

## **“I love him who craves the impossible”**

Sigmund Freud to Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi on November 1, 1929

Vienna, Berggasse 19, 2026: The year is still young and yet it already seems spent to me; every day staccato negative headlines inform us of autocratic governance, war, and extortion. The rule of law and democracy are coming under pressure due to the excessive claims of rival world powers ruthlessly pursuing their own interests at the expense of global peace and the common good. Our value system is at risk of being misappropriated before our eyes.

The intensification of these circumstances now prompts me finally to share a discovery that will astonish and move you in light of the synchronicity of events: an exceptional letter from Sigmund Freud to Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, founder of the Pan-European Union. This newly discovered document appears most timely given the current sociopolitical upheavals within and without the European Union as it fights for self-determination now more than ever.

The story of how this explosive letter from 1929 was discovered begins with a clue from Bernd Posselt, the current president of the Pan-European Union in Germany. The journalist and former member of the European Parliament remembered having read a letter from Freud to Coudenhove-Kalergi. I was astonished, because I knew nothing of such a correspondence and my inquiries among fellow Freud experts also bore no fruit. But this was not the case according to Bernd Posselt's research. His memory proved unerring. With the support of the historian Martin Posselt and the journalist Stephan Baier,<sup>1</sup> it became possible to track the letter down.

That the letter still exists is thanks to a series of fortunate circumstances under terrible conditions. In the night from March 11 to 12, 1938, just a few hours after Austria's capitulation to the Nazis, Coudenhove-Kalergi and his Jewish wife Ida Roland managed to flee Hitler's henchmen. Immediately thereafter, the Gestapo sealed their private apartment in Vienna's Heiligenkreuzer Hof and the office of the Pan-European Union in the Hofburg Palace; all documents — personal and business — were confiscated. Having been seized by the Red Army at the end of the war, they were housed in archives in Moscow, meaning that they remain largely inaccessible to independent historical research until today.<sup>2</sup> Just a few privately owned items, presumably including Freud's letter, were saved for posterity thanks to the courageous efforts of loyal employees — via a dumbwaiter that connected the servants' quarters on the ground floor with Coudenhove's apartment on the upper first floor.<sup>3</sup>

For this reason alone, it is now possible to share this letter<sup>4</sup> that contains unexpected indications of how deeply Freud was emotionally affected by the political upheavals of

his time. Once we realize the importance of its contents, Freud's message to the pioneer of the Pan-European unification movement seems particularly relevant. But read for yourself:

Nov 1, 1929

PROF. Dr. FREUD

VIENNA, 9TH DISTRICT, BERGGASSE 19

*Esteemed Sir*

*Do you think it likely that I would not fulfill a wish you have expressed if I am able and if it costs so little sacrifice on my part?*

*Your idea of a unified Europe has given me no peace ever since I first heard of it, to say nothing of my certainty that I will not live to see its realization and of my doubt whether another living inhabitant of this earth will be better off as a result its creation.*

*Often when I think of you, the words of Manto from the classical Walpurgis Night come to mind:*

*»I love him who craves the impossible «.*

*But that does not lend itself to propaganda, for which I am in any case entirely unsuited.*

*When you read my next brochure, "Civilization and Its Discontents," presume that the expectation with which the last sentence concludes refers to your Pan-Europe.*

*With sincere devotion*

*Your Freud*

Coudenhove would have to wait patiently until he could read the text to which Freud referred — it would only be published in January of the following year. For us, however, it is easy to find the solution to the riddle with which the first edition of *Civilization and Its Discontents* from 1930 concludes:

"And now it is to be expected that the other of the two 'Heavenly Powers,' eternal Eros, will make an effort to assert himself in the struggle with his equally immortal adversary."<sup>5</sup>

The preceding lines shed light on Thanatos, Eros's "immortal adversary," and were bound to have piqued Coudenhove's interest:

The fateful question for the human species seems to me to be whether and to what extent their cultural development will succeed in mastering the disturbance of their communal life by the human instinct of aggression and self-destruction. It may be that in this respect precisely the present time deserves a special interest. Men have gained control over the forces of nature to such an extent that with their help they would have no difficulty in exterminating one another to the last man. They know this, and hence comes a large part of their current unrest, their unhappiness and their mood of anxiety.<sup>6</sup>

The analytical treatment of this "fateful question" seems to describe our own circumstances today with astonishing prescience. At the same time, it relates to contemporary arguments that Coudenhove had been putting forth in the political arena since the mid-1920s: "Europe is dying not from old age, but because its inhabitants kill and destroy one another using all the means of modern technology. [...] Europe's people are not suffering from senility; only its political system."<sup>7</sup> According to Martin Posselt, with these words the Pan-European advocate delivered a clear rejection of the prevailing cultural pessimism.<sup>8</sup>

In contrast to Freud, who emphasized his cultural scepticism in the next edition of his text *Civilization and Its Discontents*, by adding a new sentence to the previous concluding sentence:

But who can foresee with what success and with what result?<sup>9</sup>

Addressing us directly in a manner typical for Freud, the addition of this question disconcerts us, the readers. Whereas only a year before, the hope for positive developments still seemed justified, it is relativized in the next version of the text from 1931: whether Eros, who seeks "to preserve living substance and to join it into ever larger units,"<sup>10</sup> will withstand the forces of the death drive, i.e., Thanatos, now remains in the literal sense of the word questionable.

The functions of culture (Freud did not differentiate between this term and "civilization") are at the heart of the debate in *Discontents*. The analyst stressed that a community's ability to regulate relationships between people is the essential factor in cultural development. From his perspective, the relationship between individuals and their collectives is determined by the psychological agency of the superego. As the representative of social norms, it induces the ego to abstain from immediately satisfying subjective instinctual wishes and to submit to the "reality principle" for the benefit of society and its values. Here, the act of "sublimating" socially unacceptable sexual or aggressive drives constitutes an effective "defense mechanism." This can almost make us forget, according to Freud, just how much more intense the gratification would be if we were to satisfy "a wild, instinctual impulse [Triebregung] untamed by the ego."<sup>11</sup> Displacing libidinal energies onto cultural or scientific activities promotes culture just

as it imposes restrictions [on us]. Despite this shadow side, which according to Freud characterizes the sociocultural struggles of all individuals and societies, he insists on the necessity of “drive renunciation” in order to maintain a functional, safe, and just communal life. This applies to the family unit, to communities, and even to the nation: “Civilized man has exchanged a portion of his possibilities of happiness for a portion of security,”<sup>12</sup> the analyst stated succinctly.

Considering the ruthless candor with which Freud approached his environment, it is unsurprising that Stefan Zweig called him a “truth sadist.”<sup>13</sup> This may also be the reason why Freud did not consider himself cut out for political propaganda, “for which I am in any case entirely unsuitable.” Here the analyst also made clear that engendering optimism was not his *métier*. For him the “will to truth”<sup>14</sup> was the first commandment, “a precondition of receptivity for the natural science of the psyche — in other words, for what is known as psycho-analysis.”<sup>15</sup>

Furthermore, we know that in the practice of his profession, whether as analyst or cultural theorist, Freud was committed to nonpartisanship. This lay in the nature of his theories where therapeutic practice as well as their generally sociological perspective are grounded in value neutrality. Nevertheless, with a view to improving the human condition, Freud did indeed subject the power relations of his age to sober critical appraisal. His experience may well have been similar to that of many proponents of psychoanalysis today, who are increasingly confronted in contemporary debates with the question of whether it is possible or justified to remain neutral or uncommitted in times of crisis and war.

