May 21st, 1952.

Dear Dr. Jones,

(1) Thank you for your suggestion about including in the Ferenczi volume his critical review of Jung's paper. I will go into the matter and let you know in due course what I think about the proposition.

(2) The fate of the four uncertain papers is a difficult task to decide. I have read them once, but cannot come to a firm enough decision.

(3) In the meantime I have found a young man who is well versed in psycho-analysis (although not an analyst), writes acceptable English poetry, and speaks German fluently. He is now translating some of Ferenczi's papers and I would like to submit a sample to you for criticism.
If you agree to this, I hope to send them in a few weeks time and also that by that time I can propose some solution about the uncertain papers.

The very pleasant day in your charming house is still quite vividly in my memory.

With best regards to Mrs. Jones and to yourself,

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Plat,
Elsed, nr. Midhurst, Sussex.
THE PLAT,
ELSTED,
NO. MIDHURST, S.X.

21.5. [52]

To Mr. Baldwin.

(Original on reverse)


Actually, he is due in England just now. He will probably visit me, so then I will put you in touch.

I appreciated very highly your most kind remarks. An Englishman would have been too shy to express himself so warmly! I will bear your suggestion well in mind. I have had the idea of reading a short paper.
sometime, but I feel my first duty is to
write the new biography. I have finished the
first two chapters of this, and am now
engaged on the laboratory period.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Note: The handwriting is legible, but some words are not clear due to the writing style and ink smudges.]
Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Plat,
Elsted, nr. Midhurst.

18th September 1952.

Dear Dr. Jones,

I have got another blurb for Ferenczi's Contributions from Woolf, but I am still not satisfied with it. I am trying to get it into better shape and will let you have the final draft for approval.

The main purpose of this letter is to report about the four papers which we could not decide whether or not to include in the new Ferenczi volume. These four are, "The Unwelcome Child and his Death Instinct" 1929, Journal Vol.10,p.125, "The Principle of Relaxation and Neo-Catharsis" 1930, Journal Vol. 11,p.426, "Child Analysis in the Analysis of the Adult" 1931, Journal Vol.12,p.468, and, lastly, "Confusion of Tongues" 1933, Journal Vol.30,p.225.

I must admit that it has not been easy to come to a considered recommendation about the papers; all four of them contain on the one hand very stimulating and highly important material, and, on the other, quite a lot which, in your own words, "is not Ferenczi at his best". Obviously there are three possibilities; to omit them, to publish them in their original form, or to edit them.

I think it would be unfair to Ferenczi's memory and his work simply to omit these four papers which are the last ones he wrote and contain a number of his most mature ideas. Since our talk I have read the papers about three times, and each time I have learnt something from them and, moreover, I was struck time and again by their highly stimulating impact. The fact that all of them were published in the Journal, three when it was under the direction of Professor Freud and the fourth to commemorate the 15th anniversary of Ferenczi's death, would make their omission appear as a wanton, unjustified action on our part, as if, so to speak, we wanted to be more Freudian than Freud himself.

On the other hand, to publish them without comment would mean misleading the public into believing that these are, so to speak, classical teachings of psycho-analysis, which they certainly are not. Ferenczi in his last month mentioned several times to me that he must re-write some of them.
So I come to my third proposition, that is, that we should either mention this fact emphatically in the book or edit the four articles; in particular I am thinking of the passage you showed to me where Ferenczi blatantly misunderstood and misquoted your paper.

This, then, is my proposition which I submit to you as editor of the library. If you consent to this, may I have your approval and I will go ahead with the editing in this spirit.

With kind regards to Mrs. Jones and yourself and many thanks to both of you for your kind hospitality.

Yours sincerely,
Sept. 21st

Dear Dr. Balint,

I am still not quite convinced by your letter. There were certainly two Ferenczis; what Mrs Klein would call the "good" one and the "bad" one. The latter was of course accorded the right, even when he was a sick man, to publish any idea he wished to. In a biography of him they would have to be taken into account, but I thought our intention was to revive his well-deserved reputation by presenting the valuable part of his work and not every word he ever wrote. May I suggest the following compromise with your plan? Instead of editing the doubtful papers by omitting certain parts, why not reverse the procedure and select only the good parts?
I notice that in the latest Institute Report (P.3) Dr. Usher's error is still perpetuated of saying that our Society was founded in 1919 instead of 1915. In 1919 its name was changed from London to British, just as Paris Society was changed to French, Berlin Society to German, Zurich to Swiss; that was by general agreement.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
24th September 1952.

3Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Plat,
Elsted,
nr. Midhurst, Sussex.

Dear Dr. Jones,

(1) Here is a copy of the blurb, a joint effort by Mr. Woolf and me. I think this will be alright.

(2) I am sorry about the stupid error in the latest Institute Report, but this was not my fault. I am secretary to the Society and not the Institute, and the Report was edited by him and Miss Drescher. I have forwarded your admonition to both of them and I promise to improve their ways and to correct the error.

(3) I will try the possibility of your suggestion, that is, to select only the good parts of the four Ferenczi papers in question. I hope you realise that this will not be an easy task, but I will let you know the result in due course.

At my last visit we discussed the possibility of your coming to one of the Society meetings. If you will consider it, may I propose the meeting at which we shall discuss the function of the Clinic, the discussion to be opened by Dr. Scott on "Problems of Treatment under Clinic Auspices". The date of the meeting will very likely be early in November.

With kindest regards to Mrs. Jones and yourself,

Yours sincerely,
Dear D. Halst:

You are an obstinate, or at least pertinacious, fellow. It is not Tarkenci's "enthusiasm" but his madness I am so hotly to adventure. And I am sure he would be grateful to me.

