

OTTO FENICHEL AND THE LEFT OPPOSITION IN PSYCHOANALYSIS

BENJAMIN HARRIS AND ADRIAN BROCK

David Rapaport's collection of Otto Fenichel's *Rundbriefe* (1934–1945) is described as a recently rediscovered, 2,500-page primary source for studying the intellectual and organizational history of European-American psychoanalysis. Beginning as the confidential newsletter of the Reich-Fenichel "Left opposition" within the International Psychoanalytic Association, its function became primarily intellectual as Fenichel's group ceased to function as a caucus. It ended when its editor decided to devote himself to the struggle against neo-Freudianism within psychoanalysis, and to practice as a licensed physician.

"He wrote letters around about what everybody did to everybody else."¹ (Wilhelm Reich, speaking of Otto Fenichel)

In January 1946 the Austrian-American psychoanalyst Otto Fenichel died in Los Angeles while completing an internship that would have qualified him to practice psychoanalysis as a licensed physician. Six months earlier he had dissolved a correspondence circle devoted to the development of a Freudian-Marxist sociology, which he had led for more than a decade. Using a characteristically political metaphor, in July 1945 Fenichel wrote that he would instead devote himself to internal, "fractional" work within the psychoanalytic movement. There he planned to help in the struggle against neo-Freudian revisionism, battling the culturalists and ego psychologists whom he believed were threatening to destroy psychoanalysis from within.²

Until recently, Fenichel's organized promotion of Marxist social theory was as unknown as his explications of orthodox Freudianism were renowned. In 1983, however, this depoliticized view of Fenichel was challenged by *The Repression of Psychoanalysis*, Russell Jacoby's history of the "political Freudians"—a group of Marxist, psychoanalytic émigrés, of which Fenichel was the most prominent member.³

As Jacoby reveals, Fenichel dialectically combined politics and psychology to analyze inter-war social phenomena, ranging from the increase in character neuroses to the political conservatism of the German working class. Believing in scientific progress through collective intellectual work, Fenichel pursued this project in collaboration with a small group of Marxist Freudians who had studied together in Berlin and were then dispersed by Hitler's rise to power. From 1934 to 1945, Jacoby explains, Fenichel attempted to hold the group together by writing and editing a series of semi-clandestine *Rundbriefe* (circular letters).

The authors thank Helen Linton, Librarian of the Austen Riggs Center, for her assistance with the *Rundbriefe*, and Lawrence J. Friedman for his comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

BENJAMIN HARRIS is an Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Wisconsin, Parkside, Kenosha, WI 53141. He is the author, most recently, of the "Psychology" entry for the Encyclopedia of the American Left (1990). A portion of this research was completed when he was a Visiting Fellow at the Institute for Research in the Humanities, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

ADRIAN BROCK is a graduate student in the History and Theory of Psychology Program at York University, Toronto, North York, Ontario, M3J 1P3, Canada. His dissertation is on the *Völkerpsychologie* of Wilhelm Wundt.

For historians of psychoanalysis and European-American social theory, the *Repression of Psychoanalysis* shows Fenichel's *Rundbriefe* to be an invaluable primary source for research. Initially typed by him in multiple carbon copies and eventually mimeographed, the *Rundbriefe* were circulated to a half-dozen fellow émigrés every few weeks for eleven years, with individual letters averaging twenty pages in length. Although Fenichel's viewpoint dominated, he regularly quoted the reports of members of his circle and other confidants concerning local psychoanalytic events; he also reprinted their criticisms of the journal literature and of previous issues of the *Rundbriefe*. Equally interesting is his reproduction of memos and letter among third parties relevant to intramural psychoanalytic conflicts, such as colleagues' letters of resignation from national analytic societies.⁴

Unfortunately, scholarly use of the *Rundbriefe* has been limited by its frustrating unavailability. Readers of Jacoby's book, for example, learn that even his access to an incomplete set of *Rundbriefe* was unlikely to be possible for others; such collections have long been assumed to either be in private hands or a closed archive.⁵ This assessment, however, turns out to be unnecessarily gloomy. For the past thirty years David Rapaport's cache of Fenichel's own copies of the *Rundbriefe* has been shelved in the library of the Austen Riggs Center in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, open to visiting researchers. Having recently discovered this collection, we offer a brief and necessarily selective sketch of the *Rundbriefe*'s history. In announcing this find to specialists in the history of psychoanalysis—which we are not—we hope to stimulate renewed interest in the dynamics of the field's Americanization, and its relation to developments in psychology and psychiatry.⁶