Despite regarding his political leanings to be a private matter, there is evidence—such as some of the campaigns he supported — to suggest that Freud inclined toward Social Democracy even before the end of the First World War. Examples include the petition for donations toward the building of a monument to Josef Popper-Lynkeus, which was signed by both Freud and Coudenhove-Kalergi.<sup>16</sup> Moreover, both men wrote about this social philosopher, whom they considered a role model, especially after reading his study on “Die Allgemeine Nährpflicht” (“The general obligation to provide food”).<sup>17</sup> For Freud, Popper-Lynkeus was “a thinker and a critic and at the same time a kindly humanitarian and reformer”;<sup>18</sup> for Coudenhove-Kalergi, he was “a socialist out of individualism.”<sup>19</sup> This example illustrates that our protagonists shared a common interest: humanitarianism.

The fact that psychology, due to the mutual relationship between the individual and society, has always been social psychology is confirmed not only by Freud’s cultural theory.<sup>20</sup> The increasingly heated social discourse around 1930 prompted him to take a more forthright stand on political issues.<sup>21</sup> Consequently, he subjected to concise analysis both the Communist doctrine, which he deemed “an untenable illusion,” and

“the dream of a Germanic world-dominion,” which in his opinion fueled anti-Semitism<sup>22</sup> not as “an unaccountable chance” but “as its complement.”<sup>23</sup>

Years later, after his escape from the Nazi regime in June 1938, Freud would again make direct reference to Richard and his father Heinrich Coudenhove-Kalergi: In “A Comment On Anti-Semitism”<sup>24</sup> he recalled the text, *On the Essence of Anti-Semitism*,<sup>25</sup> in which Heinrich Coudenhove—as a “non-Jew,” Freud emphasized—took a decisive stand against anti-Semitism: “this book [...] was published in 1901 and rereleased by his son in 1929 with a laudable introduction.”<sup>25a</sup> Looking back from his London exile on Europe’s decline, on war, destruction, and his own fate as a refugee,<sup>26</sup> Freud posed the question: “Or am I altogether mistaken? Does such a thing [the publication *On the Essence of Anti-Semitism*] not exist and did the work by two Coudenhoves truly have no influence whatsoever on their contemporaries?”<sup>27</sup> Here the rhetorical concluding question in this article no longer merely voiced fears that were also central to the thinking of Coudenhove and his fellow campaigners in the politically virulent years between 1929 and 1933<sup>28</sup> but proved that those fears were justified.

Personalities from the arts and science — including Thomas Mann, Stefan Zweig, and Albert Einstein, to name but a few — were both supporters of the pacifist Pan-European movement<sup>29</sup> and acquaintances of Freud.

The same month that Freud expressed himself so movingly with regard to Coudenhove’s Pan-European idea, he received a collected volume from Thomas Mann containing an essay on “Freud’s Position in the History of Modern Culture.”<sup>30</sup> In the 1936 translation of his “Postscript” to his autobiographical study from 1925, which had only been published the previous year,<sup>30a</sup> Freud would recapitulate: “It was in 1929 that, with words no less pregnant than friendly, Thomas Mann, one of the acknowledged spokesmen of the German people, found a place for me in the history of modern thought,” and noting that being awarded the Goethe Prize the following year was “the climax of my life as a citizen,” Freud wrote: “Soon afterwards the boundaries of our country narrowed and the nation would know no more of us.”<sup>31</sup> In 1930 Mann gave a lecture in the context of the Pan-European Congress in Berlin about “Europe as a Cultural Community,”<sup>32</sup> and some six years later the Nobel laureate in literature spoke about “Freud and the Future” to commemorate the analyst’s eightieth birthday.

Albert Einstein, a member of the Commission internationale de coopération intellectuelle since 1922, at the initiative of the League of Nations in 1931/32, corresponded with Freud on the question *Why War?* “How long have we to wait before the rest of men turn pacifist?” Freud asked, continuing:

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 by-ways this will come about, we

cannot guess. Meanwhile we may rest on the assurance that whatever makes for cultural development is working also against war.<sup>33</sup>

As early as 1924, in his Pan-European program, Coudenhove-Kalergi identified two urgent problems: “the first relates to the social” — and in his opinion “rightly dominates public discourse” — whereas “the European question, that is of no lesser importance, is met with utter silence.” He formulated the latter as follows: “Can Europe, with its political and economic fragmentation, uphold peace and independence from the extra-European powers or would it be forced to organize itself in a federation of states to secure its existence?”<sup>34</sup>

