

Thomas Aichhorn
(IPA, Viennese Psychoanalytical Society)

"NO PROVOCATIONS AND EVEN FEWER CONCESSIONS"
(S. Freud, 1933).

Summary:

The lecture starts out commenting on Freud's keen interest for politics. This initial interest, however, did not lead Freud to study law and thereafter embark upon a political career; as we all know, he turned towards the life sciences, and went on to study medicine. The paper goes on to discuss the position Freud adopted and the comments he made on some of the most significant political happenings of his time: anti-Semitism, the First World War, Communism in the Soviet Union, Marxism and Fascism in Austria, and National Socialism as it developed first in Germany then in Austria. The policy of the International Psychoanalytical Association, the main aim of which was the survival of psychoanalytic institutions, will be discussed in the context of Austria and Germany in the 1930s. An examination of the differences between psychoanalysis in Germany and in Austria in 1938 will conclude his lecture.

Résumé :

« *Pas de provocations et encore moins de concessions* » (S. Freud, 1933) : L'intervention commence par l'évocation de l'intérêt porté par le jeune Freud à la politique. Toutefois, cet intérêt ne l'a finalement pas mené vers des études de droit pour envisager une carrière d'homme politique, mais comme on le sait, il a préféré devenir homme scientifique et faire des études de médecine. Ensuite, j'expliquerai les prises de position de Freud sur les événements politiques les plus importants de sa vie: l'Antisémitisme, la Première Guerre Mondiale, le Communisme en Russie, l'Austromarxisme et l'Austrofascisme en Autriche et le Nazisme en Allemagne et enfin également en Autriche. Puis en me référant aux années 30 en Autriche et en Allemagne j'évoquerai la politique de l'Association Psychanalytique Internationale qui avait essentiellement comme but d'assurer la pérennité des institutions de la psychanalyse. Je terminerai ma communication par la description des différences entre la psychanalyse en Allemagne et celle pratiquée à Vienne en 1938.

Zusammenfassung :

"Keine Provokationen, aber noch weniger Konzessionen" (S. Freud, 1933): Der Vortrag beginnt mit dem Interesse des jungen Freud für die Politik. Dieses ursprüngliche Interesse hat ihn letztlich aber nicht dazu geführt, Rechtswissenschaften zu studieren, um Politiker zu werden, sondern er hat sich bekanntlich dazu entschlossen, Naturwissenschaftler zu werden und Medizin zu studieren. Anschließend werden Freuds Stellungnahmen zu den wesentlichsten politischen Geschehnissen während seiner Lebenszeit geschildert: zum Antisemitismus, zum Ersten Weltkrieg, zum Kommunismus in Russland, zum Austromarxismus und Austrofascismus in Österreich und zum Nationalsozialismus in Deutschland und schließlich auch in Österreich. In Bezug auf die dreißiger Jahre in Österreich und Deutschland wird die Politik der Internationalen Psychoanalytischen Vereinigung dargestellt, die im Wesentlichen zum Ziel hatte, das Fortbestehen der Institutionen der Psychoanalyse zu sichern. Dabei wird auch auf die

Stellungnahmen der so genannten linken Psychoanalytiker um Fenichel eingegangen. Die Beschreibung der Unterschiede zwischen der Psychoanalyse in Deutschland und der Psychoanalyse in Wien 1938 schließt den Vortrag ab.

Ladies and Gentlemen, dear colleagues,

I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak before you although within the limited time it is not easy to adequately describe what happened to Freud, as well as to Psychoanalysis in general, during the 30s of the last century and especially during the Nazi regime. It is not easy to talk about all that happened, how people experienced those times and why these experiences have remained so influential even today.

“You are aware of all that has tumbled down upon our Society, thanks to events that have shaken the world around us to the foundations. One could do nothing against it, just endure it”, said Max Eitingon, still in his function as chairman of the German Psychoanalytical Society, in his last annual report in November 18th, 1933.¹ Our minds have trouble grasping the fact that for the people living then, that which is granted knowledge about the past for us was a future veiled in shadows for them. I suspect that the resulting arguments are not simply concerned with mourning but with anger and infuriation with the fact that what had happened had indeed happened, and that people – including psychoanalysts and Freud himself – didn’t stop events from unfolding as they did.

The title of my contribution – *No provocations and even fewer concessions* – was taken from the correspondence between Sigmund Freud and Max Eitingon, published by Michael Schröter in 2004 (Freud 2004). On March 21st, 1933, Freud responded to a letter he had received from Eitingon 2 days earlier. In that letter Eitingon had apologized for not having written earlier due to the “uncertainty of our situation”.² “Uncertainty of our situation” refers to the gradual installation of the Nazi regime in the first months of 1933. In January Paul von Hindenburg, the “Reichspräsident”, had announced Hitler chancellor of Germany and following the fire at the “Reichstag” on the 27th of February 1933, thousands of regime critics had been deported to concentration camps. This persecution was “legalized” by the “Verordnung des Reichspräsidenten zum Schutze von Volk und Staat”, issued on the 28th of February, the so called “Reichstagbrandverordnung”, by which the basic rights of the Weimar Republic were annulled and the path was laid away from a republic to a totalitarian dictatorship. When, finally a new Reichstag was to be elected on the 5th of March 1933, there could be no talk of free elections. The election campaign had been conducted with a level of terror as yet unknown and communist and socialist politicians had been arrested, driven into the underground or into emigration. Although the NSDAP had clearly failed to reach their goal of winning an absolute majority with 43,9% of the voter populace, the results of this last “free” election had a mere symbolic value.

In his letter Eitingon asked Freud how he should respond to the possible developments of the Psychoanalytic Institute. In his response Freud presents possible developments: Either Psychoanalysis would be prohibited and the institute would have to be closed, in which case there would be very little to say or do, or if that wasn't the case then it would be in everybody's interest to preserve the institute and overcome these unfriendly times. It was possible that Eitingon would have to resign as president of the institute and delegate his office to an “indifferent such as

¹ Estate M. Eitingon, Jerusalem

² Letter from M. Eitingon to S. Freud, March 19, 1933 (Freud/Eitingon, *Correspondence*, p. 846).

Böhm”, who was not Jewish, he would still, unofficially, be able to exert an influence. Freud concludes his letter with the following words: “The wave of panic that fears the spreading of that movement to Austria can be felt here as well. I don't believe that something similar will develop here. In any case I have declared that I would not leave Vienna, my age serving as an excuse. As a parole I would like to put out the following: No provocations and even fewer concessions. They can't kill Psychoanalysis; our persons are of lesser concern.”³

Of course, today we know how things continued to develop in Berlin. Eitingon was finally forced to leave the direction of the Berlin institute to Felix Boehm⁴ and Carl Müller-Braunschweig⁵, those same people he had not trusted to withstand political pressure without giving in to false compromises, those same people who had all too eagerly pursued the leadership of the institute. In a letter to Boehm from April 1933 Karl Landauer commented on their actions in this way: “It has been a source of my pride to belong to a community that confronts all eruptions of hate with a confession to the mutual science for 20 years. When the [First] World War broke out, our ‘elder brothers’ decided to hand over chairmanship of the International Society to a neutral person, so our community could be preserved. [...] Theoretically, I could see the same possibility today. It

³ Letter from S. Freud to M. Eitingon, March 21, 1933 (Freud/Eitingon, *Correspondence*, p. 848).

