the 1990s "gradually found that the reports of forest death (*Waldsterben*) were exaggerated" (p. 172), then it is doubtful that Westerners had bought GDR rhetoric so uncritically before its fall. The lack of historiographical context also leads Nelson to questionable assumptions about the "green" qualities of National Socialist forestry and "backwardness" of the GDR. In its final decades, the GDR accumulated massive debt, asymmetries of production and consumption, and water- and air-pollution problems in its quest for a socialist modernity, but few scholars would support his sweeping assertions that "There was a near total lack of even primary sewage facilities . . . and primitive living conditions outside the ruling elite" (p. xii) or that "its economy probably lagged behind Poland's and Hungary's" (p. 183). Such assertions, made with no reference to recent literature, render the author's broader narrative less compelling.

Nelson's lack of historiographical context also obscures his work's real contribution to our understanding of social relations in the East German countryside, particularly his detailed account of peasant and farmer resistance to Soviet land reform and SED collectivization, the threat that self-sustaining, non-socialist forest cooperatives posed to the SED leadership, and the agrarian dimensions of *Republikflucht*. These points of resistance complicate our understanding of coercion and consent in the GDR. Reading Nelson's account, it is also difficult to imagine more than a handful of trees left standing in 1989, yet the author asserts in his final chapter that "Forest health was not much worse than in West Germany: declining but fitting for an industrial forest planted off-site" (p. 172). Such analysis points the way toward comparative analysis of the separate environmental trajectories of East German socialism and the West German social-market economy. Despite its lack of engagement with secondary literature, therefore, the book opens valuable avenues of inquiry into socialist environmental and agrarian history.

THOMAS LEKAN
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

DOI: 10.1017/S0008938907000751

*Viktor Frankl. Das Ende eines Mythos?* By Timothy Pytell. Translated by Elisabeth Frank-Großebner and Camilla Nielsen. Innsbruck, Vienna, Bozen: Studienverlag. 2005. Pp. 212. €19.00. ISBN 3-7065-1911-9.

When it comes to intellectual "how to . . ." books-Viktor Frankl's *Man's Search for Meaning* is right up there with the twentieth-century classics such as Khalil

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008938907000751 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gibran's *The Prophet* or Erich Fromm's *The Art of Loving*. Translated into some twenty-eight or twenty-six languages (depending on whether you refer to Timothy Pytell's footnotes or Anson Rabinbach's Preface to this volume), it made Frankl and logotherapy famous throughout the world. Rejecting Freudian and Adlerian reductionism, Frankl insisted, not entirely without justification, that psychoanalysts had no right to force their patients to accept an account of the unconscious etiology of their mental illnesses, be it sexual or social in nature, that was in fact projected upon them by the analyst. Indeed, the central thesis of logotherapy is that the analyst is there to aid patients in coming to grips with their own fears and phobias. In effect patients must cure themselves by overcoming their inhibitions. The most important of these is fear of death. Thus the route to sanity is confrontation with one's own mortality. The analyst is thus a partner in a dialogue about the meaning of one's death to oneself. In developing this so-called "third way" within psychoanalysis, Frankl leaned heavily upon Martin Heidegger's existentialist phenomenology in *Sein und Zeit*, in which the notion of "Sein zum Tode" is more or less the metaphysical determinant of the kind of beings that humans are. This philosophically based notion of therapy had a wide appeal to humanists of all sorts throughout the world, not least because Frankl was a survivor of Auschwitz who presented his logotherapy at a survival strategy. His personal experience in the concentration camp, movingly described in the book, was as much a source of its success as the theory he developed in it.

Now Pytell has come along with a book about the skeleton in Frankl's closet. Between 1939 and his deportation in 1942, he worked at Vienna's Rothchild Hospital resuscitating Jews who had made suicide attempts to avoid deportation. In effect, his job was to prevent them from escaping the fate that the Nazis had planned for them. Moreover, Frankl's connection with the Nazis did not begin there. In 1936 and 1937 he had held seminars at the Vienna branch of the Deutsches Institut für psychologische Forschung und Psychotherapie, more commonly known as the Göring Institute, named after Matthias Heinrich Göring, cousin of the infamous Hermann. This semi-private institution aimed at producing an Aryan psychotherapy and Frankl's ideas suited it to a "T." Here was a version of therapy that put the individual's psychic destiny firmly into his or her own heroic hands, one that effectively made psychological disorders a matter of the will rather than the results of subconscious conflicts. None of this is mentioned in Frankl's autobiography, whose very name, *Was nicht in meinen Büchern steht*, now takes on a bitterly ironic connotation. Neither is the fact that Frankl spent but three days in Auschwitz before being transferred to Buchenwald. So another cultural hero bites the dust as Frankl's aura comes to share the taint of greats such Mircea Eliade and Paul De Man, who might have made points of comparison in a more thorough study than this.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008938907000751 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The story is sad and sadly all-too familiar, scarcely worth the full-length study that Pytell attempts to devote to it in the absence of a reevaluation of logotherapy. How does it really fare as a form of therapy? What was Frankl's contribution to the treatment of mental disorders? We know that Freudian therapy cannot sustain its claims to be a universal method for treating psychic illnesses, but we also know that Freud's methods have no serious competitors for effectiveness in the area of psychotherapy—which is by no means to assert that Freudian analysis is methodologically unproblematic. It is the best of a bad lot as it were. In any case, without an assessment of logotherapy's claims to be a genuinely healing art, the issue of Frankl's reputation is not particularly interesting despite the accolades heaped upon him during his life; however, the question of scientific achievement is unfortunately not the kind of thing that interests Pytell. Indeed the substantial question of Frankl's intellectual development and affinities is dealt with in a highly superficial manner. He insists, for example, that the philosophers Martin Heidegger and Max Schleler were important for Frankl, but the reader gets only the foggiest idea how that was so. At another level Pytell has simply not done his homework. In a brief section entitled "Das Böse des Nationalsozialismus," Pytell summarizes Frankl's turn to religion citing an allegedly unpublished drama *Synchronization in Buchenwald* from an English translation without being aware that the text in fact appeared in German in the pages of the *Brenner* in Innsbruck in 1948 as "Synchronisation in Birkenwald." It was published under the pseudonym Gabriel Lion. *Der Brenner* was perhaps Austria's leading religious periodical after World War II. Its influence, for example, in paving the way to the Second Vatican Council, especially in connection with the declaration on the Jews, cannot be overestimated. Frankl's presence in it is not something that can simply be passed over. Moreover, ignorance of that fact is hardly excusable. There is something important to discuss here, especially in the context of what Pytell has brought to light, but he seems neither willing nor capable of pursuing such a serious intellectual inquiry.

Briefly, this book has a point to it, but it cannot possibly be considered an important study. Alas, it shows contemporary history at its muck-raking weakest while avoiding the challenges that intellectual history actually presents to students of Austria in that highly troubled epoch.

Allan Janik
The Brenner Archives Research Institute,
The University of Innsbruck

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008938907000751 Published online by Cambridge University Press