

The Einstein-Freud Correspondence (1931-1932)

The letter which Einstein addressed to Freud concerning the projected organisation of intellectual leaders was sent in 1931, or possibly 1932, and read as follows:

I greatly admire your passion for ascertaining the truth —a passion that has come to dominate all else in your thinking. You have shown with irresistible lucidity how the aggressive and destructive instincts are inseparably bound up in the human psyche with those of love and the lust for life. At the same time, your convincing arguments make manifest your deep devotion to the great goal of the internal and external liberation of man from the evils of war. This was the profound hope of all those revered as moral and spiritual leaders beyond the limits of their time and country, from Jesus to Goethe and Kant. Is it not significant that such men have been universally recognised as leaders, even though their desire to affect the course of human affairs was quite ineffective? I am convinced that almost all great men who, because of their accomplishments, are recognised as leaders, even of small groups, share the same ideals. But they have little influence on the course of political events. It would almost appear that the very domain of human activity most crucial to the fate of nations is inescapably in the hands of wholly irresponsible political rulers. Political leaders or governments owe their power either to the use of force or to their election by the masses. They cannot be regarded as representative of a nation's superior moral or intellectual elements. In our time, the intellectual elite does not exercise any direct influence on the world's history; its division into many factions makes it impossible for its members to cooperate in the solution of today's problems. Do you not share the feeling that a change could be brought about by a free association of men whose previous work and achievements offer a guarantee of their ability and integrity? Such a group of international scope, whose members would have to keep contact with each other through constant interchange of opinions, might gain a significant and wholesome moral influence on the solution of political problems if its own attitudes, backed by the signatures of its concurring members, were made public through the press. Such an association would, of course, suffer from all the defects that have so often led to degeneration in learned societies; the danger that such a degeneration may develop is, unfortunately, ever present in view of the imperfections of human nature.

However, despite those dangers, should we not make at least an attempt to form such an association in spite of all the dangers? It seems to me nothing less than an imperative duty! Once such an association of intellectuals —men of real stature— has come into being, it might then make an energetic effort to enlist religious groups in the fight against war. The association would give moral power for action to many personalities whose good intentions are today paralysed by an attitude of painful resignation. I also believe that such an association of men, who are highly respected for their personal accomplishments, would provide important moral support to those elements in the League of Nations who actively support the great objective for which that institution was created. I offer these suggestions to you, rather than to anyone else in the world because your sense of reality is less clouded by wishful thinking than is the case with other people and since you combine the qualities of critical judgment, earnestness and responsibility.

The high point in the relationship between Einstein and Freud came in the summer of 1932 when, under the auspices of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, Einstein initiated a public debate with Freud about the causes and cure of wars. Einstein's official letter is dated July 30, 1932; it was accompanied by the following private note of the same date:

I would like to use this opportunity to send you warm personal regards and to thank you for many a pleasant hour which I had in reading your works. It is always amusing for me to observe that even those who do not believe in your theories find it so difficult to resist your ideas that they use your terminology in their thoughts and speech when they are off guard.

This is Einstein's open letter to Freud, which, strangely enough, has never become widely known:

Dear Mr. Freud:

The proposal of the League of Nations and its International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation in Paris that I should invite a person, to be chosen by myself, to a frank exchange of views on any problem that I might select affords me a very welcome opportunity of conferring with you upon a question which, as things now are, seems the most insistent of all the problems civilisation has to face. This is the problem: Is there any way of delivering mankind from the menace of war?