⁴ Report on Dr. Rickman's visit to Berlin to interview Psycho-Analyst. 14th and 15th October 1946: Dr. Felix Boehm: [Address] I met Dr. Boehm first about 24 years ago in Berlin, and have seen him on several occasions since at international congresses. I rang him up and proposed visiting him at his flat. He hedged several times and told me he would be seeing me at the meeting of the Society. Eventually he was persuaded to permit me to visit him. He was obviously a very embarrassed man and found it difficult to look me in the face. He was eating his dinner at the time (for which event there were mutual apologies) but made occasion to walk all over the room looking for odd things to show me, by way as it seemed to me of interrupting the conversation. He praised the Americans, denounced the Russians, and showed his lack of tact and underlying hostility by asking me if I, as an Englishman, could explain why it was that German woman despised the British troops. They were cold and frigid sexually and hadn't the spunk of the Americans, and were altogether a queer lot. He said he didn't know much about English people, but was interested in their obvious lack of sexual characteristics. I had the impression that he was not telling me the truth about himself when he said that he had taken risks in defying the Nazis and continuing to treat Jews, or that if this part were true, it was to deflect my attention from something else. The conversation was in German, and he professed that he understood a little English, and when I tried him at early stage of the interview on the simplest statements in English he professed not to understand. Later on in the interview he got excited in regard to Dr. Kemper and burst out in fluent English: ‘That man's a diplomat: he has no enemies and no friends.’ I think he realised that he had made a mistake in betraying his knowledge of English, for he proceeded again to rummage in cupboards, looking for things to interest me, for example, a tin of English tobacco. Indeed I have never had an interview with a colleague in which he spent so much time with his head in a cupboard or down in his knees looking for a book which turned out not to be there, and so on. I gave him the same presents as I had given the others, and he took them in an off-hand manner and he seemed somewhat angry. He is utterly unsuitable for employment in G.P.R.B. [German Personal Research Branch of the Control Committee], and I think it likely that he is ‘dark grey, if not ‘black’” (Archive of the British Psycho-Analytical Society).

⁵ Report on Dr. Rickman's visit to Berlin to interview Psycho-Analyst. 14th and 15th October 1946: „Dr. Müller-Braunschweig: [Address] I had met Dr. Müller-Braunschweig at various international congresses during the last twenty-five years. We welcomed each other cordially and he introduced me to his family. A noteworthy feature of the interview was his lack of interest in the development of psycho-analysis in England and America. A second feature was the extent to which the conversation was devoted by him to the question of obtaining privileges and physical advantages, such as more coal and extra food, on which he hinted that I should assist him with the authorities, pointing out that his colleague, Dr. Boehm, was well equipped, as he had a place in the country where he could grow his food. A third point was his attitude towards receiving presents (of the kind that I have already mentioned): he became quite greedy and remarked on the frightful malnutrition that he had suffered during the war. A fourth point was the emphasis he laid on the conflict between the Russians and the English. He told me a good deal about his colleagues, most of it slightly in their disfavour, but he did not mention Dr. Boehm. Unlike Dr. Kemper I believe his personality has deteriorated during the Nazi regime. He is utterly unsuitable for employment in G.P.R.B., and I think it very likely he is ‘dark grey’” (Archive of the British Psycho-Analytical Society).

follows: You or anybody else of Arian origin would have to act as representative of our community. However, some requirements would have to be met: An understanding of what is possible. Under current circumstances it is possible that we are able to help ill people with our techniques. It is also possible for us to teach these techniques to students in private lessons. It is not possible to bring our theory before the public. To do that, would mean to deny the fundamentals of our science. [...] No psychoanalytic institute can be put under the control of the powers that be, even if that were possible nowadays. Yet, you did just that. There was a proverb in the Prussian army: Don't come to your master if you are not called upon. Through your actions you have pushed the hitherto private Psychoanalytic Institute into public view and taken away any chance of all that would have been possible. [...] From the long years of our work together I think I have gotten to know you well enough to say that you acted with the best of intentions but it was a mistake. The full responsibility for this error will have to lie with you and your friends. [...] I share Eitingon's opinion that it would have been wisest to calmly wait for events to unfold. We are not so important to the general public that they would have bothered with us.”⁶

Psychoanalysis had not been forbidden and the Institute had – at first – not been shut down. Those threatened, were the Jewish members of the Institute, they were expelled and driven away. In his last speech as chairman of the Berlin Institute on November 18th, 1933, Eitingon speaks of 37 members who had then already left the Society. After a visit to Berlin in November 1935 Ernest Jones reports to Anna Freud: “There were three questions before the Society. Two of them were decided on the lines of my advice, the third not. [...] The first question was whether to dissolve the Society altogether. Only a minority was in favour of this. [...] The second question was whether to give up the affiliation of the Society with the I.P.V. Boehm and many others were strongly in favour of this. [...] Müller-Braunschweig and Schultz-Henke being against it. I think my voice was decisive in this matter. [...] On the third point, that of expelling the Jews, I was unsuccessful. [...] Altogether I did not think very much of Boehm as a leader. [...] I think also that there is a small amount of truth in the old accusation against him that whenever he is frightened he tends to go to the authorities and suggest indirectly to them questions to which, from their side, they can only give one answer. [...] Müller-Braunschweig is busy coquetting with the idea of combining a philosophy of Psycho-Analysis with a quasi-theological conception of National-Socialistic ideology, and you can imagine that this is a very busy occupation.”⁷ No doubt he will proceed further along these lines, and he is definitely anti-Semitic, which Boehm is certainly not. [...] I suppose most of the Jews will now emigrate.”⁸

In 1936 the German Psychoanalytical Society was integrated into the “German Institute for Psychological Research and Psychotherapy” (“Deutsches Institut für Psychologische Forschung und Psychotherapie“) and was dissolved as an independent society on November 19th, 1938.

In March 1947 Anna Freud wrote to Philipp Sarasin: “I have repeatedly discussed the issue of the political behaviour of analytic members on the continent with both Jones and the Princess. As you know, many people took offence at the fact that the German Society did not break up but adapted to the outside pressure so far as it was necessary to remain in existence. [...] The princess, Jones and myself have always held the point of view that we would have to keep psychoanalysis and politics separate from one another as far as possible and not to regress to later recrimination which, especially in France, had such an unfortunate effect on public life. The

⁶ Letter from K. Landauer to F. Boehm, April 4, 1933 (Estate M. Eitingon, Jerusalem)

⁷ Carl Müller-Braunschweig: *Nationalsozialistische Idee und Psychoanalyse*. Juni 1933; *Denkschrift zur Organisation der deutschen Psychotherapie* (Archive of the British Psycho-Analytical Society).

