

The connection between Judaism and PA has been analyzed, emphasized and questioned since the birth of PA. Sigmund Freud and the majority of the early analysts were medical doctors of Jewish origin. Simultaneously, Freud expressed that PA should be protected from becoming a Jewish science. This has sometimes been taken as an indication that Freud wanted to distance himself, and PA from Jewishness. Freud's work, *Die Zukunft einer Illusion*, published in 1927 came to the conclusion that religion must be regarded as an illusion. Moreover, he consistently uses the category 'science' as a concept which is possible to place in opposition to the concept 'religion'. Science and psychoanalysis are in the same situation. They have common methods and common interests, he writes. It seems reasonable to conclude that Freud was opposed to religion, including Jewish religion. Jewish religion and Jewish identity cannot however not be equated with each other, and Freud seemed to have a positive Jewish identity, even though these positive sides often were expressed in private conversations rather than in his theoretical writings. His Jewish identity was always more present and became more important in critical situations. There was no contradiction for him having a Jewish identity and being an atheist.

It should be acknowledged that the term Jewish science was not neutral. On the contrary, it was derogatory and implied that the science concerned lacked significance for anyone who was not Jewish, that it was sectarian and that its practitioners were conspiratorial and presented a neutral façade while secretly trying to gain control over others and over the discipline. Moreover, the term implied that the science concerned was unscientific and even fraud.

As we see, derogatory statements concerning Jewish sciences, including PA, are similar to anti-Semitic statements; Jews were looked upon as sectarian, holding a neutral façade while secretly conspiring to gain control over media, money or even the whole world. In sum, some Jewish scientists met considerable resistance.

This implied a contradictory approach among psychoanalysts towards Jewishness and PA. On one hand it was obvious that the majority of the PA were Jewish physicians and anyone with a deep knowledge in traditional Jewish thinking is able to trace the Jewish roots of PA. At the same time, it became important to present PA as detached from Judaism in order not to be marginalized.

This approach has followed PA ever since. Should the Jewish tradition of thinking be acknowledged? Neglected? Hidden? Could acknowledgement invoke anti-Semitism? In order to investigate these topics, we have interviewed Jewish physicians, psychoanalytic psychotherapists and psychoanalysts about their perception of the connection between Judaism and PA, with respect to anti-Semitism.

In 1944, the married couple Lajos and Edith Székely arrived in Sweden. Edith (1909-2009), of Jewish heritage and born in Germany, was a doctor and a psychoanalyst. Lajos (1904-1995), born in Hungary, had a Ph.D. in psychology, was a trained psychoanalyst. Like his wife, he was Jewish. They met in Hungary and became a couple in the beginning of the 1930s. Anti-Semitism forced them into exile in the beginning of the 1930s. Initially they went from Hungary to Germany and from there to Holland. From Holland they went on to Russia and from there to Finland. Finally they ended up in Sweden. There they spent a short period of time in Sundbyberg, but in 1951 they settled down in Nacka, where they stayed to the end of their days. Exiled, they lived in fear for almost 15 years, between 1930 and 1944.

On numerous occasions during the 1990s, I interviewed Edith Székely in their home in Nacka. She and her husband could never forget the persecution; 15 years as fugitives marked them for life. "What have we done as Jews to deserve being persecuted wherever we are," Edith asked herself and me. Even in Sweden, where anti-Semitism finds other expressions than

the horrendously inhuman forms that the Jewish couple had encountered during their fifteen years of exile, they lived with the feeling of being exposed and at times having to struggle against hostility, due to their Jewish ancestry. I remember that they both felt threatened by the critical attitude of the Swedish social democracy towards the state of Israel. They found the generally pro-Arabic attitude that reigned in Sweden equally threatening. For them, it was a part of a threatening renewal of anti-Semitism, of violence and of the feeling of being outsiders. In spite of this and in comparison, they felt that their home in Nacka was "paradise on earth". There, they were better protected than they had been anywhere else.

When the Swedish translator of Martin Heidegger's writings, Richard Matz (1920-1992), was invited to the Swedish Psychoanalytical Association in the beginning of the 1990s, Edith and Lajos Székely were worried. Were their Swedish colleagues, psychoanalysts belonging to the Swedish Psychoanalytical Association, going to invite a person who had translated Martin Heidegger, a man who had had a dubious relation to Nazism, when for them and, as they saw it, the decisive factor for all psychoanalysts ought to be that Sigmund Freud was of Jewish ancestry and that his family, like all other Jewish families in Europe, had been victims of the Nazi terror? Their anxiety surfaced again. Have anti-Semitism insinuated itself into our psychoanalytic association, they asked themselves. Don't we have a home, a safe haven anymore? Not even in this new democratic country? In their eyes, this invitation was wrong, threatening. Nevertheless, they stayed in Sweden, attached to their home in Nacka, their safest place; the house in Nacka became their haven, which they could – in all sincerity – call "home". They lived between fear and a longing for protection.

