

Thomas Aichhorn
 Gentzgasse 125/13
 1180 Wien
 Österreich

The history of psychoanalysis in Vienna and Sigmund Freud's legacy.¹

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen, I would first like to thank you sincerely for the opportunity to speak before you here.

I will begin with a brief depiction of the history of psychoanalysis in Vienna. Subsequently, I will address a connection between Vienna and Copenhagen: Erik Bjerg Hansen had come to Vienna from Denmark at the beginning of the 1950s to train as a psychoanalyst. He met Margarete Kremenak there. They married in 1953 and went to Denmark, where they both joined the Danish psychoanalytical work group.

Finally, I will talk about Sigmund Freud's legacy and the continuing importance of psychoanalysis.

About the History of Psychoanalysis in Vienna:

The origins of the history of psychoanalysis in Vienna are inextricably linked to Sigmund Freud's life story, for it was he, who developed and practiced psychoanalysis as a science here. In „An Autobiographical Study“ (Freud 1925) he wrote: ”I was born on May 6th, 1856, at Freiberg [Příbor] in Moravia, a small town in what is now Czechoslovakia. My parents were Jews, and I have remained a Jew myself” (a. a. O., p. 7). He continued: “When I was a child of four I came to Vienna, and I went through the whole of my education there. [...] Although we lived in very limited circumstances, my father insisted that, in my choice of a profession, I should follow my own inclinations alone. [...] It was hearing Goethe's beautiful essay on Nature read aloud at a popular lecture by Professor Carl Brühl just before I left school that decided me to become a medical student” (a. a. O., p. 8).

There is much to suggest that Freud had initially aspired to a scientific, university career as a physiologist. Due to the unfavourable job situation at the university, however, he was ultimately unable to realize this plan. In order to marry and be able to support a family, he decided to settle down as a neurologist. The place from which his research had started and where it was to prove itself in practice was therefore neither the university nor the institutional psychiatry customary at the time, but the outpatient neurological private practice.

The official start of Freud's practice at Rathausstraße 7 was April 25th, 1886. To perfect his training as a neurologist, he had previously studied in Paris with Charcot. In October of that year he gave a lecture at the “Society of Medicine”. Due to the experiences Freud had made in Paris, his interest had shifted from the organic to the psychological. Thus, he had largely lost the patronage he had previously received at the university. He reported: “The duty devolved upon me of giving a report before the ‘Gesellschaft der Aerzte’ [Society of Medicine] upon what I had seen and learnt with Charcot. But I met with a bad reception. Persons of authority [...] declared that what I said was incredible. [...] I found myself forced into the Opposition. As I was soon afterwards excluded from the laboratory of cerebral anatomy and for terms on

¹ Lecture in Copenhagen on 3. 9. 2019.

end had nowhere to deliver my lectures, I withdrew from academic life and ceased to attend the learned societies” (Freud 1925, p. 15f). Freud had come to the realization that he had failed in his intention to give the whole field of neurosis a new, generally recognized basis with his contributions. This dates the point of his so-called *splendid isolation*.

It is usually assumed that Freud’s *splendid isolation* only ended with the establishment of the “Psychological Wednesday Society” in 1902. It is, however, overlooked that, although he did not give public lectures from 1896 onwards and hardly published anymore until the „Interpretation of Dreams“ (Freud 1900a) was published in 1900, he did continue to give lectures at the university.² All in all he had – with greatly varying attendance – about 296 listeners during the course of those years. Some of them became members of the Wednesday Society or the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society. The first lecture was held in the winter semester of 1886/87, the last in the winter semester of 1918/1919. He gave two-hour lectures – first on the anatomy of the brain, then on nervous diseases in children, on selected chapters of neuropathology and in the last years on the major neuroses. The „Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis“ (Freud 1916-17a) have originated from these lectures.

In “On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement” (Freud 1914) Freud gave this account: “From the year 1902 onwards [...] regular meetings took place on certain evenings at my house, discussions were held according to certain rules and the participants endeavoured to find their bearings in this new and strange field of research and to interest others in it” (a. a. O., p. 25). The group continued to grow and included, as Freud continued to write, “besides doctors, the circle included others – men of education who had recognized something important in psycho-analysis: writers, painters and so on” (a. a. O., p. 26).

