL JACOBY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
Chicago and London

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 60637
The University of Chicago Press, Ltd., London

© 1983 by Basic Books, Inc.
All rights reserved. Published 1983
University of Chicago Press edition 1986
Printed in the United States of America

95 94 93 92 91 90 89 88 87 86 5 4 3 2 1

Reprinted by arrangement with
Basic Books, Inc.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING IN PUBLICATION DATA

Jacoby, Russell.
The repression of psychoanalysis.

Reprint. Originally published: New York : Basic Books, 1983.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Psychoanalysis—Political aspects. 2. Psychoanalysis—Social aspects. 3. Philosophy, Marxist. 4. Fenichel, Otto. 5. Psychoanalysts—Germany—Biography. 6. Psychoanalysts—United States—Biography. 7. Freud, Sigmund, 1856–1939. 8. United States—Social conditions. I. Title.
[BF175.J28 1986] 150.19'52 86–11358
ISBN 0–226-39069–1 (pbk.)

For Naomi—again

PREFACE *ix*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS *xv*

CHAPTER ONE
The Repression of Psychoanalysis 3

CHAPTER TWO
Spring's Awakening: Analysts as Rebels 37

CHAPTER THREE
The Berlin Institute: The Politics of Psychoanalysis 62

CHAPTER FOUR
Exile: The Secret Freudians and Their *Rundbriefe* 76

CHAPTER FIVE
Psychoanalysis and Its Discontents: Freudians Against Freudians 98

CHAPTER SIX
The Illusion of a Future: Political Psychoanalysis in the United States 118

CHAPTER SEVEN
The Americanization of Psychoanalysis 134

APPENDIX
Four *Rundbriefe* 161

NOTES 164

INDEX 189

PREFACE

THE SPECTER of psychoanalysis continues to haunt society; few, however, are frightened. Over the years the ghost has become a ghost of itself. It traded a threatening, sometimes revolutionary, mien for an affable comportment. At the end of his career, one of the deans of American psychoanalysis, Clarence P. Oberndorf, who had studied with Freud in the early 1920s, reflected with some disappointment that psychoanalysis had turned "legitimate and respectable" as well as "sluggish and smug." Once incorporated into medical schools, psychoanalysis came to attract those who "find security in conformity and propriety."

Oberndorf drew these conclusions three decades ago, in 1953, in his *History of Psychoanalysis in America.* In the interim they have not lost their truth; on the contrary, they have gained truth and lost meaning. History often proceeds not by refuting past insights, but by depriving them of referents; in so doing, those insights are undercut, and lose the ability both to convince and to attract attention. They become inexplicable pronouncements from another era. Today, it is no longer apparent that psychoanalysis was ever rebellious or that it was ever anything but sluggish and smug.

At the moment Oberndorf passed his judgments, Robert Lindner, a Baltimore analyst, confirmed them; he denounced

psychoanalysis for succumbing to the conformist spirit sweeping America. Lindner, now almost forgotten, bucked the analytic and cultural trends of the 1950s in a series of books, *Rebel without a Cause, Prescription for Rebellion, Must You Conform?* Hardly a typical analyst, Lindner was an isolated figure, and when he died at the youthful age of forty-one in 1956, he had few analytic allies and no successors.

My account of the repression of psychoanalysis closes with a discussion of Robert Lindner. He stood at the end, perhaps beyond the end, of a long and far-reaching tradition of dissenting and political Freudians. Categorization is inseparable from miscategorization; I realize it is misleading to label these analysts as "political Freudians," as if they constituted some distinct subspecies of psychoanalysis. Rather, the political Freudians were heirs to and representatives of classical psychoanalysis, and they shared its fate; they sank into the psychoanalytic unconscious. When they are remembered, they are only half-remembered.

Today the careful clinical and theoretical works of an Otto Fenichel or an Edith Jacobson or an Annie Reich appear to exemplify the best of main-line psychoanalysis. Yet this perception is incomplete to the point of falsehood; in fact, the misperception is mute proof of the repression and self-repression of psychoanalysis. An entire dimension of the lives of these analysts has fallen into obscurity. They were not only sterling examples of establishment psychoanalysis; they were also political and analytic rebels.

The story of Otto Fenichel and a circle of analysts that included Edith Jacobson and Annie Reich exposes a virtually unknown chapter in the often strange history of psychoanalysis. As fascism drove them out of central Europe, Fenichel secretly rallied and led a number of opposition analysts. For over a decade, until 1945, Fenichel sent out *Rundbriefe* ("round letters") to a band of analysts who shared his political

and analytic orientation. The letters were secret; and insofar as Fenichel counseled recipients to destroy them, few outside his circle knew of the letters or the group. Through these communications Fenichel's circle kept alive a political and subversive psychoanalysis—to little avail. By the time of Lindner's lonely protest, Fenichel's group no longer encroached on the consciousness of psychoanalysis.

The theoretical commitments of the political Freudians did not mark them as pariahs or eccentrics; rather, they fairly represented the second generation of psychoanalysts, and more, they fairly represented classical psychoanalysis. Like them, Freud himself valued psychoanalysis more as a general theory of civilization than as an individual treatment; to be sure, it was both. Even if the insights (and myths) contained in Freud's major texts—*The Future of an Illusion* or *Civilization and Its Discontents*—were derived from a therapeutic situation, they went far beyond it. To this spirit of audacious theorizing the political Freudians remained devoted.

The psychoanalytic profession, however, abandoned Freud's bold theorizing and questioning. Against Freud's profound hopes, psychoanalysis became insular, medical, and clinical. It surrendered the general cultural terrain that Freud had staked out. Even the language of psychoanalysis came to reflect this surrender. To read almost any text by Freud is to enjoy a limpid and forthright style. Freud wrote simply and elegantly for a wide cultural audience. Much of Freud's greatness and impact, I believe, derives from this talent, the ability and wish to reach an educated public. Few recent American analysts have inherited either this capability or urge. In a technical and medical prose, contemporary analysts complacently write for one another.

In this book, I do not attribute this general abdication to a loss of talent; rather, I trace it to the cumulative effect of exile, professionalization, and Americanization, which prompted

analysts to retreat both from public issues and a public forum. The first generations of analysts embraced psychoanalysis with a missionary zeal; they sought to reform the world or, at least, its sexual and social codes. They were rebellious intellectuals with broad cultural and political commitments. The spirit and ethos that animated them and their psychoanalysis did not endure.

The onset of nazism marked a break in psychoanalysis. Expelled from continental Europe, psychoanalysis shifted primarily to England and the United States. Psychoanalysis prospered in its new quarters; however, its very success hid the discontinuities, perhaps even defeats. The cultural and political spirit of classical analysis vaporized. In the course of its decades in America, psychoanalysis became in myth, and almost in fact, little more than an affluent medical specialty with an affluent clientele. By the 1950s few remembered how many of the early analysts were rebels or radicals or, simply, maverick intellectuals and humanitarians.