It is common knowledge that, with the advance of modern science, this issue has come to mean a matter of life and death for Civilization as we know it; nevertheless, for all the zeal displayed, every attempt at its solution has ended in a lamentable breakdown. I believe, moreover, that those whose duty it is to tackle the problem professionally and practically are growing only too aware of their impotence to deal with it and have now a very lively desire to learn the views of men who are absorbed in the pursuit of science, can see world problems in the perspective distance lends. As for me, the normal objective of my thought affords no insight into the dark places of human will and feeling. Thus, in the inquiry now proposed, I can do little more than to seek to clarify the question at issue and, clearing the ground of the more obvious solutions, enable you to bring the light of your far-reaching knowledge of man's instinctive life to bear upon the problem. There are certain psychological obstacles whose existence a layman in the mental sciences may dimly surmise but whose interrelations and vagaries he is incompetent to fathom; you, I am convinced, will be able to suggest educative methods, lying more or less outside the scope of politics, which will eliminate these obstacles. As one immune from nationalist bias, I see a simple way of dealing with the problem's superficial (i.e., administrative) aspect of the problem: setting up, by international consent, a legislative and judicial body to settle every conflict arising between nations. Each nation would abide by the orders issued by this legislative body, invoke its decision in every dispute, accept its judgments unreservedly and carry out every measure the tribunal deems necessary for the execution of its decrees. But here, at the outset, I come up against a difficulty; a tribunal is a human institution which, in proportion to the power at its disposal, is inadequate to enforce its verdicts and is all the more prone to suffer these to be deflected by extrajudicial pressure. This is a fact with which we have to reckon; law and might inevitably go hand in hand, and juridical decisions approach more nearly the ideal justice demanded by the community (in whose name and interests these verdicts are pronounced) insofar as the community has effective power to compel respect of its juridical ideal. But at present, we are far from possessing any supranational organisation competent to render verdicts of incontestable authority and enforce absolute submission to the execution of its verdicts. Thus, I am led to my first axiom: The quest for international security involves the unconditional surrender by every nation, in a certain measure, of its liberty of action —its sovereignty, that is to say— and it is clear beyond all doubt that no other road can lead to such security.

Despite their obvious sincerity, the ill success of all the efforts made during the last decade to reach this goal leaves us no room to doubt that strong psychological factors are at work which paralyses these efforts. Some of these factors are not far to seek. The craving for power, which characterises the governing class in every nation, is hostile to any limitation of national sovereignty. This political power hunger is often supported by the activities of another group whose aspirations are on purely mercenary, economic lines. I have especially in mind that small but determined group, active in every nation, composed of individuals who, indifferent to social considerations and restraints, regard warfare, the manufacture and sale of arms, simply as an occasion to advance their personal interests and enlarge their personal authority. But recognition of this obvious fact is merely the first step toward appreciating the actual state of affairs. Another question follows hard upon it: How is it possible for this small clique to bend the will of the majority, who stand to lose and suffer by a state of war, to the service of their ambitions.¹ An obvious answer to this question would seem to be that the minority, the ruling class at present, has the schools and press, usually the Church as well, under its thumb. This enables it to organise and sway the emotions of the masses and makes its tool of them. Yet even this answer does not provide a complete solution. Another question arises: How do these devices successfully rouse men to such wild enthusiasm, even to sacrifice their lives? Only one answer is possible. Because man has within him a lust for hatred and destruction. In normal times, this passion exists in a latent state; it emerges only in unusual circumstances, but it is a comparatively easy task to call it into play and raise it to the power of collective psychosis. Here lies, perhaps, the crux of all the complex factors we are considering, an enigma that only the expert in the lore of human instincts can resolve. And so we come to our last question. Is it possible to control man's mental evolution so as to make him proof against the psychosis of hate and destructiveness? Here, I am thinking by no means only of the so-called uncultured masses. Experience proves that the so-called "intelligentsia" is most apt to yield to these disastrous collective suggestions since the intellectual has no direct contact with life in the raw but encounters it in its easiest, synthetic form —upon the printed page.

¹ In speaking of the majority I do not exclude soldiers of every rank who have chosen war as their profession, in the belief that they are serving to defend the highest interests of their race, and that attack is often the best method of defense.

To conclude, I have been speaking only of wars between nations, known as international conflicts. But I am well aware that the aggressive instinct operates under other forms and in other circumstances. (I am thinking of civil wars, for instance, due in earlier days to religious zeal, but nowadays to social factors or, again, the persecution of racial minorities.) But my insistence on the most typical, cruel and extravagant form of conflict between man and man was deliberate, for here we have the best opportunity to discover ways and means to render all armed conflicts impossible. I know that in your writings, we may find answers, explicit or implied, to all the issues of this urgent and absorbing problem. But it would be of the greatest service to us all were you to present the problem of world peace in the light of your most recent discoveries, for such a presentation well might blaze the trail for new and fruitful modes of action.

Yours very sincerely,
Albert Einstein

Leon Steinig, a League of Nations official who did much to inspire this correspondence, wrote Einstein on September 12, 1932:

... When I visited Professor Freud in Vienna, he asked me to thank you for your kind words and to tell you that he would do his best to explore the thorny problem of preventing war. He will have his answer ready by early October, and he thinks that what he has to say will not be very encouraging. "All my life, I have had to tell people truths that were difficult to swallow. Now that I am old, I certainly do not want to fool them." He was even doubtful whether Bonnet² would want to publish his pessimistic reply. ...