⁸ Letter from E. Jones to A. Freud, December 2, 1935 (Estate M. Eitingon, Jerusalem)

German members have conducted themselves properly in respect to their Jewish colleagues while not displaying any particular sense of heroism. But heroism is a private matter; it cannot be expected of everyone. Regarding the current invitation to the Netherlands, we have all agreed that we would like to welcome our German colleagues again. I am just saying this to illustrate our previous experience with these issues.⁹

In most of the later assessments of Freud's – and also Anna Freud's – statements on political events during the 30s of the last century the fact is being completely overlooked that Freud was not German but an Austrian. Even though the political developments in Austria in the time from 1918 to 1938 were of far less global political importance than those in Germany – and for this reason may not be as well known internationally –, the fact has to be pointed out, that Freud lived in a state that remained independent and sovereign until 1938 and that he was initially affected by political events in that country. He evaluated political events in other countries – as those in Germany – on the basis of these experiences. However questionable and hostile to Psychoanalysis Austrian politics may have been during the thirties it allowed nevertheless Freud and the Viennese psychoanalysts to continue their work fairly unhindered. It is not so surprising, then, that Anna Freud in April 1933 wrote to Eitingon: "If you really had to leave Berlin, where would you go? Not to Vienna? Should we not set up a new centre of analysis here once more? I think they will let us work here."¹⁰

Freud was confronted with varied political systems in Austria that influenced his respective possibilities at working and living and he commented on these – as of course, on questions regarding international politics – in numerous statements. Even though Freud did not preoccupy himself with political problems in the course of his scientific work, it has to be considered that he held revolutionary, socialistic views when he attended grammar school and had planned to study law with an intention of becoming politically active.

In his paper *Politics and patricide in Freud's Interpretation of Dreams* (Schorske 1961) Carl Schorske reminds us that when, at the age of forty-five, Freud was finally given an associate professorship, he reported the event to Wilhelm Fließ as a political triumph – political authority bends the knee to Eros and to dreams: "The public enthusiasm is immense. Congratulations and bouquets keep pouring in, as if the role of sexuality had been suddenly recognized by His Majesty, the interpretation of dreams confirmed by the Council of Ministers, and the necessity of the psychoanalytic therapy of hysteria carried by a two-thirds majority in Parliament."¹¹ Where Freud's playful fancy had escalated his promotion into a political triumph, his conscience thus shrank it into a moral delict. His professorship appeared to him ambiguous, it seemed to surrender to hated authority: "I have learned that the old world is governed by authority, just as the new is governed by the dollar. I have made my first bow to authority"¹², he writes to Fließ. Schorske states: "Behind these contradictory responses of fantasy and conscience to his long-awaited moment of professional success lay Freud's life-long struggle with Austrian socio-political reality: As scientist and Jew, as citizen and son. In *The Interpretation of Dreams* Freud gave this struggle, both outer and inner, its fullest, most personal statement - and at the same time overcame it by devising an epoch-making interpretation of human experience in which politics could be reduced to an epiphenomenal manifestation of psychic forces."¹³

⁹ Letter from A. Freud to Ph. Sarasin, March, 26, 1947 (Archive Library of Congress, Washington)

¹⁰ Letter from A. Freud to M. Eitingon, April, 16, 1933 (Archive Library of Congress, Washington)

¹¹ Schorske, S. 181

¹² Schorske, S. 182f

¹³ Schorske, S. 183

Letters that he sent to his friends Emil Fluß and Eduard Silberstein bear an early witness to Freud's politically-socially conscious views. In summary, one can note that antimonarchist, antifeudalistic, and anticlerical views can be found in these letters as well as civil utilitarianism, internationalism and radical liberalism. This shows Freud coming from a tradition of an enlightened bourgeois concept of the state, one that in the middle of the 19th century still had the economic power to trigger political events.

Liberalism reached a peak in Austria in 1867/70 with the so-called "Bürgerministerium" (civil ministry) that the Freud family adhered to. In the second half of the 19th century, due to its favourable economic situation, Vienna had become the goal of a migration movement within the Austro-Hungarian monarchy that had also seized the Jewish population. Around 1880 the Jewish part of the demographic was around 10%. But the economic difficulties caused by the collapse of the Viennese stock market, the "Black Friday", in the year of 1873 completely changed the political landscape within the Habsburg monarchy. The time of liberalism had definitely come to an end, political anti-Semitism had grown more out-spoken and more agitated and the era of the mass-parties, the Social Democrats, the Christian Socialists and the German Nationalists had begun. Being a liberal, Freud attentively and with distaste regarded the successes of the Christian Socialist party in Vienna, led by Karl Lueger, who owed his victory largely to severely anti-Semitic campaigns during the elections.

However controversially this subject may have been discussed, Freud kept his Jewish identity all his life. In his paper *An Autobiographical Study* [*Selbstdarstellung*], published in 1925, he writes: "My parents were Jews, and I have remained a Jew myself" (Freud 1925, p.6). Furthermore, Freud states that he could never understand why he should have to be ashamed of his origin, or of his race – a term that began to be used then. Even later, Freud always refused to overcome obstacles put in his way because of his Jewish origin in the course of his academic career, by being baptized and assimilating, as many others in those times, did. On the contrary, in 1897 he joined a Freemason's lodge that had been founded two years earlier, the Austrian Israelitic Humanitarian Society B'nai B'rith.

On December 14th, 1969, Anna Freud wrote to Wilhelm Solms, then the chairman of the Viennese Psychoanalytical Society: "And now to the idea of 'Sigmund Freud and Judaism' as a subject of discussion: I hope you will not be disappointed when I tell you that I am quite adverse to placing this at the centre of discussion at this point in time. [...] As you know I have already corresponded with the gentlemen of B'nai B'rith and that is why I am aware of their views or at least the reasons behind them. They are quite ready to accept the notion that my father was not only consciously Jewish (which is true) but that he was also religious in a more fundamental way or that he was influenced by Jewish religion. Both of the latter statements are absolutely false. My father was an atheist in the truest sense of the word and as consciously an atheist as he was consciously aware of his Jewish heritage. To lift anything else from his writings would mean distorting the truth. I am convinced that such a distortion would occur if the subject was discussed from a Jewish point of view. Most of all, it doesn't seem right to focus on 'Freud, the Jew', instead of 'Freud, the Scientist'. If he is a good scientist, that honours Judaism, but that is all. I have talked about your letter with my brother as well. He shares my opinion; maybe because we both know how much it would have upset my father if he were falsely attributed with any impression of religiosity."¹⁴

What did worry Freud was an anti-Semitic motivated disapproval of psychoanalysis. This led him to take care that Carl Gustav Jung was elected the first president of the International

¹⁴ Letter from A. Freud to W. Solms, December 14, 1969 (Archive of the Viennese Psychoanalytical Society)