Until now, the most complete account of the purpose and production of the *Rundbriefe* has been *The Repression of Psychoanalysis*. In it, Jacoby portrays the Fenichel group as having begun for primarily intellectual reasons, with the *Rundbriefe* serving as a forum for the exchange of ideas on Marxist psychoanalytic sociology. According to Jacoby, the letters were begun by Fenichel to unite his close colleagues after they had suspended collaborative work with Wilhelm Reich.⁷

Unfortunately, Jacoby seems to have lacked access to the first ten *Rundbriefe* which detail the founding and early development of what eventually became known as Fenichel's group. As a result, his account neglects the early political aspirations of the *Rundbriefe* circle, and misconstrues its relationship with Wilhelm Reich. Coupled with Jacoby's apparent admiration for Fenichel's social theory, these errors contribute to a portrayal of Fenichel as a lone, heroic figure pursuing historically transcendent goals.⁸

Contrary to Jacoby's account, the *Rundbriefe* did not begin as a primarily intellectual vehicle for Fenichel and six other anti-Reichians. The letters were designed to facilitate caucus work within the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA) by Wilhelm Reich, Fenichel, and a group of colleagues who initially numbered almost a dozen. The first issue was sent in March 1934 to thirteen colleagues that a smaller group ("inner circle") hoped to organize into a Marxist-Freudian opposition within the IPA. Almost all the recipients had long collaborated in Berlin in an extracurricular discussion group known as the Children's Seminar, which met from 1924 until its members left Germany in the fall of 1933. Most of the *Rundbriefe*'s inner circle had also been in a smaller group that met to work out theoretical issues from an explicitly Marxist viewpoint.⁹

The goals of the group were both political and theoretical. Politically it would act as an unofficial Leftist caucus, defending Marxists against discrimination by journal

editors and psychoanalytic membership committees. It also hoped to move the IPA's leadership toward political action, such as resisting the Nazification of the German Psychoanalytic Association. Intellectually, the group planned to criticize the growing number of Fascist and anti-Semitic versions of psychoanalysis, and to further develop its own Marxist, Freudian theory of personality.¹⁰

To these ends the *Rundbriefe* acted as a caucus newsletter, helping the group's dispersed members maintain their awareness of theoretical trends and organizational changes in psychoanalysis throughout the world. They also helped the group organize itself, printing members' discussion of how to best deal with the psychoanalytic establishment. This aspect of the *Rundbriefe* accounts for the secrecy surrounding their contents, and also their candid editorial tone. As originally planned, the circulation of these confidential letters would be restricted to an inner circle of those carrying out active "opposition work" in groups such as the IPA. Discussions and positions of the group would then be selectively shared with a larger "outer circle" of supportive colleagues. Similar to the sympathizers of a Communist or Socialist Party, the outer circle was to be a source of potential recruits for the more disciplined inner group.¹¹

A month after the first *Rundbrief* appeared, a majority of the inner circle (Fenichel, George Gerö, Nic Hoel, Edith Jacobson, and Wilhelm Reich) met in Oslo to confirm these goals and tactics. As the second *Rundbrief* reported in April 1934, all agreed to function as a loyal opposition within the various national associations and the IPA, whose Congress would soon be held. The group also decided that Fenichel would edit the *Rundbriefe* with the help of Norwegian analyst Hoel, sharing authority for its content with the inner circle.¹²

The most significant event for the group in its first year—and perhaps in its entire history—was its severing relations with Wilhelm Reich. Expelled from the IPA at its August meeting, Reich resented what he considered to be the group's lack of public support for him. Despite this perceived slight, he and other group members agreed to maintain their initial purpose of burrowing from within the psychoanalytic movement, rather than operating as exiles from it. The rest of the inner circle would collaborate with Reich, they agreed, but he would stay outside and they would operate as members of national associations.