Einstein replied to Steinig four days later, saying that even if Freud's reply would be neither cheerful nor optimistic, it would certainly be interesting and psychologically effective.

Freud's reply, dated Vienna, September 1932, has also never been given the attention it deserved:

² Henri Bonnet, Director of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation in Paris.

Dear Mr. Einstein:

When I learned of your intention to invite me to a mutual exchange of views on a subject which interested you personally and seemed deserving of public interest, I cordially assented. I expected you to choose a problem lying on the borderland of the knowable, as it stands today, a theme which each of us, physicist and psychologist, might approach from his own angle to meet at last on common ground, though setting out from different premises. Thus, the question which you asked me —what is to be done to rid mankind of the war menace?— took me by surprise. And, next, I was dumbfounded by the thought of my (of our, I almost wrote) incompetence, for this struck me as being a matter of practical politics, the statesman's proper study. But then I realised that you did not raise the question in your capacity of scientist or physicist but as a lover of his fellow men, who responded to the call of the League of Nations much as Fridtjof Nansen, the polar explorer, took on himself the task of succouring homeless and starving victims of the World War. Next, I reminded myself that I was not being called on to formulate practical proposals but to explain how this question of preventing wars strikes a psychologist. But here, too, you have stated the gist of the matter in your letter —and taken the wind out of my sails! Still, I will gladly follow in your wake and content myself with endorsing your conclusions, which I propose to amplify to the best of my knowledge or surmise. You begin with the relations between might and right, and this is assuredly the proper starting point for our inquiry. But, for the term might, I would substitute a tougher and more telling word: violence. In right and violence, we have today an obvious antinomy. It is easy to prove that one has evolved from the other, and when we go back to our origins and examine primitive conditions, the solution to the problem follows easily enough. I must crave your indulgence if, in what follows, I speak of well-known, admitted facts as though they were new data; the context necessitates this method. In principle, conflicts of interest between man and man are resolved by the recourse to violence. It is the same in the animal kingdom, from which man cannot claim exclusion; nevertheless, men are also prone to conflicts of opinion, touching, on occasion, the loftiest peaks of abstract thought, which seem to call for settlement by quite another method. This refinement is, however, a late development.

To start with, group force was the factor which, in small communities, decided points of ownership and the question of which man's will was to prevail. Very soon, physical force was implemented, then replaced by the use of various adjuncts; he proved the victor whose weapon was the better or handled the more skillfully. Now, for the first time, with the coming of weapons, superior brains began to oust brute force, but the object of the conflict remained the same: one party was to be constrained, by the injury done him or impairment of his strength, to retract a claim or a refusal. This end is most effectively gained when the opponent is definitely put out of action—in other words, is killed. This procedure has two advantages: the enemy cannot renew hostilities, and, secondly, his fate deters others from following his example. Moreover, the slaughter of a foe gratifies an instinctive craving—a point to which we shall revert hereafter. However, another consideration may be set off against this will to kill: the possibility of using an enemy for servile tasks if his spirit be broken and his life spared. Here, violence finds an outlet not in slaughter but in subjugation. Hence springs the practice of giving quarter, but the victor, having from now on to reckon with the craving for revenge that rankles in his victim, forfeits to some extent his personal security.

Thus, under primitive conditions, it is superior force—brute violence, or violence backed by arms—those lords it everywhere. We know that this state of things was modified in the course of evolution, and a path was traced that led away from violence to law. But what was this path? Surely it issued from a single verity: that the superiority of one strong man can be overcome by an alliance of many weaklings, that *l'union fait la force*.³

Brute force is overcome by a union; the allied might of scattered units makes good its right against the isolated giant. Thus, we may define "right" (i.e., law) as the might of a community. Yet it, too, is nothing else than violence, quick to attack whatever individual stands in its path, and it employs the selfsame methods, follows like ends, with but one difference: it is the communal, not individual, violence that has its way. But, a certain psychological condition must first be obtained for the transition from crude violence to the reign of law. The union of the majority must be stable and enduring. If its sole *raison d'être* is the discomfiture of some overweening individual and, after his downfall, it is dissolved, it leads to nothing. Some other man, trusting to his superior power, will seek to reinstate the rule of violence, and the cycle will repeat

