



Research Repository

Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham: Queer Encounters with the Psychoanalytic Archive

Accepted for publication in *Psychoanalysis and History*

Research Repository link: <https://repository.essex.ac.uk/43267/>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite this paper.

<http://doi.org/10.3366/pah.2026.0579>

Introduction

ANNA FREUD AND DOROTHY BURLINGHAM: QUEER ENCOUNTERS WITH THE PSYCHOANALYTIC ARCHIVE

*Agnes Meadows, London, UK,
Harriet Mossop,¹ Wivenhoe UK and
Raluca Soreanu, Wivenhoe, UK*

This issue of *Psychoanalysis and History* is a record of two queer encounters that took place at the Freud Museum in London on 31 January and 1 February 2025: a museum tour about Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham's shared home in the Hampstead house that became the Freud Museum after Anna Freud's death, and a symposium responding to the portrayal of their relationship in the film *Freud's Last Session* (2024). As editors, we view these encounters through a queer historiographic lens, looking backwards through time to the institutional and intimate moments that led up to them. Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham's personal and professional partnership began in Vienna in 1925 and endured until Dorothy's death in 1979. This extra-ordinarily long relationship spanned significant societal changes in respect of gender

¹Correspondence to harriet.mossop@essex.ac.uk

AGNES MEADOWS is studying early child development at the Anna Freud Centre. She completed her MA in Psychoanalysis at Birkbeck.

HARRIET MOSSOP is a PhD student and Assistant Lecturer in the Department of Psychosocial and Psychoanalytic Studies at the University of Essex, and Research and Development Officer in the Centre for Anthropological Mental Health Research in Action at the School for Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

RALUCA SOREANU is a psychoanalytic and psychosocial thinker and writer. She is Professor of Psychoanalytic Studies in the Department of Psychosocial and Psychoanalytic Studies, University of Essex, UK, and a psychoanalyst, member of the *Círculo Psicanalítico do Rio de Janeiro*, Brazil, and of the Site for Contemporary Psychoanalysis, UK.

and sexuality that affected how their relationship was seen by their colleagues, friends and family in Europe and North America: first-wave feminism focusing on suffrage for white middle-class women; legal trials in Austria and Britain that brought increased – usually negative – visibility to lesbian relationships; brief flourishings of queer and trans life during the 1920s and 1930s; intensified homophobia and transphobia during the 1940s and 1950s; second wave feminism in the late 1960s; decriminalization of homosexuality in many countries, and the early lesbian and gay rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s. Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham were both still alive when gay psychiatrist John E. Fryer put on a Nixon mask to speak about his sexuality at the American Psychiatric Association conference in 1972 and homosexuality was removed from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) in 1973. Societal change has continued in the 40 years since their deaths in 1979 and 1982: the horror of the AIDS pandemic; the expansion of mainstream Western activism to include bisexual, queer, trans and intersex rights; anti-discrimination laws; same-sex marriage, and increased protection of transgender rights. However, at the time of the tour in early 2025, Donald J. Trump had just become President of the United States for the second time, and the scale of his administration's attacks on reproductive, LGBTQIA+, Black, migrant, neuro-divergent and disability rights was just becoming clear. The new Labour administration in the UK was also demonstrating increasingly shaky support for LGBTQIA+ rights, especially transgender rights. It felt like an important moment to create a consciously queer space in this museum at the heart of psychoanalysis; to think about how psychoanalytic theory about queer and trans identities had influenced and been influenced by societal changes during the hundred years since Anna and Dorothy first met in Vienna in 1925.