According to Fenichel's subsequent account, this plan was sabotaged by Reich's rejection of the authority of the collective. After agreeing to the strategy, Reich unilaterally applied for membership in the Norwegian Psychoanalytic Association, threatening a split in that organization and its exclusion from the IPA; the resulting uproar, Fenichel believed, discredited him and the group. In response, Fenichel declared in December 1934 that Reich could not be considered a member of the inner circle, and would no longer be sent the *Rundbriefe*.¹³

Following the break with Reich, Fenichel and the rest of the group continued their theoretical and organizational work. Although they eschewed categorization as a "political group," the members of the Fenichel circle attempted to maximize their influence within the psychoanalytic movement, circulating drafts of their convention papers and journal articles, both for joint study and revision. They also met in advance of the IPA's 1936 meeting in Marienbad and discussed a mixture of theoretical and organizational issues.¹⁴

As time passed, producing the *Rundbriefe* became the group's chief activity, and one that became less and less collaborative. Although the other members sent Fenichel their reactions to his literature reviews and theoretical papers, they failed to satisfy his

expectations for editorial guidance and answers to the many direct requests for information that peppered the *Rundbriefe*. In response to Fenichel's complaints, group members offered a combination of excuses, praise, and pledges of future cooperation. When this first occurred only a year and a half after the first issue, Fenichel was encouraged by these responses, but anticipated lax standards in the future, and doubted his ability to singlehandedly "bring scientific discussion into being." To compensate for members' lapses in discipline, additional volunteers could have been added to the inner circle. However, when Fenichel met with Annie Reich and Edith Jacobson to discuss recruiting new members from the outer circle, they decided to maintain their current small size. In this as in other organizational matters, the group felt isolated by changes in the psychoanalytic movement, and adopted a defensive strategy of "holding the front," to preserve its resources.¹⁵

At some point in the late 1930s the group seems to have implicitly agreed upon the pattern of collaboration that persisted until the *Rundbriefe* ended in 1945. Fenichel continued as editor and chief contributor; other members of the inner circle sent reports on local events, reactions to Fenichel's writing, and encouragement when his spirits lagged. Gone were collective efforts at caucus work by the group; what persisted were individual attempts at influencing psychoanalytic practice and theory through teaching, writing, and serving on psychoanalytic committees and editorial boards. Such interventions were encouraged by Fenichel through the *Rundbriefe* and his outside correspondence.¹⁶

Once he and much of the group moved to the United States, Fenichel used every venue possible in his campaign against revisions of Freudian personality theory and in defense of dialectical-materialist, psychodynamic sociology.¹⁷ As a member of the *Psychoanalytic Quarterly's* editorial board, for example, he unsuccessfully protested the exclusion of a paper by fellow group member Edith Jacobson, and rejected a simplistic psychopolitical study by Pryn's Hopkins.¹⁸ The fate of his own writing seems to have depended on the audience and how narrowly Fenichel focused his argument. Reprinted copies of his paper on didactic psychoanalysis, for example, were ordered by almost all training analysts in the United States, while another article on Freudian sexual theory evoked little interest. Similarly, his admittedly frank criticism of short-term psychotherapy was well received when read to sympathetic colleagues on the West Coast, but its acceptance by the managing editor of *Psychiatry* was overturned by Harry Stack Sullivan, who characterized it as polemical, presumptuous, and in bad taste.¹⁹

In the face of such frustrations, Fenichel soldiered on, pouring his energy, commitment, and intelligence into the *Rundbriefe*. The result reflects many of its editor's unique skills, such as his creative psychopolitical vision. Repeatedly, Fenichel wrote as someone compelled to see psychological questions through political eyes, and to see the psychodynamics beneath the most common political phenomena. In his published work, this is apparent to only the most careful, selective readers. Privately, Fenichel was more open; in the *Rundbriefe* political metaphors are constantly applied to developments in the psychoanalytic movement.