We have also interviewed two Jewish psychoanalytic psychotherapists. They were both 92 years old, male and born in Germany. They had both left Germany before the war and had studied to become social workers and psychoanalytic psychotherapists. They had also achieved an academic career, one was associate professor and the other was a full time professor. They both still had clients in psychotherapy.

There the similarities stop. One man, Joseph, lived in Israel, the other one, Walter, in Europe. Joseph had moved to Israel with his family since his father was a convinced Zionist. Walter had been sent abroad to be rescued while his family and relatives were murdered. During his childhood, his parents had him baptized and the family detached from Jewishness. They did not celebrate Jewish holidays, did not take part in congregational life, did not identify with any Jewish traditions. Joseph's family was described as deeply involved in Jewish life and traditions, both religious and cultural. Their social life was predominantly Jewish and they were Zionists. For them Jewish identity was self-evident.

As elderly men, they took opposite stands toward Jewish identity; Walter said that he never thought about being Jewish, and that on the few occasions when he had been involved with other Jews perceived Jewishness as limiting. Joseph said that being Jewish was the major part of his identity. Living in Israel, his Jewish identity was obvious and he felt comfortable and sensed that he could be true to himself and his roots.

They both perceived Judaism and PA as related to each other, but also in this question they took opposite stands.

Walter perceived Judaism and PA as sectarian and therefore he distanced himself from them both. He sensed that there were elements of psychoanalytic theory that were important to psychotherapy but rejected psychoanalysis and its associations for being sectarian.

Joseph perceived Judaism and PA as intermingled. During childhood, his family socialized with people of Jewish origin, some were psychoanalysts. His mother during the twenties underwent PA, and the home was filled with literature and discussions about Judaism as well as PA. He sensed that continual reading, trying to understand the world, asking, interpreting, and especially perpetual learning, was central to PA and that this was a legacy from Judaism, which outsiders could perceive as sectarian and threatening.

The perceptions of Judaism and PA presented by Walter and Joseph illustrate two paradoxical, and rather typical attitudes that European Jews could adapt during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Partly, there was a striving towards assimilation, which could imply Jews to abandon their Jewish identity completely. This was not uncommon. The Jews who abandoned their Jewishness sensed that vulnerability, racism and discrimination could be avoided if one became a part of the majority. Tragically, this proved to be wrong. Some years later, it did not matter if you were baptized, and totally ignorant of Jewish tradition. You were murdered nevertheless.

There was also an opposite striving – towards Zionism. This striving should be regarded with respect to the formation of national states during this era. Zionism might be seen as parallel to the strivings to identify as say Swedish or Italian. Zionism was connected to a strong Jewish identity that not necessarily was religious. Among Zionists there was also a sense of pride in Jewishness, sometimes fueled by racism and discrimination.

These contradictory attitudes seem to have been inscribed in PA. Not only concerning Judaism but concerning PA itself. PA is a minority discipline that has to relate to a majority society with other traditions and other assumptions about human life and science. Some PA practitioners and researchers lean towards a positivistic scientific tradition, working in the medical discourse, while others lean towards a hermeneutic scientific tradition. PA theory, research and practice are thus not homogenous.

There is a perpetuating question concerning whether practitioners should strive to assimilate into a positivist scientific majority, or to create their own associations in which they can refine and develop their thinking? Can marginalization be avoided through adapting to the thinking of the majority or does adapting to majority mean that PA becomes diluted or even abandoned? If own associations are created; is it possible to develop an alternative to the positivistic scientific majority? Or does it mean being marginalized and perhaps accused for being unscientific, fraud, sectarian or even conspiratory? And thus eliminated.

Just as Jewishness has been, and is, connected to a question of how to survive and how to identify, PA might be seen as a discipline that grapples with the question of how to survive and how to identify. So, the historical and ongoing struggle of Jewishness seems to have been inscribed in PA.

A final remark concerning this struggle: Walter said that he was detached from Judaism and sensed no connection to Jewish identity. Yet, his bathroom and the small waiting room that was connected to the bathroom were covered with pictures by Chagall, showing religious motives and typical Jewish life and culture in a world that was.

You may ask yourself whether these examples are representative with regard to the complexity that marks a person who is forced to leave his or her native country.

The Székelys, Walter and Joseph, what do they have in common? What separates their fates in life? What is the common denominator? In what way are their experiences of living in exile the same and how are they different?

A common theme in their narratives is that the connection between Judaism and PA has become intermingled with anti-Semitism. Perhaps psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy, and its practitioners, as the Székelys suggested, need to be understood with respect to the historical fact that Sigmund Freud was of Jewish ancestry and that his family, like all other Jewish families in Europe, became victims of the Nazi terror?