³ "*L'union fait la force*" is French, and it translates to "Unity makes strength" or "Strength in unity" in English.

itself unendingly. Thus, the union of the people must be permanent and well organised; it must enact rules to meet the risk of possible revolts; must set up the machinery to ensure that its rules —the laws— are observed and that such acts of violence as the laws demand are duly carried out. This recognition of a community of interests engenders among the members of the group a sentiment of unity and fraternal solidarity, which constitutes its real strength. So far, I have set out what seems to me the kernel of the matter: the suppression of brute force by the transfer of power to a larger combination founded on the community of sentiments linking up its members. All the rest is mere tautology and glosses. Now, the position is simple enough so long as the community consists of a number of equipollent individuals. The laws of such a group can determine to what extent the individual must forfeit his freedom, the right to use personal force as an instrument of violence, to ensure the group's safety. But such a combination is only theoretically possible; in practice, the situation is always complicated by the fact that, from the outset, the group includes elements of unequal power, men and women, elders and children, and, very soon, as a result of war and conquest, victors and the vanquished —i.e., masters and slaves— as well. From this time on, the common law takes notice of these inequalities of power, laws are made by and for the rulers, giving the servile classes fewer rights. Thenceforward, there exist within the state two factors making for legal instability, but legislative evolution, too: first, the attempts by members of the ruling class to set themselves above the law's restrictions and, secondly, the constant struggle of the ruled to extend their rights and see each gain embodied in the code, replacing legal disabilities by equal laws for all. The second of these tendencies will be particularly marked when a positive mutation of the balance of power within the community occurs, the frequent outcome of certain historical conditions. In such cases, the laws may gradually be adjusted to the changed conditions or (as more usually ensues) the ruling class is loath to rush in with the new developments, the result being insurrections and civil wars, a period when the law is in abeyance and force once more the arbiter, followed by a new regime of law. There is another factor of constitutional change, which operates in a wholly pacific manner, viz.,⁴ the cultural evolution of the mass of the community; this factor, however, is of a different order and can only be dealt with later. Thus, we see that, even within the group itself, the exercise of violence cannot be avoided

⁴ "viz." word is pronounced as "vee-ziz," is an abbreviation for the Latin word "videlicet," which means "namely" or "that is to say."

when conflicting interests are at stake. But the common needs and habits of men who live in fellowship under the same sky favour a speedy issue of such conflicts, and this being so, the possibilities of peaceful solutions make steady progress. Yet the most casual glance at world history will show an unending series of conflicts between one community and another or a group of others, between large and smaller units, between cities, countries, races, tribes and kingdoms, almost all of which were settled by the ordeal of war. Such war ends either in pillage or in conquest and its fruits, the downfall of the loser. No single all-embracing judgment can be passed on these wars of aggrandisement. Some, like the war between the Mongols and the Turks, have led to unmitigated misery; others, however, have furthered the transition from violence to law since they brought larger units into being, within whose limits a recourse to violence was banned and a new regime determined all disputes. Thus, the Roman conquest brought that boon, the Pax Romana, to the Mediterranean lands. The French kings' lust for aggrandisement created a new France, flourishing in peace and unity. Paradoxical as it sounds, we must admit that warfare well might serve to pave the way to that unbroken peace we so desire, for it is the war that brings vast empires into being, within whose frontiers all warfare is proscribed by a strong central power. In practice, however, this end is not attained, for, as a rule, the fruits of victory are short-lived. The created unit falls asunder once again, generally because there can be no true cohesion between the parts that violence has welded. Hitherto, moreover, such conquests have only led to aggregations which, for all their magnitude, had limits, and disputes between these units could be resolved only by recourse to arms. For humanity at large, the sole result of all these military enterprises was that, instead of frequent, not to say incessant, little wars, they had now to face great wars which, for all they came less often, were so much the more destructive. Regarding the world of today, the same conclusion holds good, and you, too, have reached it, though by a shorter path. There is but one sure way of ending war: by common consent, the establishment of a central control which shall have the last word in every conflict of interest. For this, two things are needed: first, the creation of such a supreme court of judicature; second, its investment with adequate executive force. Unless this second requirement is fulfilled, the first is unavailing. Obviously, the League of Nations, acting as a Supreme Court, fulfils the first condition; it does not fulfil the second. It has no force at its disposal and can only get it if the members of the new body, its constituent nations, furnish it.