It is so long now that those forgotten which were your paper were. I have just got from Basie Books two fat books of Tarkenci. Have you seen them?
We are looking forward to your next visit with the bride and the rest of the family (or relatives, copies). I am very hard at work.

Yours sincerely,

Ernest Jones
28th October 1952.

Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Flat,
Kestad,
nr. Midhurst, Sussex.

Dear Dr. Jones,

The blurb will be printed with your corrections as contained in your last letter.

This autumn I gave two lectures to the third year students on Ferenczi and his work. I used this opportunity to read the four undecided papers very carefully once again and I bore in mind all the time your suggestion about editing them.

Although it is quite obvious that in one or other aspect Ferenczi was carried away by his enthusiasm for a new idea, I do not think this would justify our meddling with his writings. The fact is that all these four papers contain a real wealth of new ideas, admittedly revolutionary in their times, but now for the greater part accepted and incorporated in our everyday technique. This fact in itself rules out the possibility of excluding them altogether. On the other hand, I think it would be a disservice to the history of science to perpetrate on Ferenczi what Bowdler tried to do on Shakespeare. Just as much as Shakespeare ought to be studied and appreciated at his best and at his worst, so I think Ferenczi has the right both to his greatness and to his mistakes.

So I come to the proposition to include all these four papers in the form in which they were published in the Journal, and to restrict my function as editor to calling attention in a preface to justified criticisms against them. I hope you will agree to this proposition.

With kind regards to Mrs. Jones and to yourself,

Yours sincerely,
November 3rd, 1952.

Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Plat,
Elsted,
Mr. Midhurst,
Sussex.

Dear Dr. Jones,

Thank you very much for your reluctant consent, and I promise not to misuse it.

You mention that you do not remember the four papers in question, so may I enumerate them. They are "The Unwelcome Child and his Death Instinct", Journal Vol.X (this was the one where you pointed out an inaccuracy in Ferenczi's quotation of your paper), "The Principle of Relaxation and Neo-Catharsis" Journal Vol.XI, "Child Analysis in the Analysis of the Adult" Journal Vol.XII, and "Confusion of Tongues" Journal Vol.XXX.

I am getting on with the translations, but the work is progressing rather slowly.

With regard to the Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, I will sort this out as soon as I can do it and then get in touch with you to find out what would be convenient date for you to see us. Can you let me know in the meantime which years you want to have this time.

With many thanks,

Yours sincerely,
2nd December 1952.

Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Hat,
Elsted,
Mr. Midhurst, Sussex.

Dear Dr. Jones,

Once again it was very pleasant to have you and to realize from your address that there is no need for psychoanalysis to be boring, and that it is still mainly concerned with human suffering and human pain and not only with science.

I was very annoyed that once more the lecture was called "The Dr. Ernest Jones Memorial Lecture". Hearing you was certainly convincing that it was anything but a memorial.

As I mentioned to Mrs. Jones several of us would very much like to ask you to undertake the next Dr. Ernest Jones (not memorial) Lecture which is to take place some time next autumn. I want to put this to the Council at their next meeting and would like to know whether you would in principle consider such a proposition, which I am sure would be welcomed by everybody within and without the Society. As the next meeting is on December 8th I would be very grateful if you would let me have, I hope, your consent before that date.

Further, I would like to confirm that the Parensi letters will be ready for you by the middle of next week. As I have very few copies of this correspondence I would be very grateful if you would let me have back the previous years if you have finished with them, or as soon as you have done so. We are considering the possibility of publishing it.

With many thanks to Mrs. Jones and yourself for your kind interest in the changes in my life,

Yours very sincerely,
Dec. 5th 1952

Dear D. Ballant,

Excellent! I shall be in London for an hour or two on Wednesday next, and will call about midday for the parcel. If you are engaged then, just leave it with your secretary.

I might consider giving a Memorial Lecture later on, when I am even more ghost-like, but at present my first duty is to the Biography of our declining all destinations.

Yours sincerely,

E. Jones
P.S. What about some activity on the
History of Medicine (not of Science,
for they are all scientific)?
8th December 1952.

Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Flat,
Elsted,
r. Midhurst, Sussex.

Dear Dr. Jones,

I am sorry that I have to see a patient at the Tavistock Clinic at midday on Wednesday and very much regret that I shall therefore not have the pleasure of seeing you.

I will have ready for you the full correspondence from January 1912 to December 1917. Please let me know when you would like further instalments.

As you know, this period was most eventful for Ferenczi and the letters contain a very great deal about his complicated three-cornered relation. I promised first to Gisella and later to Elma, that, apart from Anna Freud, nobody should see these letters before the highly intimate parts had been taken out. I know that I break my promise, and do it deliberately because I think that your biography of Freud must come first, and it is very important that you should have all the available material to complete it. May I ask you, however, not to include in the biography any detail about these happenings unless, in your estimation, it is absolutely necessary, and certainly not to quote from the letters anything relating to these events. If you should feel compelled to do so in spite of my request, may I ask you to let me see the relevant passages before publication.

As mentioned in my previous letter, these copies are very valuable to me, and may I ask you whether you still need the previous years, and if so, for how long. In any case I would like to have them back as soon as you have finished with them.

I am very sorry that you cannot accept the invitation to give the next Ernest Jones (Not Memorial) Lecture, but perhaps it may change your decision to know that the next Lecture is
scheduled for the autumn of 1953. I am quite certain that everybody in the Society would welcome you there and enjoy what you say. The sample you have given us up to now, especially the last occasion, whetted our appetite very much.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Dr. Balint,

I don't know if you are on holiday, but I wanted to let you know how valuable I am finding the correspondence. It has many important self-revelations on friends' part, a mass of other data (holidays, etc.) besides reference to his preparing various papers & books. I regret I had not read them before Vol. 1. Some of which would even have been written
differently. I have now been through 1901-2 carefully.