For the politician and journalist, diplomatic communication and persuasion reflected the transnational worldview that had been instilled in him from the cradle and that focused on lasting peace in Europe,<sup>35</sup> as well as on economic and technological progress, and promoted the abolition of inner-European borders as the solution to the minority question. Because there is only this “one radical path,” Coudenhove maintained.<sup>36</sup> Even though years would pass after World War II before the pan-European movement would culminate in the European Union, Thomas Mann attested as early as 1926 that this visionary “knows how, with the clearest energy, both in writing and in person, to bear and propagate [this idea] to the world.” Impressed by Coudenhove’s demeanor and skill, he added:

After all, what could impress one if not this foresighted and nobly democratic top personality from a new society who by his nature thinks on a continental scale and takes it upon himself to shape the world according to insights that are the product of his reason.<sup>37</sup>

The vision of making a peaceful and open society — some might call it utopian — a reality through the exercise of reason, characterized Coudenhove-Kalergi’s ambitions — just as it did Freud’s theories, since “There is no court of appeal beyond reason,”<sup>38</sup> as Freud wrote in *The Future of an Illusion*:

We may insist as much as we like that the human intellect is weak in comparison with human instincts [Triebleben], and be right in doing so. But nevertheless there is something peculiar about this weakness. The voice of the intellect is a soft one, but it does not rest until it has gained a hearing. [...] This is one of the few points in which one may be optimistic about the future of mankind, but in itself it signifies not a little.<sup>39</sup>

While the postulate of reason remained important for Freud throughout his life, his letter from 1929 reveals another aspect of his participation in political life that went beyond a purely intellectual reflection on current affairs. The analyst not only declared his willingness to support Coudenhove’s project,<sup>40</sup> but he also frankly admitted that the “idea of a united Europe” has occupied his thoughts so much that it “has given me no peace.” Furthermore, Freud expressed himself in a trusting and affectionate manner unfamiliar to us — at least in his professional correspondence. Like Manto, the seer in

Goethe's *Faust, Part Two* who marvels at the eponymous hero's boldness,<sup>41</sup> we perceive in Freud's emotional response that he was deeply touched by Coudenhove's unwavering resolve and effort: "Often when I think of you, the words of Manto from the classical Walpurgis Night come to mind: 'I love him who craves the impossible.'"

If we now return to our present day and to current world affairs, we must acknowledge that we too cannot escape being profoundly moved and dismayed. How can we ignore the fears and doubts that are spreading as a result of ignorance and the degradation of our core humanitarian values? How can we adequately respond to the defamation of our response to the devastation of the last world war, which culminated in 1945 in the establishment of the International Court of Justice to ensure that human rights would be upheld worldwide?

The answer to the question of how passively we can accept the emergence of a world order that only acknowledges the right of the strongest is long overdue.

The American philosopher and writer Siri Hustvedt wrote in February 2026 that the present should never be equated with the past; nevertheless, there are important lessons to be learned from the past. Thus, history has taught us not to succumb to the temptation to remain passive. "Resistance is crucial, but it is just as crucial to understand what we are resisting. We are not resisting conservatism but a new form of fascism that affects the entire world." And with regard to Europe's past and its position between the great powers of the USA and Russia, she writes: "The argument for strengthening Europe must be political and strategic, but above all it must be ethical."<sup>42</sup>

In his 2026 New Year's address, Austrian President Alexander van der Bellen appealed to our "European patriotism" — entirely in line with Coudenhove-Kalergi, who equated the "Pan-European sense of community" with "European patriotism" and conceived of this emotional connection of shared cultural and political values as a necessary "complement to national sentiment."<sup>43</sup>