I survey the repression of psychoanalysis by way of the political Freudians of the second generation. The analysts of this generation were born at the turn of the century and were in the middle of their careers when fascism forced them into exile. They straddled two worlds: the world of classical psychoanalysis that flourished in the 1920s and 1930s, and that of an American psychoanalysis that matured in the 1940s and 1950s. Consequently, the transformation of psychoanalysis—its theoretical retreat—is etched in the lives of these analysts; and insofar as their project required living contact with a classical tradition, the fate of the political Freudians testifies to the general fate of psychoanalysis.

I should clarify that I do not believe for an instant that the immigrant analysts were hapless victims of a vulgar American culture. They were grateful—more than grateful—to live their lives and pursue their profession. They were victims of fascism,

not of American culture. Nevertheless, in their new homes, many assumed a reserve about their nonconformist ideas; and this caution facilitated, rather than caused, a constriction in the collective psychoanalytic vision.

This book will follow the rise and fall of the political Freudians from Otto Gross in bohemian Munich before World War I to Robert Lindner in McCarthyite America, the first and last of a tradition. Between these figures, I situate Otto Fenichel and his circle. I hope to reclaim the political Freudians, and a classical tradition that sustained them, from the historical unconscious, and perhaps free psychoanalysis from its own repressions.

Los Angeles, California
January 1983

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

DURING the years that I sifted through the lives of the political Freudians I have incurred many personal debts to family, to friends, and to those who offered essential materials and memories. First of all I wish to thank Randi Markowitz for her support and generosity; in assembling and sharing with me Otto Fenichel's papers she made possible this study. For their warm encouragement and interest I would especially like to thank Norman Reider, Martin Grotjahn, Edith Ludowyk Gyömröi, and Clare Fenichel. I should note that while some principals in this study, or their families, have graciously responded to my questions, they have not read the manuscript and are not responsible for its contents. I should also record that both Dr. K. R. Eissler, secretary of the Sigmund Freud Archives, and Dr. Lore Reich Rubin refused to cooperate with my study; both possess materials by Fenichel that would have greatly facilitated my research. Others, however, have been of decisive help. I am grateful to: Kathleen Juline, librarian of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society and Institute; the Hanna Fenichel Testamentary Trust for permission to quote from Otto Fenichel's unpublished writings; the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation for its support during a very lean period; and David James Fisher and Martin Shapiro for their comments and suggestions. For Naomi Glauberman, a consummate editor, and Sarah, our consummate daughter, thanks do not suffice: they have not let me forget what life is all about.

The Repression of Psychoanalysis

CHAPTER ONE

The Repression of Psychoanalysis

ON SATURDAY, 12 March 1938, Sigmund Freud jotted in his diary "Finis Austriae" as the Nazis marched into Vienna.[1] The next day, with England and France grumbling but passive, Austria officially ceased to exist. Ernest Jones hurriedly flew from London to help rescue Freud and found the streets full of "roaring tanks" and "roaring people."[2] On Tuesday, 15 March, an enthusiastic crowd crying "Sieg Heil!" drowned out the Führer himself as he addressed Vienna. Within two weeks the first transports carrying Austrians arrived at the Dachau concentration camp.[3]

Aided by a wide network, including President Roosevelt, Freud obtained permission to emigrate. The ailing doctor boarded the Orient Express which carried him to Paris, and from Paris he proceeded to London. As a final condition for his release, the Gestapo demanded that Freud sign a prepared statement affirming that he had been well treated. He signed, appending the ironic sentence, "I can heartily recommend the

analysts publicly expressed a belief that the sleek American psychoanalysis did scant justice to the original project. Oddly, while the knowledge of Freud steadily increases, knowledge of the psychoanalytic movement and its original imperatives recedes.

Perhaps this is not so odd. Events within living memory are less secure than more distant happenings. Industrial society undermines an oral tradition. No one is expected to know by direct or indirect account the events of a century ago; they are learned through books and schools—or not at all. As we approach the present, where the written accounts do not (yet) exist, the role of living participants and witnesses increases, along with the risk of imperfect communication. Participants may not communicate their full knowledge for many reasons: they may, for example, think what they know is too obvious, the common coin of their generation; they may find the subject unpleasant; or they may lack an appropriate audience.

Consequently, a living knowledge of a culture may rapidly fade. Familiar insights of one generation may become totally lost to the next. What was known and immediate to the second generation of analysts may be unknown to the third and subsequent generations. These later generations have no way of learning that the second generation grew up within a radical political culture; that its members saw themselves as dissenters, pioneers, and cosmopolitan humanitarians. The second generation viewed psychoanalysis not only as a therapy but also as part of a larger social project. Yet they witnessed, and partly facilitated, the emergence of a narrowed psychoanalysis, an almost decultured, streamlined version.

To be sure, the newer generations of analysts and students have read and consulted the texts of the second generation, particularly the works of Otto Fenichel, Edith Jacobson, and Annie Reich. Indeed, these writings are deemed essential to the study of psychoanalysis. Thirty years after their initial pub-

lication, Fenichel's own essays, in his two-volume *Collected Papers*, are still in print; and, apart from Freud's own texts, perhaps no book shows up as frequently in psychoanalytic courses as Fenichel's *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis.* It has reached the status of "standard," an absolutely reliable benchmark of classical psychoanalytic information. A recent survey states that it is "justly" considered to "summarize all major psychoanalytic knowledge to that date."[5]

Nevertheless, these texts do not reveal that Fenichel or Jacobson or Annie Reich were not merely outstanding theorists and clinicians, they were also radicals devoted to a social psychoanalysis. This is not gossip or trivia; rather these convictions structured their lives. Moreover, they were not exceptions; many from their generation shared their commitments. Nevertheless this psychoanalytic culture, even a memory of it, did not survive the catastrophe of nazism. The psychoanalytic texts endured, but the spirit and culture vaporized. Americans who did not experience the European chapter accepted a reduced psychoanalysis, devoid of its politics and culture, as the whole enterprise.

For the refugees, suppression of their culture was a small price to pay. Initially they buried, adjourned or abandoned a political psychoanalysis in the name of personal survival. Fenichel spelled it out quite clearly several weeks after the Nazi invasion of Austria. Fenichel was then living in Prague. Like many analysts in Czechoslovakia, he had left Berlin in 1933 when the Nazis came to power. With Austria now part of the Reich, and with the prime minister of Britain, Neville Chamberlain, still making concessions—in the name of appeasement—to avoid war, the future of Czechoslovakian and European psychoanalysis looked dim. Fenichel knew that time was running out, and he prepared to abandon Europe.

Fenichel delivered a parting address to the Prague analysts in which he told the beleaguered group that a friend, who was

not an analyst, had asked him to identify the pressing question in current psychoanalytic research. "I answered him: 'The question of whether the Nazis come to power in Vienna.' Now they have come." Fenichel's remarks to the Czechoslovakian group outlined the desperate situation facing psychoanalysis in 1938. The gathering barbarism imperiled all culture. For years, Fenichel stated, he had devoted himself to a psychoanalysis that was more than a private therapy; he had worked to develop a social and political theory. Now, these efforts belonged to history: "What once was is past." He felt that the overwhelming danger to life and liberty compelled theoretical modesty. The past hopes and plans had lost their urgency, even reality. "Many are oppressed; many are in need; and whoever thinks is threatened." A political psychoanalysis was no longer possible; survival itself was the watchword. The best one could do, Fenichel believed, was to preserve psychoanalysis and wait. The task was to "hold out" *(durchzuhalten)* (XLVIII/25 June, 1938/19).*

Fenichel spoke openly to the Prague group; he often employed the first person plural: "our hopes" and "our plans." He addressed friends, and more than friends, analysts who shared his devotion to a political, perhaps Marxist, psychoanalysis. The group included Annie Reich, Henry Lowenfeld, Steff Bornstein, and several others. Edith Jacobson briefly joined the Prague analysts before departing for New York. Each represented a common species, psychoanalysts with political and cultural commitments.