Two questions. (1) Is "Konrad" in

"Blue Danube", which it should logically
be, or of something else. (2) Did you
ever guess what the "Nationalgesellschaft"
was from which he bought antiquities,
in Helgoland?

I see you have kept back 4 of

"Friend's" Colles 6-2 of December, 1911. There's no reason for doing this unless it refers to you personally.

I don't see any real canse for that! So why?

Sincerely yours

Ernest Jones.
August 10th, 1953.

Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Flat,
Elsted,
Mr. Hichurst, Sussex.

Dear Dr. Jones,

Thank you very much for your appreciation of our work at the Congress. It is nice to have the praise of an expert who organised the first of all Psycho-Analytic Congresses.

I am very glad that you too find the Freud-Pernozzi correspondence valuable. I am quite certain that a close study of it would help us considerably to understanding both Freud and Pernozzi's personality, their respective neurotic limitations, and especially the history of their tragic friendship. Unfortunately I think the time had not yet come when all this can be discussed in an objective and understanding atmosphere, so may I again ask you to treat the material with caution.

About your questions. 1. "Der arme Konrad" is one of Freud's favourite phrases which, as you will see, he used quite often to describe his body or his "es" which is not quite as willing a servant as his master would like him to be. I think the origin is one of the German folk tales, or perhaps one of Haeckel's comedies, or something like that, which I do not recall now, but I am sure that Anna Freud would be able to give you the source immediately, as "der arme Konrad" was a household phrase in Freud's home.

I am a bit more uncertain about "Nationalgeschenk", but as far as I remember it must be either (a) an unexpected sum of money which Freud received or (b) (and more likely) a new idea that he was about to publish. I am more for the second idea, but I ought to read the whole previous correspondence before deciding, for which unfortunately I have no time now. Should you still be in doubt about it, I would be very pleased to do anything you need in the autumn on my return.
The origin of "Nationalgeschenk" is rather grand seigneurish, almost majestic. It is usually the ruling sovereign, in Freud's case Franz Josef, who gracious allows the plebe to use something which until then has been his royal prerogative.

About the few letters that I retained. As already mentioned to you, I had to promise both Gisella and Irma to spare their feelings. I know it is an ungrateful task which will cause me quite a lot of inconvenience, and I wish to reassure you that nothing at all important is contained in these letters.

It was very nice to see Mrs. Jones and yourself at our party and I was sorry that you disappeared so quickly for me, as I wanted to reintroduce my son and his wife. You saw him last when he was 14 and he is now a Registrar at Brompton and more than ever your admirer, and was very disappointed not to see you.

With kindest regards to both of you from us both,

Yours sincerely,
Dear Dr. Balint,

I hear from Dr. Scott that you are getting on well with the Ferenczi book you have been preparing. Have we come to an agreement about its contents? I should be glad to hear from you about the lines along which you have tackled the work.

I have been just looking through the later Ferenczi correspondence. It was a great surprise to me to find how strongly he had turned against me in his later paranoid phase. What is remarkable is that he never showed it to me personally, though no doubt he poisoned Freud's mind somewhat. He held such extreme views about forcing the Americans to accept lay analysis that they would have immediately split off if he had
been made President, but this thwarted ambition
hurt him very much.

Yours sincerely

[Signature: Russell Jones]
January 20th, 1954

Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Flat,
Elsted,
nr. Midhurst, Sussex.

Dear Dr. Jones,

Ferenczi's last years were really tragic ones, but I do not think they could be called a paranoid phase. It is true he was profoundly disappointed and bitter, especially against Freud. The reason was that Freud could not see the importance of the discovery of Ferenczi (and Rank) that everything that happens in analysis has also a meaning as a transference phenomenon. In a way Freud could not develop beyond his great discovery as it is described in the Dora case. Ferenczi was not able to realise that this was a scientific controversy, and felt it as a personal slight. As he was profoundly attached to Freud, he tried to solve the resulting increased ambivalence by looking for scapegoats, who would then account for Freud's reluctance to acknowledge the importance of his discovery, the correctness of which was proved to him every day by every analytic session. The Americans, especially Brill, and throught hem you, and to a certain extent Eitingon, were the easiest targets. It is very difficult to say who poisoned whose mind; whether it was Freud, whose inability correctly to assess the intensity of the American resistance inflamed Ferenczi's enthusiasm for the "right cause", or whether it was Ferenczi, who used a cause which he knew to be very dear to the Professor.

As I saw Ferenczi very frequently during his last years, several times a week, I can testify from first-hand experience that there was not much paranoia in him, although like everyone else in a situation of this kind, he used paranoid mechanisms to a certain extent. If I had to describe his state of mind, I would rather call it severe depression, the main symptoms being a feeling that nobody loved him, especially not his master, and a
knowing fear that his enthusiasm had carried him away once again, and that he had lost forever the respect and esteem of his colleagues. In his last months he talked a lot of re-writing his last papers, but never of attacking anybody else.

Your second question about the Ferenczi book; perhaps you remember that we agreed, on that famous occasion when I appeared in the huge number, that the only two items left open were (a) the inclusion of the two critical papers about Jung and Rank, and (b) whether or not to include in the volume all his last four papers. We agreed that I should read these up again and decide.

When reading the Jung and Rank criticisms I became convinced that they are now of merely historical interest, and so I decided not to include them. On the other hand, the last four of his papers, although open to criticism on many counts, contain so many original ideas, many of them still the focus of attention to-day, that I decided to include all four.

Apart from this, the only change I have made is to include two book reviews, of Groddeck's pamphlet on the Psychogenesis of Organic Diseases, and of the Seelensucher. I enclose a copy of the table of contents as it now stands, for your information.