Psychoanalytical Association, when it was founded in 1910. In letters from 1908 to Karl Abraham Freud had already stated that Jung “as a Christian and a pastor's son finds his way to me only against great inner resistances. His association with us is therefore all the more valuable. I was almost going to say that it was only by his emergence on the scene that psychoanalysis was removed from the danger of becoming a Jewish national affair.”¹⁵ In the same year he writes to Abraham: “I nurse a suspicion that the suppressed anti-Semitism of the Swiss that spares me is deflected in reinforced form upon you. But I think that we as Jews, if we wish to join in anywhere, must develop a bit of masochism, be ready to suffer some wrong. Otherwise there is no hitting it off. Rest assured that if my name were Oberhuber [a distinctly non-Jewish name] in spite of everything my innovations would have met with far less resistance.”¹⁶

Already two years before the outbreak of World War I, in December 1912, Freud had written to Jones: “The political situation in Austria seems stormy and we are prepared to meet a very bad time”¹⁷ and on the occasion of the declaration of war in July 1914 Freud wrote to Abraham: “However, perhaps for the first time in 30 years I feel myself to be an Austrian and would like to try it once again with this not very hopeful Empire.”¹⁸ During the war years Freud not only wrote his important metapsychological treatises, in a paper published in 1915 called *Thoughts for the Times on War and Death* (*Zeitgemäßes über Krieg und Tod*) (Freud 1915) he also took a position on current events of the day. It would go beyond the scope of this lecture to delve more deeply into this paper, but I do think that the politically critical observations and the psychoanalytical attempts at explanation published in this paper can be read as an anticipation of those insights that Freud continued to develop during his later life.

As Freud had foreseen it, the First World War did actually destroy the bourgeois world that had thought itself peaceful and progressive quite thoroughly. Political circumstances in Austria had become extremely unstable after the end of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. The Habsburg-monarchy had broken up into several national states and the Germans in the monarchy had also proclaimed a new state – called “Deutsch-Österreich”. After initial demands from all parties for a union of this new state with Germany – the negotiations conducted Austria’s ambassador in Germany Ludo Hartmann, Heinz Hartmann’s father –, this plan was forbidden by the victorious nations and Germany was forced to recognize Austria’s sovereignty with the treaty of Versailles. Political forces in Austria – Christian Socialists, Social Democrats and German Nationalists – opposed each other with increasing animosity and readiness to resort to violence. Para-military groups were formed and as soon as the summer of 1927, violent confrontations broke out after a politically motivated court ruling. Freud wrote to Ferenczi: “This summer is simply catastrophic, as though a giant comet stood in the skies. Now we hear of uprisings in Vienna, but have become almost cut off and without secured information about what is happening there and what will become of it. It is a rotten matter.”¹⁹

In 1933 Engelbert Dollfuß, a conservative-clerical Austrian-nationalist used a crisis of the standing orders in parliamentary procedure to dissolve the Austrian Parliament on March 4th, 1933. The opposition’s attempt at continuing and closing the session of parliament in an orderly manner was prevented by the police by force of arms. A ban on public assembly was introduced, the Austrian Nazi party and the Communist party were forbidden, censorship of Austrian

¹⁵ Letter from S. Freud to K. Abraham, May 3, 1908 (Freud/Abraham, *Correspondence* p. 38).

¹⁶ Letter from S. Freud to K. Abraham, July 23, 1908 (Freud/Abraham, *Correspondence* p. 52f).

¹⁷ Letter from S. Freud to E. Jones, December 8, 1912 (Freud/Jones, *Correspondence* p. 182).

¹⁸ Letter from S. Freud to K. Abraham, July 26, 1914 (Freud/Abraham, *Correspondence* p. 264).

¹⁹ Letter from S. Freud to S. Ferenczi, July 16, 1927 (Freud/Ferenczi, *Correspondence* Volume III/2, p. 156).

newspapers was introduced and the valid democratic constitution was abolished – an austrofascist dictatorship crafted after a corporate state was installed.

On March 16th of the same year Freud wrote to Marie Bonaparte: “How fortunate you are to be immersed in your work without having to take notice of all the horrible things around. In our circles there is already a great deal of trepidation. People fear that the nationalistic extravagances in Germany may extend to our little country. I have even been advised to flee already to Switzerland or France. That is nonsense; I don't believe there is any danger here and if it should come I am firmly resolved to await it here. If they kill me – well. It is one kind of death like another. But probably that is only cheap boasting.”²⁰ And the 26th he wrote: “The brutalities in Germany seem to be diminishing. The way France and America have reacted to them has not failed to make an impression, but the torments, small but not less painful on that account, will not cease, and the systematic suppression of the Jews, depriving them of all positions, has as yet scarcely begun. One cannot avoid seeing that persecution of the Jews and restriction of intellectual freedom are the only features of the Hitler program that can be carried out. All the rest is weakness and utopian.”²¹

In April of the same year – 1933 – Freud wrote to Jones: “Despite all the newspaper reports of mobs, demonstrations, etc., Vienna is calm. We can expect with certainty that the Hitler movement will spread to Austria, is indeed already here, but it is very much more likely that it will be bound through the alliance with the other rightist parties. We are in transition toward a rightist dictatorship, which means the suppression of social democracy. That will not be an agreeable state of affairs and will not make life a pleasant one for us Jews, but we think that legal emergency declarations are impossible in Austria because the terms of our peace treaty expressly provide for the rights of minorities, which did not happen in the Versailles treaty. Here legalized persecution of the Jews would immediately result in the intervention of the League of Nations. For Austria, however to annex herself to Germany, in which case the Jews here would be equally without rights, is something that France and her allies will never allow. Besides, Austrians are not inclined to the German brutality. In such a way we lull ourselves into – relative – security. In any case, I am resolved not to budge an inch.”²² Sadly, these evaluations would later be proved very wrong. Nobody intervened on behalf of the Jewish population in 1938 and since the Nazi-time at the latest, Austrians have proven that they are thoroughly capable of even surpassing German brutality. It is also one of Freud's remarks that show him as a true Austrian, for his evaluation largely corresponds with the Austrian self-definition of being rather passive and relaxed, as well as using a certain prejudice against anything German, that is wide spread in Austria.

Jones immediately replied to this letter: “Dear Professor, it was a special pleasure to get a personal letter from you, and to hear again your manly and firm tones in these difficult times. So far as I can judge, my opinion about the situation in Austria is the same as yours, though I should attach more value to the national-patriotic desire of the Heimwehr [“home front” – a part of the austrofascist movement] people to retain the personality of old Austria; they must have noted how swiftly Bavaria allowed herself to be swallowed by Prussia. I am in touch with the Austrian Embassy here and know how strong a fight they are opposing to the Nazi-Anschluß movement.”²³

²⁰ Letter from S. Freud to M. Bonaparte, March 16, 1933 (Jones III, p. 175).

²¹ Letter from S. Freud to M. Bonaparte, March 26, 1933 (Jones III, p. 175).

²² Letter from S. Freud to E. Jones, April 7, 1933 (Freud/Jones, *Correspondence* p. 716).