The founding of the Wednesday Society with its strictly ritualized context of discussion, which carried certain group therapeutic traits, signified a first, momentous step towards a specific model of psychoanalytical education. It maintains a tense balance between institution and privacy, distance and emotional attachment, knowledge transfer and affective self-knowledge. On April 15th, 1908, the Wednesday Society adopted the name “Vienna Psychoanalytical Society” – April 15th has since been considered the official date of birth of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society.

Generally, little attention is paid to the fact, but it seems quite remarkable to me that Freud certainly did not teach psychoanalysis through his writings alone, but that the oral component was especially important to his teachings. It goes without saying that this oral tradition of psychoanalysis, which was to become so crucial for the history of psychoanalysis in Vienna, could only have taken place there. In all other places, Freud’s publications were the only point of reference.

In 1958, to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Society’s founding, Anna Freud wrote: “A founding anniversary in the Vienna Society has more significance than similar dates in any other branch of the International Psychoanalytical Association. The others celebrate the duration of their own existence on such days. You simultaneously celebrate the date of birth of the psychoanalytic movement, and – though not the date of birth of psychoanalysis itself –

² Comp. Augusta 2019, Eissler 1966, Gicklhorn & Gicklhorn 1960.

the 50th return of the moment when the founder of the new doctrine considered it mature enough to begin a public life.³

Freud's thinking did have a significant influence on overall cultural development in Vienna. From the very beginning his culture-critical train of thought attracted social democrats and leftists without there being a pronounced proximity to social democracy – contrary to 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, representatives of a new generation joined the Society during and particularly after the war, people, who had through their experiences during the youth culture movement and during war times, been politically and socially sensitized.

Since it was Adler's individual psychology that had found hearing among relevant social-democratic politicians, and because the influential psychological faction at the university (Karl and Charlotte Bühler) opposed psychoanalysis, psycho-analysts were unable to participate in the educational reforms that were at the centre of the social-political actions of "Red Vienna". Psycho-analytic work was only possible in areas that had been on the fringes of the public educational system 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. It was mainly in these areas that 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 psycho-analysis that was applied to the public educational system, earlier and more decisive than in other centres. The students and successors of this group whose work has become known far beyond the field of psycho-analysis, include: Bruno Bettelheim, Peter Blos, Edith Buxbaum, K. R. Eissler, Rudolf Eckstein, Erik H. Erikson, Ernst Federn, Margaret S. Mahler and Fritz Redl.

I purposefully emphasized this branch of development within the Viennese Society, because I feel that the politically and culturally critical spirit of psycho-analysis becomes especially apparent here. It was work with necessary ties to public life in Vienna, which became a field of experience for a new analytical practice and also for new scientific insights. On her first visit to Vienna, after 1938, Anna Freud reminded us of this. At the beginning of a speech she held at the 27th Congress of the International Psychoanalytic Association, which took place in Vienna in July of 1971, she 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 in 1980, in the introduction to her "Writings" she states: „As promising as these undertakings may have seemed back then, they met with their natural end when Hitler invaded Austria in 1938. This event, however, did not bring about the end of our work, but the emigration and spreading of numerous analytically educated specialists, mainly to England and the United States."

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.

Political circumstances in Austria had become extremely unstable after the end of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. Political forces in Austria – Christian Socialists, Social Democrats and

³ Anna Freud to W. Solms und A. Winterstein, letter from April of 1958; Original in the archive of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society.

German Nationals – opposed each other with increasing animosity and readiness to resort to violence.

In January 1933 Hitler became chancellor of Germany and following the fire at the Reichstag on the 27th of February thousands of regime critics had been deported to concentration camps. The basic rights of the Weimar Republic were annulled and a path was forged, away from a republic to a totalitarian dictatorship. Freud's sons Ernst and Oliver, who had lived in Berlin, emigrated to England and France with their families, and the emigration of Jewish psychoanalysts away from Germany, some coming to Vienna, had already begun.

During the same year Engelbert Dollfuß, a conservative-clerical Austrian-nationalist, exploited a crisis to dissolve the Austrian Parliament. A ban on public assembly was introduced, the Austrian Nazi party and the communist party were forbidden, censorship of Austrian newspapers was introduced and the valid democratic constitution was abolished – an austro-fascist dictatorship was installed.

On the 16th of March 1933 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 - good. It is one kind of death like another. But probably that is only cheap boasting."

