

Title of Honor: The Psychoanalytic Congress in Jerusalem

PAUL SCHWABER

A delighted, half-incredulous colleague smiled at me and asked: "At what other scholarly convention would they sing *Tum-Balayka*?" With the other sixteen hundred delegates, we had witnessed the dedication of the first tenured Sigmund Freud Chair in Psychoanalysis anywhere. Festively now, we followed the strong singer's lead through the refrain of that Yiddish song of shy and teasing courtship. In August last year in Jerusalem, The International Psychoanalytic Association held its first biennial Congress outside of Europe, in part to coincide with the inauguration of the Freud professorship at the Hebrew University. True, 20 years had passed since the Israel Society offered to host the Congress. But this was a time to celebrate firsts, for a science with special interest in the past, in a land of uncanny continuities with the historic and prehistoric. And a time for music, in addition to folk singing and the troupe of Israeli dancers at the dedication ceremony. At 9:00 on the morning the Congress convened, the Jerusalem Art quartet played Haydn. The final evening we dined to mellifluously sad

PAUL SCHWABER is Associate Professor of Letters at Wesleyan University and a Clinical Associate of the Western New England Institute for Psychoanalysis. Work on this essay was facilitated by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to the College of Letters for courses and writing on science as a humanistic discipline.

shtetl music, then danced the rhythms of many nations before linking arms for a *hora*. Hundreds and hundreds of psychoanalysts dancing a *hora*—it was not something one sees every day, or even dreams about.

To have imagined such a confluence at the turn of the century would have taxed the powers of even those two visionaries Herzl and Freud. Only 80 years before at Basel, Theodor Herzl cunningly insisted that the delegates to the first Zionist Congress wear formal attire so as to take their cause, and especially themselves, seriously. Characteristically resorting to theater, he encouraged life to follow art; for if they willed it, it would be no fairy tale.

All the while, his neighbor on Vienna's Berggasse struggled through clinical and personal thickets toward *The Interpretation of Dreams* and the new science of psychoanalysis. The dream-book reveals that Freud, too, worried about resurgent anti-Semitism. All but the most assimilated or hopeful European Jews did after the Dreyfus trial. To his dream after seeing Herzl's *The New Ghetto*, his associations begin: "The Jewish problem, concern about the future of one's children, to whom one cannot give a country of their own, concern about educating them in such a way that they can move freely across frontiers." Subsequently, Freud sent Herzl a copy of the book, praising him as "the poet and fighter

Congress

danced the rhythms
before linking arms
reds and hundreds of
ancing a *hora*—it was
le sees every day, or
t.

ed such a confluence
century would have
of even those two vi-
nd Freud. Only 80
asel, Theodor Herzl
that the delegates to
ongress wear formal
ke their cause, and
es, seriously. Charac-
g to theater, he en-
low art; for if they
be no fairy tale.

his neighbor on
struggled through
al thickets toward
of *Dreams* and the
psychoanalysis. The
that Freud, too,
gent anti-Semitism.
milated or hopeful
after the Dreyfus
fter seeing Herzl's
his associations
problem, concern
one's children, to
ive a country of
about educating
at they can move
s." Subsequently,
copy of the book,
poet and fighter

for the human rights of our people" and probably hoping for a review in the influential *Neue Freie Presse*, of which Herzl was the Literary Editor. Nothing came of the overture, and they never met.¹ Their progenitive stature looms with the years, however, and in retrospect their proximate distance on Berggasse takes on emblematic character, seeming to presage important aspects of the movements they started. The actuality of both psychoanalysis and the State of Israel could not have been more clear last summer. Only less apparent was their mutual address, the sense of progeny finding one another though their ancestors could not.