These names hardly account for all the political psychoanalysts of the second generation. The psychoanalytic mi-

*These parenthetical notations refer to Fenichel's unpublished *Rundbriefe* ("round letters"), which are cited throughout this book by letter number/date/section number. Letter numbers will be in Roman or Arabic in accord with Fenichel's own citations. The date of a letter indicates when the letter was circulated, not necessarily when its contents—an anthology of materials—were written or delivered. For instance, Fenichel made these remarks on 29 April 1938.

gration was already well advanced by 1938 and analysts were scattered across the globe. Psychoanalysis has treated them ambivalently. Many, including Siegfried Bernfeld and Otto Fenichel, remain familiar figures. Their oeuvre, however, survives laundered, its political and cultural vitality bleached out. The familiarity with their work is deceptive.

Familiarity, derived from family, implies a lengthy and close relationship; by virtue of its completeness, familiarity does not encourage further exploration. The familiar is well-charted, harboring no secrets or surprises. The major writings of Fenichel or Jacobson or Annie Reich are available; their contributions seem both solid and transparent, with neither shadows nor dark recesses; their writings can be summarized, studied, and categorized.

As psychoanalysts should know, however, the familiar is not outside history; it is drenched in the past. The familiar has been made familiar by effacing the foreign and, perhaps, forbidden; in this sense, psychoanalysts are acceptable after their unacceptable past has been censored. In brief, the lives and oeuvres of Fenichel and a wide group of other political analysts have been sanitized and prettified, often with their own cooperation. The catastrophe of exile and their ineluctable Americanization buried their nonconformist theories, hopes, and commitments. In the end, they fit in and succeeded by sacrificing their own identities.

The significance of the political Freudians transcends their own lives and contributions. The retrieval of Fenichel and other Freudians is only part of the story; the real story, and the real issue, is the nature of the psychoanalytic enterprise. The fate of the political Freudians points to and exemplifies a decisive turn in American psychoanalysis; that is, its palpable retreat from the cultural and political commitments that animated the early analysts, including Freud. The political Freudians are artifacts from a psychoanalytic dig; they sum-

mon up a village and culture of great vitality that has been paved over by the psychoanalytic highways of America.

It is important to realize that the Freudians of the first and second generation were primarily cosmopolitan intellectuals, not narrow medical therapists. Compared to recent American analysts, they represent another species. To Freud or Ferenczi or Jones, clinical practice did not exhaust psychoanalysis. Actively engaged with cultural and social issues, they spun audacious theories. The soundness of these theories—from Freud's *Totem and Taboo* to Ferenczi's *Thalassa*—is not the point; the theories testified to the reach and vitality of psychoanalysis in its classic period. The early analysts envisioned their science not only as a trade, but as a cultural and, sometimes, political force.

The number of these political Freudians was sizable and their individual contributions important. Most significant, however, was their collective devotion to social theorizing that kept alive the breadth of classical psychoanalysis; they were an index of the health of psychoanalysis. The political Freudians dissipated as classical psychoanalysis declined. When American psychoanalysis embraced a neutral clinical theorizing, it simultaneously became inhospitable to cultural and political psychoanalysis. The political Freudians, once common, became an extinct breed. To put it sharply, the repression of the political Freudians and the repression of psychoanalysis itself is the same story.

To recount this double tale of repression runs against the grain of contemporary psychoanalysis and, at the least, risks falling on deaf ears. The victory of the psychoanalytic establishment against its own dissenters—and ultimately against itself—harbors a self-perpetuating dynamic that is difficult to slow down or redirect. The political Freudians unsuccessfully resisted the intellectual division of labor which slices into modern cultural life. Psychoanalysis became what these analysts fought

against, a medical specialty that relegated society to the sociologists, economics to the economists, and philosophy to the philosophers. Today few are less receptive to the political and cultural contours of psychoanalysis than professional analysts. This undermines in advance any attempts to reset the historical record. Even the appropriate vocabulary—"left-wing Freudians," "Marxist psychoanalysts," "political psychoanalysts," even "humanism" itself—sticks in the throat of contemporary psychoanalysis. These words today seem odd and foreign.

Foreign is the opposite of familiar: it is tempting to turn psychoanalysis on itself, the psychoanalysis of psychoanalysis. Freud wrote a sparkling essay on the power of the uncanny. The "uncanny is in reality nothing new or foreign, but something familiar and old-established in the mind that has been estranged only by the process of repression."[6] Together with another statement by Freud, a clue to the fate of the political analytic tradition may be in reach: "The doctrine of repression is the foundation-stone on which the whole structure of psychoanalysis rests."[7] Freud did not intend a (Freudian) double entendre, but it is arguable that the structure of psychoanalysis is founded on repression—the repression of its own past. The history of the political Freudians has been blocked; occasionally it troubles the sleep of psychoanalysis.

Psychoanalysts guard the past of their discipline. Far beyond the boundaries of ethics and decency, they have closed archives for decades, even centuries. Some material in the Sigmund Freud Collection of the Library of Congress, which includes the papers of many analysts, is closed until the twenty-second century! What is there to hide? In the typical chronicle, biography, or obituary, the socialist past of many analysts is not mentioned. Fenichel's more political writings were carefully omitted from his *Collected Papers,* assembled after his death. Just as an individual may pay for an obsession with a loss of

vitality, for psychoanalysis as a whole, the obsessive flight from its past drains its theoretical life.

Today it is easy to forget how many early psychoanalysts identified themselves as socialists and Marxists. They may even have constituted a majority of the analysts. They included Paul Federn, Helene Deutsch, Siegfried Bernfeld, Herman Nunberg, Annie and Wilhelm Reich, Edith Jacobson, Willi Hoffer, Martin Grotjahn, Karl Landauer, Bruno Bettelheim, Ernst Simmel, and Fenichel. Before the onset of fascism these analysts were not isolated individuals. Located in Vienna and Berlin in the politically charged atmosphere of the late 1920s and early 1930s, their lives and projects frequently overlapped.

It is also difficult to remember the number of women participating in the psychoanalytic movement. After a decade of feminist criticism, it has become conventional wisdom that psychoanalysis constituted the vanguard of the sexual counterrevolution. Nothing is further from the truth. Regardless of the relative accuracy (or inaccuracy) of Freud's theory of female sexuality, indisputably psychoanalysis breathed of a sexual enlightenment and emancipation especially germane to women; psychoanalysis viewed women as sexual beings. Freud left no doubt that his female patients—originally the bulk of his practice—suffered from repression, sexual ignorance and misinformation.