1934 civil war broke out in Austria, when the already outlawed social-democratic "Schutzbund" started an uprising which was brutally put down within a few days. Subsequently, the Social Democratic Party was declared illegal and a single united party was established. Freud wrote to his son Ernst: "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 its way across the borders: The Catholic Church as our protector! So we shall stay."

One of Hitler's main goals was the annexation of Austria by Germany. In a treaty of July 11th, 1936, the German government recognized Austria's sovereignty, but an additional, secret agreement was far more unfavourable for Austria. Austria was now under the obligation to grant an amnesty to imprisoned national socialists and to accept trusted German nationalists as ministers in the government.

The year of 1936 was also the year Freud celebrated his 80th birthday, the last festive birthday he was able to experience, or had to experience, as his letters from that time indicate. In the end he 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 he had expected. Freud wrote 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."

The change in political power in Austria in 1933/34, the establishment of the corporative state and the banning of all left-wing parties had virtually no effect on psychoanalysis. The Vienna Psychoanalytical Society had never shown itself officially in favour of a political movement. Therefore psychoanalysts were able to continue their work more or less unhindered during

that period. The 1930s were without doubt an exceptional golden age in the development of the Society, a peak, which could not be reached again. But, the influence of politically motivated events on the Society did not remain totally without consequences. The emigration of Viennese psychoanalysts had already begun. On the whole 28 members of the Viennese Society emigrated between 1933 and 1938; others had been driven away from Berlin and had come to Vienna. Freud refrained from publishing his theses that dealt critically with religion in "Moses and Monotheism: Three Essays" (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 "foundation" of this undemocratic construction of a state.

In the February of 1938 Anna Freud wrote to Max 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."

The "political events" Anna Freud mentions in her letter were in fact the so called "Berchtesgarden Settlement": Kurt Schuschnigg, the Austrian chancellor, 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.

Schuschnigg, who had sought a way out of the precarious situation after the "Berchtesgarden Settlement", announced a people's referendum, 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 the 11th of March. The German armed forces marched into Austria and on the 12th of March Hitler crossed the border at Braunau on the Inn. In his diary, Freud simply noted "Finis Austriae" 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 traveling to Holland. I am going to keep you informed as soon as we know more." In his 48th circular dating from the 25th of June, 1938, Otto Fenichel wrote: "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." He goes on to write: "Now the Viennese Society is lost and one has to ask a frightening question: What is to become of psychoanalysis?"

On the 13th of March a board meeting of the Viennese Society was held, at which two decisions were passed: All members of the society should flee the country as quickly as possible and the headquarters of the Society would be relocated to wherever Freud was going to settle down. On the 20th of March, 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 Vienna Society was to be placed in the hands of the German Psychoanalytical Society. Due to an intervention by higher ranking party-officials this never came to pass, and on the 25th of August, 1938, the Society was closed once and for all by an official decree.

Freud was able to leave Vienna with his family on the 4th of June, 1938. Most of the members of the Society and most candidates managed to escape from the national socialists as well, having to flee the city not because they were psychoanalysts, but because they were Jewish.

Their escape was aided by Anna Freud, Ernest Jones and the “Emergency Committee on Relief and Immigration”, that was chaired by Lawrence S. Kubie, Bettina Warburg und Bertram Lewin.

Of all the active members of the Society at the time, three remained in Vienna: Richard Nepallek, who died by poisoning with a fluorescent gas in 1940, Alfred Winterstein, who retired from public life and August Aichhorn. A request for "suspension of the annulation of the Viennese Psychoanalytical Society and an approval for a resurgence of the Society's activities" from September of 1945 reports the following on August 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’ of the SS and chief of the German police in March of 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 was formed, led by a psychoanalyst [Aichhorn] who had remained in Vienna. The doctors and psychologists who were united in this group set themselves the goal of keeping 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 Psycho-therapy’ in Berlin, without the leadership there recognizing the group's true intentions."

In September of 1945 Anna Freud wrote to Aichhorn: "I was very happy to get your letter. Thank you very much for writing. It is so 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 any and all conditions people would 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."

Of the training candidates who Aichhorn analysed and supervised during those years, ten became members of the reopened Society in 1946. Igor A. Caruso who had joined in 1944, founded a society, independent of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, the „Vienna Work Group for Depth Psychology“ – today „Vienna Psychoanalytic Association“ – which was formally constituted in 1947 and is now member of the International Psychoanalytical Association.