Whether racial, religious, philo-
sophic, or Zionist, identification as
Jewish has been a tender matter for
psychoanalysis. Its founder and many
of its practitioners, clients and avid
students, of course, have been Jews.
But like any science, psychoanaly-
sis makes claims to generalizable truth
and as such resists localization. When
Freud published *The Interpretation of
Dreams*, Jews were beginning to enter
European academic, scientific and cul-
tural life in great numbers. Opportuni-
ties abounded for uneasiness and worse
on all sides. Almost inevitably, his un-
settling depth psychology lent itself to
consideration as a thing apart, "Jew-
ish." In its way the situation illustrates
the argument of *The Jewish State*.
Wherever circumstances permit, Herzl
explained, Jews rush in and work vig-
orously; their influx then triggers the
fear-ridden cycle of anti-Semitism all
over again. It took the Nazis fully to
demonstrate the implications of distin-
guishing between "Jewish" and other
sciences; the drift, however, was present
from the first. Jews are different. Be-
cause not representatively human, their
discoveries do not merit credence—

certainly not suggestions about distress-
ingly sexual sources of one's inner life.

Herzl proposed a solution through
Jewish nationalism. As a young man,
Freud had considered politics and
metaphors of governance and warfare
informed his mature thought. But upon
hearing Goethe's essay on Nature read
aloud in high school,² he committed
himself to science, and his commitment
never wavered. Scientific procedures
and standards of public presentation
and critique secured ideas to move
freely across frontiers, whether of minds
or of countries. His nascent psychoanal-
ytic psychology, he knew, needed to
be tested and disputed, augmented or
superseded. One could be misled too
easily studying the unconscious. He also
understood that people had difficulty
with his theories; after all, both he
and his patients experienced the same
resistances. Subsequently he would re-
mark—with daring that escapes preten-
sion by dint of his achievement—that
psychoanalysis delivered the third se-
vere blow to human narcissism: After
Copernicus displaced us from the cen-
ter of the universe, and Darwin traced
our descent from animals, psychoanaly-
sis concluded that we are not even
masters of ourselves. There were dif-
ficulties enough. The Jewish issue was
not needed.

Yet it reared up almost immediately
and poignantly in his relations with
Carl Jung. Everything disappointing,
misguided and manipulative between
them bore not only on interactions of
psychological fathers and sons but on
the Jewish issue. That the brilliant
young psychiatrist at the Burghölzli in
Zurich was drawn to his ideas delighted
him, especially when Jung showed their
applicability to institutionalized psy-
chotics Freud did not see in his practice
and believed untreatable by his meth-
ods. Soon Jung hovered in his mind as

a Joshua to his Moses, a respected academician, a Swiss, and a Christian who could lead and, yes, protect psychoanalysis in the Promised Land of science. Karl Abraham warned quite early that Jung's thought took dangerous turns, but Freud counseled tolerance: "Do not forget that it is really easier for you than it is for Jung to follow my ideas, for in the first place you are completely independent, and then you are closer to my intellectual constitution because of racial kinship, while he as a Christian and a pastor's son finds his way to 'me' only against great inner resistances. His association with us is the more valuable for that," he continued, before hesitating suggestively over his motives: "I nearly said that it was only by [Jung's] appearance on the scene that psychoanalysis escaped the danger of becoming a Jewish national affair."

Freud had strong if vulnerable Jewish ties.³ Something in his enduring childhood quarrel with his loved father, Jacob, gave rise both to psychoanalysis and to his reserve toward the faith of Israel. Jacob, whose father had been a Hassid and perhaps a rabbi, sent his son to study Hebrew and Scriptures from age 7 to 13 with Professor Hammerschlag in Vienna. We do not know if Sigmund (Hebrew name *Shlomo*: Solomon) became Bar Mitzvah but can infer that Moses, the liberator, and Joseph, the dream-interpreter captivated his imagination. Later he named his daughters Sophie and Anna after the Hammerschlags' niece and daughter; and on his 35th birthday, Jacob presented him with a family Bible and inscribed it lyrically to him in Hebrew. Yet oddly, despite his notable linguistic gifts, Freud claimed not to know Hebrew. His antagonism to religion is well-known. But he married the grand-

daughter of Hamburg's late Chief Rabbi, though he insisted that she not be observant any more. Accounts of Freud's daily life accord with his publications and letters in conveying a consistent impression of keen pleasure taken in Jewish humor, friendships, patterns of behavior and thought, and survival.