Since psychoanalysis challenged repressive codes and received knowledge, it attracted not only women but also radicals and bohemians of all types. Apart from traditional professions assigned to women, such as teaching and nursing, it is likely that no other profession counted among its ranks as many women as did psychoanalysis in its early years. These women were not quiet and demure; they frequently bucked family and tradition to study psychoanalysis; they also were often cultural and political radicals. With a single exception, Fenichel's circle of political psychoanalysts was exclusively female. Today Helene Deutsch may symbolize repressive psychoanalytic theorizing about women. Yet as a young woman she identified with female emancipation, rubbed shoulders with Rosa Luxemburg, and called "the revelation of socialism" a great influence on her life.[8]

While the plans, hopes, and sometimes the writings of the political Freudians have been washed away, it must not be supposed that they passively suffered history: the repression of psychoanalysis is also its self-repression. The political Freudians themselves often facilitated and intensified the repression; this is why it is so difficult to reassemble, even find, the pieces of the story. The best sources—the political Freudians themselves—turned silent. The catastrophe of fascism and exile compelled or, at least, encouraged them to bury their own histories. In the United States, a hostility to Marxism intimidated the immigrants; it forced radicals, especially radical refugees, to clean out their bookshelves and censor their pasts.

Of course the erasure is never complete. Devoted disciples and biographers have documented the life and work of Wilhelm Reich, for example. Other political Freudians, however, have not fared as well. Cognoscenti of the history of psychoanalysis who recall that Fenichel was once a radical might imagine his Marxism belonged exclusively to the 1930s, when it was excusable. A recent history of psychoanalysis reports that Fenichel and Reich once led a Marxist opposition within the official psychoanalytic organization, "but it soon collapsed. In 1934 Reich was expelled from the International [Psychoanalytic Association]; Fenichel altered his views."[9]

This is not accurate: Fenichel did not alter his views; he hid them. The realities of exile compounded by the conservatism of the psychoanalytic establishment forced the radicalism of Fenichel and an entire network of analysts underground. Within a generation the past was dislodged; few wanted to remember; even fewer knew about this tradition. The rupture

contraction of a humanist study that once appealed to a wide intellectual class into a technical discipline. While this disintegration of writing skills has affected many fields, it is especially marked in psychoanalysis. To chart an erosion in style between the writings of Max Weber and Talcott Parsons might challenge the finest minds and sensibilities. A chasm, however, divides the prose of Freud and current analysts.

Few of the many studies of Freud suggest that his impact, and perhaps his genius, may have derived from the simplicity of his writing. Freud wrote elegantly for a cultured public. He never received a Nobel Prize for medicine; he did obtain a literary award, the Goethe Prize.[13] In acknowledgment of the cultural breadth of his work, Freud's students invited Thomas Mann to deliver a key address upon Freud's eightieth birthday.[14] These honors reflect Freud's intellectual milieu, that of a literate and heterogeneous community. His texts endure not merely because they contain the original presentations of psychoanalysis, but because of their prose. Even a text like *The Question of Lay Analysis*, which might seem a technical discourse, is a small gem of lucid writing.

The decline of its prose is not a cause of the repression of psychoanalysis, although it is a sign of its contraction into a medical specialty. As psychoanalysis transformed itself into a private club open only to medical doctors, its language and substance unavoidably shifted. Exclusively engaged with clinical practice, the doctors ignored the cultural and political implications of analysis. Texts such as Freud's "Why War?" or his *The Future of an Illusion* did not prompt elaboration by clinicians. With no premium placed on readability by a literate public, psychoanalytic literature approached the standard and cramped norm of medical communications.

A complete account of the causes underlying the American repression of psychoanalysis will not be offered here; this would

require, among other efforts, an evaluation of the American optimism and pragmatism that colored the European import. Studies such as Nathan G. Hale, Jr.'s *Freud and the Americans* have begun to address this project.[15] My own intention, rather, is to shed light on the repression of psychoanalysis—its mechanisms and tolls—by attending to the political Freudians.

The forces acting on psychoanalysis that are directly relevant to the political Freudians include professionalization and medicalization; the insecurity of immigrant analysts; hostility toward Marxism; and the impact of the neo-Freudians. Together these factors almost conspired to domesticate psychoanalysis, subduing its broader and also critical implications.

The exclusion of lay or nonmedical analysts accelerated, almost defined, the professionalization of psychoanalysis. Freud never doubted that the stakes were high in the feud over lay analysis: the preservation of psychoanalysis as a cultural force versus its contraction into a medical therapy. Standard references to Freud's supine followers conveniently forget that on this issue Freud's students almost universally rebuffed their master. Freud deployed all his power to defend nonmedical analysts; everywhere, especially in the United States, he encountered rebellion. American psychoanalysis virtually prohibited lay analysis.

As Freud feared, the elimination of lay analysis surrendered psychoanalysis to the medical doctors who reduced it to a recondite therapy. Several dire consequences followed. The medical imprint deeply penetrated the institutional, intellectual, and finally human bases of psychoanalysis. Psychoanalytic institutes and education subordinated themselves to medical imperatives. Insofar as medical doctors taught psychoanalysis to medical students, its more cultural dimensions were not censored, but slighted. "Medicalization exacted its price," Nathan G. Hale, Jr., writes, surveying the trajectory of American

psychoanalysis. "Institute training was narrower than in Europe, and the rather broadly humanist culture of Berlin and Vienna did not survive well in the American medical air."[16]

Perhaps the impact of medicalization on those who practice and write about analysis proved most damaging. Although it would be difficult to measure this impact with any precision, the accumulated testimonies and impressions suggest a fundamental change in the kind of individuals who are drawn to psychoanalysis. Even within the limits of medicine, European doctors have tended to be more cultured than their American counterparts; European medical education reflects, and partly causes, this richer humanist vision. American physicians obtain a more specialized education. With a lucrative renumeration as the reward, a technical education as the vehicle, and a keen competition to gain entry into medical school, the profession filters out mavericks, humanists, and dissenters.

Inasmuch as lay analysis has been eliminated, American physicians constitute the exclusive pool for psychoanalytic recruitment; obviously the doctors form psychoanalysis in their own image. Even many analysts have observed that, compared to the first and second generation of Europeans, the more recent American analysts were conventional and conservative; this shift in the human bases of the profession has profoundly affected psychoanalysis as a cultural and social theory.

Medicalization has also operated to limit the entry of women into the field of psychoanalysis. While in Europe the number of female analysts has been considerable, in the United States medicine has been almost exclusively a male preserve. Until very recently the United States had the dubious distinction of having among the lowest proportions of female physicians in the world, far below the average in Europe. Inasmuch as the medical community in the United States has supplied the candidates for psychoanalysis, few female doctors were even available. Consequently, only a limited number of women have

navigated the American medical profession to become psychiatrists. Even today, many—perhaps most—of the female analysts are immigrants.