These encounters within the institutional space of the Freud Museum had their origin in a more personal encounter. Two of us, Harriet and Agnes, became fascinated by Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham; Agnes, through her archival research at the Freud Museum, and Harriet, through her

work on queer female sexuality in psychoanalysis. Having read Agnes's paper about a letter from Anna Freud to Dorothy Burlingham that was marked 'to destroy' (Meadows, 2022), Harriet contacted Agnes online by guessing her email address – since Agnes's institutional email address had stopped working – and a discussion at a coffee shop in rainy Shoreditch, East London, was arranged. This first meeting was a tentative encounter, but a productively queer one, especially given the tenuousness of the virtual connections that led to it. The idea of a tour, hosted jointly by the Queer Encounters psychosocial research network² and the Freud Museum London, soon emerged. We wanted to draw on the less visible signs of Anna and Dorothy's lives in the Museum, to bring the lives and the work of these two women into focus from a feminist and queer perspective in the context of the history of psychoanalysis. The UK release of the film *Freud's Last Session* (2024) provided a further catalyst for our ideas for queer encounters at the Freud Museum; Raluca agreed to chair an academic symposium the day after the tour. The film stars Anthony Hopkins, Matthew Goode, Liv Lisa Fries and Jodi Balfour and is based on a play by Mark St. German that imagines Freud meeting with the author C.S. Lewis on the day that England declared war on Germany, only days before Freud's death in September 1939. On the surface, at least, the film confidently portrays Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham's relationship as lesbian; in a speculative scene that the contributions to this edition will return to, they eventually 'come out' to Freud on his psychoanalytic couch. Questions about the nature of Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham's relationship are not new: it was the subject of gossip in Vienna and London during their lifetimes in ways that were consequential to their professional lives, and tour guides at the Freud Museum today are often asked, 'Was Anna Freud a lesbian?' (Smith, 2024). We were joined by Patricia Gherovici, Noreen Giffney

² Queer Encounters is a research network for psychosocial early career and PhD researchers in gender and sexuality. Founded in 2021, it holds online and in person events. More details can be found at www.queerencounters.org.

and Hannah Zeavin for an online symposium to consider *Freud's Last Session* in the context of the (queer) history of psychoanalysis.

This edition is also published at a moment that we can qualify as a time of working-through for psychoanalysis on issues of race, coloniality, non-normative genders and sexualities and disability. The publication of *Clinical Encounters in Sexuality*, edited by Noreen Giffney and Eve Watson (2017), was a true intervention in the fields of clinical psychoanalysis and sexuality studies. Innovative in format, this book proposed an interlocutor for each psychoanalytic voice, structurally acknowledging that psychoanalysis needs an Other. The volume's name – *Clinical Encounters* – is consciously echoed in the name of the psycho-social research network that hosted our events – Queer Encounters – and of the Freud Museum Tour and symposium: *Queer Encounters with psychoanalytic history at the Freud Museum – the relationship between Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham*. Dagmar Herzog expanded queer psychoanalytic history with a special edition of this Journal, *Queering Freud Differently* (2020). This considered the work of 'two iconic anti-homophobes', Robert J. Stoller and Fritz Morgenthaler, in the contexts of 'the history of psychoanalytic theorizing about homosexuality; both men's work at the border of ethnography; and the shifting stakes caused by the sexual revolution of the 1960s–1970s and each man's ensuing conceptual innovations in theorizing sexuality more generally' (Herzog, 2020, p. 1). The previous year, Herzog's special edition *Psychoanalysis Confronts Cognitive Disability* (2019) had opened psychoanalytic history in another direction, drawing attention to psychoanalysis' ambivalent engagement with learning disability. The editors of a recent edited collection of essays *The Queerness of Psychoanalysis* ask: '[t]o what extent can one speak of a queer history or heritage of psychoanalysis?' (Sinclair *et al.*, 2024, p. 3). They make a strong case, through the contributions to their volume, that 'psychoanalysis has from the beginning been a site of queer and trans* creation and resistance' (2024, p. 1). At the end of 2025, *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society* published a special issue on

‘Psychoanalysis and Colonialism’ (2025), edited by David Pavón-Cuéllar and Robert K.