He confronted occasional anti-Semitic encounters firmly. During the worst of them, near the end of his life, he wished defiantly to stay on in occupied Vienna. When close colleagues and friends at last persuaded him to leave, he called their attention to Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai, who, after Titus sacked Jerusalem and destroyed the second Temple, had petitioned for and received permission to go to Yavneh, there to study Torah with his followers. The precedent helped him. When he had felt "despised and universally shunned" in the gestative period of his creativity, before the turn of the century, he had joined the Jewish fraternal order B'nai B'rith and attended meetings regularly. The members honored him on his 70th birthday, and he responded by writing gratefully of the strength they had given him and of the perspectival heritage he had by birthright: "Because I was a Jew I found myself free from many prejudices which restricted others in the use of their intellect; and as a Jew I was prepared to join the Opposition and to do without agreement with the 'compact majority.'" He wrote to Karl Abraham during the Great War of being disheartened and isolated but cheered by the Balfour Declaration: "The only thing that gives me any pleasure is the capture of Jerusalem and the British experiment with the Chosen People." Later he became a founding trustee of the Hebrew University. Although in *Moses and Monotheism* he shocked Jewry with the the-

burg's late Chief Rabbi insisted that she not be more. Accounts of accord with his publishers in conveying a vision of keen pleasure, humor, friendships, and behavior and thought, and

occasional anti-Semitism. During the worst end of his life, he stayed on in occupied Palestine with close colleagues and persuaded him to leave, drawing attention to Rabbi Akiba, who, after Titus destroyed the Temple and petitioned for and refused to go to Yavneh, was helped by his followers. When the Jewish state was established and universally respected, the period of his life joined the Jewish people together, particularly in the Diaspora. The memorial on his 70th birthday was written gratefully by those who had given respect to his heritage: "Because I was not free from many restrictions as others in my field; and as a Jew in the Opposition movement with the Hebraic. He wrote to Karl Marx after the Great War of being isolated but our Declaration: it gives me any sense of Jerusalem's commitment with the fact that he became a member of the Hebrew University and Monographs with the the-

—March, 1978

sis that Moses was Egyptian, Freud was no renegade.

By way of his assimilated mother and Catholic nanny, his formal education and love of the German language, he felt strongly attached to the majority culture he could challenge and oppose with his intellect. For him Europe's best promise lay in Enlightenment humanism, which encompassed not only the exemplary Shakespeare, Goethe, Sophocles, Lessing, Ibsen and Zola, but the proud progressivism of science. Like other Jews of his generation—those trying for social, professional and financial success, those drawn to Marxist or other kinds of socialism—like Herzl and like countless immigrants to America at the time, Freud had aspirations for and in a new world. And like many minority citizens nourished by profound, dual loyalties then and since, he struggled as well with dual ambivalences. Quixotically perhaps, he tried to keep psychoanalysis free of them, free at least of prejudice from within or without. "Incidentally, why was it that none of all the pious ever discovered psychoanalysis?" he famously teased his friend Reverend Oskar Pfister. "Why did it have to wait for a completely godless Jew?" Jewishness, however defined, presided over his creativity and crucially sustained him; it may have contributed in displaced ways to psychoanalytic thought; but it had no formal place in the continuing regimen of psychoanalytic practice and research. If of its nature Zionism was a Jewish national affair, science could not be; nor, indeed, should this science even seem to be.

Freud's tenderness about the Jewish connection has at times in the history of the psychoanalytic profession bloomed to a taboo. It lingered into the International Association's decision

to hold its 30th Congress in Israel. From all reports, the decision was not easy, but significantly it reversed the one taken in 1957. Then the membership had voted to meet in Israel, the Americans and the non-Jews overwhelmingly so, I was told. But soon after World War II and just after Suez, European Jewish analysts tended to be skittish or opposed, citing Israel's inexperience in handling international conventions, its torrid summer heat, the high cost of travel, the difficulty older analysts would have traveling so far and worries about security. The Executive Committee sided with them. By 1977 matters had changed. The French alone objected seriously. Israel had proved itself a convention center, and the world economy enabled most European delegates to travel widely—to plan on New York City, as an instance, for the Congress two years hence. Israel's summer climate continued very hot; and its political climate was hotter. So there were problems, recognizably old if in new form. By meeting in the Jewish state, would psychoanalysis compromise its neutrality? Bluntly, would it seem to be siding with the Israelis against the Arabs? Could security be assured? In fact, would the members attend? Raphael Moses, President of the Israel Society, announced with evident delight that registration had equalled that of the London meeting two years earlier. And it could not but matter that Serge Lebovici of Paris, outgoing President of the International Association, presided handsomely throughout, whatever his feelings were. Ironically, the sole note of discord sounded when the Germans discomfited Jewish delegates by offering to host the Congress after next. All could see the proposal's fitness; but would they go? They maneuvered the matter to a mail ballot. As Leopold Bloom