In May 1942, for example, Fenichel described psychoanalysis as a "micro-cosmos" which reflects events in the "macro-cosmos" of world politics. Neo-Freudianism, he asserted, was similar to fascism and other "reactionary movements starting with 'left' ideologies." Such movements, unfortunately, were "effective in such a way that a paradox[ical] coalition of conservative and revolutionary forces has to be the result." Thus, as the Soviet Union was allied with England, so Fenichel's group of Marxist Freudians

was allied with the most "conservative forces" in the American Psychoanalytic Association.²⁰

As much as he was a resolute psychoanalytic politician, Fenichel was willing to modify his tactics in the face of necessity. By the early 1940s, the *Rundbriefe* reflected such a change in Fenichel's attitude toward the work of his group of close collaborators. Upon his production of the hundredth issue in July 1943, he acknowledged the group's having ceased to function as a caucus or even a coordinated group of researchers:

We certainly will all agree that there is no question of any organized or pseudo-organized group which would unite its activities so as to influence the psychoanalytic movement, or so as to do sociological or political research work.²¹

With the others' encouragement, however, he maintained the *Rundbriefe* for another two years as a source of reprinted documents and correspondence, and as a sociological abstracting service.²¹

At the same time, Fenichel was moving toward a concentration upon the defense of orthodox Freudian theory—abandoning one of the two fronts on which he and his colleagues had struggled for twenty years. In a final *Rundbrief* in the summer of 1945, he announced to his group that he was forsaking the struggle for "the correct application of psychoanalysis to sociology" in favor of "more urgent tasks," including his pursuit of a license to practice medicine. In Fenichel's opinion, it was futile to try to maintain the fiction of a Marxist-Freudian grouping held together by the *Rundbriefe*. Looking to the future, he saw no role for what had begun as the Fenichel-Reich group in 1934, since subsequent factions would be defined by their adherence to orthodox Freudianism, not by psychoanalytic, Marxist sociology.²² Such Freudian factions might develop their own circular letters, he implied, but they would not be Marxist. Six months after making this announcement and forecast, Fenichel died from a ruptured cerebral aneurysm.²³

By the time of their final issue, the *Rundbriefe* had attained a cumulative length of approximately 2,500 pages, almost all of which were eventually collected and preserved at the Austen Riggs Center by Fenichel's colleague and translator, David Rapaport.²⁴ As with any single source, such a mass of material requires both validation of its factual details and contextualization of its character and events. This brief history of the *Rundbriefe* does not pretend to be such a comprehensive analysis. It does, however, suggest two issues that need further study.

First is the question of the psychopolitical dynamics which kept Fenichel and his group both loyal to Sigmund Freud and isolated from the majority of their colleagues. From before Reich's expulsion from the IPA until after the *Rundbriefe*'s demise, Fenichel was adamantly opposed to the majority leadership in the international and national psychoanalytic associations. Unlike Reich, Karen Horney, Erich Fromm, and others, however, he refused to break with the established movement. While avoiding actions that would endanger his membership in the IPA, he was unwilling (or unable) to draw others to his program of trying to change the official organizations from within.²⁵

Without access to further biographical material such as Fenichel's private correspondence, we can only speculate about the causes of this self-defeating isolation. One source suggested by the *Rundbriefe* is Fenichel's adoption of some of the more maladaptive tactics of religious, scientific, and political sects. For example, Fenichel prized doctrinal purity over coalition building; he wanted to establish a movement dedicated to the work of a great man (Freud), and was willing to battle over the right

to describe one's work using a terminology of ultimate authority ("psychoanalytic"). With the substitution of the name of a political leader for Freud's, these tactics resemble those of Left sectarians, such as Communists during the isolation of their "Third Period." Not unlike Fenichel, they pursued doctrinal purity (refusing to collaborate with Socialists), dedicated themselves to the work of a great man (for example, Stalin), and were willing to fight over the exclusive rights to a term of ultimate authority ("Marxist").²⁶

Ideologically, Fenichel was no Stalinist. His own tactics, however, could be as authoritarian as those of the psychoanalytic leadership or of the sectarian Left. This rigidity and its possible psychodynamic roots are worthy of further study.²⁷

A second issue of interpretation that we raise is the relation of the émigré political Freudians to their U.S.-trained colleagues, and to larger developments in American psychiatry, psychology, and politics. According to Jacoby's account, the isolation of Fenichel and the *Rundbriefe* group by the late 1930s was largely due to the narrow professionalism of American psychoanalysts. In the United States, Jacoby asserts, "the medical doctors and neo-Freudians threatened to tame psychoanalysis . . . streamlining [it] so as to fit it neatly into their offices; they stripped it of its cultural and political implications."²⁸