I am going away for a skiing holiday and shall return only early in February.

With kindest regards,

Yours sincerely,
Jan. 27/33, Pechora, Komi

Dear T. Buleit,

I am now working on Vol. II, but am held up by the lack of important documents, viz. the Randbriefe circulated among members of the "Committee".

Are there in your possession any of the copies of the "Committee"? Most of mine were lost in the blitz.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

B. Jones
7th February, 1955.

Dear Dr. Jones,

I am glad to hear that you have reached the stage of vol. III.

Unfortunately I cannot help you very much with regard to the Rundbriefe, as Ferenczi kept only a very few of them. And the same seems to be true about Professor Freud, who included only those on which Ferenczi made some personal additions.

All these have been copied with the correspondence and are included among the letters, according to their respective dates.

With kindest regards to you both,

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Ernest Jones.

Dear Dr. Jones,

May I ask a real favour from you? It is about the new Ferenczi volume. As with the other volumes, I agreed with Mr. Rosenthal of Basic Books that he should have the American rights for this volume, too. Our agreement was the standard form, no particular stipulation from either side.

As the Hogarth Press was rather slow in producing the volume, Mr. Rosenthal got impatient. In order to urge me and the Hogarth Press to action he sent me a circular to show that he is already advertising this volume. I learned only from this circular that he not only had commissioned Dr. Clara Thompson to write a preface, but included this fact in the advertisement. I protested against this behaviour of his and a lengthy correspondence developed. I do not think that the details are of any importance, but in case you want to know them I enclose all the correspondence, with the request to have it returned when you have finished with it.

The outcome of our correspondence was a kind of ultimatum contained in Mr. Rosenthal's last letter, stating that either I agree to the inclusion of Dr. Thompson's introduction or he withdraws from the publication. I know that there is some chance that I might get him to fulfil his contract but I do not like this idea, and my solicitor agrees with me.

I enclose also a copy of Dr. Thompson's introduction, which is not very bad, not very good. Anyway it is too emotional for my liking, dishing up again the old story about the fatal disagreement between Freud and Ferenczi, it is true in a sympathetic form. My dilemma is, which is the lesser of the two evils, to swallow Dr. Thompson's introduction or to break up the series and have the third volume published by another publisher in America. I dislike equally both of them and need somebody to tell me what to do. It is a fact and not a compliment that in the whole Society I think you are the only one who is unbiased, aloof and objective enough to size up the situation properly. So may I ask you to go into the matter as far as you think is necessary and let me know your opinion? I should be most grateful for any help you can give me.

With many thanks,

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Ernest Jones.

Dear Dr. Balint,

You have certainly given me a Solomon's task, so I shall follow his example by dividing the baby in half. On the one hand I think it was rather like Rosenthal's hustling tendency to go ahead without having the courtesy to communicate with you first. He does this sometimes, and it is far removed from Hungarian manners. He apologised for that and also deserves good marks for the way he calmed down after getting your first heated letter.

On the other hand I think he is in his rights in claiming to know what is best for American sales and in referring to the very frequent custom of having a different introduction there.

I agree with your estimate of Clara Thompson's introduction, although I think myself it is definitely misleading in some respects. Still it is what one would expect from an enthusiastic devotee, and she seems to be the official one in America, having written a Preface (also without my knowledge) for my translation of Ferenczi's first book.

You may not altogether like my final decision, but here it is. I suggest that you write to Rosenthal, telling him that you have submitted the matter to me for arbitration, and, although you do not agree with me, I recommended that the Cl. Thompson introduction stands on condition that one passage is altered which I have marked in your copy. It would be very unfair to Freud to say that Ferenczi strove to win his tolerance since, as I shall show, Freud was always completely tolerant of his later heresies although naturally he could not
approve of them.

With best wishes

Yours very sincerely

[Signature]
28th November 1957.

Dear Dr. Jones,

During the last few months, indeed since I read your Third Volume, I have hesitated to many occasions to write to you. The reason is, as you certainly know, your description of the last phase of Ferenczi's life.

I think what you say in the book about him is in many ways out of true and misleading. This is especially so about what you say of his mental condition during his last period. I saw Ferenczi during the last months of his life on many occasions, once or twice every week, and I never found him deluded, paranoid or homicidal. On the contrary, though he was physically incapacitated by his ataxia, mentally most of the time he was quite fresh and often discussed with me the various details of his controversy with Freud and his plan to revise some of his ideas published in his last papers — if he ever would again be able to write. I saw him on the Sunday before his death and though he was very weak, his mind even then was completely clear.

Quite a number of people have written to me from various parts of the world asking whether your statements on Ferenczi were correct and what my opinion about them was.

I really do not know what should be done about this disagreement between us. Obviously you have reasons to believe what you wrote and the same is true about me and my memories. On the other hand, if I remain silent, the fact that I, as Ferenczi's literary executor, had put at your disposal the whole of the Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, will be interpreted as if I were in agreement with your description. On the other hand, I would hate to start a kind of public polemic. Perhaps you with your very wide experience could suggest some ways in which we two could publicly state that, although respecting each other's view, we agreed to differ. If, however, you would prefer not to associate yourself with any statement of this kind, I still would be grateful if you would advise me in what form whatever I have to say should be said.
28.11.57.

Dr. Ernest Jones.

Needless to say, I am very sorry that all this has arisen but I hope you will understand that it is impossible for me not to do anything in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Plat,
Elsted,
Mr. Midhurst,
Sussex.
November 29, 1957

Dear Balint,

I knew all along that Vol. III would be the most troublesome and now, just when I am least able to cope with them, I have been attacked on all sides for my various "misrepresentations". People in America have also written to me about my alleged "attack on Ferenczi".

