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(Freud’s oppositional heirs—B.N. on his 70th birthday). *Psychoanalyse* *Texte zur Sozialforschung* 19(2/2015). Gast Herausgeber André Karger & Bertram von der Stein.

This issue is a festschrift celebrating the 70th birthday of Bernd Nitzschke, one among Freud’s oppositional heirs. However, Freud himself was a rebel with revolutionary theories about sexuality. In 1998 I first saw Nitzschke’s name in *Die Zeit* citing Freud (1911) on Paul Schreber: “*The delusional formations, which we take to be the pathological product, is in reality an attempt at recovery, a process of reconstruction*” (p. 71; italics Freud’s). I wrote to him, we met in 1998, became friends, and collaborated on a number of psychoanalytic projects. This review is my tribute to Bernd’s life-time achievement as psychoanalyst and prolific historian of psychoanalysis.

The wide-ranging interview of Nitzschke with André Karger covers major events in his life and evolution from a student with a passionate interest in philosophy, committed to anti-authoritarianism, freedom and independence of thought, a participant in *Aktion-Sühnezeichen* (action reparation), staying on a kibbutz in Israel, to culminate as PhD in psychology and philosophy and psychoanalyst. He became interested in Sigmund Freud and other revolutionaries: Wilhelm Reich, Otto Gross, Sabina Spielrein, Erich Fromm, and authored numerous articles, books, and scholarly reviews about Freud and these followers.

Bertram von der Stein devotes his article to “*Grenzgänger*”, or borders-crossers, “people who shuttle between two or more disciplines,” and practices, norms, and rules of different psychoanalytic organizations that developed during decades of dissents and splits between the DPG and DPV in Germany, pleading for building bridges and new relationships in the 21st century. He cites Nitzschke’s 2006 essay on the magical triangle Spielrein, Jung, and Gross.

Albrecht Götz von Olenhusen’s approach to the problem of the revolutionary as rebel against the patriarchs is to examine the life of Otto Gross, psychiatrist, psychoanalyst, and enfant terrible between Freud and Jung, Nitzschke’s great interest, too. At the Burghölzli, therapist Jung and patient Gross were switching roles when the Jung-Spielrein drama reached a peak (Lothane, 2012, 2016). Gross (1904) was important to me as the first psychiatrist who analyzed Schreber’s book and who, like Schreber, became entangled in battles with German institutional psychiatrists (Lothane, 2010a).

A more notorious rebel was Wilhelm Reich, discussed by Andreas Peglau, citing six publications by Nitzschke. Over the years Reich’s books and the reactions to them filled libraries and gave rise to two historiographies: the orthodox and the revisionist. Fallend and Nitzschke (1997) documented the drama, history and politics of Reich’s expulsion from the IPA and the DPG (Lothane, 2001), followed by Nitzschke (2003) and Lothane (2003). I discussed Reich and Peglau in 2015.

In her scholarly paper Galina Hristeva presents a very different kind of *Grenzgänger*, Georg Groddeck, who adored Freud but disagreed with him too, and correctly concludes that whereas Groddeck began as an enfant terrible he was later neither rebel nor martyr—au contraire, he originated psychoanalytic psychosomatics and was credited by Freud for giving the unconscious a new name, das Es or the Id. Actually, Groddeck’s ideas were a continuation of the Romantic tradition in German medicine and psychiatry as declared in 1846 by Carl Gustav Carus: “The key to knowing the conscious life of the soul lies in the region of the unconscious” (p. 1); “The organism is a totality,…is never this or that structure sick but the whole person is sick” (p. 89); “the wonderful inner and secret action of unconscious life resides in the so-called healing power of nature” (p. 91). As cited by Hristeva, Groddeck was correct telling Freud he “needed people of his breed, like a little pepper,” people of the heart, not “systematic heads” like Freud and his intellectualist ego psychology.

Thomas Anz reflects on the relationship between psychoanalysis and modern literature affirming that 20th and 21st century history of literature and the reception history of psychoanalysis go hand in hand, citing Arthur Schnitzler, Karl Kraus, Adolf Döblin and Thomas Mann. In his 1997 publication Anz did not mention, he cited the Swiss literature historian Walter Muschg and emphasized “the striking parallels between Mann’s *Death in Venice* and Jensen’s *Gradiva*,” a wonderful meeting of two inspired minds, Jensen’s and Freud’s (Lothane, 2010b).

Helmut Dahmer posits that psychoanalysis is “a sister of Marx’s critique of political economy” but without citing Wilhelm Reich, the father of this idea. Curiously, economic in Freud means sex, in Marx—money. Activist Marx roused the workers of the world to lose their chains which created Soviet Russia, China and North Korea. Interpreter and armchair revolutionary Freud only talked about sex but did not create the LGBT revolution. Dahmer dismisses free association as a “psychoanalytic shibboleth” but misses its meaning as free speech in analytic therapy. Free speech does not exist in a dictatorship and has its limits in a democracy, too. Fascinatingly, Freud’s 1933 “hope for the future…[was] that intellect—the scientific spirit, reason—may establish a dictatorship in the mental life of man” (p.171). Freud acted dictatorial towards some followers and opponents and all engaged in furious wars of theories and other wars of words.

Interestingly, Paul Schreber (1955), an ancestor of Freud’s theories, is omitted in this festschrift even though he qualifies for two reasons: first, as a “person who wishes to pave a way for a new conception of religion…[using] flaming speech (*Flammenworte*) as Christ used towards the Pharisees or Luther towards the Pope and the mighty of the world” (p. 309), he was rebel and revolutionary imagining to be a woman and prophesying the transgender revolution; second, because Nitzschke discussed Schreber (1985, 1998, 2000, 2003, 2010, 2011) and endorsed my Schreber work. In his “closing words” Nitzschke cites his 2012 review of Cronenberg’s film *A Dangerous Method*, characterizing it as a deceptive kitsch. In 2012 I concurred.
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