And, as things are, this is a forlorn hope. Still, we should be taking a very shortsighted view of the League of Nations were we to ignore the fact that here is an experiment the like of which has rarely —never before, perhaps, on such a scale— been attempted in the course of history. It is an attempt to acquire the authority (in other words, coercive influence), which hitherto reposed exclusively in the possession of power, by calling into play certain idealistic attitudes of mind. We have seen two factors of cohesion in a community: violent compulsion and ties of sentiment ("identifications," in technical parlance) between the group members. If one of these factors becomes inoperative, the other may still suffice to hold the group together. Obviously, such notions as these can only be significant when they are the expression of a deeply rooted sense of unity shared by all. It is necessary, therefore, to gauge the efficacy of such sentiments. History tells us that, on occasion, they have been effective. For example, the Panhellenic conception, the Greeks' awareness of superiority over their barbarian neighbours, which found expression in the Amphictyonies, the Oracles and Games, was strong enough to humanise the methods of warfare as between Greeks, though inevitably it failed to prevent conflicts between different elements of the Hellenic race or even to deter a city or group of cities from joining forces with their racial foe, the Persians, for the discomfiture of a rival. The solidarity of Christendom in the Renaissance age was no more effective, despite its vast authority, in hindering Christian nations, large and small alike, from calling in the Sultan to their aid. And, in our times, we look in vain for some such unifying notion whose authority would be unquestioned. It is all too clear that the nationalistic ideas, paramount today in every country, operate in quite a contrary direction. Some there are who hold that the Bolshevist conceptions may make an end to war, but, as things are, that goal lies very far away and, perhaps, could only be attained after a spell of brutal internecine warfare. Thus, it would seem that any effort to replace brute force with the might of an ideal is, under present conditions, doomed to fail. Our logic is at fault if we ignore the fact that right is founded on brute force, and even today, it needs violence to maintain it. I can now comment on another of your statements. You are amazed that it is so easy to infect men with the war fever, and you surmise that man has in him an active instinct for hatred and destruction, amenable to such stimulations. I entirely agree with you. I believe in the existence of this instinct and have been recently at pains to study its manifestations. In this connection, may I set out a fragment of that knowledge of the instincts we psychoanalysts have compassed after so many tentative essays and gropings in the dark?

We assume that human instincts are of two kinds: those that conserve and unify, which we call "erotic" (in the meaning Plato gives to Eros in his Symposium), or else "sexual" (explicitly extending the popular connotation of "sex"); and, secondly, the instincts to destroy and kill, which we assimilate as the aggressive or destructive instincts. As you perceive, these well-known opposites, Love and Hate, transformed into theoretical entities; they are, perhaps, another aspect of those eternal polarities, attraction and repulsion, which fall within your province. But we must be chary of passing overhastily to the notions of good and evil. Each of these instincts is every whit as indispensable as its opposite, and all the phenomena of life derive from their activity, whether they work in concert or in opposition. It seems that an instinct of either category can operate but rarely in isolation; it is always blended ("alloyed," as we say) with a certain dosage of its opposite, which modifies its aim or even, in certain circumstances, is a prime condition of its attainment. Thus, the instinct of self-preservation is certainly of an erotic nature, but to gain its end, this very instinct necessitates aggressive action. In the same way, the love instinct, when directed to a specific object, calls for an admixture of the acquisitive instinct if it is to enter into effective possession of that object. It is the difficulty of isolating the two kinds of instinct in their manifestations that has so long prevented us from recognising them. If you will travel with me a little further on this road, you will find that human affairs are complicated in yet another way. Only exceptionally does an action follow on the stimulus of a single instinct, which is, per se, a blend of Eros and destructiveness. As a rule, several motives of similar composition concur to bring about the act. This fact was duly noted by your colleague, Professor G. C. Lichtenberg, sometime Professor of Physics at Gottingen; he was perhaps even more eminent as a psychologist than a physical scientist. He evolved the notion of a "Compass-card of Motives" and wrote: "The efficient motives impelling man to act can be classified like the thirty-two winds and described in the same manner, e.g., Food-Food-Fame or Fame-Fame-Food." Thus, when a nation is summoned to engage in war, a whole gamut of human motives may respond to this appeal—high and low motives, some openly avowed, others slurred over. The lust for aggression and destruction is certainly included; the innumerable cruelties of history and man's daily life confirm its prevalence and strength. The stimulation of these destructive impulses by appeals to idealism and the erotic instinct naturally facilitates their release.