While this may reflect Fenichel's viewpoint, historians of medicine suggest that a different process was at work within the mental health professions from the late 1930s to the 1950s. Psychiatrists, for example, participated in the politicization of their discipline, transforming what had been a medical specialty attempting to transcend social problems—both in its theory and applications. This politicization began before World War II, as culturalists such as Horney and Abram Kardiner popularized personality theories explicitly tied to anthropology and political economy. It continued during and after the war as psychiatrists and psychoanalysts worked for a new social order more attuned to the damage caused by economic exploitation, war, and racial conflict.²⁹

By the mid-1940s, psychoanalysis and related fields had become more environmental in theory and more liberal in social viewpoint. It is this *liberalization* that appears to be the basis of Jacoby's complaint about the political stripping of psychoanalysis, since he correctly sees liberalization as antithetical to the radicalization for which Fenichel had worked.

With access to the complete *Rundbriefe*, however, even this process of liberalization is revealed to have been selective. To mention just one exception to this trend, the 1940s saw the emergence of a cohort of U.S.-trained psychiatrists and psychoanalysts who were as dedicated as Fenichel to developing a Marxist, psychoanalytic personality theory and critique of society. These young therapists, some of whom went on to positions of prominence in the psychoanalytic and psychiatric establishment, had experienced their own, domestic equivalent of the youthful, communist-zionist-radical experiences of émigrés such as Fenichel, Seigfried Bernfeld, and David Rapaport. Although their adult clinical beliefs were more likely to be neo- or post-Freudian psychoanalysis, from the mid-1930s to the mid-1950s these younger Marxist clinicians organized themselves into domestic versions of the Reich-Fenichel group in Berlin.

In the month of Fenichel's death, for example, two articles appeared in U.S. Marxist journals defending psychoanalysis from its critics on the Left. In the *New Masses*, post-Freudian personality theory was defended from the charges of idealism and political reaction by a Horney protégé who taught part-time at a Marxist college in New York. Simultaneously, a former student member of the Horney, Fromm, Robbins resignation from the New York Psychoanalytic Institute wrote in *Science and Society*

of the dialectical materialist nature of neo-Freudian psychoanalysis. Both authors, as well as their opponents in the debates, were members of a new, public group of Marxist psychiatrists, the Benjamin Rush Society.³⁰

Although Fenichel did not approve of the revisions of Freud proposed by some of these native-born Marxist therapists, the *Rundbriefe* reveal the existence of equally prominent, non-émigré analysts who agreed with Fenichel's psychopolitical orthodoxy, remained loyal to it throughout their careers, and were regular correspondents of his. Thus, at the time of Fenichel's death there were significant numbers of psychoanalysts who were eager to pick up the banner of Marxist, psychodynamic sociology that he had put down.³¹

Rather than the product of coincidence, the demise of Fenichel's *Rundbriefe* and the birth of a U.S. Marxist psychiatric group in the same year were related, albeit minor, events in the history of American psychiatry. Both were strategic attempts to influence developments in the newly politicized professions of psychiatry and psychoanalysis, and both hoped to recapture intellectual territory lost to liberalism. As such they are informative episodes in larger transformations of social thought in the United States from the 1930s to the 1950s. Although Jacoby portrays the radicals as routed by 1946, we believe that a broader look at the mental health professions will show otherwise. We offer the *Rundbriefe* of Otto Fenichel as a source for exploring such issues, and hope that their availability will help evoke renewed interest in modern struggles over the politics of the psyche.

NOTES

1. Mary Higgins and Chester M. Raphael, eds., *Reich Speaks of Freud* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1967), p. 97.

2. Otto Fenichel, *Rundbriefe*, no. 119, 14 July 1945 (All references to the *Rundbriefe* are to the collection of the Austen Riggs Center, Stockbridge, Massachusetts, subsequently cited by issue number). Fenichel's death is described in Sanford Gifford, "'Repression' or Sea-Change: Fenichel's *Rundbriefe* and the 'Political Analysts' of the 1930s," *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 66 (1985): 269; and Norman Reider, "Fenichel, Otto," *Dictionary of American Biography*, supplement 4.