You and I have a pretty difficult problem to solve which should be the test of our good will. I consider in fact that we are both in the right. That you never observed any paranoid traits in Ferenczi is doubtless true, but it is not conclusive evidence, because nothing is common even in a case of advanced paranoia for a subject to be entirely lucid on most topics. You may be sure, however, that I had good evidence for what I said about his last days. There is also ample evidence in the correspondence and elsewhere of mild paranoid traits going back to his jealousy and suspicion of his brother. It came out for instance strongly in connection with Abraham as well as with several other people. I think myself that the real basis of his trouble was his insatiable desire to be loved (which started his later theories), and his constant mistrust of the people who were fond of him, but evidently not fond enough for the insatiability. The many years he spent debating the simple question of his marriage with Gisela, who was certainly devoted
to him, was in itself highly pathological.

It would be most harmful to his memory if we started a public debate about the numerous problems of his psychology, and there is nothing I should really hate more. The practical question is whether you feel obliged to take any public step or will let the matter die down. If you feel you cannot get out of it, after prolonged reflection, then I think you can hit on a compromise with which I should be willing to agree. You could say "that you knew Ferenczi very well and and often saw him in the last month and had been very surprised to read what I said about them. You yourself had never observed any such symptoms, but you know that it is common for even advanced cases not to display their symptoms openly or to beguile lucid otherwise.

Think it all over well.

Yours most sincerely

Ernest Jones

My health is very feeble still. I wish the summer were coming instead of this winter.
3rd December 1957.

Dear Dr. Jones,

Many thanks for your understanding and co-operative letter.

I am sorry to hear that you do not feel well and I wish you a quick recovery so that you can speak again in the same glowing terms about the pleasures of mature age as you did a few months ago.

After receiving your letter I got in touch with Dr. Hoffer with the proposition that a short letter should be published in the Journal. He accepted it and said he could publish it in the coming number of the Journal if he gets it before Christmas. As I wish to avoid even the semblance of a public controversy I would suggest that I draft the letter now, and I will send it to you for your comments in a few days to give you ample time to consider it.

With kind regards to both of you,

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Flat,
Elsted,
Nr. Midhurst, Sussex.
6th December 1957.

Dear Dr. Jones,

Enclosed I am sending a draft of the letter I am intending to send to Dr. Hoffer. I wish to emphasise that it is a draft only and I should be grateful for your comments, especially about the wording.

I am fully aware that we have a pretty knotty problem to solve which will be a test not only of our goodwill but also of our friendly relationship. I hope very much that the version proposed by me will be acceptable to you. If we two can agree on this letter any public controversy, which is just as distasteful to me as it is to you, will be avoided.

Once again, my sincere wishes for your speedy recovery, and kind regards to you and Mrs. Jones,

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Plat,
Elsted,
Nr. Midhurst, Sussex.
Sir,

The publication of the Third Volume of Dr. Jones's great Freud Biography created an awkward situation for me, Ferenczi's literary executor.

In this Volume Dr. Jones expresses rather strong views about Ferenczi's mental state, especially during the last years of his life, diagnoses it as a kind of slowly developing paranoia with delusions and homicidal impulses. Using his diagnosis as a basis, he interprets Ferenczi's scientific publications on the one hand, and his participation in the analytic movement on the other, in this sense.

Undoubtedly this last period, which may be taken as having started with the "Genitaltheorie" (Thalassa) and the book written jointly with Rank, the "Entwicklungziele" (Developmental Aims), is most controversial. It was during these years that Ferenczi advanced a number of new ideas which were felt at that time to be fantastic, revolutionary, exaggerated, without proper foundation, and so on. Moreover, on several occasions he himself had to withdraw or modify one or the other of the ideas just proposed and it was also widely known that Freud adopted a rather critical attitude towards many - though by far not towards all - of them.

All this created a highly unfavourable aura which has made exceedingly difficult any proper re-evaluation of what was good and of lasting value among Ferenczi's ideas.
If now Dr. Jones's views about Ferenczi were to remain unchallenged by me who had made the whole Freud-Ferenczi correspondence available for the Biography, the impression might be created as if I, Ferenczi's literary executor, one of his pupils and a close friend, were in agreement with them. This certainly would make the psycho-analytic public feel that the writings of the last period do not merit proper attention. In my opinion exactly the opposite is the truth. Ferenczi's last writings not only anticipated the development of psycho-analytic technique and theory by 15 - 25 years but still contain many ideas that may shed light on problems of the present or even of the future.

It is for this reason only that I wish to state that I saw Ferenczi frequently - once or twice almost every week - during his last illness, a pernicious anaemia which led to a rapidly progressing combined degeneration of the cord. He soon became atactic, for the last few months had to stay in bed and for the last few days had to be fed; the immediate cause of his death was a paralysis of the respiratory centre. Despite his progressive physical weakness, mentally he was always clear and on several occasions discussed with me in detail his controversy with Freud, his various plans how to re-write and enlarge his last Congress paper - if he would ever be able to take a pen in his hand again. I saw him on the Sunday before his death, even then - though painfully weak and atactic - mentally he was quite clear.
True, as in every one of us, there were some neurotic traits in Ferenczi, among them a touchiness and an inordinate need to be loved and appreciated - correctly described by Dr. Jones. In my opinion, the difference between Dr. Jones and myself is not so much in respect of facts as in respect of their interpretation. As both of us were - at some time - analysed by Ferenczi, it is possible that both Dr. Jones's interpretations and mine are biased. May I propose with Horace that 

_hence veniam patimurque damnumque vicissim_, that is, we record our disagreement and trust the next generation with the task of sorting the truth out.