Musing on the atrocities recorded on history's page, we feel that the ideal motive has often served as a camouflage for the dust of destruction; sometimes, as with the cruelties of the Inquisition, it seems that, while the ideal motives occupied the foreground of consciousness, they drew their strength from the destructive instincts submerged in the unconscious. Both interpretations are feasible. You are interested, I know, in the prevention of war, not in our theories, and I keep this fact in mind. Yet, I would like to dwell a little longer on this destructive instinct, which is seldom given the attention that its importance warrants. With the least of speculative efforts, we are led to conclude that this instinct functions in every living being, striving to work its ruin and reduce life to its primal state of inert matter. Indeed, it might well be called the "death instinct"; whereas the erotic instincts vouch for the struggle to live on. The death instinct becomes an impulse to destruction when, with the aid of certain organs, it directs its action outward against external objects. The living being, that is to say, defends its own existence by destroying foreign bodies. But, in one of its activities, the death instinct is operative within the living being, and we have sought to trace back a number of normal and pathological phenomena to this introversion of the destructive instinct. We have even committed the heresy of explaining the origin of human conscience by such as "turning inward" of the aggressive impulse. Obviously, when this internal tendency operates on too large a scale, it is no trivial matter; rather, it is a positively morbid state of things, whereas the diversion of the destructive impulse toward the external world must have beneficial effects. Here is, then, the biological justification for all those vile, pernicious propensities which we are now combating. We can but own that they are really more akin to nature than this our stand against them, which, in fact, remains to be accounted for. All this may give you the impression that our theories amount to a species of mythology and a gloomy one at that! But does not every natural science lead ultimately to this—a sort of mythology? Is it otherwise today with your physical sciences? The upshot of these observations, as bearing on the subject in hand, is that there is no likelihood of our being able to suppress humanity's aggressive tendencies. In some happy corners of the earth, where nature brings forth abundantly whatever man desires, there flourish races whose lives go gently by, unknowing of aggression or constraint. This I can hardly credit; I would like further details about these happy folk. The Bolsheviks, too, aspire to do away with human aggressiveness by ensuring the satisfaction of material needs and enforcing equality between man and man. To me, this hope seems in vain.

Meanwhile, they busily perfect their armaments, and their hatred of outsiders is not the least of the factors of cohesion among themselves. In any case, as you too have observed, complete suppression of man's aggressive tendencies is not an issue; what we may try is to divert it into a channel other than that of warfare. From our "mythology" of the instincts, we may easily deduce a formula for an indirect method of eliminating war. If the propensity for war is due to the destructive instinct, we always have its counter-agent, Eros, in our hands. All that produces ties of sentiment between man and man must serve us as war's antidote. These ties are of two kinds. First, such relations as those toward a beloved object void though they are of sexual intent. The psychoanalyst needs to feel no compunction in mentioning "love" in this connection; religion uses the same language: Love thy neighbour as thyself. A pious injunction, easy to enounce, but hard to carry out! The other bond of sentiment is by way of identification. All that brings out the significant resemblances between men calls into play this feeling of community identification, which is founded, in large measure, the whole edifice of human society. In your strictures on the abuse of authority, I find another suggestion for an indirect attack on the war impulse. That men are divided into the leaders and the led is but another manifestation of their inborn and irremediable inequality. The second class constitutes the vast majority; they need a high command to make decisions for them, to which decisions they usually bow without demur. In this context, we would point out that men should be at greater pains than heretofore to form a superior class of independent thinkers, unamenable to intimidation and fervent in the quest for truth, whose function it would be to guide the masses dependent on their lead. There is no need to point out how little the rule of politicians and the Church's ban on liberty of thought encourage such a new creation. The ideal conditions would obviously be found in a community where every man subordinated his instinctive life to the dictates of reason. Nothing less than this could bring about so thorough and so durable a union between men, even if this involved the severance of mutual ties of sentiment. But surely, such a hope is utterly utopian, as things are. The other indirect methods of preventing war are certainly more feasible but entail no quick results. They conjure up an ugly picture of mills that grind so slowly that men are dead of hunger before the flour is ready. As you see, little good comes of consulting a theoretician, aloof from worldly contact, on practical and urgent problems! Better it was to tackle each successive crisis with means that we have ready on our hands.

