

Otto Fenichel's Rundbriefe for the Present Moment: Community Psychoanalysis in the U.S.

Letter One, Take II -Background and Project Information

Cambridge, MA and Athens, GA, August 22, 2023

Dear Colleagues,

Fraction – a disconnected piece, a fragment

Fractal – an object whose parts, at infinitely many levels of magnification, appear geometrically similar to the whole

We are writing to you to continue a conversation that was broken off a while ago—about psychoanalysis and its role in our fractured world. We are calling this project the Rundbriefe Project, because it grew out of a 2022 discussion, during an early meeting of our newly formed Community Psychoanalysis Concentration (CPC) at the Boston Psychoanalytic Society and Institute. The CPC participants read Russell Jacoby's 1998 book *The Repression of Psychoanalysis* that describes the Rundbriefe (or circular letters) of Otto Fenichel's group of "political Freudians" in the 1930s and '40s. The Rundbriefe contributors struggled through fascism, forced migration, and institutional politics, working to elucidate the role of psychoanalysis as a political and sociological theory.

The CPC group was riveted by the content of Jacoby's book. Many of the participants have international connections; as a group we are connected to Argentina, China, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Palestine, Panama, Turkey, the U.K., and the United States, and carry within us stories of political repression, war, and migration that inform our political engagement. So, it was perhaps not surprising that the story of the Rundbriefe resonated with us. The ideas also resonated with some participants' combined passion and reservations about psychoanalysis in the United States. The group's response led us, the co-directors of the CPC (Jany and Paola), to think of a way to continue Fenichel's conversation with his colleagues.

You are receiving this letter as an invitation to contribute to Rundbriefe: Take II. To initiate this second part, we are contributing thoughts and reactions about selected content not yet published in English of Fenichel's Rundbriefe from the 119 letters in the original German published in 1998 by Stroemfeld in Vienna. If you have read Jacoby's book, like the CPC participants, you too may have felt inspired by the idealism and unrelenting dedication to the social that the author describes of Fenichel and the other "political Freudians." Jacoby based his thoughts on a very select number of Fenichel's letters that were available to him at the time.

Jany's reading of some of the 119 Rundbriefe in German suggest that other threads, some less inspiring to us, existed. However, the range of positions—from the left-leaning political position that Jacoby emphasized to the more conservative institutional-theoretical positions that we found to be intertwined with the political—together, reflect with shocking accuracy many of the

dilemmas that psychoanalysis in the United States continues to face today. While initially we were disappointed with some of the threads, upon further reflection we realized that this complexity was important. As psychoanalysts we know that a single truth is fallacy. If we accept that we are constantly working within multiple discourses and embrace this perspective, we might be able to locate a more sensible reality that works for more of us, even if it seems, at some moments in time, less exciting.

Therefore, our invitation to you is one that we hope to embark on with excitement for the opportunity to exchange and converse about ideas related to the social and community and psychoanalysis. We also know that there is no answer or solution to some grand question, and that the less exciting proposal is that we continue to work, despite and because of the challenges, toward a new reality. That that, the work together, is the hope and the path.

To start Rundbriefe: Take II, we will do the following: 1) This letter will follow with a description of what we found in the selected content that Jany reviewed in the 119 Rundbriefe publication. 2) Then we ask that you write a letter of response that will become the content of Rundbriefe: Take II. 3) Next, we will respond with a summary and reflection of all letters submitted. 4) To close the experience, we will hold the Rundbriefe: Take II Conference at BPSI on December 9, 2023 where we will have a live discussion about the whole experience.

A Summary of Selected Content from the 119 Rundbriefe and Our Response

The informal grouping of leftist analysts that convened around Fenichel in the 1930s in Berlin initially formed in response to a controversy around the publication in the *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* (International Journal of Psychoanalysis) of Wilhelm Reich's 1932 paper on "The Masochistic Character," subtitled "a sexual-economic refutation of the death drive and the repetition compulsion." This paper challenged the notion of a death drive, seeking to unravel the twists and turns Freud had made to conceptualize phenomena seen as "beyond the pleasure principle," and see the masochist's character formation instead as a failed attempt at the pleasure principle: "an unsuccessful attempt to free himself from his fear and displeasure. Unsuccessful because, despite the attempts, he never gets rid of his inner tension, which constantly threatens to turn into fear." (p. 320, JK's translation) In reconceptualizing masochism, Reich was returning to Freud's original conflict between the ego ("Ich") and the outside world, in a way that necessitated some examination of that outside world:

Suffering comes from society, so we are in fact fully entitled to ask why it creates suffering, who has an interest in that. We must now prove that the "unmanageable destructive drives" to which human suffering is attributed are not biological, but rather social, that it is the inhibition of sexuality by authoritarian education that makes aggressiveness an unmanageable demand, by transforming inhibited sexual energy into destructiveness. And what looks like self-destructiveness in our cultural life is not a manifestation of "self-annihilation instincts," but rather of the very real destructive intentions of a layer of capitalist society with an interest in the suppression of sexual life. (Reich, 1932, p. 350, JK's translation)

The social critique inherent in Reich's theory—and indeed in the early interest in sexual freedom and sexual enlightenment of Freud and many first and second-generation psychoanalysts—was clearly seen as troubling. According to Johannes Reichmayr and Elke Mühlleitner, editors of the 1998 collection of the 119 Rundbriefe, Freud would only permit the article to be published if it included a footnote stating that Reich was a member of the Communist Party and that “Bolshevism limits academic freedom as much as the Church.” (119 Rundbriefe, p. 16, JK's translation) Fenichel and other colleagues attempted to mediate, and ultimately the article was published without Freud's footnote, but accompanied by an article by Siegfried Bernfeld outlining the discussion of Reich's work in the journal of the German Communist Party, which essentially, though Bernfeld himself identified as a Marxist, served as a takedown of those seen as too far left. The Fenichel group began meeting to address how political issues were being avoided in the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA), while also sharing their ideas about a Marxist psychoanalysis.

Hitler's rise to power in 1933 and the subsequent flight of most members of the group necessitated a shift from meetings to letters, and so the Rundbriefe were born. Fenichel—first in Oslo, then Prague, then Los Angeles—served as the central point to whom group members sent word of their own activities, efforts to bring colleagues to safety, papers published, ideas discussed, and developments (and conflicts) in psychoanalytic institutes and associations around the world. He painstakingly summarized these updates and distributed them to the group in carbon copies. As Fenichel later described: “The Berlin colleagues dispersed all around the world. We missed each other and at the same time, justifiably, had the impression that influencing the psychoanalytic movement, which was also internally threatened by fascism, was more necessary than ever.” (Rundbrief 72, Section 1, pp. 1383-4, JK's translation) The somewhat secretive group trusted as Rundbriefe recipients seems to have included: Edith Jacobson, Wilhelm Reich (until the end of 1934), Annie Reich, Georg Gerö, Edith Gyömröi, Barbara Lantos, Frances Deri, Sabina Spielrein, Samuel Goldscheim, Nic Hoel, Käthe Misch, Emanuel Windholz, and Martin Grotjahn.

For our CPC group, the Rundbriefe, and the existence of this group of political thinkers, Marxists, and rebels, served as a way of (re-)connecting with the subversive, politically engaged origins of psychoanalysis.

The early Rundbriefe included news from emigrants in England, France, Hungary, Holland, Switzerland, the Soviet Union, USA, India, Japan, Scandinavia, Palestine, Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Latvia, Spain, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Romania, and were particularly focused on the disturbing situation in the German Psychoanalytic Association/Berlin Institute and what they saw as the IPA's failure to take a stand against it. As Jewish analysts were banned from leadership positions in the German Association, many forced to flee the country, non-Jewish analysts were making controversial decisions around the relationship of the Association and the psychoanalytic field (or “movement,” as Fenichel refers to it) to the Nazi government. According to Fenichel, the founding of a new German Society for Psychotherapy was “in full swing under the leadership of Göring [Matthias H. Göring – a psychiatrist and “cousin of the famous addict” (as Ernest Jones expressed it in a letter to Anna Freud)] and with the collaboration of Schultz-Hencke,” and Göring was “taking for granted that all

psychotherapists 'have worked through Adolf Hitler's seminal work *Mein Kampf* with all scientific seriousness, and recognize it as a fundamental position.'" Meanwhile, the German Psychoanalytic Association "was striving to be included in this professional body because it feared it would have no chance of survival outside of it," quietly securing the approval of Ernest Jones and Johann van Ophuijsen in their IPA roles, and, when Fenichel and Ernst Simmel protested, they were told that the new leadership assumed that "since we intended to leave Germany, we would no longer have any interest in the matter." (Rundbrief 1, Section 2, pp. 37-8)