²³ Letter from E. Jones to S. Freud, April 10, 1933 (Freud/Jones, *Correspondence* p. 716).

On May 7th Freud answers Jones' congratulations on his birthday: "You are right that, compared to my seventieth birthday, my worries are no longer focused on psychoanalysis. It is secure, and I know it to be in good hands. But the future of my children and my grandchildren is bleak and endangered, and my own impotence is painful."²⁴ Freud's sons Ernst and Oliver, who had lived in Berlin, had emigrated to England and France with their families and the emigration of Jewish psychoanalysts away from Germany, some coming to Vienna, had already begun.

In June 1933 Freud once more wrote to Marie Bonaparte: "It seems to me that not even in the War did lies and empty phrases dominate the scene as they do now. The world is turning into an enormous prison. Germany is the worst cell. What will happen in the Austrian cell is quite uncertain. I predict a paradoxical surprise in Germany. They began with Bolshevism as their deadly enemy, and they will end with something indistinguishable from it – except perhaps that Bolshevism after all adopted revolutionary ideals, whereas those of Hitlerism are purely medieval and reactionary."²⁵

In 1934, on the 12th of February, civil war broke out, when the already outlawed social-democratic "Schutzbund" ["defence alliance"] started an uprising which was brutally put down within a few days. In consequence the Social Democratic Party was declared illegal and a single united party, called the "Vaterländische Front" ["Fatherland Front"] was established.

At the same day Freud writes to his son Ernst: "Thanks to the foremost principle in journalistic coverage, to stir up a maximum amount of noise, it has become quite hard to learn what is going on in a city where there is shooting. The fact that we had no electric light for almost twenty-four hours probably hit us hardest. [...] But for the most part it was civil war and not pretty. [...] Of course, those victorious are now the heroes and the saviours of a holy order, the others are the cheeky rebels. But a different outcome would have been no better, and would have brought a military invasion upon this country. One mustn't judge the government too harshly, it would have been equally hard to live with a proletarian dictatorship, the declared goal of their so-called leaders. [...] The future is uncertain, either an Austrian fascism or the swastika. If the latter comes to pass we will have to leave; we are ready to tolerate quite a lot from indigenous fascism, since it will hardly treat us as badly as its German cousin. It will not be nice, but neither is moving someplace strange, something I don't have to tell you, who have, all things aside, been quite fortunate. Our relationship with the two political possibilities for Austria's future can only be expressed by Mercutio's exclamation from 'Romeo and Juliet': 'A plague on both your houses.' Just now – Wednesday, the twenty-first of February, in the morning – martial law has been lifted. Our government and our Cardinal expect a lot from God's aid."²⁶

Then, on March 11th, in a letter to his son Ernst that was published only recently by Gerhard Fichtner, Freud wrote: "I think things are starting to slowly clear up here. The progress of the catholic reaction is unbelievably swift and extensive. But even in that lies a certain guarantee that Hitler's barbarism, which we fled, will not make it's way across the borders: The catholic church as our saviour! So we shall stay. [...] You may remember that the American ambassador in Russia, W.C. Bullitt was a patient of mine for many years. Recently he began to work with me on a study, which cannot be published now, on Wilson. (All this in confidence) Bullitt has now in turn instigated the American delegate in Vienna, G. Earle, to offer a sanctuary at the American

²⁴ Letter from S. Freud to E. Jones, May 7, 1933 (Freud/Jones, *Correspondence* p. 719).

²⁵ Letter from S. Freud to M. Bonaparte, June 10, 1933 (Jones III, p. 181f).

²⁶ Letter from S. Freud to E. Freud, February 12, 1934 (Freud 1960, p. 434f)

embassy in the case of a personal threat by the Nazis. Apparently I am on top of the Nazi-list. I hope it will not come to a situation where I would have to accept this protection.”²⁷

One of Hitler’s main goals was the annexation of Austria by Germany. Even though the Austrian nationals and National-Socialists had not joined the uprising of 1934, during May and June of the same year, Austria was struck by a Nazi wave of terror that was orchestrated from Germany. On the 25th of July members of an illegal Austrian SS- battalion murdered the Chancellor of State, Dollfuß. In his memoirs Martin Freud claims that the Freud family’s sympathies lay with Dollfuß and his successor Kurt Schuschnigg, because they had protected Austria’s sovereignty against Germany.

The insurgent’s plan of Nazi-Germany annexing Austria failed because Mussolini positioned military along the Austrian borders to protect them from German troops. With the Italian invasion of Abyssinia in October 1935, the political distribution of power was fundamentally changed. Germany supported Italy while the League of Nations sanctioned the aggressor and Austria’s dependence on the protection from fascist Italy led to its complete isolation in foreign politics. Due to his alliance with Germany, Mussolini could no longer support Austria and urged the Austro-fascist government to try to come to an agreement with Hitler. In the treaty of July 11th 1936 the German government recognized Austria’s sovereignty but a secret supplementary agreement was far more unfavourable for Austria. Austria was under the obligation to grant an amnesty to imprisoned national socialists and to accept a trusted German nationalist as minister in the government.

The year of 1936 was also the year Freud celebrated his 80th birthday, the last festive and “round” birthday he was able to experience, or had to experience, as his letters from that time indicate. In his Freud biography Jones depicts the level of worry and doubt with which Freud had awaited the arrival of that date. In the end Freud was unable to prevent celebrations on his birthday. Although the “public authorities” did partake in the celebrations, they did it with as much ambivalence as Freud had expected. He writes to Arnold Zweig: “The minister of education politely congratulated me and then all the newspapers were forbidden to publicize this act of participation by threat of confiscation. Several regional and international newspaper articles have expressed disapproval and hate very clearly. One could observe with satisfaction that truthfulness has not entirely disappeared from this world.”²⁸ Regarding Thomas Mann, who held one of the honorary speeches at the event, Freud writes to Zweig: “Thomas Mann [...] was so kind as to repeat it [the honorary speech] on Sunday the fourteenth of the month, just for me, personally, in my room here in Grinzing [Freud hadn't shown up at the official celebrations]. For my family, who was attending, and myself it was a great pleasure. A noble Go! Good to see, that there is such a thing. One could get doubtful sometimes.”²⁹

One of Thomas Mann’s statements was: “Freud is of the opinion that the significance of psycho-analysis as a science of the unconscious will in the future far outrank its value as a therapeutic method. But even as a science of the unconscious it is a therapeutic method, in grand style, a method overarching the individual case. [...] The analytic revelation is a revolutionary force. With it a blithe scepticism has come into the world, a mistrust that unmasks all the schemes and subterfuges of our souls. Once roused and on alert, it cannot be put to sleep again. It infiltrates life, undermines its raw naiveté, takes from it the strain of its own ignorance, de-emotionalizes it, as it were, inculcates the taste for understatement, as the English call it - for the deflated rather

²⁷ Letter from S. Freud to E. Freud, March 11, 1934 (Fichtner 2007).

²⁸ Letter from S. Freud to A. Zweig, May 31, 1936 (Freud/Zweig, *Correspondence* 137).