Yours faithfully,
Sir,

The publication of the Third Volume of Dr. Jones's great Freud Biography created an awkward situation for me, Ferenczi's literary executor.

In this Volume Dr. Jones expresses rather strong views about Ferenczi's mental state, especially during the last years of his life, diagnoses it as a kind of slowly developing paranoia (with delusions and homicidal impulses). Using his diagnosis as a basis, he interprets Ferenczi's scientific publications on the one hand, and his participation in the analytic movement on the other, in this sense.

Undoubtedly this last period, which may be taken as having started with the "Genitaltheorie" (Thalassa) and the book written jointly with Rank, the "Entwicklungsziele" (Developmental Aims), is most controversial. It was during these years that Ferenczi advanced a number of new ideas which were felt at that time to be fantastic, revolutionary, exaggerated, without proper foundation, and so on. Moreover, on several occasions he himself had to withdraw or modify one or the other of the ideas just proposed and it was also widely known that Freud adopted a rather critical attitude towards many - though by far not towards all - of them.

All this created a highly unfavourable aura which has made exceedingly difficult any proper re-evaluation of what was good and of lasting value among Ferenczi's ideas.
If now Dr. Jones's views about Ferenczi were to remain unchallenged by me, who had made the whole Freud-Ferenczi correspondence available for the Biography, the impression might be created as if I, Ferenczi's literary executor, one of his pupils and a close friend, were in agreement with them. This certainly would make the psycho-analytic public feel that the writings of the last period do not merit proper attention. In my opinion exactly the opposite is the truth. Ferenczi's last writings not only anticipated the development of psycho-analytic technique and theory by 15 - 25 years but still contain many ideas that may shed light on problems of the present or even of the future.

It is for this reason only that I wish to state that I saw Ferenczi frequently — once or twice almost every week — during his last illness, a pernicious anaemia which led to a rapidly progressing combined degeneration of the cord. He soon became atactic, for the last few months had to stay in bed and for the last few days had to be fed; the immediate cause of his death was a paralysis of the respiratory centre. Despite his progressive physical weakness, mentally he was always clear and on several occasions discussed with me in detail his controversy with Freud, his various plans how to re-write and enlarge his last Congress paper — if he would ever be able to take a pen in his hand again. I saw him on the Sunday before his death, even then — though painfully weak and atactic — mentally he was quite clear.
True, as in every one of us, there were some neurotic traits in Ferenczi, among them a touchiness and an inordinate need to be loved and appreciated—correctly described by Dr. Jones. In my opinion, the difference between Dr. Jones and myself is not so much in respect of facts as in respect of their interpretation. As both of us were—at some time—analysed by Ferenczi, it is possible that both Dr. Jones's interpretations and mine are biased. I propose with Horace that hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim, that is, we record our disagreement and trust the next generation with the task of sorting the truth out.

Yours faithfully,

[In addition, it is possible that Dr. Jones had access to other sources than mine he mentioned. Still, whether our disagreement can be explained by other sources or not, I would like to]
December 7, 1957

Dear Balint,

I am sure our friendly relationship is not going to have any trouble in standing the test of what you call this knotty problem. In the worst case we can amicably agree to disagree, but I think we should be able to get a bit closer to each other than in your draft. That is obviously easy to do over the matter of the value of his latest writings, for, as you say, they are still controversial, and raise once more the old question of what is development of analysis and what deviation. Now you give in your second paragraph the definite impression ("using the diagnosis as a basis, he interprets etc") that it is I who stigmatised the writings in question as a deviation. I find this most unfair because I have done little but recall the opinions of others. There was Eitingon, the President, and the whole Council who refused to accept Ferenczi's deviating last paper for the Congress, whereas I on the other hand was the only one to insist that he should be allowed to give it; there was Freud's definite opinion, and above all Ferenczi's own when he said that his opinions differed so much from psycho-analysis that it would not be honest for him to accept the Presidency of the International at a moment when the ever-kind Freud was pressing him to accept it. I am sure you will agree that this part of the draft should be altered.

I am sure also that you want to give the impression of objective judgement and not simple bias. You would increase this if you included your honest admission that clarity of mind, such as you have observed, far from ex-
including paranoia is a frequent accompaniment of it. People would say: Yes isn't Balint an honest man.

I should of course also like it to be said, since it is quite true, that probably Dr. Jones has access to evidence from other sources than those he mentioned.

I am not sure that our difference is over interpretation of facts as in the varying account we take of them. Let me take a minute example. When Ferenczi was staying in my house he asked me one day if I had met Brill in Italy. Not having done so I naturally answered no. It would be a very strange thing, and completely unlike me, to lie to one's best friend, as I then thought Ferenczi was, over such an unimportant matter. But he had to write at once to Freud saying he was sure I was lying and that Brill and I had been plotting together in Italy in a conspiracy against him. Now do we really differ in the interpretation of such a fact, of which there are many examples quoted in my book, or is it not rather that you ignore them where I am bound to take them seriously?

Nor do I like your last paragraph which tries to reduce the knotty problem to the personal differences of positive and negative transference to an ex-analysis. Life is not so simple as all that.

Yours very sincerely

[Signature]

Endorsement
12th December 1957.

Dear Dr. Jones,

However hard we try to narrow down our controversy I am afraid we have to accept the fact that on certain points we disagree. Were it not so there would be no need for me to think of writing this awkward letter.

The two main points of our disagreement are:

1) The value of Ferenczi's last writings. Although you say in your letter that you never stigmatised his last writings, this is not absolutely true. As a very convincing instance may I quote page 15 of your Third Volume, paragraph 2, the sentence starting on the sixth line. After re-reading it I do not think you can disagree that you give as your opinion that Ferenczi's last Congress paper should be considered as a symptom of his "illness".