muses, history repeats itself with a difference. The past-riddled present does not go away and always—as who should know better than psychoanalysts—there are feelings to consult and decisions to make.

While delegates were arriving from the United States, Canada, Australia, and Japan, from most West European and many South American countries, an Israeli newspaper wondered why Freud's Jewishness would not be the focus of discussion. The discipline had its own issues, however, and that one would be touched on in a paper or two, or no doubt at the dedication of the Freud chair. Our diverse group seemed to me no more Jewish than would a convention of literature professors, or for that matter of biologists, physicists, historians, political scientists, or cardiologists. Psychoanalysis has manifestly burgeoned to an intercontinental as well as international procedure, largely Western and middle-class in appeal—and in more than one way in opportunity. A few East Europeans attended but did not register, to avoid repercussions at home. We were warmly greeted by Teddy Kollek, Jerusalem's Mayor, who urged that we not listen to papers we could read when published but give ourselves over to the city instead. Our scientific topic, Affects, would be complemented by Jerusalem, a proved catalyst of emotions.

The stilted technical term "Affects" refers to all conscious and unconscious feelings, which surprisingly remain elusive to psychoanalysis, for all that they have been elucidated by it. In the analytic situation everywhere, emotions are tracked, defended, discovered, realized, scrutinized and worked through; but they have still to be comprehended within the overlapping topographical

and structural frames of systematic psychoanalytic knowledge. To be sure, such relative vantages as ego and superego psychology, character formation, primitive wishes and fantasies, formative experience, object relations, narcissism, and mental grammars illuminate a good deal. But their affective locus has not emerged clearly. Thus the dialectic of theory and practice in psychoanalysis continues, and did in Jerusalem. Representatives of major contemporary modes reported: linguistically-attuned French, American and English developmentalists, English and South American probes of earliest fantasies and object ties. Israeli analysts spoke of what they had learned of battle traumas and its bearing on established theory. The syncretic, flexible quality of this Freudian school belies its reputation. We listened, questioned and commented, soon accustomed to actual persons with names from the literature and to a dim babble of translation machines, lured by the city, slowed only by blazing temperatures remarkable even for the Middle East in August.

An admired senior analyst I know, a Brooklyn-born Jew in Israel for the first time, shook hands at the opening cocktail party, introduced his family and launched exuberantly into all he had seen. He was thrilled beyond measure, amazed at his very ecstasy. I remembered my own first visit and excitement. Some discoveries can be made only here, I thought. Late one night, after lectures, seminars, dinner, a reception and good talk at an outdoor cafe, two analytic friends and I went to the Western Wall—all that stands of the Temple that Titus destroyed. Lit and silent under the brilliant stars, it partook of all the ages. As one of us wandered toward it, I drifted in thought, recalling the first moment I had stood there. I had touched it and felt at one with Abraham. The great

frames of systematic psychology. To be sure, such as ego and superego character formation, pride fantasies, formative relations, narcissism, mirrors illuminate a good affective locus has not

Thus the dialectic of practice in psychoanalysis is vivid in Jerusalem. Rep- major contemporary linguistically-attuned and English develop- sh and South American st fantasies and object sts spoke of what they battle traumas and its blished theory. The quality of this Freud's reputation. We ed and commented, to actual persons with literature and to a translation machines, slowed only by blaz- remarkable even for in August.