In the light of the rise of extreme rightwing forces in the world, Slavoj Žižek spoke as early as 2019 about the importance of the "idea of Europe" as a transnational community that guarantees cultural standards and human rights, adding: "And if we lose it [the idea of Europe], I don't know what remains. I am a communist, and Europe is not communist, but what other political power can compete with it?"<sup>44</sup> With this relevant contemporary position, he addresses Freud's and Coudenhove's nonpartisan perspective. Today the Slovenian philosopher and psychoanalyst calls for the sharpening of the profile of European liberal democracy — and in this sense for the "radicalization" of our faith in its "emancipatory potential."<sup>45</sup>

Although we cannot foresee the future of the current misery in Europe and the wider world, we share Freud's expectation "that the other of the two 'Heavenly Powers', eternal

Eros, will make an effort to assert himself in the struggle with his equally immortal adversary.”<sup>46</sup>

Translation from German into English by Thomas Kohut (AI-assisted translation/Claude) and Maria Slater

---

<sup>1</sup> Stephan Baier quotes the same letter, but with slight differences in punctuation and without the phrase "ever since I first heard of it.", in: Europa-Gesellschaft Coudenhove-Kalergi (2010), *Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi. Leben und Wirken*, Vienna/Graz: Neuer Wissenschaftliche Verlag, p. 96. Trans. Maria Slater.

<sup>2</sup> Only at the beginning of our century was it briefly possible to conduct research in the Moscow archives, cf. Anita Ziegerhofer-Prettenthaler (2004), *Botschafter Europas, Richard Nikolaus Coudenhove-Kalergi und die Paneuropa-Bewegung in den zwanziger und dreißiger Jahren*, Vienna/Cologne: Böhlau Verlag.

<sup>3</sup> Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi (1958), *Eine Idee erobert Europa. Meine Lebenserinnerungen*, Vienna/Munich/Basle: Verlag Kurt Desch, pp. 216ff.

<sup>4</sup> Archives Cantonales Vaudoises (ACV): CH ACV PP 1000/2, env. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Sigmund Freud (1930), *Das Unbehagen in der Kultur*. Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, p. 136. [SFG 19, 1930-01]. This translation is taken from *Civilization and Its Discontents*, trans. Joan Riviere. London: Hogarth Press and Institute of Psycho-Analysis, and New York: Cape and Smith, p. 145.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Richard N. Coudenhove-Kalergi (1923/2019), *Pan-Europa*, trans. Tabaré Salvagno, Rome: Liber Veritate, n.p.

<sup>8</sup> Martin Posselt (2025), *Ein Parlament für Europa. Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, Paneuropa und die westliche Demokratie 1922–1952*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, p. 38.

<sup>9</sup> Sigmund Freud (1931), *Das Unbehagen in der Kultur*, 2nd edition. Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, p. 136 [SFG 19, 1931-07]. This translation is taken from *Civilization and Its Discontents*, trans. Joan Riviere. London: Hogarth Press and Institute of Psycho-Analysis, and New York: Cape and Smith, p. 145.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 118.

<sup>11</sup> Sigmund Freud (1930), op cit, p. 79.

<sup>12</sup> Sigmund Freud (1930), op cit, p. 115.

<sup>13</sup> Stefan Zweig (1931/1962), *Mental Healers: Franz Anton Mesmer, Mary Beker-Eddy, Sigmund Freud*, trans. Eden and Cedar Paul, New York: Frederick Ungar, pp. 263–264: “his ‘truth sadism’ has triggered a revolution in the way we view all matters of the soul [trans. Maria Slater] [...] With alarm these illusionists, these optimists, these idealists, these advocates of shame and the good old morality, became aware that Freud was a man [...] who could not be scared by any taboo or intimidated by any prohibition; a man to whom, in very truth, nothing was ‘sacred.’” The published translation by Eden and Cedar Paul of the first sentence cited here was rendered without the term “truth sadism” and has therefore been adapted.

<sup>14</sup> Thomas Mann (1936/1956), “Freud and the Future,” in: *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 37, pp. 106–115, here p. 107.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Christfried Tögel (2019), *Freud als Unterzeichner von Aufrufen*, lecture, 32nd symposium *Zur Geschichte der Psychoanalyse*, Berlin.