The letters are a space to outline the group's developing strategy with the IPA and the German Psychoanalytic Association:

- 1. There is a need to do both positive work and opposition work.*
- 2. Both should be done as long as is at all possible from within the IPA.*
- 3. The criticism should always be inherently psychoanalytic, i.e., argue scientifically and stay on the ground of psychoanalysis. The positive work should be clinical, or deal with theory based on clinical empiricism. The movement-political criticism, as far as it should be made publicly within the IPA, should be "democratic" (freedom of research, justice within the journals, etc.).*
(Rundbrief 2, Section 1, p. 75)

A lengthy debate ensued first, since Reich thinks that the Marxist analysts should have demanded the dissolution of the German Association in order to openly document the conflicts between psychoanalysis and fascism before the whole world, while Edith J.[acobsohn] is against that. We finally agree that, as things stand now, we must pursue a contradictory policy. (In the spirit of Edith [Gyömröi-]Glück): On the one hand, Edith Jacobsohn has to continue her work in Berlin and we have to support her with all our strength. This work consists above all in leading a small group of younger colleagues, among whom she has already won broad sympathy for our work, in the manner of the earlier "Children's Seminar" ; then in her work on the Education Committee, which, if it cannot prevent "Gleichschalterei" [this is a disparaging version of the term "Gleichschaltung," the Nazi concept of "coordination" (Nazification) of the entire German state after 1933], can at least keep us informed; and finally in her continuous cultivation of all members of the association, which has already led to interesting 'confessions' from Boehm and Müller to her. – On the other hand, the Marxist analysts have to protest externally against "coordination" ("Gleichschaltung"/Nazification). (Edith J.[acobsohn] naturally will not take part in such a step). (Rundbrief 2, Section 2, p. 76)

As they prepare for the 1934 IPA Congress in Lucerne, they discuss plans to submit papers in a coordinated way and protest if Reich's or the majority of their papers are not accepted, and Fenichel presents for his colleagues' edits the draft of a letter to submit to the IPA, outlining their concerns about the German Association, including its "undemocratic," "authoritarian" behavior, and the development of a memorandum that aimed to respond to (Nazi) criticisms of psychoanalysis as "un-German" by providing reassurances that there were plenty of "enthusiastic young people" to fill the gaps in the teaching faculty left by those who had had to flee, and that psychoanalysis (in the hands of the right people!) can "transform incapable

weaklings into people fit for life” and serve the new goal of a “heroic, reality-oriented, constructive view of life and the world in a valuable way”:

We, members of the German Association, who have moved our place of residence abroad in connection with the political events in Germany, are concerned by the direction that the German Psychoanalytic Association has taken since then, and would like information about the position of the Board of Directors of the IPA on these matters, whether the Board is aware of the following incidents, whether it intends to do anything about it, and what.

These strategy issues are interspersed with theoretical discussions, with the theoretical framework that connects the group outlined in the opening of the first letter: “We are all convinced that Freud’s psychoanalysis is the germ of a future dialectical-materialist psychology, and that we therefore urgently need to cultivate and develop this science.” (Rundbrief 1, March 1934, Section 1, p. 35, JK’s translation) This task brings them into complex relationship with Freud. Fenichel quotes a letter from Reich on this matter:

It goes without saying that we revere and love Freud, even though he has not always acted correctly in recent years. Likewise, that when we criticize Freud we speak and act differently than when we criticize Róheim; but we cannot and must not exclude Freud from criticism. Because we have to establish: a.) The scientific sins of Róheim, Laforgue, Jones, Klein, Deutsch, etc., are all more or less laid out in Freud, prepared for them by him; b.) A discussion between dialectical-materialist analysts and the bourgeois analysts will first and foremost have to show that, and where, Freud as natural scientist came into conflict with Freud as bourgeois philosopher of science, where psychoanalytic research rectified the bourgeois conception of culture and where the bourgeois conception of culture impeded scientific research, confused it, led it astray. The theme of ‘Freud versus Freud’ is the central theme of our critical work. (Rundbrief 2, April 1934, Section 1, pp. 71-2, JK’s translation)

Yet Fenichel and others are reluctant to engage in theoretical debates outside of the Rundbriefe group in the context of the contemporary political climate, and eventually separate from Reich around strategic differences.