Senior analyst I know, Jew in Israel for the hands at the opening introduced his family liberantly into all he thrilled beyond mea- is very ecstasy. I re- n first visit and ex- coveries can be made ght. Late one night, minars, dinner, a I talk at an outdoor riends and I went to —all that stands of Titus destroyed. Lit he brilliant stars, it ages. As one of us it, I drifted in the first moment I had touched it and braham. The great

stones seem more like skin than stone to the touch, having been worn smooth and softened somehow by centuries of gently petitioning fingers. Above on the Temple Mount, the Dome of the Rock and the El Aqsa Mosque rise magnificently; and through winding streets to the left one comes upon the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and Christ's Via Dolorosa. It is awesome at the Wall at night. One sifts civilization, time and permanence.

Distinct, private experiences like these, infused as they are with public meanings, can be shared by transforming them into words. In the talking cure, with the aid of a trusted, impartial listener, one's most costly early experiences can be repossessed and mastered. All such personal meanings, however, differ from the aspects of ourselves we reveal by virtue of being social creatures with public identities and responsibilities. What we show of our inner awarenesses, when and to whom, is up to us—although subject to unconscious exigencies, and to political ones as well. In the nature of things, the vast majority of delegates showed little more than the surface of their feelings to any one observer. What might I infer, then, about those analysts during *Kabalat Shabbat* services at the Wall, still sporting their "IPAC 1977" badges, walking slowly through the bustle of praying groups? What of the young delegate with his eyes closed, swaying with the Hassidim? Or the impassive one in a *minyán* of North African Jews? They testified to their commitment as Jews while reserving for themselves the intensity, special meaning and resonance of their actions.

Eighty-two now and still active, known to be shy of crowds and fuss, Anna Freud, who has never been to Israel, prepared a lecture for the dedica- tion of the professorship named for her

father. It was delivered on her behalf by Arthur Valenstein of Boston. Not there, she proved the most memorable participant, the one most finely attuned to significant change. She always writes simply, bringing unpretentious clarity of statement to the complicated psychic processes she explicates. In contrast to her father, she does not present herself dramatically in her prose to establish the point of view; nor does she use herself as representative example, as he did in *The Interpretation of Dreams*; or tacitly accept her public stature, as he did when thanking the B'nai B'rith. Her inaugural lecture for the Sigmund Freud Chair focused, characteristically, on public issues, drawing the line firmly and protectively around her privacy. Nevertheless, it paralleled her father's B'nai B'rith Address in importance.

An international committee headed by Martin Wanh of New York had raised funds for the Chair at the Hebrew University. But what qualifies psychoanalysis for a Chair or program of its own, Anna Freud asked. It has thrived on independence, to be sure. But its therapeutic aim would warrant its inclusion among the medical or psychiatric faculties. Besides, the success of psychoanalysis as a therapy is not unqualified and at best takes a long time. "For a miracle," she recalled her father saying, "it is much too slow." Psychoanalytic metapsychology on the other hand, elaborated and fascinating though it be, invites comparison only with other psychological theories. She maintained that the working method distinguishes it. Based not on persuasion or coercion but on cooperation with the patients, its method connects the practice and theory of psychoanalysis inextricably. Both depend on unconscious mental processes being brought to consciousness. "Thus, what-

ever psychic content is unearthed from the mind of an individual patient, becomes a legitimate item for incorporation into the theory. And, vice versa, every item of the theory becomes in this manner a tool for the understanding of the problems of life." Ground concern with human problems assures the usefulness of psychoanalytic knowledge to all disciplines traditionally studied at a university. She speculated briefly that extreme abnormality and formulation of a general psychology of normal development would attract more analytic attention in the future, then startled the assemblage with her conclusion. I quote it in full:

During the era of its existence, Psychoanalysis has entered into connection with various academic institutions, not always with satisfactory results. It has also, repeatedly, experienced rejection by them, criticized for its methods being imprecise, its findings not open to proof by experiment, for being unscientific, even for being a "Jewish science." However the other derogatory comments may be evaluated here, it is, I believe, the last-mentioned connotation which, under present circumstances can serve as a Title of Honour.

People hesitated, turned, wondered: a Jewish science! It came from nowhere in the speech. Yet under the circumstances of the Hebrew University—a title of honor, ^{and} maintaining her reserve, but emphatic^{ly} at the climax, Anna Freud faced down the old issue, unexpectedly, transvaluing values. The very quality of unencumbered statement suggests that the tension has not been resolved but dealt with differently. Nonetheless, with proximate distance still, she bespoke a changed attitude. An historical moment.