The nervousness and caution of the immigrant analysts themselves also facilitated the domestication of their discipline. Often the refugee analysts arrived in the United States after several stops; for instance, Fenichel fled from Berlin to Oslo to Prague and to Los Angeles within a five-year period. These immigrants knew only too well that the Western democracies were not rushing to open their doors to the victims of nazism. Those who gained entry into the United States were both grateful and understandably fearful of jeopardizing their tenuous legal status. They generally desired social and political invisibility, which in turn prompted a public conformism to prevailing intellectual trends. The insecurity of the refugees accelerated the Americanization of psychoanalysis.

Analysts with political pasts were especially cautious; they had participated in Austrian or German political life when socialism and Marxism were respectable theories and choices. It must be recalled that in central Europe the Communist parties did not monopolize Marxism. Huge Social Democratic parties in Austria and Germany also made claim to Marxism, and these Social Democratic parties were almost popular institutions, deeply rooted in public life. To be sure, compared to the Communist parties, the Social Democrats were hardly subversive. Robert Michels's classic work on bureacratic conservatism, *Political Parties,* dwells on the German Social Democracy as its prime case.[17]

Nevertheless the Social Democrats appealed to the legacy of Marx. In Austria, especially, Social Democracy brought forth a number of distinguished theorists, among them, Otto Bauer, Karl Renner, and Rudolf Hilferding. Many, perhaps even a majority of European analysts, were themselves Social Democrats; personal associations between analysts and Social Demo-

crats were close. Freud himself was linked to the socialists in a number of ways.[18]

There is a letter of Freud's that highlights not only his proximity to the Austrian Social Democrats, but also the distorted way—minor though illustrative—in which this information was transmitted to later American analysts. In 1956 the psychoanalyst Martin Grotjahn, himself the son of a prominent Berlin Social Democrat, Alfred Grotjahn, published in the official American psychoanalytic journal a letter Freud wrote to Julie Braun-Vogelstein. Her husband, Heinrich Braun, a student friend of Freud's, had died, and she wrote to Freud in 1927 asking for his reminiscences about her husband. He responded in part:

> The last impressive meeting which we had may have taken place in 1883 (?) or 1884 (?). He came to Vienna then and invited me for lunch at his brother-in-law's, Victor Adler. I still remember that he was a vegetarian then and that I had a chance to see the little Fritz who must have been one or two years of age. (I think it is remarkable that this happened in the same rooms in which I have been living for thirty-six years.)[19]

In his commentary, Grotjahn, who certainly knew all the facts, noted vaguely that Heinrich Braun was an editor and "leader in the theory of social economy and its political applications"; and that Victor Adler was a "physician, psychiatrist and political leader in Vienna. Victor Adler and Heinrich Braun shared the same political philosophy."[20] In 1956—the year the Hungarian revolt was put down by the Soviet army—Grotjahn was writing very carefully. His phrases—"leader in the theory of social economy," "shared the same political philosophy"—managed to avoid stating the obvious: Braun and Adler were the most prominent socialists of the day. Braun edited the main Social Democratic theoretical journals, and Adler was chairman of the party. Nor did Grotjahn indicate that "little

Fritz" grew up to be a "political assassin," to use the subtitle of a recent biography. In the third year of World War I, Friedrich Adler shot the prime minister of Austria shouting "Down with tyranny! We want peace!"[21] Nor does this exhaust the interest of the letter. As Freud indicated to Julie Braun-Vogelstein, he was living in the rooms where he had originally met her husband and Adler. The fact tht Freud purchased Adler's home, the famous Berggasse 19, and lived in it for most of his life, has been suggestive to several historians. They have surmised that Freud wished to supplant the revolutionary leader, who had overshadowed him when they had been students together.[22]

The tangled web of psychoanalysis and socialism—personal and theoretical—unraveled in the United States. The refugee analysts realized that they had entered a terrain very different from that of Central Europe. Even if the 1930s was a high-water mark for American Marxism, it never gained the prestige or acceptance of European Social Democracy. Marxism and socialism remained culturally marginal in the United States, if not suspect—especially among conservative doctors. The immigrant analysts therefore tabled their political beliefs and nonconformist opinions in order to ease their integration into American life. In Berlin, Ernst Simmel had been president of the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute; he had also presided over the Association of Socialist Physicians. In the United States his connection to socialist groups ceased. Fenichel believed his own political past slowed his naturalization. For those who did not get the message postwar McCarthyism made it clear.

The issue in the United States was not the persecution of dissidents and intellectuals, but the insecurity of political refugees who were legal aliens; understandably, to avoid attention, they assumed the lowest possible political profile. Even on narrower organizational and theoretical issues facing American psychoanalysis, they were cautious. Fenichel often reiterated

that he did not want himself and his collaborators to appear as a clique of immigrants who in accented English opposed the main thrust of American psychoanalysis.

The immigrant analysts infused vast energy into psychoanalysis, but in splitting off their political and cultural commitments they abetted its Americanization. Of course, this process was not obvious to them at the time. Fenichel secretly worked to sustain an opposition in the hope that the climate in the American psychoanalytic community would allow a more public identity. However, the situation did not change, and the opposition remained secret until it finally disappeared. Although a body of dissenting literature, ideas, and programs survived, the disciples and successors to develop these did not materialize. Why?

The transmission of knowledge across generations is more delicate than one would suppose. To remain a vital force, knowledge, especially psychoanalytic knowledge, requires the living contact of teachers and students. Knowledge is bathed in emotions, desires, and commitments. Without these nurturing fluids, it withers into empty words. Texts can be saved and studied, but they lose their urgency; they drift out of the public culture to library shelves. This fate befell political psychoanalysis, and indeed much of classical psychoanalysis. On the basis of their own commitments, the political Freudians did not seek or attract students; nor did they impart the full body of their ideas to the students they did have. Within a single generation, their ideas came to be completely excluded from mainstream psychoanalysis. The newer generation of analysts, essentially devoted to clinical issues and practice, lacked living contact with the breadth of psychoanalysis. By the 1950s, the very few psychoanalytic rebels, such as Robert Lindner, were theoretically stranded; classical analysis was only a memory to a few refugees.

The critical role of the neo-Freudians in facilitating the

Americanization of psychoanalysis is difficult to assess. I pursued the subject briefly in chapters 5 and 7, and it has been discussed elsewhere by numerous commentators. To Fenichel and his circle, the neo-Freudians exemplified Americanization; they watered down a radical depth psychology that hinted of liberation into a tepid doctrine of social meliorism. Nevertheless, Fenichel shared with the neo-Freudians a dissatisfaction with the conservatism of "establishment" psychoanalysis in America. The political Freudians were paralyzed by their half-solidarity with and half-antagonism toward the neo-Freudians.

Two opposite tendencies in the process of Americanization fed off of each other. On the one hand, a secure orthodoxy embraced the medical establishment and dispensed with the culture and humanism of classical psychoanalysis. On the other hand, the neo-Freudians managed to salvage this culture but at the cost of jettisoning the erotic and unconscious dimensions of psychoanalysis. The neo-Freudians also successfully filled the public space that the orthodox analysts had vacated as they evolved into clinicians. Offering accessible books, the neo-Freudians oriented themselves toward a wider public.