2) That Ferenczi deteriorated mentally towards the end of his life and the diagnosis of this deterioration is a slowly developing paranoia.

Although I see the ways through which you came to this conclusion I cannot agree with it and that is the main reason why I feel I have to write this letter.

With all the other points you raise I am in full agreement and I have changed the text of my letter accordingly. I should be very pleased if you could accept that the description of our disagreement should be published in this form. I again enclose a copy.

As mentioned, I have received several letters from all over the world urging me to do something, the last being from Elze and Magda Ferenczi's step-daughters, who are, as you know, the legal owners of the Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, asking me to get either a rectification by you or the withdrawal of the permission to use this correspondence. Of course, I have advised them not to be
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Dr. Ernest Jones.

as foolish as that, but I hope you will see from this that, quite apart from my own conviction, I have simply got to do something.

Once again, I am very sorry about this state of affairs and I hope you will understand my situation.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Flat,
Elstree,
Mr. Midhurst, Sussex.
Sir,

The publication of the Third Volume of Dr. Jones's great Freud Biography created an awkward situation for me, Ferenczi's literary executor.

In this Volume Dr. Jones expresses rather strong views about Ferenczi's mental state, especially during the last years of his life, diagnoses it as a kind of slowly developing paranoia, with delusions and homicidal impulses in its final phase. Using his diagnosis as a basis, he interprets Ferenczi's scientific publications on the one hand, and his participation in the analytic movement on the other, in this sense.

Undoubtedly Ferenczi's last period, which may be taken as having started with the "Genitaltheorie" (Thalassa) and the book written jointly with Rank, the "Entwicklungsziele" (Developmental Aims), is most controversial. It was during these years that Ferenczi advanced a number of new ideas which were felt at that time to be fantastic, revolutionary, exaggerated, without proper foundation, and so on. Moreover, on several occasions he himself had to withdraw or modify one or the other of the ideas just proposed and it was also widely known that Freud adopted a rather critical attitude towards many - though by far not towards all - of them.

All this created a highly unfavourable aura which has made exceedingly difficult any proper re-evaluation of what was good and of lasting value among Ferenczi's ideas.

If now Dr. Jones's views about Ferenczi's mental state were to remain unchallenged by me who had made the whole Freud-Ferenczi correspondence available for the Biography, the impression might be created as if I, Ferenczi's literary executor, one of his pupils and a close friend, were in agreement with them. This certainly would make the psycho-analytic public feel that the writings of the last period - when, according to Dr. Jones, his
mental health was declining - do not merit proper attention. In my opinion exactly the opposite is the truth. Ferenczi's last writings not only anticipated the development of psycho-analytic technique and theory by 15 - 25 years but still contain many ideas that may shed light on problems of the present or even of the future.

It is for this reason only that I wish to state that I saw Ferenczi frequently - once or twice almost every week - during his last illness, a pernicious anemia which led to a rapidly progressing combined degeneration of the cord. He soon became ataxic, for the last few months had to stay in bed and for the last few days had to be fed; the immediate cause of his death was a paralysis of the respiratory centre. Despite his progressive physical weakness, mentally he was always clear and on several occasions discussed with me in detail his controversy with Freud, his various plans how to re-write and enlarge his last Congress paper - if he would ever be able to take a pen in his hand again. I saw him on the Sunday before his death, even then - though painfully weak and ataxic - mentally he was quite clear.

True, as in every one of us, there were some neurotic traits in Ferenczi, among them a touchiness and an inordinate need to be loved and appreciated - correctly described by Dr. Jones. In addition, it is possible that Dr. Jones when arriving at his diagnosis had access to other sources than those he mentioned. Still, in my opinion the difference between Dr. Jones and myself is not so much in respect of facts as in respect of their interpretation. As both of us were - at some time - analysed by Ferenczi, it is possible that both Dr. Jones's interpretations and mine are biased. Whether our difference has other sources or not I would like to propose with Horace that hanc veniam petinamque demusque vicissim, that is, we record our disagreement and trust the next generation with the task of sorting the truth out.

Yours faithfully,
Dear Balint,

May I say that I admire the way you are tackling your very difficult situation. I think it should come out all right. As for myself I am learning once more that pour faire une omelette il faut casser des œufs. It is very unpleasant to hurt the feelings of people when you have not the slightest intention of doing so. Perhaps you might tell Elma and Magda that I was extremely careful to avoid dealing with Ferenczi’s personal life, e.g. the way he treated Gisela, his intimacy with her daughter etc., but kept strictly to his relations with Freud. There I could leave out nothing of importance.

I think you and I could still get somewhat closer and that it is worth the effort to try, although of course there will be final disagreement. I could accept your revised draft but for two passages. One is the reference to our having been analysed by Ferenczi. This implies not only that neither of us can form an independent judgement, but that what I wrote is dictated by an negative after-transfer, which I should strenuously deny and which I think you have no right to insinuate.

The other, less important, point is the way I am made to bear full responsibility for the judgement about his later work, etc. In those days I was very much preoccupied with other interests and did not take much interest in his later writings beyond noting the opinion of Freud and all other analysts about them. Freud himself was in no doubt
at all that the change of views as well as his inexplicable estrangement were due to personal mental changes. It is true that I have come to accept this opinion also, but it did not come from me, and therefore the passage in your draft, and perhaps also the one you quote from Vol. III, should be more carefully worded.

Naturally those who differed from Ferenczi's own expressed opinion about his later work being a deviation from psycho-analysis will not need to search for any explanation of it, and that I gather is on the whole your position to which of course you have every right. In that case, however, it is clear that we start from different premises, which should be the basis of your objection to what I wrote.