<sup>17</sup> Josef Popper-Lynkeus (1912), *Die allgemeine Nährpflicht als Lösung der sozialen Frage, eingehend bearbeitet und statistisch durchgerechnet. Mit einem Nachweis der theoretischen und praktischen Wertlosigkeit der Wirtschaftslehre*, Dresden: Reissner. The term “Nährpflicht” can be translated as the (society’s) duty to feed or nourish, but its phonetic similarity with *Wehrpflicht* (military conscription) also suggests that this is a duty shared by everyone in society—and is not just the responsibility of its government. See Alexander Linsbichler and Marco P. Vianna Franco (2024), Universal basic income in Viennese Late Enlightenment: Rediscovering Josef Popper-Lynkeus and his in-kind social program. *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 32(3), pp. 363–390, footnote 12. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09672567.2024.2444921> (accessed: February 20, 2026).

---

<sup>18</sup> Sigmund Freud (1932), My Contact with Josef Popper-Lynkeus, in: *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, vol. XXII (1932–1936 22, pp. 217–224, p. 223,

<sup>19</sup> Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi (1978), Vorwort. In Frederick P. Hellin and Robert Plank (eds.), *Der Plan des Josef Popper-Lynkeus*, p. 5.

<sup>20</sup> Sigmund Freud (1921/1922), *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, trans. James Strachey. London/Vienna: The International Psycho-Analytical Press [SFG 17, 1921-01].

<sup>21</sup> See Wolfgang Müller Funk (ed.) (2016), *Das Unbehagen in der Kultur (Sigmund Freuds Werke. Wiener Interdisziplinäre Kommentare*, vol. 3), Vienna: Vienna University Press, pp. 26ff. [SFG 19, 1921-01].

<sup>22</sup> Despite his cultural identification with Judaism and the growing anti-Semitism that would affect him from his youth and throughout his entire professional career up to his escape from Vienna, he did not agree with the “Jewish people’s national aspirations in Palestine.” He expressed his misgivings in this regard very plainly in a letter to Chaim Koller in 1930. See Eran Rolnik (2013), *Freud auf Hebräisch. Geschichte der Psychoanalyse im jüdischen Palästina*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 90ff. Trans. Maria Slater.

<sup>23</sup> Sigmund Freud (1930), op cit, pp. 113ff.

<sup>24</sup> Sigmund Freud (1938), A Comment on Anti-Semitism, in: *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, vol. XXIII (1937–1939), trans. James Strachey, London: Hogarth and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, pp. 287–294

<sup>25</sup> Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi would himself later refer to the renowned analyst Sigmund Freud holding in high regard the 1901 study by his father Heinrich Coudenhove-Kalergi. Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi (1958), *Eine Idee erobert Europa. Meine Lebenserinnerungen*, Vienna/Munich/Basle: Verlag Kurt Desch, p. 37: “Despite having been written decades ago, this book is still a standard work on the Jewish question. Shortly before his death Siegmund [sic] Freud called it one of the best books ever written on this problem.” Trans. Maria Slater.

<sup>25a</sup> Freud (1938), op cit, p. 4. Trans. Maria Slater.

<sup>26</sup> Freud, who passed away in London on September 23, 1939, did not live to hear of the murder of his four sisters Adolfine, Marie, Pauline, and Rosa in the extermination camps of Theresienstadt and Treblinka in 1942.

<sup>27</sup> Sigmund Freud (1938), op cit, p. 4

<sup>28</sup> See Martin Posselt (2025), op cit, pp. 78–89.

<sup>29</sup> Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, son of the Austrian diplomat Heinrich Coudenhove-Kalergi and the Japanese citizen Mitsu(ko) Aoyama, owed a large proportion of his contacts to his wife Ida Roland, who as an acclaimed actress at the Burgtheater had introduced him to “a stimulating new milieu: thespians, artists, literary figures, and journalists of all manner of political colors” from the mid-1910s. See Martin Posselt (2025), op cit, p. 13. Trans. Maria Slater.