The repression of psychoanalysis proceeded by these two contradictory routes, medical professionalization and theoretical banalization. Neither the orthodox nor the revisionist analysts preserved the scope and ambition of classical analysis; rather a constricted medical version confronted a flat cultural version. It is important to grasp that these two tendencies fostered each other. Unhappiness with an obdurate medical orthodoxy spurred rebellions that yielded a thin neo-Freudianism; and unhappiness with a popular neo-Freudian moralizing prolonged the grasp of a conservative orthodoxy.

Political Freudians sought to remain loyal both to the depth dimensions of psychoanalysis—its unconscious and erotic levels—and to its humanist implications. If theoretically cogent,

practically and organizationally the political Freudians were defeated. On the institutional battlefield of American analysis, only two sides mustered sizable forces: orthodox and revisionist. The political Freudians sympathized with the cultural and social impulse of the neo-Freudians, but they could not subscribe to a doctrine that radically abridged psychoanalysis; they sympathized with the loyalty of the orthodox analysts to classical psychoanalysis but profoundly objected to their social and political blindness. In effect the political Freudians were homeless.

The fate of Fenichel perfectly illustrates the repression of psychoanalysis. For countless students and professionals Fenichel is synonymous with his *Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis;* and this text is regarded as synonymous with reliable and comprehensive psychoanalytic knowledge. It also seems conservative to a fault. A review in the progressive journal, *The New Republic,* complains that the book ducks the social reality, concluding it often "runs against social facts; but they are hardly ever acknowledged as such and are never elaborated."[23]

Ironically, little animated Fenichel more than the "social facts" of psychoanalysis. Today, this is hardly obvious, for, to the uninitated, Fenichel exemplifies establishment psychoanalysis—and for good reason. In exile, he hid but did not renounce his political vision of psychoanalysis; indeed, Fenichel pursued his political theorizing but outside of a public forum. Nor was he alone; many refugee analysts publicly represented an almost neutral psychoanalysis while privately they remained steadfast in their devotion to its social and political implications.

Fenichel stood at the hub of these analysts. As he was completing *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis,* he was also relinquishing his leadership of a secret group of political analysts. The story of this circle constitutes a veritable repressed chapter of psychoanalytic history: at the heart of the analytic

establishment some of the most prominent practitioners sustained a secret and dissenting network.

For almost twelve years, beginning in Berlin where they had all assembled, Fenichel assiduously, almost fanatically, directed this group. As exile dispersed them, Fenichel maintained contact by a regular system of *Rundbriefe* ("round letters"). The group was secret. Fenichel often advised them to destroy the letters, which most of them did; consequently, few copies exist today. Fenichel and six other analysts composed the core group. Fenichel, Edith Jacobson, and Annie Reich are the best known of the circle; Kate Friedländer is known in England; and Barbara Lantos, Edith Ludowyk Gyömröi, and George Gero are the least prominent. (It is possible that Berta Bornstein also belonged to the group.)

They shared an almost identical cultural background; in this respect they accurately represented the first generations of analysts. Bruno Bettelheim, an acquaintance of Fenichel's, wrote recently of his own past: "As a child born [1903] into a middle class assimilated Jewish family in Vienna, I was raised and educated in an environment that was in many respects identical with the one that had formed Freud's background."[24] Although not all were Viennese, those in Fenichel's circle all belonged to the secure bourgeoisie of central Europe.

Members of the circle were also close in age; their birthdates clustered around 1900: Fenichel, 1897; Edith Jacobson, 1897; Annie Reich, 1902; Kate Friedländer, 1903; George Gero, 1901; Barbara Lantos, 1894; Edith Ludowyk Gyömröi, 1896; and Berta Bornstein, 1899. The dates themselves suggest a critical distance from Freud. His world was rapidly succumbing to the ravages of war, revolution, and economic depression. The members of Fenichel's group were all in their teens and early twenties when World War I and the postwar revolutions resolutely ended the nineteenth century.

Perhaps the first reference to Fenichel in the psychoanalytic

literature appears in the *Minutes of the Vienna Society*. Siegfried Bernfeld, already well known as a leader of socialist youth, lectured the Society on Poetic Writing by Youth. The ensuing discussion included a comment by a "guest" identified as "medical student Fenichel."[25] Fenichel was just twenty. This discussion took place in the middle of the events that molded the lives of the political Freudians. At the time of this meeting of the Vienna Society (19 November 1918) World War I had been over for a week. The Provisional National Assembly in Vienna ended six centuries of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy by declaring a republic some days earlier. The Bolsheviks, celebrating the first birthday of the Russian Revolution, faced Europe, expecting and promoting revolution. Throughout Germany and Austria workers and soldiers returned from the fronts to form self-governing councils. In the next weeks and months, Soviet republics were established in Budapest and Munich. The Spartacists called for revolution in Berlin; right-wing military outfits galvanized; political assassinations became regular events; Rosa Luxemburg was murdered.

These events resonated throughout the lives of Fenichel and his friends. Fenichel, Annie Reich, and Edith Jacobson participated in the left and Jewish youth movements that swept Germany and Austria in the first decades of the century. The Hungarians (Lantos, Gero, and Gyömröi) moved in the Budapest student circles around George Lukács and Karl Mannheim. Lukács assumed the position of cultural commissar in the brief Hungarian Revolution of 1919 and went on to become one of Europe's most prominent Marxists.[26] Mannheim, an equally prominent sociologist, remained a socialist (and critic of Marxism); his wife, Julia Mannheim, became a psychoanalyst.[27]

The careers of the political Freudians followed roughly parallel courses. In the years 1915–20 they engaged in left-wing political activities—student and youth politics. In the early

1920s, they completed medical degrees and analytic training and went on to establish practices; political commitments became subordinated to professional work. In the later 1920s the conflict among Social Democrats, Communists, and Nazis charged the political and cultural atmosphere of Weimar Germany. These Freudians became drawn not simply to politics but to the project of a political psychoanalysis.

They all gravitated to Berlin. Otto Friedrich explains:

> Marlene Dietrich, Greta Garbo, Josephine Baker, the grandiose productions of Max Reinhardt's "Theatre of the 5,000," three opera companies running simultaneously . . . the opening night of *Wozzeck*, and *The Three Penny Opera*. . . . Almost overnight the somewhat staid capital of Kaiser Wilhelm had become the center of Europe, attracting scientists like Einstein and von Neumann, writers like Auden and Isherwood, the builders and designers of the Bauhaus School. . . . Above all, Berlin in the 1920s represented a state of mind, a sense of freedom and exhilaration.[28]

It also attracted the leftist analysts. By 1930 the participants in Fenichel's circle all resided in Berlin.[29] Several joined the Communist party. A veritable garden of left-wing analytic groups emerged.

By 1933, when Hitler attained power, it was over. Jewish Marxist psychoanalysts were thrice marked—as Jews, Marxists, and psychoanalysts—and were eager to exit. Martin Grotjahn recalls helping Ernst Simmel out his back window when Simmel received a message that the Nazis were en route to arrest him.[30] Fenichel fled to Oslo, Prague, and then to the United States. Gero departed first for Copenhagen and later America. Annie Reich moved to Prague and afterward New York. Friedländer and Lantos first settled in Paris and later London. Gymöröi spent some years in Budapest before immigrating to Ceylon. Jacobson lingered in Germany and was arrested; she later escaped to New York. A chapter in psychoanalysis closed.