I trust that the good will of the approaching season is helping us both to a better and entirely friendly understanding,

Yours Cordially

[Signature]
19th December 1957.

Dear Dr. Jones,

You say quite rightly that whatever we do a certain amount of disagreement will remain between us, so after due consideration I came to the conclusion that I accept your request to leave out the reference to Ferenczi being the analyst of both of us, but otherwise not to change the text of my letter. I enclose a copy of the version I have sent to Hoffer.

May I use this opportunity to thank you very much for your understanding co-operation, and express my hope that this highly unpleasant and awkward battle-axe between us two will have been buried for good.

One more point, and that is very important to me: perhaps you remember when I handed over the whole correspondence to you that I made the stipulation that as long as Elma and Magda are alive nothing from it may be disclosed to anybody concerning Ferenczi's private life, especially his relation to Gisela and Elma. As you know, Magda and Elma do not even know about the existence of the interchange of letters between Freud and Ferenczi, and I wish to do everything in my power to prevent them getting to know this fact which might cause them considerable embarrassment and suffering.

With best wishes for Christmas to both of you,

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Plat,
Eistedd,
Nr. Midhurst, Sussex.
I certainly sympathize with Dr. Balint in his rather painful situation. Naturally it would not occur to me to doubt the faithfulness of his memory or the accuracy of his observations. He omitted, to mention, however, that they are quite compatible with a more serious diagnosis, since it is a characteristic of paranoid patients to mislead friends and relatives by exhibiting complete lucidity on most topics.

Nor should I expect Dr. Balint to doubt my own bona fides. What I wrote about Ferenczi's last days was based on the trustworthy evidence of an eye witness.

The varying value of Ferenczi's last writings remains, as Dr. Balint remarks, controversial. I merely recorded my acquiescence in the opinions expressed so firmly by Freud, Boring and everyone I knew in 1933 that they had been to some extent influenced by subjective personal factors.
Dec. 22, 57

Dear Balint,

Yes, it is good to get to the end. Hoffer will probably send me a copy of your draft and I feel inclined at the moment, unless you very much object, to send him the enclosed riposte. I feel I owe it to myself.

Your conscience may lie easy about Gisela and Elma. I learned nothing new about them from the letters you kindly lent me; the only compromising ones you kept back and I have never seen them. My knowledge comes straight from Ferenczi, but naturally I have not the faintest motive ever to mention such matters to anyone.

With best wishes for a peaceful Christmas for us both

Yours very sincerely

Ernke Less
30th December 1957.

Dear Dr. Jones,

As we have weathered the controversy may I wish you a happy birthday, a happy New Year, and many happy returns.

Of course, I have absolutely no objections against you sending your reply to Dr. Holfer. In fact I find it excellent and admirable. The only thing I wish to say is that you should consider whether it is worth while having the second paragraph of your letter printed. My reason is this. Several people, among them Clara Thompson, Alice Lowell, Izette de Forest, and so on, have already written to me strongly criticising your description. If you now state that your description is based on the evidence of an eye witness I am afraid all of them will come forward with their testimony, perhaps even challenging the trustworthiness of your witness. This would lead to exactly the same public controversy that I tried to avoid. On the other hand, if you omit the second paragraph, your letter reads just as well as with it and, moreover, there will be nothing controversial in it.

By the way, just to satisfy my curiosity, I would like very much to know who your eye witness was. I thought I knew practically all the people who had any contact with Ferenczi during his last weeks and I can’t imagine which amongst them could get in touch with you and describe Ferenczi’s state; but of course, if you are bound by any consideration or discretion, I shall desist from my request.

With kindest regards to both of you,

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Ernest Jones,
The Flat,
Elsted,
Mr. Midhurst, Sussex.
Jan. 1st, 58

Dear Balint,

Many thanks for your good wishes, which I warmly reciprocate. It is pleasant to think that we have come through this little trouble like gentlemen.

I think you are right in supposing that the American women will continue their attack in any case. If so, having said my little say, I shall not take them up any further.

Yours very Sincerely

[Signature]
February 4th 1970.

Dear Mrs. Jones,

May I ask for your help in a rather complicated matter?

As perhaps you remember, your husband translated some of Ferenczi's papers before the First World War. This translation was published in America by R.G. Badger, Boston, in 1916, under the title "Contributions to Psycho-Analysis"; in later editions the title was changed to "Sex and Psycho-Analysis".

As this translation was made before the English terminology of psychoanalysis was settled, the wording is somewhat antiquated and we are planning to translate these papers again into modern English usage. This is the reason why I am writing to you. I should like to find out whether you know anything about the contractual arrangements regarding this publication. This means:

1. Was there any agreement between Ferenczi and your husband concerning the translation rights?

2. Has there been any agreement between the publisher in America, R.G. Badger, Boston, and your husband about the copyright of this translation?

Any information, however vague, that you might be able to give me would be of considerable importance.

With many thanks in advance,

Yours sincerely,

Michael Balint.

Mrs. K. Jones,
14 Seymour Mews,
W.1.
14 Seymour Mews
London, W.1
WELbeck 7170
9.2.70

Dear Dr. Balint,

I have thought very hard about that matter. The only thing, positive I hope, I can say is that all my husband's scientific and private correspondence (except our love letters) were given to Mansfield House. Let the secretaries look for 1916 correspondence.

I have never heard of Badger. But Rosenthal, Basic Books, might have an idea. There is also Eliz. Zetzel in Boston who is devoted to E.J. She might try and help.

Sorry not to be of more use. I wish you and your wife would call in some late evening.

My house is worth seeing, if I am not (which I don't really believe.)

With kind regards

Yours sincerely

[Signature]