However, I would like to deal with a question which, though it is not mooted in your letter, interests me greatly. Why do we, you and I and many others, protest so vehemently against war instead of just accepting it as another of life's odious importunities? For it seems a natural thing enough, biologically sound and practically unavoidable. I trust you will not be shocked by my raising such a question. For the better conduct of an inquiry, it may be well to don a mask of feigned aloofness. The answer to my query may run as follows: Because every man has a right over his own life, and war destroys lives that were full of promise; it forces the individual into situations that shame his manhood, obliging him to murder fellow men, against his will; it ravages material amenities, the fruits of human toil, and much besides. Moreover, wars, as now conducted, afford no scope for acts of heroism according to the old ideals, and, given the high perfection of modern arms, war today would mean the sheer extermination of one of the combatants, if not of both. This is so true, so obvious, that we can but wonder why the conduct of war is not banned by general consent. Doubtless, either of the points I have just made is open to debate. It may be asked if the community, in its turn, cannot claim a right over the individual lives of its members. Moreover, all forms of war cannot be indiscriminately condemned; so long as there are nations and empires, each prepared callously to exterminate its rival, all alike must be equipped for war. But we will not dwell on any of these problems; they lie outside the debate you have invited me to. As it strikes me, I pass on to another point, the basis of our common hatred of war. It is this: We cannot do otherwise than hate it. Pacifists we are since our organic nature wills us thus to be. Hence, it becomes easy for us to find arguments that justify our standpoint. This point, however, calls for elucidation. Here is the way in which I see it. The cultural development of mankind (some, I know, prefer to call it civilisation) has been in progress since immemorial antiquity. To this process, we owe all that is best in our composition but also much that makes for human suffering. Its origins and causes are obscure, and its issue is uncertain, but some of its characteristics are easy to perceive. It may lead to the extinction of mankind, for it impairs the sexual function in more than one respect, and even today, the uncivilised races and the backward classes of all nations are multiplying more rapidly than the cultured elements. This process may, perhaps, be likened to the effects of domestication on certain animals—it clearly involves physical changes of structure—but the view that cultural development is an organic process of this order has not yet become generally familiar.

The psychic changes which accompany this process of cultural change are striking and not to be gainsaid. They consist of the progressive rejection of instinctive ends and a scaling down of instinctive reactions. Sensations which delighted our forefathers have become neutral or unbearable to us, and if our ethical and aesthetic ideals have undergone a change, the causes of this are ultimately organic. On the psychological side, two of the most important phenomena of culture are a strengthening of the intellect, which tends to master our instinctive life, and, secondly, an introversion of the aggressive impulse, with all its consequent benefits and perils. Now, war runs most emphatically counter to the psychic disposition imposed on us by the growth of culture; we are therefore bound to resent war, to find it utterly intolerable. With pacifists like us, it is not merely an intellectual and affective repulsion but a constitutional intolerance, an idiosyncrasy in its most drastic form. And it would seem that the aesthetic ignominies of warfare play almost as large a part in this repugnance as war's atrocities. How long have we to wait before the rest of men turn pacifist? It is impossible to say, and yet perhaps our hope that these two factors —man's cultural disposition and a well-founded dread of the form that future wars will take— may serve to put an end to war in the near future is not chimerical. But by what ways or byways this will come about, we cannot guess. Meanwhile, we may rest on the assurance that whatever makes for cultural development is also working against war. With kindest regards and, should this expose prove a disappointment to you, my sincere regrets,

Yours,
SIGMUND FREUD

Einstein was apparently not disappointed when Freud's reply was received. He addressed the following letter to Freud on December 3, 1932:

You have made a most gratifying gift to the League of Nations and myself with your truly classic reply. When I wrote you, I was thoroughly convinced of the insignificance of my role, which was only meant to document my goodwill, with me as the bait on the hoof, to tempt the marvellous fish into nibbling.

You have given in return something altogether magnificent. We cannot know what may grow from such seed, as the effect upon man of any action or event is always incalculable. This is not within our power, and we do not need to worry about it.

You have earned my gratitude and the gratitude of all men for having devoted all your strength to the search for truth and for having shown the rarest courage in professing your convictions all your life. ...

By the time the exchange between Einstein and Freud was published in 1933, under the title Why War? Hitler, who was to drive both men into exile, was already in power, and the letters never achieved the wide circulation intended for them. Indeed, the first German edition of the pamphlet is reported to have been limited to only 2,000 copies, as was the original English edition.