<sup>30</sup> Thomas Mann (1929/1941), Freud’s Position in the History of Modern Culture. *The Psychoanalytic Review*, 28(1), pp. 92–116. Trans. Clara Willard and Smith Ely Jelliffe.

<sup>30a</sup> Sigmund Freud (1924/1935), *An Autobiographical Study*, trans. James Strachey. London: Hogarth Press [SFG 17, 1935-01].

<sup>31</sup> Sigmund Freud (1925/1936), “An Autobiographical Study” (1925 [1924]), second revised and expanded version, in: *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, vol. XX (1925–1926), trans. James Strachey, London: Hogarth and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, pp. 1–74, here pp. 72f. [SFG 20, 1936-06]. A “Postscript” was added to the second edition of the *Autobiographical Study*.

<sup>32</sup> Martin Posselt (2025), op cit, p. 68.

<sup>33</sup> Albert Einstein and Sigmund Freud (1933): *Why War? An International Series of Letters*, Paris: League of Nations. International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, pp. 56f.

<sup>34</sup> Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi (1923/2019), op cit, n.p.

<sup>35</sup> As early as 1924 Coudenhove-Kalergi warned in particular of “the march of Russia towards Occident”: “Europe should be conscious that the peace between the democratic states and the Soviet States is not more than an armistice, a pause, to gain strength and prepare for the next attack, because the final and definitive objective of the Communist chiefs is still the world Communist revolution. Only in terms of the method of execution there exist differences of opinion between the Russian politicians, not in terms of the objective.” Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi (1923/2019), op cit, n.p.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Thomas Mann (1926), *Pariser Rechenschaft*. Cited in Martin Posselt (2025), *Ein Parlament für Europa. Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, Paneuropa und die westliche Demokratie 1922–1952*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, p. 67. Trans. Maria Slater.

---

<sup>38</sup> Sigmund Freud (1927), *The Future of an Illusion*, trans. W.D. Robson-Scott. In Ernest Jones (ed.), *The International Psycho-Analytical Library*, no. 15. Edinburgh: R. & R. Clark, p. 49 [SFG 18, 1927-03].

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 93.

<sup>40</sup> This probably concerns his request to support the Pan-European Union with his signature. Two letters from Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi to Sigmund Freud are preserved in the Freud Archives: Library of Congress, Washington, Sigmund Freud Papers: General Correspondence, 1871–1996; Coudenhove-Kalergi, Richard N., 1925, 1931: In 1925 the president of the Pan-European Union solicited “the most distinguished Europeans for their opinions on the necessity of European integration” and asked Freud for a “basic statement on the enclosed questions” and for a swift response as he wanted to publish the results of his survey in the next issue of the magazine *Paneuropa*, which had been founded in 1922. In the second letter, dated November 19, 1931, Coudenhove thanks Freud for signing a petition to award him the Nobel Peace Prize. Coudenhove-Kalergi and Freud were nominated for the prize several times; neither of them ever received it.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Johann Wolfgang Goethe (1832), *Goethe's Werke. Vollständige Ausgabe letzter Hand*, vol. 41, Stuttgart/Tübingen: J. G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung, p. 134.

<sup>42</sup> Siri Hustvedt (2026, February 3), *Wir leben in einer Lüge*. *Die Zeit*, no. 05/2026. Trans. Maria Slater.

<sup>43</sup> Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi (1923/2019), *op cit*, n.p.

<sup>44</sup> Slavoj Žižek (2019), in: *Dimensionen. Slavoj Žižek – ein Ereignis. Zum 70. Geburtstag des slowenischen Philosophen*, presented by Lukas Wieselberg, Österreichischer Rundfunk (Ö1), first broadcast on March 21, 2019. Trans. Maria Slater.

<sup>45</sup> Slavoj Žižek (2026, February 3), *Radikalisiert euch*. *Die Zeit*, no. 05/2026. Trans. Maria Slater.

<sup>46</sup> Freud 1930, p. 145.