²⁹ Letter from S. Freud to A. Zweig, June 17, 1936 (S. Freud, GW, *Nachtragsband*, S. 679f).

than for the inflated word, for the cult which exerts its influence by moderation, by modesty. [...] May we hope that this may be the fundamental temper of that more blithely objective and peaceful world which the science of the unconscious may be called to usher in?" (Mann 1936, p. 114).

As Max Schur reports (Schur 1972), Mann's speech was not only understood as an homage to Freud, but as an unmistakable challenge to the forces of a fundamental understanding and as a vehement plea for resistance against the national-socialist threat that Austria was then subjected to. It was understood as a praise of individual rights, a scientific view of the world and the power of the mind, the power of that intellect which by comparison to the power of religious and political ideologies may seem weak. And, as Freud wrote in *The Future of an Illusion*, "we may insist as often as we like that man's intellect is powerless in comparison to his instinctual life (kraftlos im Vergleich zum menschlichen Triebleben)." But he continues: "Nevertheless, there is something peculiar about this weakness. The voice of the intellect is a soft one, but it does not rest till it has gained a hearing. Finally, after a countless succession of rebuffs, it succeeds. This is one of the few points in which one may be optimistic about the future of mankind, but it is in itself a point of no small importance. [...] The primacy of the intellect lies, it is true, in a distant, distant future, but probably not in an infinitely distant one" (Freud 1927, p. 53).

Psychoanalysts in Vienna were able to continue their work more or less unhindered during that period of time. Even though Elke Mühlleitner and Johannes Reichmayr in their article *Psychoanalysis in Austria after 1933-34: History and Historiography* (Mühlleitner & Reichmayr 2003) come to the conclusion that with the consolidation of National Socialism in Germany in 1933 and Austrofascism in Austria in 1934 psychoanalysis was isolated from an important part of its public and any psychoanalytical reflection that was critical of political and cultural trends was extinguished and psychoanalysts reacted by adopting an attitude of political abstinence, accompanied by self-censorship, they concentrated on training and clinical work, Mühlleitner and Reichmayr also write, that Vienna — once again — became the centre of the psychoanalytical movement in Central Europe, taking over the role Berlin had played during the twenties. In May 1936, after many peripatetic years, the Society finally acquired premises of its own at Bergasse 7, where the society itself, the training institute, the outpatient clinic and the International Psychoanalytic Press [Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag] were accommodated – while Alfred Adler's Society for Individual Psychology [Verein für Individualpsychologie] lost much of its importance, due to the civil war of 1934. The society was not dissolved but all activities that had stood in proximity with Social Democratic Party had to be abandoned. Adler himself left Vienna in 1934. In February 1939 the Nazis officially shut down the society for Individual Psychology. But the influence of politically motivated events on the Psychoanalytical Society did not remain totally without consequences. The emigration of Viennese psychoanalysts had already begun with the confrontations in February 1934. On the whole 28 members of the Viennese Society emigrated between 1933 and 1938 – among them some members that were no longer active – others, like Jeanne and Hans Lampl, had been driven away from Berlin and had come to Vienna, and Freud refrained from publishing his theses that dealt critically with religion in *Moses and Monotheism* (Freud 1939) because he did not want to risk a public ban of psychoanalysis and felt that in a catholic authoritarian state, his theory of religion could have easily been seen as criticism that attacked the "fundament" of this undemocratic construction of a state.

In March 1937 Freud writes to Jones: "Our political situation seems to become more and more gloomy. The invasion of the Nazis can probably not be checked; the consequences are disastrous for analysis as well. The only hope remaining is that one will not live to see it oneself. The

situation is similar to that in 1683, when the Turks were outside Vienna. At that time military reinforcements came over the Kahlenberg; today – nothing like that is to be expected. An Englishman has already discovered that they have to defend their border on the Rhine. He should have said: Outside Vienna. If our city falls, then the Prussian barbarians will swamp Europe. Unfortunately the power that has hitherto protected us – Mussolini – now seems to be giving Germany a free hand. I should like to live in England like Ernst, and travel to Rome like you.”³⁰

In February 1938 Anna Freud writes to Eitingon, who had emigrated to Jerusalem: “And apart from that? We are taking in political events in a calm manner, although there is a little panic to be felt around us. At least the Palestinian article on us is quite premature. I wish you would disclaim it. As of today, we have never experienced even the slightest discomfort here. Those are the true fairy-tales!”³¹

The “political events” Anna Freud mentions in her letter were in fact the so called “Berchtesgaden agreement”: On February 12th, 1938, a meeting between Hitler and Schuschnigg had taken place on the Obersalzberg. Pressured by Hitler, Schuschnigg signed a treaty, in which he agreed to announce the national socialist Arthur Seyß-Inquart minister of interior affairs and security as well as granting an amnesty for political offenders – among those, around 3000 national socialists.

On March 9th Schuschnigg, who had sought a way out of the precarious situation after the “Berchtesgaden agreement”, announced a people’s referendum, which was to take place on the 13th of March, to decide on Austria’s further independence. Hitler responded by threatening with an immediate invasion of German troops and demanded that the referendum be called off once and for all. Giving in to Hitler’s demands, Schuschnigg resigned on the evening of March 11th.

The German armed forces (Wehrmacht) marched into Austria and on March 12th, at 5 a.m. the “Reichsführer” of the SS, Heinrich Himmler arrived at the Vienna airport. At 4 p.m. on the same day Hitler crossed the border in Braunau on the Inn. First arrests were already being made in the night from the 12th to the 13th of March – at first mainly representants of the old regime – and Nazis took over all political functions. German anti-Semitic laws were introduced almost instantly and not only SA and NSDAP searched houses and confiscated Jewish property but also the Viennese started immediately raids.

In his diary, Freud simply noted “Finis Austriae” (Molnar 1992, p. 62 & 408) and Anna Freud wrote the following to Eitingon: “I just discarded a letter, I started to write two days ago; the unfolding events have, in the meantime overtaken it. I don't want to write too much about this matter, just that you needn't worry and that we are making all kinds of plans. As soon as everything is taken care of legally, we shall probably be travelling to Holland. I am going to keep you informed as soon as we know more.”³²

In his 48th circular dating from June 25th, 1938, Otto Fenichel writes: “A few years ago a friend asked me [...] what the most important field of research in Psychoanalysis was. I replied: The question whether the Nazis would come into government in Vienna – now they have come” (Fenichel 1998, p. 931). He goes on to write: “Now the Viennese Society is lost and one has to ask a frightening question: What is to become of Psycho-analysis?” (Fenichel 1998, p. 921).

With the law regarding the “reunion” of Austria with Germany dating from March 13th, the so called “Anschluß” of Austria with Germany, had been all but completed. On the same day a board meeting of the Viennese Psychoanalytical Society was held, at which two decisions were

³⁰ Letter from S. Freud to E. Jones, March 2, 1937 (Freud/Jones, *Correspondence*, p. 757).