On the 1st of December, 1945, the notification was issued that the nullification of the Society had been lifted. Its ceremonious re-opening took place on the 10th of April 1946 and in July the Viennese Psychoanalytical Society was confirmed as a branch of the International Psychoanalytical Association.

On the occasion of the Society's reopening, Anna Freud wrote to Aichhorn: “Your news that a new psychoanalytical institute will be opened in Vienna made a great impression upon me. The destruction of the old Institute by the National Socialists, the closing of the Ambulatorium, the destroying of the books and the dissolving of the Psychoanalytical Publishing House seemed in 1938 to signify the end of psychoanalysis in Austria. [...] I wish your new creation the very best in vitality and effect on its environment. The destruction of psychoanalysis in 1938 was logically inevitable. Psychoanalysis can only flourish where there is freedom of thought. The new freedom in Austria will, I think, mean new life for psychoanalytical work.”

The hopeful, at first, publicly welcomed new beginning was followed by difficult and crisis-laden years during which the continued existence of the Vienna 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 1990s.

For the Viennese psychoanalysts the traumatic experience of the destruction of psychoanalysis from outside represented a conflict situation. In the two decades following the re-opening one tried, probably under the influence of a kind of conspiratorial mentality after surviving persecution, to concentrate on training and conservation, to be as inconspicuous as possible to the outside world, to stay 'small', so to speak. This led, however, to a rather conservative, indeed orthodox attitude. This began to change slowly during the 1980s and 1990s. Whereas the attitude of the Society had been characterized by certain orthodoxy until that time, the numerous, often contradictory orientations that can be found in modern psychoanalysis, are now all represented by members of the Vienna Society.

The Society, which now has 141 full members, 82 provisional members and 3 affiliated members, has long since emerged from its shadowy existence. In 2006, for example, the Vienna Society, together with the Vienna Psychoanalytic Association founded the Vienna Psychoanalytic Academy, a publicly accessible centre for psychoanalysis and its applications. It provides an institutional framework for mediation and research tasks, for interdisciplinary exchange and project-related cooperation.

The Freud museum in Vienna, which attempts to make psychoanalysis accessible to the public in numerous exhibitions and events, should also not go unmentioned.

Some comments on a connection between Vienna and Copenhagen: Erik Bjerg Hansen and Margarete Kremenak-Hansen:

A letter from Erik Bjerg Hansen to the "Teaching Committee of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society" dated 8th of June, 1950, reads: "I take the liberty of applying for admission to the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society as a candidate for psychoanalytical training. Since September 12th of 1949 I have been in training analysis with Dr. Thea [Tea] Genner and – with 6 hours of analysis per week – have had 210 hours so far. I will probably have had 250-260 hours of analysis by the beginning of the 1950 winter semester. I would like to point out that I am a foreigner and came to Vienna solely for the purpose of psychoanalytical training. It is therefore of particular importance to me to begin theoretical training as soon as possible." His attached curriculum vitae held information on his birth date – the 28th of October 1917 – and his graduation in 1936. He then studied medicine in Copenhagen and received his doctorate in 1943. He completed his general medical training in various Danish hospitals, worked as an assistant doctor in the psychiatric department of the Copenhagen municipal hospital and in a Norwegian insane asylum. From 1945 to 1949 he had been employed as a ship's doctor for a Norwegian whaling fleet and during the summer months he had worked in in the Danish army, in a Norwegian hospital, in 1949 in Paris and as an assistant doctor in Copenhagen. The minutes of the meeting of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society from May 28th 1952 read: "Dr. Erik Hansen gave his trial lecture on the development of the concept of transference in the writings of Sigmund Freud and was subsequently unanimously elected as a full member of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society."