3. Russell Jacoby, *The Repression of Psychoanalysis* (New York: Basic Books, 1983).

4. Examples of news items include Anna Freud's work in wartime Britain (e.g., no. 87, 27 March 1942, item 1, p. 1) and Bruno Bettelheim's arrival in the United States (no. 97, 15 March 1943, item 1, p. 1). See also the resignation letter of Karen Horney, Erich Fromm, Bernard Robbins, et. al., from the New York Psychoanalytic Institute, (no. 78, 1 July 1941, item 6, pp. 7-9), and that of Edward Glover from the British Association (no. 108, 15 June 1944, item 2, pp. 1-12). For more personal attacks, see Horney's characterization by Fritz Wittels as someone who surrounds herself with former analysts whose transference to her is still "in full bloom" (no. 66, 15 April 1940, item 1, p. 2), and Fenichel's comment that a paper of hers titled "The Role of Unconscious Arrogance in Neuroses" was "very much suited to her personality" (no. 89, 15 May 1942, item 4, p. 18).

5. See, however, Michael M. Sokal and Patrice A. Rafail, *A Guide to Manuscript Collections in the History of Psychology and Related Areas* (Milwood, N. Y.: Kraus, 1982), p. 45. Individuals' collections of the *Rundbriefe*, such as those consulted by Jacoby and by a recent biographer of Wilhelm Reich, contain significant gaps (see Jacoby, *Repression*, p. xv, and Myron Sharaf, *Fury on Earth* [London: Hutchison, 1984], pp. 504-505). See also Norman Reider's reference to *Rundbriefe* in the Freud Archives ("Fenichel, Otto", p. 264).

6. Although ignored by Jacoby, Rapaport was—like Fenichel—an émigré lay analyst committed to socialism, dialectical materialism, and public discretion on political matters. At the time of his death in 1960, Rapaport was planning to edit and publish an edition of the *Rundbriefe*; Hanna Fenichel gave him her husband's copies and literary rights. Attempting to complete that set, Rapaport borrowed copies from others and made photostatic copies (see David Rapaport to Hanna Fenichel, 19 August 1960; Annie Reich to Rapaport, 12 June 1959; and Paula Gross to Rapaport, 2 July 1959, in the David Rapaport Papers, Library of Congress). Although access to the Austen Riggs *Rundbriefe* is available during the library's regular business hours, photocopying is currently not permitted.

7. Jacoby, *Repression*, pp. 29, 84, 88.

8. In a footnote Jacoby acknowledges that "if other letters or pages show up reinterpretation might be possible or necessary," *Repression*, p. 167. But neither Jacoby nor any of his book's reviewers note the contradiction between his account and the story told by Reich's published correspondence and quotations from an early *Rundbrief*. See Wilhelm Reich, *People in Trouble* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1976), p. 242, and *Reich Speaks of Freud*, pp. 183-184.

9. Fenichel apparently initiated the *Rundbriefe* to help prepare for a meeting of most of the inner circle in Oslo. It was sent to [Frau] Bers, [Francis] Deri, [Erich] Fromm, [George] Gerö, Glück [Edith Ludowyk Gyömröi], [Nic] Hoel, Jacobsson [Edith Jacobson], Misch [Kate Friedländer], Annie Reich, [Wilhelm] Reich, [Vera] Schmidt, [Barbara] Schneider-Lantos, and [Sabina] Spielrein, with the first two designated as "guinea pigs" to test the reactions of members of the outer circle to receiving the *Rundbriefe*. By the time of the second *Rundbrief*, the inner circle had become Fenichel, Gerö, Gyömröi, Hoel, Jacobson, and Annie and Wilhelm Reich. Apparently, Friedländer and Lantos were added subsequently (no. 2; Jacoby, *Repression*, pp. 67-69, 176-177).

10. On sanctions against Left analysts, see also Reich, *People in Trouble*, p. 239. English language accounts of the Nazification of psychotherapy include Arthur H. Feiner, "Psychoanalysis During the Nazi Regime," *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, 13 (1985): 540; Rose Spiegel, "Survival, Psychoanalysis and the Third Reich," *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, 13 (1985): 534; Geoffrey Cocks, *Psychotherapy in the Third Reich* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 62-65, 160-165; and Reich, *People in Trouble*, p. 238.