Beshara. The contributors ask what a transmodern psychoanalysis might look like and stress that it will involve stretching theory and practice beyond our comfort zone, to include ‘dark continents’ that were negated, ignored, forgotten or muted. In the editorial introduction, Pavón-Cuéllar and Beshara ask: ‘Should Freud be cancelled?’ and the answer comes: ‘In short, no’. They recognize the challenge of living with ambiguity: while psychoanalysis has colonial aspects and legacies, it also has important decolonial and anticolonial potentialities. Queer, trans and decolonial approaches to psychoanalysis figure prominently in the new zine-inspired psychosocial journal *Parapraxis*. And the next issues of *Psychoanalysis & History* will host the special issue ‘Trans-Analytics: Psychoanalysis, Gender, and History’, edited by Carolyn Laubender, and will grapple with ‘the pressing intersections, gaps, overlaps, discords, illuminations, erasures, continuities, repressions, and syntheses that have long characterized the relationship between transgender experience and psychoanalytic theory and practice’. Together with these and many other publications, this edition forms parts of the increasingly rich constellation of a queer, trans, disabled, anticolonial and post-human psychoanalysis. This constellation points to an intensification, a consistent questioning – informed by consciously historiographic thinking – of ossified theoretical and clinical psycho-analytic structures.

Ambiguity also plays an important role in our project to reassess Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham’s relationship through a queer historiographic lens. There is a temptation either to present psychoanalysis as very repressive and sexually conservative, or to create an imaginary ‘pink Freud’ who was always queer and radical. In this edition, we consider the parallel fantasy of a lesbian Anna Freud, as depicted in *Freud’s Last Session*. But we avoid straightforward answers to the questions the relationship poses, focusing instead on why the questions conjured by these two women’s uncertain sexualities continue to be so compelling. Our desire to avoid conclusive answers – to explore, instead, the fantasies and theories that we create in response to uncertainty, as well as the

ambiguities that refuse to fit into our theories – is informed by our queer approach to their history. The archival collection at the Freud Museum London, with its gaps and revisions, also demands an open approach towards uncertainty. Attempts to close an issue by removing an item from the archive can raise more questions than they answer. The gaps leave us with questions; erasure or repression is never the end of the matter in either psychoanalysis or queer historiography. There are traces of the removal, and we are left with an even stronger desire to know. The articles in this issue pose the question: what use can we make of these gaps?

This edition also works with a queer relationship to the temporality of psychoanalytic history. In focusing on the generative and intricate relationship between these two women, which has been largely erased or misconstrued in the history of psychoanalysis, we can find ourselves in potential time, in a space of reversibility, or at the intersection of what could have been with what might yet be. For Ariella Azoulay, potential history is a form of being with others, both living and dead, across time, against the separation of the past from the present (2019 p. 60). Queering also involves a temporal move, allowing the possibility of touching across time, or – as Caroline Dinshaw put it – collapsing time through affective contact between marginalised people now and then (1999). Through queer historical touches we can form communities across time. We ask, then: can the psychoanalysis we practice be a space for such community across time? The psychosocial and psychoanalytic space created by the tour and symposium at the Freud Museum allowed us to aim not at reconstituting precisely, through documentary images, the kind of time and space Anna and Dorothy lived in, but instead at being alongside a collection of traces, marks and remains for uncovering marginal histories. Casting a ‘queer eye’ on Anna and Dorothy means lingering in a time at the intersection of what could have been with what might yet be, and this is a strong and enlivening intersection.

In this edition, we create space for difficult questions for our present moment, in the name of the psychoanalysis that might yet be. What might psychoanalysis have been had it dealt with

homosexuality (including the homosexuality of psycho-analytic trainees) in a different manner? What might psychoanalysis yet be if it deals with trans sexualities and identities differently? This means asking how we can approach the psychoanalytic with a queer eye, in order to see the relationship between Anna and Dorothy differently: not to establish exactly who they were, or what their sexual orientation was, but to think through what they could create together. Here, our provocation is to make sense of psychoanalytic knowledge beyond individual figures and great authors, considering instead the importance of creative dyads. We hope that our readers will come away with the question: what has the dyad Anna-Dorothy created?