...Reich wrote to us that we should carefully consider our “pre-Congress” tactics. “The Marxist analysts must be prepared for the fact that the diplomatically extremely skillful leadership of the IPA will prepare everything to practically exclude them. I think we must do and prepare everything necessary to gain even greater influence by making it clear to Congress in an absolutely objective, calm manner what goals are being fought for. ... It is now a matter of showing why psychoanalysis has this meaning and why it can only fulfill its function in the camp of the political left and never in the camp of the right.” - To which I replied: “I absolutely can’t agree that it should come to making this clear to the IPA at the forthcoming congress. In fact, I think that goes strictly against our agreements before Easter... [...] That psychoanalysis can only fulfill its mission in the camp of the political left, is to be shown in factual scientific work, but under no circumstances now hurled as a resolution before a plenary session of the IPA. (Rundbrief 7, Section 1, August 20, 1943, p.116, JK’s translation)

The group's discussions at the Marienbad IPA Congress of 1936 seem to have involved a sense of disillusion, and the letters change in nature, to encompass only "a) personal information about factual events within the analytic movement; b) as complete as possible information about the literature of the psychoanalytic-social field, which appears rarely enough." (as reviewed in Rundbrief 72, November 25, 1940, Section 1, p. 1385, JK's translation)

Although various "Marxist" analytical working groups had been working in Oslo, London and Prague, and the participants certainly learned a lot from them, all these groups disintegrated, most likely because of a general political malaise, as well as because we all had too much work to do clinically, and, after all, we were not sociology specialists. Plans for a "summer school" we were to put on failed due to time and money issues. Our scientific work has remained individual, largely because we are all analysts and not sociologists, and working purely clinically. (Rundbrief 72, November 25, 1940, Section 1, pp. 1384-5)

As World War II breaks out, the refugees continue their efforts to build lives in other countries, and the letters become a forum to share their experiences and fears:

1.) *When we read the latest news from Romania, we probably all instantly thought that it had not been possible to get colleague Winnik out in time. - I haven't heard from him, of course, - and would like to hope for the best. –*

2.) *The English colleagues continue to report that the work is going on, and several write what one colleague expresses as follows [in English in the original]:*

"You are wrong in assuming that our present worries would make us uninterested for your peace time life and your scientific controversies. On the contrary! ..."

From one letter [in English in the original]:

"I suppose you will be interested to know how we live at present. At the moment I am writing to you in the dining room of a rest center for bombed out children, which Anna Freud and Mrs. Burlingham have started. They got the house from the County Council and have all helped to furnish it. Today I am on night duty. As there is no alarm at present, I have only to listen whether one of the children cries; if there should be an alarm, I have from time to time to go upstairs to look of whether any incendiaries have fallen in our ground or on the roof. During the day I am very busy, esp. now during these short days, when one can only work with patients from 9 – 6 o'clock. So far I have worked nearly without any interruption during the whole time of the Blitz, and bombing does not play any great role in the material of the patients. Life is in so far changed very much as one cannot go out in the evenings and social and also scientific contacts are not longer available. It does not make such difference at the moment of whether ones friends are in America or in London. [...] I am much more worried about the analytical situation here than about anything else. I prefer the situation now to the last years where one was in constant anxiety of what was going to happen. Now we know and there it is, one can stand it and one gets accustomed to it. Sometimes, for a moment, one thinks one has gone crazy, but that are only rare moments. Reality fear feels quite different from neurotic fear, it is unpleasant while it lasts, but one

forgets about it. I should have expected that during the day one would live in constant fear of the night, whilst in reality, as soon as it is light, the night is forgotten and not thought of for one moment during the day."