11. On attempts to recruit from the outer circle, see footnotes 9 and 15. As initially planned by Fenichel and Jacobson, the outer circle consisted of those who (a) agreed fully with the opposition group but were not judged ready for the responsibilities of the inner circle, (b) were sympathetic to the group, or (c) were likely to become sympathetic. IPA members who were perceived to fit these categories included: (a) Kate Friedländer, Erich Fromm, Barbara Lantos, Vera Schmidt, Sabina Spielrein, Hugo Staub; (b) Anny Angel, Edith Buxbaum, Frances Deri, O. Spurgeon English, Else Fuchs, Paula Heimann, M. Ralph Kaufmann, Helmuth Kaiser, Edward Kronengold, Lotte Liebeck, Harald K. Schjelderup; and (c) Therese Benedek, Bertha and Steff Bornstein, Ángel Garma, Alfred Gross, Charles Odier, Sándor Radó, Ola Raknes, Hans Zulliger (no. 2, item 4). In listing these names, we note that Fenichel identified most members of each circle by last name only; constructing definitive lists of these groups requires further biographical and textual research.

12. The metaphor "loyal opposition" is ours, indicating that they avoided tactics that would split or paralyze the associations. Their goal was instead to increase their ranks and persuade the majority to change its policies.

13. No. 10, 4 December 1934, p. 1. For Reich's version, see *People in Trouble*, pp. 244-250; and *Reich Speaks of Freud*, pp. 176-201. For an example of Reich's subsequent accusations and threats against the Fenichel group, see no. 21, 31 December 1935, item 14.

14. We use "political" to refer to the group's attempt at gaining greater influence for its ideas within the psychoanalytic movement and organizations, rather than to work for a political party. In preparing for collaboration at the Marienbad Congress of the IPA, Fenichel stated that they "would not appear as a 'political' group," and went on to appeal on a "personal" basis for attendance at a pre-Congress discussion (no. 25, 28 April 1936, item 5, p. 4). This terminology could have been a change in tactics, reacting against Reich's insistence that the group function openly as a faction; more likely, it was Fenichel's rejection of the term "political" applied narrowly.

15. See no. 20 (23 November 1935); 21 (31 December 1935), item 16; and as an example of Fenichel's requests for information, Jacoby, 162. The meeting of Fenichel, Reich, and Jacobson is described in no. 22, 27 January 1936, item 9, p. 26. "Hold the front" is from Otto Fenichel, "Prague, 29 April 1938," Austen Riggs Library, which we believe to be applicable to the group as early as 1936.

16. For example, after attacking a paper by Ernest Jones (no. 87, 22 March 1942, item 9, p. 7), Fenichel asks whether he should write a public polemic. For an example of Fenichel being the recipient of such coordinating advice (proposing a critique of Paul Goodman), see Fenichel to David Rapaport, 21 December 1945, Rapaport to Fenichel, 23 January 1946, David Rapaport Papers.

17. See no. 87, 22 March 1942, items 9 and 10, pp. 7, 10, for examples of Fenichel's condemnation of the twin evils of "psychologism" and "culturalism."

18. See *Rundbriefe* no. 113, 4 December 1944, item 6, p. 9; and no. 101, 20 August 1943, item 6.

19. No. 108, 15 June 1944, item 6, p. 15.; no. 117, 20 April 1945, pp. 8-9.

20. No. 89, 15 May 1942, item 1, p. 1. Returning to this metaphor a month later, Fenichel compared the behavior of his colleagues who opposed lay analysis to that of the Nazis, characterized Ernst Simmel as a psychoanalytic Neville Chamberlain, and warned against further compromises on criteria for membership in psychoanalytic societies. "The progressive suppression of non-physician analysts in California," he warned, "is a symptom of the development of the progressive degradation of psychoanalysis into a psychiatric method, and is carried out with . . . fascist methods . . . any Munich has to be avoided." Conscious of this psychopolitical parallelism, Fenichel noted that "the analogy with great politics is striking" (no. 90, 10 July 1942, item 4, pp. 10, 12).