Common Israeli wisdom has it that the Yom Kippur War of October, 1973 marked a watershed for both public

and private feelings. One young psychoanalyst, who has now participated in three Middle-Eastern wars, put it this way: "We had to go from civilized standards as reserve soldiers to killing ones, as before; but this time we had to do it without warning, immediately, while struggling to believe that we were really at war. We had to worry all over again for the safety of our families and for the future. And we had seen destroyed the myth of our invulnerable army, intelligence services, and leaders." When the Egyptians and Syrians caught the Defense Forces unawares and insufficiently supplied, part of Israel's image of itself gave way. The shock to confidence proved as severe as the casualties and suffering.

Although it has been formally at war with all its neighbors since declaring its independence, the Jewish state has survived and collectively Israelis have forged an identity distinguishable from that of the European Jews who were annihilated and from American Jews who, with all their blessings, live as a minority. Strong, laconic, shrewd without being airily intellectual, generous and very hospitable though often rude, practical, assertive and aggressive rather than introspective, they are above all determined and resourceful in battle. This adaptive style of being has limits and fragilities, however, which the last war in part exposed. While courageous and again eventually victorious in the October War, Israelis radically experienced not only their danger but their bond to world Jewry and dependence on the United States. They had been otherwise isolated. Willy nilly, though they had surely changed Jewish history, they had not escaped it and shared the historical Jewish fate of being few in number and vulnerable. Even in the Promised Land—that was the bitterest lesson—they still were as if in the Dias-

feelings. One young psychoanalyst has now participated in the Middle-Eastern wars, put it had to go from civilized reserve soldiers to killing; but this time we had no warning, immediately compelling to believe that we were in a war. We had to worry about the safety of our families and the future. And we had to dispel the myth of our invulnerable intelligence services, when the Egyptians and the Defense Forces insufficiently supplied, part of itself gave way. Confidence proved as casualties and suffering. It has been formally at its neighbors since dependence, the Jewish people and collectively Israel had an identity distinct from that of the European annihilated and from those who, with all their might, without being airily inebriated and very hospitable, rude, practical, assertive rather than introverted, above all determined in battle. This adapting has limits and fractures which the last war revealed. While courageous and usually victorious in the past, Israelis radically experienced their danger but their bewilderment and dependence. They had been changed. Willy nilly, though they changed Jewish history, they escaped it and shared the Jewish fate of being few and vulnerable. Even in the past that was the bitterest were as if in the Dias-

pora, needing support from the exile communities no less than, since 1948, the latter had for their own moral and spiritual sustenance needed Israel. Such leveling understanding was hardly new. But so much had ridden on the illusion of self-reliant strength that the blow to self-esteem mattered. Morale sagged for several years, and only by electing the maverick Menahem Begin, implying, however ironically, a restoration of the founding generation, did they rekindle hope, much to the surprise of a good many Western and Israeli observers. Once more the round, perhaps to get it right this time.

The Yom Kippur War produced more battle shock, panic in action, survivor's guilt, casualties with psychological after-effects, bereft families and national mourning than any of Israel's previous wars by far. As had been America's experience during World War II, psychological therapy proved palpably necessary and useful and public respect for it escalated. One result has been that Israelis now more frequently seek out help for personal troubles, though rarely, apparently, do they speak of it even with friends. Psychotherapies there tend to be brief, for reasons that include the yearly military call-up, cost—though fees are low, analogous to those in England—and social acceptability. Not fitting comfortably with public toughness, being psychoanalyzed has yet to become enviable, as it has in areas of this country. But inner needs, wishes and fears that had been going unrecognized begin to have their day. Near the end of *Envy the Frightened*, Yaël Dayan's suggestively titled early novel, a crippled Israeli warrior writes in his suicide note: "It takes great courage to be afraid and we don't have this kind of courage." Increasingly, they do and in a moral sense can afford to. The point

is that Israel is changing, not alone by impetus of the last war but by the logic and achievement of its 30-year existence. Despite danger, geographical and human limitations, pressing taxes and endless inflation, the country has been built up, the immigrants brought in and a viable and vibrant national culture established. There are plenty of problems: to mention only a few, social and political inequities, still no peace and major disagreement about what to yield to get it and economic scandals. But there are separate and private problems too, having to do with self-blighted careers, unhappy marriages, divorces and children, anxiety, guilt, inhibited pleasure, and unfulfilled lives that now, without selfishness, can be attended to. One legitimate goal of a state can be so to secure the safety of its citizens as to enable them to try to transform (echoing Freud) neurotic misery into common unhappiness.