To answer that question, we need to consider how we approach the theoretical work and the research of women in psychoanalysis. There is a risk of retrospective feminisation of women psychoanalysts in which women are second-order voices, seen as involved primarily in matters of ‘care’. This attitude assumes a rift between a ‘masculine’ psychoanalysis, whose central matter is metapsychology, and a ‘feminine’ psychoanalysis, whose matters are the ‘pre-oedipal’ but also ‘containing’ and ‘holding’. What do we make, in our time, of the historical pre-occupation of some women analysts with child analysis, the analysis of the early mother–infant relationship, or the issue of female sexuality? We may be at risk of treating the developments of psychoanalytic theory as a familial, oedipal story by dividing things between maternal and paternal preoccupations. This edition offers a space for investigating our own orientation to these topics, and to this rift between the feminine and the masculine, allowing us to ask ourselves whether we ‘feminise’ certain topics retrospectively. In this sense, it has been a much more rewarding analytical proposition to ‘queer’ the history around Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham than to ‘feminise’ it (and them) by enhancing their association with child analysis. But what does it really mean to queer psychoanalysis and its history? The contributions of this edition each speak to this question.

In this edition, we also argue for bringing that queer, enigmatic and potential sensibility –

which resists declaring either a conservative Freud or a pink Freud; a lesbian Anna Freud or a straight one – to psychoanalysis’ engagement with disability, which has been equally ambivalent. A revision of psychoanalytic thinking about disability is not our main project; however, we note how remarkably psychosocial Burlingham’s work on blindness was at a time when most analysts working on disability adopted a more medical model. We have paid attention to what is missing in accounts of Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham; the queerness of their relationship, its ambiguity, their lives beyond work, their co-parenting of Burlingham’s children, and Burlingham’s interest in blindness. And we can ask why Anna and Dorothy as a pair, couple or dyad have been overlooked historically; their gender, sexuality and their work with young children certainly play into this. But if we are asking that question, we should also ask: why has Burlingham been so particularly overlooked, given her important role in the development of much Anna-Freudian theory, such as the Hampstead Psychoanalytic Index? Is Burlingham’s obscurity linked to her professional interest in blindness as well as to her status as the less well-known partner in the Freud–Burlingham dyad? While psychoanalysis has not completely neglected disability, psychoanalytic work in this area has remained counter-cultural, out of the mainstream, and obscure. The histories that we tell of psychoanalysis have mirrored this, leaving out the rich insights that psychoanalysis has to offer to disability studies. Although some are foregrounded more than others in this edition, there are many dimensions related to, not only disability, but also race and class, as well as gender and sexuality to bear in mind when we consider the historiography of these two women.

Queer encounters at the Freud Museum

This edition opens with ‘Queering the Freud Museum: Critical Reflections on a Tour about Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham’s Life Together at 20 Maresfield Gardens’, by Harriet Mossop

and Agnes Meadows. They explore their landmark January 2025 Freud Museum tour in two sections. In the first, they reproduce their tour, grounded in the spaces and objects of the museum and attentive to the traces of the house's longest occupants. The tour tells the story of the two women's meeting; their professional partnership, with special emphasis on Dorothy Burlingham's work on blindness and twins; the constellation of holidays, crafts and illness that shaped their shared domestic life; their archive collections; and, finally, the effect of lesbophobia in psychoanalysis and society on Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham's personal and professional lives. In their second section, Mossop and Meadows explore the method and theory that informed their tour. Drawing on museum studies, object relations theory, queer theory, psychosocial studies and archive theory, they create a generative history that leaves space for both the gaps in our knowledge and the fantasies that we create in our attempts to fill them. They consider what queer readings of Freudian theory about gender and sexuality might contribute to the ongoing 'queering the museum' movement. And they playfully suggest that we might encounter the Freud Museum London both as a ruined museum and as the queer family home of psychoanalysis, conjuring the hope that the metaphorical ruins of the museum might give rise to dreams of queer and trans futures.