In a letter dated 12th of September, 1950 to the „Teaching Committee of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society“ Margareta Kremenak applied for admission as a training candidate. Her curriculum vitae states that she was born in Vienna on November 28th in 1921. She had been employed as a teacher at the “Institute for women’s commercial occupations”. In addition to her work there, she began to study at the University of Vienna in 1946, majoring in psychology with a minor in anthropology. In May of the same year she had begun a therapeutic analysis with Tea Genner-Erdheim, which had developed into a training analysis. Kremenak wrote: „Stimulated by my studies and analysis, my psychological interest in analytical theory grew more and more, so that today, after consulting my analyst, I am seeking admission as a training candidate.“

The minutes of the meeting of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society on June 24th 1958 state Dr. Hansen-Kremenaks trial lecture „The Sublimation“ would now be read. The reading of lectures in the absence of the candidate was possible, but not desired. The minutes also show: „In her lecture the candidate Dr. Hansen-Kremenak tries to give an overview of the development of the term sublimation. In particular, she deals with the so-called ‘narrower‘ and the so-called ‘broader‘ definition of the term, as well as with the function of sublimation within the framework of the defence mechanisms of the ‘Ego‘ and in the light of the newer analytical ego-psychology.” The members of the Society agreed that the lecture of Dr. Hansen-Kremenak meets the requirements and voted in favour of her admission as an extraordinary member of the Society.

Erik Bjerg Hansen and Margareta Kremenak were married in 1953. They moved to Copenhagen, where they joined the Danish psychoanalytical working group, which had been founded that same year. Erik Bjerg Hansen was later appointed training analyst, Margareta Hansen-Kremenak was appointed training analyst after his death in 1971. Margareta Hansen-Kremenak died in 2004.⁴

Who was Tea Genner-Erdheim, Bjerg Hansen’s and Hansen-Kremenak’s training analyst? She was born in 1906 as the daughter of a Jewish merchant and a non-Jewish mother from a middle-class family. She grew up in the enlightened Jewish milieu typical of Vienna at the time. While in middle-school, she was a member of the union of socialist middle-school students. Later she often spoke about the youth-groups of that time, but also about her contact with the cultural events of the Twenties. Despite a certain critical distance, her love for all things growing, searching and her open-mindedness to new questions, stayed with her from that time on. The time in which she had grown up was a time of great general hardship, which served as an education in frugality for her. Hence her sovereign disdain for appearances, for luxury and fashion, as well as her aversion to alcohol and the alcoholic forms of conviviality. In 1932 Genner-Erdheim received her doctorate in medicine from the Medical Faculty of the University of Vienna; she specialized in psychiatry and neurology. In 1934 she began a training analysis with Eduard Hitschmann, which she abandoned at the end of 1936 due to a prolonged illness. In 1937, one year after beginning her analysis, she was admitted to theoretical training at the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society. She began her practical training; her control analyst was Otto Isakower. She did not continue her analysis with Hitschmann, because it had not met her expectations. At the time, she was most fascinated by Heinz

⁴ Comp.: Bodin, G. (2004). ‘This is not psychoanalysis’ On the stony way of the Danish Psychoanalytical Society. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 85(5):1191-1208.

Hartmann, at whose station she had worked for a long time. His medical knowledge, but also his philosophical, historical and artistic interests and knowledge impressed her, as did his very humane bearing.

In February of 1938, Genner-Erdheim decided to continue her analysis with Jeanne Lampl-de Groot, but could not continue the analysis because Lampl-de Groot had fled to Holland in 1938. She was also in analysis with August Aichhorn after the war. Genner-Erdheim rejected the possibility of emigrating to the USA. Initially she worked in her private practice; from 1941 to 1944 she was obliged to take over a general practice as a war service. At the end of 1944 she managed to escape from Vienna with her later husband Laurenz Genner.⁵

Tea Genner-Erdheim did not belong to the group that Aichhorn had gathered around him during the national socialist era, but as early as 1946, she was one of the first members of the re-established Vienna Psychoanalytical Society. After Aichhorn's death in the autumn of 1949, Genner-Erdheim became a member of the provisional teaching committee of the Vienna Society and was commissioned with training analyses. In 1954 she was appointed training analyst. For many years she taught introductory courses at the teaching institute – especially on the study of neuroses – and became one of the most popular and respected analysts of the Viennese Society. In her lectures Genner-Erdheim dealt with various topics, with applied psychoanalysis, with the ego psychology of Hartmann and his colleagues, but also with casuistry. Her main interest, however, was the analysis of her younger colleagues. Even today, many of her analysands – and their analysands – play an important role within the Vienna Society. I too, belong to those who can trace their „ancestry“ back to her.

Genner-Erdheim did not publish any of her scientific papers, but her lectures had a tremendous effect on the members and candidates of the Society. She died in 1977.