(Rundbrief 74, March 1, 1941, pp. 1422-3)

But the strategic tensions remain, as illustrated by this extract, in which Fenichel questions the ongoing relevance of the Rundbriefe:

If there were a group of Marxist analysts who decided to work in this field and at the same time to ensure that the development of psychoanalytic organizations did not go in a contradictory direction - if there were such a group, it would have to come together in some loose organizational form. As a cross between no organization and a secret cabal, the Rundbriefe serve as a suitable way of keeping a group together. But the question is: is there such a group today? 1. Current circumstances make full contact with Europe and Asia impossible. For a long time now, I have been sending my colleagues there personal letters instead of circulars, giving them brief information about a few things worth knowing. 2. In America, on the other hand, the members of this alleged group are partly apathetic, partly impeded from active work through no fault of their own, and then partly there are such contradictory views on fundamental questions among them that cooperation sometimes seems impossible. Because of my stance on the American Psychoanalytic Association I have been described by members of our circle both as a 'lazy opportunist,' because I have tried to avoid open arguments, and as a 'rigid dogmatist' who does not accept that one's views change when circumstances change and that it is not our place to jeopardize the unity of analysis in America 'for the sake of a few laymen.' (I must take this opportunity to say that a detailed practical discussion among friends would be very important to me right now, if there could be one.) Up until now, I have compared our present situation in America with the situation of our group at the Lucerne Congress. Although we were "in opposition" at the time, nevertheless we were convinced that our opposition could only have any prospects from within the organization. I had assumed the same for our present relationship with the APA. Psychoanalysis, it seemed to me, is still so lonely and hated in the world that it would fall apart and perish without a firm organization of its followers. – But various recent events have made me reflect further. Isn't it perhaps already the case that today it is the organizations with their rigid "medical" orientation that are blocking scientific development more than the general resistance of the world?
(Rundbrief 72, November 25, 1940, Section 1, pp. 1385-86, JK's translation)

* * *

The similarities in the sociopolitical landscape of the 1930s and 40s, when Fenichel and Colleagues were contributing to the Rundbriefe, and that of today are jarring. Once again there is war in Europe, and we face the rise of authoritarianism and fascism worldwide. This time the

US is no safe haven, as we are forced to confront the longstanding efforts of many groups, most presumably from the Right, to curtail democracy and attack people of color, women, LGBTQI+, and other communities, as well as the environment. As they did in Fenichel's time, the national and international political realms seep into the organizational politics of institutes and associations. Geopolitical decisions that local institutes, societies, and the International Psychoanalytic Association were making in the face of fascism were of great concern to Fenichel and his colleagues, and closely tied up for them with what he terms “movement-political” questions about issues such as lay analysis and what constituted a “true” Freudian “scientific analysis.” Our institutes and societies too wrestle with their responses to “external” political issues—and these fights also feel closely tied to fights about the very nature and status of psychoanalysis.

As we began to immerse ourselves deeper in the letters to understand more, we did not always find ideas that resonated. The political and social concerns of Fenichel and his colleagues were intertwined with a forceful commitment to a “pure,” classical Freudianism that feels rigid and closed off from this distance. He uses the Rundbriefe to vent much harsh criticism of Klein, Horney, Fromm. Indeed, Fenichel's reviews of articles seem increasingly critical; it is as if no writer can satisfy his need for the most flawless, most loyal theoretical union of Freud and Marx. Yet Fenichel's Rundbriefe were also documenting the group's struggles with similar questions that we are grappling with today within and beyond the CPC and that may resonate with some of you, Rundbriefe: Take II letter writers:

- What is the role of psychoanalysis in our current sociopolitical climate?
- How might we need to revise psychoanalytic theories in this light?
- Who “owns” psychoanalysis?
- Will psychoanalysis survive?

Our encounter with these questions leads us in different directions than Fenichel and Colleagues. We are working to engage more openly with ideas from a range of worlds outside of psychoanalysis, with the sense that psychoanalysis tends to develop theoretically through interaction with other communities, and that psychoanalytic concepts can be enlivened through thoughtful cross-disciplinary dialogue. We also consider it critically important to remember that no one person or organization owns psychoanalysis: like the Tree That Owns Itself, in Athens, GA (an oak that has legal ownership of itself and the land around its roots), psychoanalysis owns itself!

Nonetheless, as we continued to meet with our CPC group, we were learning something about the importance of the kind of connection the Rundbriefe were trying to maintain in the face of war and displacement. Meeting and sharing ideas with our first cohort of CPC members, bringing outside faculty in to dialogue with us about different kinds of psychoanalytic thinking and working, and processing difficult cases and situations in Balint groups, we realized we were building a space for connection and support that was critically important in the context of sociopolitical crisis and the limits of a profit-driven healthcare system. A regular theme in the

CPC is the radical nature of the very act of building community. As we have discussed the kinds of traumatic and oppressive experiences faced by the communities CPC members work with and come from, it becomes clear that much pain is inflicted by those in power to prevent those with less power from coming together, sharing experiences, and uniting to resist, and indeed that much healing emerges from that coming together in community.