The classical psychoanalytic treatment procedure of several years' duration seems alien to most Israelis. Their psychoanalysts, however, at present report waiting lists; and applications for training at the Israel Psychoanalytic Institute have notably increased. Moreover, many clinical psychologists apply and are accepted. That numbers of social workers, teachers, and others professionally involved with mental health in Israel attended the Congress testifies to their interest as well as to responsiveness to the occasion. Psychoanalysis in fact has deep roots in Israel. It came early to the Jewish settlement in British Palestine, where Freud was read as a revolutionary theorist. Ernest Jones recalled Chaim Weizmann's commenting to him in 1920 on the great interest in psychoanalysis in Palestine: "He told me that immigrants from Galicia

arrived there with no clothes, but with copies of *Das Kapital* and *Die Traumdeutung* . . . under their arms." The first psychoanalysts to make a go of it depended on clients whose socialist *kibbutzim* paid approximately 50¢ an hour, or in eggs and other farm produce when cash was short. *Kibbutzim* geared their educational patterns to the developmental needs of children, in the light of Freud's ideas as they understood them. Central sleeping quarters for the children, for example, derived in part from a winning desire to spare them unconscious fantasies of primal scenes, which, it was believed, came from seeing or hearing parental intercourse. In the 1930s, Henrietta Szold of Youth Aliyah, the organization that cared for immigrant children, took counsel from Max Eitingon and other psychoanalysts in matters of absorption, mental difficulties, early diagnosis and sex education. The crucially formative influence of these institutions in turn helps to account for Israeli hospitality to applied psychoanalytic ideas—as often as not unacknowledged—in school systems, child-guidance and outpatient clinics, parole boards, and the Defense Forces, which pay attention both to socialization and to soldiers' problems.

Eitingon, who was a Zionist, visited Palestine in 1910 and returned to stay in 1933, when Hitler came to power in Germany. One of Freud's most devoted followers, he had joined the "Committee" that formed around Freud after his break with Jung, founded and for many years directed the Berlin Institute, and served as President of the International Association. The year he arrived he helped to form the Palestine Psychoanalytic Society. In Avner Falk's apt words: "Metaphorically one might say that Freud and Herzl, who never met in Vienna when they lived across the street from each other, met in

Jerusalem in the person of Max Eitingon." He hoped to set up a Chair of Psychoanalysis at the Hebrew University and enlisted Freud's interest in the idea.⁴ When, however, the University Senate decided instead on a Chair of General Psychology, he founded what is now the Israel Psychoanalytic Institute. Thus, the new Sigmund Freud Chair at the Hebrew University rectifies an earlier refusal and can symbolize a turning in Israeli thinking, one that has been matched appropriately by the international psychoanalytic community. The children of Herzl and the children of Freud, all sins of omission and commission admitted, have contributed to the sum of human freedom and dignity. They met last summer, not figuratively but declaratively, in Jerusalem.

When Heinz Hartmann, Marianne and Ernst Kris, Ruth and Kurt Eissler and many others fled Vienna ultimately to settle in the United States, their colleague Heinz Winnik headed for Palestine. There he became one of Israel's foremost training analysts, editor of its psychoanalytic journal, several times President of its Psychoanalytic Society and an archeological buff greatly fond of walking in Jerusalem. On a blistering morning after the Congress, Dr. Winnik led a small group of delegates and their families through the Jewish quarter of the old walled city. In our midst were several American-born Jewish analysts and trainees. As a little girl, one of our number had been spirited by her parents from Vienna to safety, through Jung's and Pfister's Switzerland. There was an editor considering manuscripts of new archeological studies of ancient Israel, and a Long Island physician who, at each year's meeting of the American

person of Max Eitingon to set up a Chair of the Hebrew University and Freud's interest in psychology, he founded the Israel Psychoanalytic Society at the Hebrew University. His refusal and can symbolize a turning point in Israeli thinking, which matched appropriate national psychoanalytic children of Herzl and Freud, all sins of omission admitted, have the sum of human freedom. They met last summer but declaratively,