21. No. 100, 10 July 1943, item 1, p. 1. As he described it later, "I asked [the group] to admit the fictive character of our 'Organization' in these 'Rundbriefe,' stressing that there is no real group behind them and that they actually consist only in my sending reviews . . . to my friends" (no. 119, 14 July 1945, p. 1).
22. This move is anticipated by Fenichel's comment that "after the war, sooner or later, a new Freud Society will have to be formed" (No. 108, 15 June 1944, item 2).
23. For a different interpretation of the last *Rundbrief*, see Jacoby, *Repression*, p. 132.
24. Jacoby's estimate is 3,000 pages. Ours is based on an anonymously produced, consecutive numbering of the first half at 1,173 pages (issues 1-59). If the final sixty issues averaged twenty pages each, the result would be a total length of 2,400.
25. On the one hand, the intellectual appeal of strict Freudianism should not be discounted, particularly as it was creatively interpreted by Otto Fenichel. On the other hand, Fenichel's adherence to rigid Leftist and Freudian customs prevented him from making the sort of tactical alliances that he needed greatly. The psychoanalyst Martin Grotjahn recalled, for example, being sympathetic to the *Rundbriefe* but being denied direct access to them despite his friendship with Fenichel. Such precautions may seem to have been warranted by the very real threat of governmental sanctions against Leftists, both in Europe and the United States. On the other hand, Grotjahn was able to obtain copies of the *Rundbriefe* from colleagues, suggesting that Fenichel's secrecy eventually became symbolic and dysfunctional (Grotjahn to B. Harris, 8 September 1990).
26. On Third Period Communism, see Paul Buhle and Dan Georgakas, "Communist Party, USA," in *Encyclopedia of the American Left* (New York: Garland, 1990), p. 150. Fenichel believed that psychoanalysis was the scientific method for studying human psychology, and that those making modifications to Freudian theory were disqualified from calling their work "psychoanalytic"—a term used defiantly in the titles of Fenichel's works (e.g., "Psychoanalytic Remarks on Fromm's Book 'Escape from Freedom,'" *Psychoanalytic Review* 31 (1944): 133-153). His hostility to calls for academic freedom within psychoanalytic institutes made it impossible for him to collaborate with the U.S.-trained, Marxist clinicians—such as Bernard Robbins—who were sympathetic but who believed that a fully scientific psychoanalysis would only come from collaborative discussion and research to correct Freud's shortcomings. See Bernard Robbins, "Psychotherapy of Schizophrenia," p. 55, undated manuscript in the possession of Robert S. Cohen, Boston University; Francis Bartlett, "The Psychoanalyst as Social Critic: The Legacy of Bernard Robbins," *Benjamin Rush Bulletin* [n.s.] 4, no. 3 (1983): 17-21.
27. Fenichel's critical attitude toward the Soviet Union can be seen in no. 99, 15 June 1943, item 14, pp. 19-20; and no. 118, 13 May 1945, pp. 25-26. Lawrence J. Friedman has suggested the potential of group dynamics for understanding the refusal of the *Rundbriefe* group to widen the inner circle (Friedman to B. Harris, 30 August 1990).
28. Although Jacoby lists other causes for the *Rundbriefe* group's failure to aggressively promote a "political analysis" (e.g., threats of deportation and its geographic dispersal), medicalization receives his greatest emphasis (*Repression*, pp. 120-126).
29. Gerald N. Grob, "The Forging of Mental Health Policy in America: World War II to New Frontier," *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 42 (1987): 418-420; I. Peter Glauber, "Psychiatry and Social Reconstruction," Course Syllabus, February 1946, Rand School Papers, Tamiment Library, New York University, Series C:1.
30. J. B. Furst, "What Psychoanalysis Can Do," *Masses and Mainstream* (22 January 1946): 14-18; and Judson T. Stone [Judd Marmor], "The Theory and Practice of Psychoanalysis," *Science and Society* 10 (1945-1946): 54-79. For an account of the founding of the Benjamin Rush Society, see "Editorial Comment," *Benjamin Rush Bulletin* 1 no. 1 (February 1949): 3.
31. The *Rundbriefe* show at least two instances of Fenichel being praised by Marxist-Freudian study groups. One was a group of physicist colleagues of Robert Oppenheimer at Caltech, which Fenichel met and lauded for being more aware of the social implications of Freudian theory than most physicians (no. 59, 15 July 1939, item 17, p. 26). The other was a group of leftist psychoanalysts in New York (no. 55, 12 March 1939, item 5). Two non-émigrés identified in the *Rundbriefe* as regular correspondents were Norman Reider and Emmanuel Klein (no. 55, 12 March 1939, item 6, pp. 20-21; no. 98, 7 May 1943, item 14; no. 116, 15 March 1945, item 15).