³¹ Letter from A. Freud to M. Eitingon, February 20, 1938 (Archive Library of Congress, Washington).

³² Letter from A. Freud to M. Eitingon, March 13, 1938 (Archive Library of Congress, Washington).

passed: All members of the society should flee the country as quickly as possible and the headquarters of the Society would be moved to wherever Freud was going to settle down.

Jones had already arrived in Vienna on March 15th. In records from the British ministry of foreign affairs titled: "Fate of Dr. Freud" it says: "Lord De la Warr had been approached by a Dr. Jones who has recently been in Vienna to see if he could do anything to help Dr. Freud. [...] Dr. Jones understood that President Roosevelt had, a fortnight ago, sent a message to Herr Hitler through the United States Ambassador in Berlin, asking for permission to be given for Dr. Freud to leave Germany. No answer had been given to this communication by the German government and Dr. Jones had heard that the American Ambassador in Berlin was accordingly going today to press for the answer."³³ News from Berlin, from the British Ambassador Sir Henderson arrive on April 12th : "As regards Freud I am informed by the United States Ambassador that he has been authorized to leave and will do so as soon as his health permits."³⁴

In 1956 Anna Freud is going to write to Jones, commenting on the report in his Freud biography: "I do not think what happened in Vienna can be called an 'American diplomatic intervention'. But it is true that the American Embassy kept an eye on us and behaved in an exceedingly friendly manner. I do not think it was 'official'; on the other hand they could probably not have done it if they had not been permitted to do so from Washington. There was no Ambassador at the time, only a Charge d' Affairs. His name was Wiley. We were constantly in touch with him and you may remember that he came to see my father on the evening of the S.A. raid on our house. He was also told at the time when the Gestapo had fetched me and there may have been some intervention behind the scenes. At least there was a mysterious telephone call after I had been there a few hours."³⁵

On March 20th, in a meeting, called into session by Anton Sauerwald, the commissary head of the Society, who had been put into place by the Nazis, it was decided that the Viennese Society's property – apartment, books and money – was to be placed in the hands of the German Psychoanalytical Society.

On April 4th, 1938, Jones wrote to Eitingon: "Things are moving terribly slowly in Vienna. Some people think it may be a couple of month before the Professor is able to get leave to travel. I think myself, and very much hope, that it will be quicker than this. What news we have is not pleasant. [...] Anna last week had to spend five hours at the Gestapo which was disquieting to her and still more to her father. [...] Müller-Braunschweig will probably secure the rooms and Bibliothek for the future use of the Viennese Branch of the Deutscher Gesellschaft für Psychotherapie. There does not seem to be anyone at the moment to start an analytical section of this in Vienna. This is the second time we have presented Jung and Company with a magnificent suite of rooms, etc. [...] They did not take anything from Berggasse 19 except money. I do not think it was a very large sum, between £ 30 and £ 50. The only remark Professor made about the 'Besuch' was that he had never received so much money for one in his life. You see he keeps his humour magnificently."³⁶

As there was no Viennese psychoanalyst who would agree to take over the leadership of the Vienna branch of the "Deutschen Institut für psychologische Forschung und Psychotherapie" in Berlin, finally Heinrich von Kogerer was appointed as its leader. Kogerer was the director of the "Vienna Psychotherapeutic Ambulatorium" and member of the "General Medical Society for

³³ Archive British Psycho-Analytical Society

³⁴ Archive British Psycho-Analytical Society

³⁵ Letter from A. Freud to E. Jones, February 20, 1956 (Archive British Psycho-Analytical Society).

³⁶ Letter from E. Jones to M. Eitingon, April 4, 1938 (Estate M. Eitingon, Jerusalem).

Psychotherapy” [Allgemeine Ärztlichen Gesellschaft für Psychotherapie] at this time under the presidency of Jung. Due to an intervention by higher ranking Nazi party-officials Müller-Braunschweig was not able to take over the Society’s property – it was all confiscated. On August 25th, 1938, the Society was closed once and for all by an official decree.

In a letter, from May 14th to his sister-in-law, Minna Bernays, who had been able to reach London as early as the 5th of May, Freud writes: “We are now in the possession of passes for the French and British admission, having a fourteen day deadline for leaving the country. Every other day, Anna reports to the police station that we are still here. Everything is depending on when a declaration of safety from the tax authorities; without this document we will not be able to safely cross the border.”³⁷ On May 20th he writes to her: “We find ourselves caught in a jam, like someone who wants to leave the room and finds his coat caught in the doorway. [...] The saying goes that a fox caught in a trap will gnaw off his own leg to limp away on three legs. We shall follow that example and hopefully escape to freedom, even if we must limp. [...] This week I took two trips with my car to bid Vienna farewell. The Kobenzel in all the glory of spring was magnificent.”³⁸ And on May 26th he writes: “Everything has become unreal in a sense, we are no longer here and not yet there.”³⁹

Finally, Freud was able to leave Vienna with his family on June 4th. In a last letter from Vienna on the day of his departure Freud writes to Zweig: “Leaving today for 39, Elsworth Road, London N. W. 3. Affect, greetings Freud.”⁴⁰ Zweig’s response is already addressed to the London address: “Now you are in safety, away from the victims of a decade-long lust for revenge. [...] Your archive, your books and the collections are safe.”⁴¹

Most of the members of the Society and of the candidates were able to make their escape from the Nazis as well, having to flee the city not because they were psychoanalysts, but because they were Jews. Of all the active members of the Society at the time, only three remained in Vienna: Richard Nepalpek, Alfred Winterstein und August Aichhorn.

A request for “suspension of the annulment of the Viennese Psychoanalytical Society and an approval for a resurgence of the Society’s activities” from September 1945 reports the following on Aichhorn’s activities during the time when there was no Psychoanalytical Society in Vienna: “The Viennese Psychoanalytical Society was dissolved by order of the ‘Reichsführer’ SS and chief of the German police in March 1938, the rooms as well as the furniture confiscated, the library destroyed, the finances impounded and psychoanalysis declared illegal in Austria as well. In spite of this ban, a group of supporters of Dr. Freud who continued to work, formed, led by a psychoanalyst who had remained in Vienna. The doctors and psychologists who were united in this group set themselves the goal to keep Dr. Freud’s school of thought free from any falsifications during the time of National Socialism. The meetings of this group initially took place in private, then within the confines of the ‘German Institute for Psychological research and Psychotherapy’ in Berlin, without the leadership there recognizing the group’s true intentions.”⁴²

In September 1945 Anna Freud writes to Aichhorn: “I was very happy to get your letter. Thank you very much for writing. It is very good to know that you are all right, even in your new surroundings and that your work continues. Somehow I always felt sure that you would manage to work whatever the outside circumstances were, and that under all conditions people would

³⁷ Letter from S. Freud to M. Bernays, May 14, 1938 (Freud/Bernays, *Correspondence* p. 310).

³⁸ Letter from S. Freud to M. Bernays, May 20, 1938 (Freud/Bernays, *Correspondence* p. 312).