An obituary for Genner-Erdheim mentions her tendency for discretion as one of her outstanding qualities. One reason for her low publicised output was that she considered the distortion of the case histories problematic for publication. She also spoke little about herself and her personal affairs. This was also true for her political views. Even in difficult times, she had remained steadfastly loyal to the Communist party, but the events in Hungary in 1956 had made it necessary for her to distance herself from the party. As a result of these events she had lost her political home and analysis became even more important for her.

With regard to the indication and technique of psychoanalysis, she had a rather conservative standpoint; she always advocated for a non-directive attitude on the part of the analyst in therapy. If, sometimes, she could not quite follow her own theoretical ideas, she clearly benefited from being able to make fun of herself. Her humour was never malicious and never loud; it often got expressed in unexpected and astonishing remarks. Despite her clear views on what to do and what not to do, she showed considerable tolerance for the views of others.

⁵ Laurenz Genner (1894-1962) was a writer. From 1917-1924 he was editor of the „Arbeiter Zeitung“ (Worker's Paper) and before the rise of Austrofascism he was a Social Democratic member of the National Assembly. From 1934 on he was active with the illegal revolutionary Socialists and joined the Communist party in 1938. In August of 1938 he was arrested and convicted of aiding and abetting of treasonous activities. After 1945 he was deputy governor of Lower Austria and Undersecretary of State for Agriculture in the first Austrian post-war government. The marriage was separated in the early 1950s; they had two daughters. Genner died in 1962.

About Sigmund Freud's legacy and about the continuing importance of Psychoanalysis:

In February of 1920 Freud wrote to Ernest Jones, that a colleague had given him a book of Havelock Ellis as a present, “containing an essay on ψ A or rather on my personality which is the most refined and amiable form of resistance and repudiation calling me a great artist in order to injure the validity of our scientific claims [which is all wrong, *I am sure in a few decades my name will be wiped away and our results will last*]”.⁶ This prediction, the forgetting of Freud's name for the sake of psycho-analysis' scientific validity has not yet fulfilled itself. The fact that psycho-analysis has remained closely connected to Freud's name has various reasons. On the one hand because the reproduction of psychoanalysis, i.e. psychoanalysts, does not only occur through a theoretic-practical education, whose learning-processes take place within the medium of basic general knowledge, but also through training-analysis, which refers back to Freud's enigmatic messages.⁷ On the other hand Freud, whom Michel Foucault counts among the initiators of discursive practices, has radically shifted an entire mode of thinking. Between psycho-analysis' initiation by Freud and its ulterior transformations there exists the fundamental heterogeneity that overshadows the initiation of a discursive practice which is necessarily detached from its later developments and transformations, and so the call for a “Return to the Source”, namely to Freud, is going to be made loudly with unavoidable necessity again and again.⁸

Freud initially saw himself as a researcher who studied phenomena that he had identified as psychic dysfunctions, later he claimed to have developed a general theory of the inner life – encompassing the “normal” psyche as well – and to be the founder of a new science. He did not consider the therapeutic application to be his most important contribution. He wrote: “I have told you that psycho-analysis began as a method of treatment; but I did not want to commend it to your interest as a method of treatment but on account of the truths it contains, on account of the information it gives us about what concerns human beings most of all – their own nature – and on account of the connections it discloses between the most different of their activities. As a method of treatment it is one among many, though, to be sure, *primus inter pares*.”⁹

Freud was able to draw his conclusions because he questioned traditional values and suspended those seemingly normal dichotomies – powerful in both society and the subject – of good/evil, beautiful/ugly, sick/healthy and normal/abnormal for his studies. He did not see

⁶ Freud, S. (1993e [1908 – 39]): *Letters Sigmund Freud – Ernest Jones, 1908 – 1939*. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, S. 370.

⁷ Gondek, H-D. (1998): „*La séance continue*“ *Jacques Derrida und die Psychoanalyse*. In: *Jacques Derrida Vergessen wir nicht – die Psychoanalyse!* Frankfurt am Main: edition suhrkamp, S. 182f.