Hartmann, Marianne and Kurt Eissler led Vienna ultimately to the United States, their Winnik headed for and became one of the leading analysts, editor of the psychoanalytic journal, several of its Psychoanalytic colleagues were great in Jerusalem. On a trip after the Congress, a small group of delegations through the old walled city. Several American students and trainees. As for our number had their parents from through Jung's and Freud. There was an abundance of manuscripts of new studies of ancient Israel, a physician who, at the age of the American

stream—March, 1978

Psychoanalytic Association, leads a discussion group devoted to the psychic effects of the Holocaust on the second generation of survivors. We ambled easily through the gate that David Elazar and his Palmach soldiers blew open when trying to relieve the siege of the Jewish quarter in 1948—enjoying the shade of its arch. After the Jews had surrendered and left, the Jordanians left the quarter in ruins. Now it is being artfully rebuilt to preserve its character. At the Yochanan ben Zakkai Synagogue, built where Rabbi Yochanan began his wanderings in the days of Titus, we paused. Jewish residents had huddled there during bombardments by the Arab Legion. With Freud, Vienna, Rabbi Yochanan, Jerusalem lost and regained time and again, the

Lower East Side, the Wall, ancient and modern Israel running in my head, I thought bizarrely of my first morning of observing children at a nursery school in Woodbridge, Connecticut. It was part of my training. My supervisor had charmed me with a gift packet of index cards. She was not the first woman to give me a present on the first day of school. "Miss Freud always advises that we use them," she said. "Jot down anything interesting you notice, and later you'll see whether it makes sense." In a flash it came to me: from Sigmund, to Anna, to Alice, to me! It was amazing, and more than a little comical. History with a difference. That wasn't progress; but it *was* continuity. And change. Change and structuring continuity: *Tum Balalayka!*

Footnotes

1. See Avner Falk's cogent discussion, "Freud and Herzl," *Midstream*, XXIII (January 1977), 3-24.
2. In 1956 the essay was shown to be not actually by Goethe but by a Swiss writer, G. C. Tobler. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, tr. and ed. James Strachey et al., 24 Vols. (London: Hogarth, 1953-1974), V, 714.
3. Ernest Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, 3 Vols. (New York: Basic Books, 1953-1957) and Max Schur, *Freud: Living and Dying* (New York: I.U.P., 1972) are illuminating on Freud's Jewish upbringing and identity. Notable specialized studies include Falk, *op. cit.*; Ernst Simon, "Sigmund Freud, the Jew," *Leo Baeck Institute, Year Book II* (1957), 270-305; Peter Loewenberg, "'Sigmund Freud as a Jew': a Study in Ambivalence and Courage," *Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences*, VII (1971), 363-369. Léon Vogel, "Freud and Judaism: an Analysis in the Light of his Cor-

respondence," *Judaism*, XXIV (Spring 1975), 181-193; Marthe Robert, *From Oedipus to Moses: Freud's Jewish Identity*, tr. Ralph Manheim (New York: Anchor, 1976). Carl E. Schorske weaves Freud's political and cultural situation as a Jew into "Politics and Patricide in Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams*," *American Historical Review*, LXXVIII (April 1973), 328-347. Schur, Simon, Loewenberg, and Robert consider connections between traditional Jewish thought and psychoanalysis. See also David Bakan, *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition* (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1958) and Robert Gordis, "The Two Faces of Freud," *Judaism*, XXIV (Spring 1975), 194-200. Peter Gay offers a contrasting view in *Freud, Jews and Other Germans: Masters and Victims in Modernist Culture* (New York: Oxford, 1978).

4. See Milton Rosenbaum, "Freud-Eitingon-Magnes Correspondence: Psychoanalysis at the Hebrew University," *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, II (1954), 311-317.