Not quite. As the analysts dispersed, Fenichel commenced the *Rundbriefe;* he sought to keep alive a left-wing analytic tradition. At times he considered the letters a "written" extension of a seminar his group had all frequented in Berlin. Privately and cautiously he hoped these analysts would continue to discuss the issues critical to a political psychoanalysis.

This was not the first secret grouping or system of *Rundbriefe* in the history of psychoanalysis. For a number of years Freud and "the committee" communicated by "round letters." In the wake of unsettling splits in the psychoanalytic movement, Ernest Jones had proposed that "we form a small group of trustworthy analysts as a sort of 'Old Guard' around Freud." Freud greeted the idea with joy: "What took hold of my imagination immediately is your idea of a secret council composed of the best and most trustworthy among our men to take care of the future development of psychoanalysis." Freud stressed, "First of all: This committee would have to be *strictly secret* in its existence and in its actions."[31] In addition to Freud six analysts originally composed "the committee": Rank, Abraham, Sachs, Eitingon, Ferenczi, and Jones. Between 1920 and 1924 the committee circulated round letters.[32]

Fenichel's group was also secret and was also composed of six members. Technically its members did not circulate round letters. Instead, Fenichel sent out identical letters to each member who in turn responded, commented, or amended the contents by writing directly to Fenichel. Fenichel then cited or summarized the responses in the next *Rundbrief.* This procedure facilitated and hastened the communication, since letters did not have to circulate slowly from one recipient to another with each adding comments. Rather, everything was directed to Fenichel, who organized, edited, and typed out the identical letters.

Few collections of correspondence equal Fenichel's *Rundbriefe;* and even to call them letters is misleading. Fenichel

lavished unselfish energy on these communications. Not destined for publication or a wide public, they testified to a devotion to psychoanalytic theorizing that sought not recognition but mutual understanding. They were not casual or intermittent affairs. In the days before cheap photocopying, Fenichel typed out the letters with at least six carbons, and he carefully corrected the typing errors in each carbon. Each letter was numbered, and each was subdivided into numbered sections. There were a total of 119 letters extending over eleven and a half years.[33] His gargantuan effort concluded on 14 July 1945. His final letter explained that due to diminished involvement by the recipients the correspondence no longer merited his energies. Six months later Fenichel was dead.

These letters were not brief. Short ones might be ten pages; more frequently, they ran in the range of fifteen to twenty-five pages; and often they reached forty to sixty pages. The longest, almost eighty pages, was Fenichel's first communication from the United States, typed, as usual, with six carbons, each corrected. From Oslo, Prague, and Los Angeles Fenichel's letters came, informing, arguing, commenting, and reproducing incoming reports. Altogether they constitute perhaps some three thousand pages of manuscript or, if published unedited, four to five stout volumes.

Theoretical discussions and exchanges, their original purpose, formed the heart of the *Rundbriefe.* At first the group's relationship with Wilhelm Reich received considerable attention. Fenichel worked to elaborate "our" position, meaning that of the political analysts who did not follow Reich. Lengthy discussions on national character and the Oedipus complex meandered through many letters. These debates overlapped with exchanges that Fenichel first conducted privately, outside the *Rundbriefe*—for instance, with Erich Fromm or Abram Kardiner. He cited such exchanges wholesale in the *Rundbriefe* and invited responses.

Fenichel's group tried to meet on more than one occasion; this was difficult because members were scattered across Europe. They often discussed their tactics, since Fenichel did not want them to appear publicly as a compact and tight organization. At the time of the Marienbad Psychoanalytic Congress Fenichel broached how they might gather without drawing attention to themselves. A suggestion to retreat to a hotel some miles away, where no one might stumble upon them, was debated. In fact, they succeeded in preserving their secrecy—to a fault. Few of their contemporaries, and fewer later analysts, learned of their existence.

While the literature on Wilhelm Reich and Erich Fromm, often based on their own autobiographical essays, continually grows, next to nothing has been written on Fenichel. Yet he shared with Reich and Fromm a common past that reached back to the same Berlin study group; the three constituted the most productive, committed, and original of the political Freudians. This neglect of Fenichel derives from his success in camouflaging his thought, especially significant because it was so typical of the political psychoanalysts. While Reich and Fromm departed from Freud, Fenichel's group remained committed to classical psychoanalysis. Their public orthodoxy and private heresies illuminate the subterranean history of psychoanalysis.

Fenichel initiated, sustained, and terminated the *Rundbriefe;* he was the force behind the group which, in fact, occasionally was called "Fenichel's circle," a term he did not like. It was a circle of kindred analysts; yet it was also a one-man show. The *Rundbriefe* served as the lifeline for a group in exile, but it was Fenichel who did the typing, editing, and lion's share of the writing. None of the others came close to expending in a year the time and effort that Fenichel devoted each month.

Even as I follow the contours of his life, I do not intend to write Fenichel's biography or probe his emotional life. If psychoanalysis conducted in an office is fraught with difficulties, that conducted by way of incomplete letters and texts would vie for validity with astrology. In any case Fenichel's significance resides more in the psychoanalytic and political networks he established and represented. As a youth-movement activist, Jew, psychoanalyst, socialist, and refugee, Fenichel expressed the spirit of his times. I do not wish to imply that Fenichel was simply an exemplary product of his situation; however, I do wish to emphasize that the issue here is the fate of Fenichel's project and circle as well as of psychoanalysis as a whole.

Nevertheless, this story would be incomplete without at least some comments about Fenichel the person. The very difficulty of gaining access to his emotional life suggests the world of Freud; a sharp line divided the public and private person. The thousands of pages of *Rundbriefe* are almost completely impersonal. Fenichel arrived in New York as an immigrant, traveled across the continent, and settled in Los Angeles. The letter of close to eighty pages he sent out from Los Angeles contained hardly a word on his reactions to New York, the midwest, California, or American life. He reported only on the psychoanalytic situation in various cities. At the same time, over the course of his life, he vented his feelings in poems, which he apparently showed to no one.

Fenichel perfectly represented a culture that gave much to the world, the turn-of-the-century Jewish Viennese bourgeois family. Many of its sons and daughters shared a supreme self-discipline, devotion to learning, and introspection. A small library can be filled with studies of Jewish identity in the German-speaking countries of this period.[34] The Jews—especially those who, like Fenichel's father, were from Eastern Europe—were indebted to Germany for abolishing legal dis-

crimination. They valued, prized, and finally identified with high German culture. In his youth Fenichel filled notebooks with poems by Rilke.