⁸ Foucault wrote: “If we return, it is not the result of accident or incomprehension. In effect, the act of initiation is such in its essence, that it is inevitably subjected to its own distortions; that which displays this act and derives from it is, at the same time, the root of its divergences and travesties. This nonaccidental omission must be regulated by precise operations that can be situated, analysed and reduced in a return to the act of initiation. [...] In addition, it is always a return to a text in itself, specifically, to a primary and unadorned text with particular attention to those things registered in the interstices of the text, its gaps and absences. We return to those empty spaces that have been masked by omission or concealed in a false and misleading plenitude. [...] A last feature of these returns is that they tend to reinforce the enigmatic link between an author and his works. A text has an inaugurative value precisely because it is the work of a particular author and our returns are conditioned by this knowledge.” Foucault, M. (1969): *What is an author?* In: *language, countermemory, practice*. Cornell University Press 1980: 113-138, p. 135f.

⁹ Freud, S. (1933a): *New introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*. SE 22, p. 156.

these categories as self-evident but analysed their genesis and opened up areas for science that could be claimed from the realm of magic and religion. As Otto Fenichel wrote, this was the main reason why psychoanalysis received other quantities and a different quality of resistance than other disciplines of science. For Freud studied the psychic reality without any reservation just as he did with physical occurrences: “He was able to witness circumstances that, although in plain sight had not been recognized before, infantile sexuality being an example”, as Fenichel wrote.¹⁰ In that respect Freud's psychoanalysis plays an important role in the formation of a liberal way of thinking as a general cultural attitude that confronts religious prejudice but also a certain materialism – which denies definitely existing psychic phenomena – with the ideals of pure reason and the unprejudiced examination of reality. Therefore all modern, pseudo-rational ideologies that promise bliss and happiness to their followers must face psychoanalysis – where any aspirations to omnipotence must undergo rational criticism – adversely by principle. Such ideologies draw their seductive powers from the fact that humans are born more helpless than other mammals and have learned that in a state of fear and helplessness a seemingly omnipotent force from the outside world comes to their aid. This force representing attempts at healing that seem to revoke the original, incurable trauma, the distress of helpless isolation, something that is bound to return later and even more forcefully on a collective scale. Indeed, any form of psycho-analytic work is characterized by its fundamental renouncement of power and its acknowledgement of subjects as subjects.

Freud suspected that his findings would be exposed to continuous threats. He foresaw a disfigurement, watering down and destruction of psychoanalysis caused by the society but also by his successors, who through an inherent human resistance could not bear the frightening truths that he had uncovered. With the establishment in 1910 of the International Psychoanalytic Association he wanted to prevent misuse of psychoanalysis. He wrote: “There should be some headquarters whose business it would be to declare: ‘All this nonsense is nothing to do with analysis; this is not psycho-analysis.’”¹¹ In the following years many psychoanalytic societies were founded around the world. Freud's hope that these societies would follow the path he had led was disappointed however. While he had to face adversity and slander from his opponents from the very beginning for his so-called overestimation of the importance of sexuality in psychic processes, he now had to experience similar rejection from many people – only beginning with Adler and Jung – who had been closely associated with him for some time. The issue always revolved and revolves around Freud's sexual theory, around his insight that sexuality plays the decisive role in the human unconscious. Freud's sexual theory was and still is euphemized and ignored even by analysts, as though it were a foolish notion or a youthful misapprehension which can easily be neglected. And yet it is this very same result of Freud's sexual theory, which represents the source and foundation of psychoanalytical experience and treatment. Freud's truly revolutionary insight was the discovery of infantile sexuality – determined by the drive and rooted in the Id and therefore inaccessible to any direct observation – and another aspect of sexuality that is, similarly to animals, controlled by instinct. This instinct only emerges with puberty depending on the organism's process of maturation. While human sexuality expresses itself through the body it

¹⁰ O. Fenichel: *119 Rundbriefe*. Frankfurt am Main: Stroemfeld Verlag 1998; p. 922.

¹¹ Freud, S. (1914d): *On the History of the Psycho-Analytic movement*. SE 14: 7-66, p. 43.

is at the same time intimately connected with the individual's personal history, with the diversity of its desires.

Infantile sexuality, bisexuality, the introduction of a difference between biological sexuality and psychosexuality are Freud's capital discoveries. Of course we now know that the influence Freud and his followers had, remained marginal in the course of history. There can be no knowledge that transcends into the future, we can only hope, but never know absolutely whether people in the 21st century will respond to the message that Freudian psycho-analysis represents – namely to learn to bear the truths about ourselves without reservation. 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 with his instinctual life." But he continued: "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 future, but probably not in an infinitely distant one."¹²

¹² Freud, S. (1927c): *The Future of an Illusion*. SE 21: 5-56, p. 53.