Fenichel's last *Rundbrief* has a melancholy and bitter tone—as if he feels abandoned by his community of colleagues. He is signing off from the battle for a political Freudianism. He has committed himself to the fight “for the very existence of Freudian psychoanalysis,” which he sees as threatened by its migration to and assimilation within the US. He was also struggling with his own migration and assimilation: forced to retrain as a physician to continue practicing the psychoanalysis he cared so much about, he died in Los Angeles, CA, in January 1946 at the age of 49. He writes that last letter, in English, just six months before his death:

July 14, 1945

This is going to be the last “Rundbrief.”

Nearly two years ago I asked you 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 on psychoanalytic sociological papers to my friends. I asked whether under these circumstances the edition of the “Rundbriefe” was still worthwhile. You remember that at that time several of you answered in the affirmative and asked me to continue.

The development of psychoanalysis in the whole world and in this country especially went into a direction which makes it necessary not so much to fight for “the correct application of psychoanalysis to sociology” but rather for the very existence of Freudian psychoanalysis. I suppose that the development will go toward the formation of “fractions of psychoanalysts” within the various so-called psychoanalytic associations. The members of these (present and) future fractions will, of course, not be identical with those who understand the application on sociology. Sooner or later, a kind of “Rundbriefe” will come into being in various places which will be very different from ours. I doubt whether a collection of reviews on sociological papers is of any value at all. I doubt this the more since my time will be taken up by a lot of more urgent tasks.

When I visited New York where I met several recipients of these “Rundbriefe” I wondered whether somebody of them would suggest a meeting of our “fraction.” Silently I thought that such a wish would be a sign of the “Rundbriefe” still having some meaning. Not only did nobody ask for such a meeting, but nobody even mentioned the existence of the “Rundbriefe.”

We had initially envisaged this project as a continuation of the *Rundbriefe*, but how does one pick up and move forward from this final letter? We find ourselves wanting instead to shift course a little.

Fenichel's "mistake" in his last letter, in referring to factions as "fractions" is understandable. He composed this letter in English, but the German "Fraktion" refers both to a mathematical fraction or a fragment, and to a political group or faction. But it highlights the shift we would like to propose. Can we move from faction and fraction to fractal?

In *Emergent Strategy*, Adrienne Maree Brown outlines a strategy for change movements—for ways of "transforming ourselves to transform the world" (Grace Lee Boggs). Brown writes of an "imagination battle," where change requires us to imagine new worlds with new ideologies and norms: "This is a time-travel exercise for the heart. This is collaborative ideation—what are the ideas that will liberate all of us?" (p. 19) The concept of the fractal is central to the strategy of emergence:

How we are at the small scale is how we are at the large scale. The patterns of the universe repeat at scale. There is a structural echo that suggests two things: one, that there are shapes and patterns fundamental to our universe, and two, that what we practice at a small scale can reverberate to the largest scale. (p. 54)

Rundbriefe: Take II is an attempt to create something at a small scale to change and generate something meaningful that can show us how other, new things, can be done at the large scale. As we (Jany and Paola) were starting the CPC project, we discovered that we were both reading Brown's book and thinking about the following principles of emergent strategy in shaping what we were trying to do:

Small is good, small is all. (The large is a reflection of the small.)

Change is constant. (Be like water.)

There is always enough time for the right work.

There is a conversation in the room that only these people at this moment can have. Find it.

Never a failure, always a lesson.

Trust the People. (If you trust the people, they become trustworthy.)

Move at the speed of trust. Focus on critical connections more than critical mass—build the resilience by building the relationships.

Less prep, more presence.

What you pay attention to grows. (pp. 41-2)

This is what emerges for us from the Rundbriefe story and from the experiences that accompanied our metabolization of this story: that the task is to shift from living in factions to building something new and whole, to move from fraction to fractal, from institution to community.

We are eager to hear your thoughts about any part of this. Please write us a letter back, responding in any way you wish to the questions and ideas we have shared here. We will

gather your letters, post them on www.rundbriefe.com, and then summarize and respond to thoughts that emerge. Then we hope to see you all at the December 9, 2023, Rundbriefe: Take II Conference at BPSI, where we will continue our dialogue.

Warmly,

Jany & Paola