Those who knew Fenichel recalled his prodigious capacity for work, his photographic memory, and his razor-sharp intellect. Ralph R. Greenson's memoir of Fenichel is subtitled "The Encyclopedia of Psychoanalysis." The 1,600 bibliographical references in *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis,* Greenson reminded us, were not decorative; integrated into the text, they evidenced Fenichel's "enormous fund of knowledge and a fabulously retentive memory."[35] (And Greenson might not have been aware that Fenichel considered these references a poor substitute for the comprehensive bibliography he had prepared for the volume; a shortage of paper, due to the war, prevented its use.) Rudolph M. Lowenstein's obituary remembered Fenichel's "exceptional intelligence, his extraordinary memory and his unusual capacity for work."[36] Bertram Lewin characterized Fenichel as an "eager and alert intellect, an indefatigable worker and student, an avid and incisive observer, digester, elaborator and systematizer."[37]

If only by its quantity, the published record supports these judgments. Fenichel's life was relatively short, forty-eight years, and the last thirteen were beset by the misfortunes of exile, not the least of which included the exhausting effort of moving and establishing legal status in several countries. Despite the turmoil, Fenichel's productivity remained awesome. The standard bibliography of his works runs some twenty pages and includes over five hundred items.[38] Without letup, Fenichel wrote essays, books, reviews, and abstracts. His published works—outside of the *Rundbriefe*—tower in quantity above the writings of the others in his circle. His second wife recalled that he would excuse himself after dinner and a half hour later would reappear to read her a complete paper from a series of paragraphs he had jotted down.[39] Others report that,

at every spare moment, even between patients, Fenichel would type or take notes.

The discipline and dedication of Fenichel's generation are almost obsolete; they valued their own cultural education with unsurpassed seriousness. For instance, during the course of his life, Fenichel kept a list of every cultural production he attended. He would enter the details—name, author, date, place —in a regular Viennese artifact, a "Concert and Theater Book," advertised as essential for all those who take "seriously" art and "Geist." His parents kept track of his early cultural experiences, and he transcribed and maintained the list throughout his wanderings. The productions ran from *Frau Holle, Max and Moritz,* and *Hansel and Gretel* when Fenichel was four, five, and six years of age to the 392nd entry, *Oklahoma,* seen in New York in June 1945.

Fenichel was a man of lists. If nothing were known of his published works or the *Rundbriefe,* it would be difficult to believe that he did anything but list. He was consumed and inundated with lists. Everything he did was jotted down somewhere, often several places, and was then cross-listed, added up, charted, alphabetized, and numbered. Even the entries in his "Concert and Theater Book" were not simply enumerated; they were recategorized on separate sheets, evaluated, for example, by number of cultural events per year (a high of twenty-two in 1916 and a low of one in 1901 when he was only four!), or events per country (one in the USSR, two in Italy, and so on). He also listed and numbered every movie he saw (a total of 530), including the location of the cinema and his companions. He documented every train trip, no matter how minor, and by 1925, when the list apparently stops, he had cited over 800. Every auto excursion was listed, complete with destination, stopping points, and traveling companions; the last trip entered was number 859, Christmas 1945, to Palm Springs, California. There were scores of other lists, catalogs, and enu-

merations, often completely private and opaque, including—possibly—a list of the women he slept with.

Two lists dwarfed all others. On a fat wad of paper he kept a log, in shorthand, with one-line entries for every day, beginning in 1911 until the end of his life, and he kept a comprehensive catalog of his correspondence. He maintained an immense correspondence, receiving some ten thousand letters in his lifetime. Each incoming letter was assigned a number; next to the number he noted the author, date, and origin. A separate sheaf of papers listed authors alphabetically, and next to each author's name he added the number of the letter.

Fenichel's fondness for lists was probably complemented by his photographic memory. Among his friends it was well known that Fenichel possessed instant recall not only of passages from Freud (with page numbers), but of the entire European train schedule. His mental feats and discipline proved practical. The rigorous systematization of his correspondence enabled him to fetch with ease any letter. He brought the same zeal and logic to his research and reading; he noted, abstracted, and cataloged everything he read. When queried on a subject, he could retrieve within moments appropriate bibliographical information. On this solid foundation he built his books and essays.

Fenichel's incessant listing and enumerating should not mislead; it would be unfair to indulge in pop psychoanalytic notions of an anal or compulsive character. Nor should the element of play or games which informed his listing be ignored; he was regularly engaged in private competitions, for instance, counting the number of letters he received by city and country within a particular time period, presumably to discover the "winner."

All who knew him testify to his zest for living, his gusto for travel, and love of humor.[40] He was far from a dour systematizer. Like Freud, he was a witty conversationalist and con-

noisseur of Jewish jokes. He even mimicked himself and derided his own fondness for schedules and guidebooks. His humor and laughter are the first things his friends recall. He was also generous with his money, helping acquaintances and family.

His students found him not only a brilliant lecturer but also a good listener. An intense concentration on texts marked his seminars. Grotjahn recalled a Berlin seminar on Freud's analysis of the Schreber case that covered only two pages in a semester. Greenson described a seminar in Los Angeles that after three hours had not got beyond the word "libido" in the second sentence of the first essay in Freud's *Three Essays on Sexuality.* "Those evenings were so stimulating that . . . several of us continued the debate until well after midnight—on the sidewalk in front of Fenichel's house."[41] In an unpublished manuscript, Fenichel revealed his pedagogical thoroughness: "175 Topics of Discussion about Freud's *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex* for the Use of Freud Seminars."

Fenichel never minced words; nor did he defer to anyone. Hence many found him oversharp and intolerant. His critical spirit was ruthlessly democratic. He listened to everyone; his seminars were open to all; and he bluntly differed with anyone, including Freud and senior analysts. Yet he seemed to bear no grudges; even though he railed against the general theories and influence of Sandor Rado and Franz Alexander—two of his bêtes noires—he appreciated occasional papers they wrote.

Otto Fenichel was a formidable person, intellect, and presence in psychoanalysis. As the *Rundbriefe* hint, Freud and the Viennese analysts deeply respected Fenichel and even feared him. Smarting from the "loss" of Wilhelm Reich, who in the 1920s was considered a wunderkind, they very much wanted to keep Fenichel within the psychoanalytic fold. They need not have worried. Fenichel gave his mind, heart, and life to psy-

young. Some forty years younger than Freud, he survived the master only by six years. Fenichel's chef d'oeuvre, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis*, was published in December 1945, while he was celebrating his forty-eighth birthday. Within weeks, on 22 January 1946, as the letters still poured in with congratulations for the book, Fenichel died.

Spring's Awakening: Analysts as Rebels

MYTHS of the educated depict psychoanalysis as a reactionary force in a somnolent pre–World War I Europe. This assessment is inaccurate on two counts. A reforming zeal permeated early psychoanalysis; and its social environs reverberated with a cultural rebellion. The Utopian and revolutionary spirit often ascribed to the 1920s and the Weimar Republic more properly belonged to this earlier prewar period. Cubism, atonal music, Futurism, linguistic philosophy, as well as psychoanalysis flowered before the war. Many of these innovations, as T. W. Adorno observes, were already fading by the 1920s. "The heroic period of the new art lies much more around 1910."[1]

A revolt among the youth of Europe marked the prewar era and left its imprint on psychoanalysis. Throughout central Europe youth, often yearning to "return to nature" and a freer existence, fled the constrictions of bourgeois life. The themes of youth (and sons) against fathers and schools regularly surfaced in the contemporary literature. Even the titles of the