³⁹ Letter from S. Freud to M. Bernays, May 26, 1938 (Freud/Bernays, *Correspondence* p. 317).

⁴⁰ Letter from S. Freud to A. Zweig, June 4, 1938 (Freud/Zweig, *Correspondence* p. 169).

⁴¹ Letter from S. Freud to A. Zweig, June 18, 1938 (Freud/Zweig, *Correspondence* p. 170).

⁴² Estate A. Aichhorn, Wien

need you and your help. [...] If you think that it is possible to have an Institute again, then I am sure you are right. Anyway, I would always trust your judgement of any situation.”⁴³

Then, in September 1946 she writes to him: “Tomorrow is the 7th anniversary of my father’s death. I still think it was yesterday, when I sat at his bedside. For once, I would so much like to know something about you personally, not only in connection to work and the Society. How you feel about your own person, how you dealt with all of us leaving, what these years have meant for your inner life. [...] What wouldn’t we have done in Vienna if it were not for Hitler. Only in retrospect do I realize how wonderful our Institute and our other institutions were.”⁴⁴

On December 1st, 1945, the notification was issued that the nullification of the Society had been lifted, its ceremonious re-opening took place on April 10th and in July 1946, Jones confirmed the Viennese Psychoanalytical Society as a branch of the International Psychoanalytical Association. The hopeful, at first, publicly welcomed new beginning was followed by difficult and crisis-laden years during which the continued existence of the Society was repeatedly in danger. The level of membership that the Society had in 1938, could only be reached again near the end of the 90s.

While psychoanalysis has never become directly politically active – politically used here in a close sense of the word – Freud’s thinking did have a significant influence on overall cultural development, and on the way in which political and cultural developments and processes have been interpreted (and still are). From the beginning his culture-critical train of thought attracted social democrats and leftists without there being a pronounced proximity to social democracy – as in the case of Alfred Adler’s Individual-Psychology. The group around Adler had already left the Viennese Society in 1911. Apart from psychoanalysts who had already been Social Democrats before the beginning of the First World War – such as Paul Federn or Josef Karl Friedjung – representatives of a new generation joined the Viennese Psychoanalytical Society during and particularly after the First World War, people who had through their experiences during the youth culture movement and during war times, been politically and socially sensitized. They were involved in the socialist’s goal of forming a new society and were attempting to unite Psychoanalytical and Marxist concepts to further the circles of experience influence of psychoanalysis. Among them: Siegfried Bernfeld, Helene Deutsch, Otto Fenichel, Willi Hoffer and Annie and Wilhelm Reich.

Public educational psychoanalytic work with children and adolescents was only possible in areas that had been on the fringes of the educational system even before the war, and had therefore been institutionalized to a lesser degree than the schools, such as the Kindergartens and after-school care-centres, the welfare education and Child Guidance Services. In these areas mainly the members of a working group around Anna Freud, among them August Aichhorn, Siegfried Bernfeld and Willi Hoffer, were active. They developed a pedagogically oriented form of psychoanalysis that was applied to the public educational system, earlier and more decisive than in other centres of psychoanalysis.

The students and successors of this group, whose work has become known far beyond the field of psychoanalysis, include: Bruno Bettelheim, Peter Blos, Edith Buxbaum, K. R. Eissler, Rudolf Eckstein, Erik H. Erikson, Ernst Federn, Margaret S. Mahler and Fritz Redl.

I emphasized this strain of development within the Viennese Psychoanalytical Society, because I feel that the politically and culturally critical spirit of psychoanalysis becomes especially

⁴³ Letter from A. Freud to A. Aichhorn, September 17, 1945 (Estate A. Aichhorn, Wien).

⁴⁴ Letter from A. Freud to A. Aichhorn, September 22, 1946 (Estate A. Aichhorn, Wien).

apparent here. It was a work with necessary ties to public life in Vienna that, at once, became a field of experience for a new analytical practice and for new scientific insights. On her first visit to Vienna, after 1938, at the beginning of the speech she held at the 27th Congress of the International Psychoanalytic Association, which took place in Vienna in July 1971, Anna Freud said: “It is hard not to keep thinking one thing: If we hadn’t been interrupted by political events, if we had continued to build up on these beginnings, where would psychoanalysis in Vienna stand today?” and – as I want to add – all over the world.

Literature:

- Fenichel, O. (1998): *Otto Fenichel: 119 Rundbriefe*. Frankfurt am Main: Stroemfeld Verlag
- Fichtner (G.): »... eine schmerzhaftes Schilderung der brutalen Umwälzung in Deutschland« Ein Brief Freuds an seinen Sohn Ernst aus dem Jahre 1934. *Jahrbuch der Psychoanalyse*, 54/2007: 191-204
- Freud, S. (1915) : *Thoughts for the Times on War and Death*. S.E., Volume XIV : 275-300
- Freud, S. (1925) : *An Autobiographical Study*. S.E., Volume XX : 7-70
- Freud, S. (1927): *The Future of an Illusion*. S.E., Volume XXI: 5-56
- Freud, S. (1939): *Moses and Monotheism*. S. E., Volume XXIII: 7-137
- Freud, S. (1960): *Sigmund Freud, Briefe 1873-1939*. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag
- Freud, S. (1968): *Sigmund Freud-Arnold Zweig, Briefwechsel*. Freud, E. L. (Ed.) Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag
- Freud, S. (1993): *The complete correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Ernest Jones 1908-1939*. Paskauskas R. A. (Ed.) Cambridge, London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press
- Freud, S. (2002): *The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham 1907-1925*. Falzeder E. (Ed.) PEP
- Freud, S. (2004): *Sigmund Freud-Max Eitingon, Briefwechsel 1906-1939*. Schröter M. (Ed.) Tübingen: edition diskord
- Freud, S. (2005): *Sigmund Freud-Sándor Ferenczi, Briefwechsel. Band III/2*. Falzeder E. et al. (Hg.) Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau Verlag
- Freud, S. (2005): *Sigmund Freud-Minna Bernays, Briefwechsel 1882-1938*. Hirschmüller A. (Ed.) Tübingen: edition diskord
- Jones, E. (1957): *The life and work of Sigmund Freud. Vol. III: 1919-1939, The last Phase*. New York: Basic Books
- Mann, Th. (1936): *Freud and the Future*. *Int. J. of Psycho-Analysis* 37, 1956: 106-115, p. 114.
- Molnar, M., Hg. (1992): *Sigmund Freud Tagebuch 1929-1939, Kürzeste Chronik*. Frankfurt am Main: Stroemfeld 1996, p. 62 and 408f
- Mühlleitner, E. & Reichmayr, J: *Psychoanalysis in Austria After 1933/34. History and Historiography*. *International Forum Psychoanalysis*, 12, 118-128
- Schur, M. (1972): *Freud: Living and Dying*. New York.
- Schorske, C. E. (1961): *Politics and patricide in Freud’s Interpretation of Dreams. Fin-De-Siècle Vienna. Politics and Culture*. New York : Vintage Book 1981 : 181-207