In 'Anna-Antigone and Freudipus', Patricia Gherovici narrates the complex history between psychoanalysis, non-normative gender and homosexuality. She interrogates why, despite Freud's polymorphous perverse account of sexuality, psychoanalytic institutions have pathologised homosexuality until very recently. She touches on Anna Freud's relationship with Dorothy Burlingham, Sigmund Freud's letter to the mother of a homosexual, Magnus Hirschfeld's research into gender and sexuality, Leo Bersani's experiences of conversion therapy in psychoanalysis, and Paul B. Preciado's act of speaking out to French psychoanalysts in 2019. All this, Gherovici explores against the backdrop of Freud's curious nickname for Anna Freud, Anna-Antigone – itself a sign of psycho-analysis' radical reconfiguration of kinship, family, and sexuality that its institutions have resisted.

In ‘Enigmatic Messages from Anna and Dorothy: Theorising my Lesbian Ghost Hunt Through Psychoanalytic History’, Harriet Mossop uses Jean Laplanche’s theory of infantile sexuality and enigmatic transmission to make sense of why Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham’s relationship continues to fascinate her today. In the tradition of auto-theory, she explores the pleasure and pain that drives her to seek out a queer legacy in psychoanalytic history, nonetheless striving to maintain the enigmatic mystery of this potentially queer relationship at its heart. Mobilising Saidiya Hartman’s account of archival gaps and Derrida’s ‘archive fever’, Mossop provides a deeply psychoanalytic account of the many contradictory desires that bring us back to history, to archives, and to psycho-analysis, thus intervening in both queer studies and archive studies. Thickening this theory beyond the immediately personal, she proposes a traumatophilic history for psychoanalysis that could, in turn, support more generative clinical work with queer sexualities and trans identities.

Other Encounters with Psychoanalytic History

This edition includes two interventions in psychoanalytic history that were not part of the Queer Encounters events at the Freud Museum, but nonetheless speak to our ongoing interest in intimate moments from the history of psychoanalysis, especially those centred around the Sigmund Freud family. In their pieces, Daniel Pick and Michael Molnar look a generation back from Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham, investigating domesticity in Sigmund Freud’s life – from pets to arguments about buying furniture. Working with archival material, each shares this edition’s question of how we might respond to the enigmatic gaps and traces in psychoanalytic histories and the tensions they create around fantasy and wild analysis.

In ‘The Curious Case of Freud’s Dog’, Daniel Pick explores a 1928 letter from Sigmund Freud to Eva Rosenfeld. Written after Freud’s dog, Lün Yu, escaped and died while in Rosenfeld’s care, Freud consoles Rosenfeld of her guilt. Yet, as Pick draws out, Freud’s letter

is ambivalent. With a careful awareness of the dangers of wild analysis – and the theories we are drawn to create when faced with enigmatic archives – Pick makes a subtle reading of the jealousies and triangular relationships that frame this episode. Lün was, after all, a gift to Freud from Dorothy Burlingham, Eva Rosenfeld’s friend and rival for Anna Freud’s affections – Rosenfeld being, until Burlingham’s appearance, Anna Freud’s closest companion.

In ‘... written away and worried away ...’, Michael Molnar reviews the fifth and final volume of the *Brautbriefe* (‘Engagement Letters’) of Sigmund and Martha Freud, edited by Gerhard Fichtner, Ilse Grubrich-Simitis and Albrecht Hirschmüller. The letters trace the conflicts and ambivalences of Freud and Martha’s engagement alongside Freud’s time in Paris in 1885 and his crucial encounter with Charcot at the Salpêtrière. Molnar is attentive to Martha’s experience of this period, as she looked on from Germany. Running throughout is a young Freud’s struggle to arrange his life in a way that reconciles love and work – a familiar tension from Anna Freud’s archival letter in the first piece of this edition. But Martha has the last word here, and when Freud’s final letters to Martha before their marriage are missing, the book continues with Martha’s voice alone.

Brief encounters with the gaps in this edition

The contributions of two of the speakers at the Queer Encounters and Freud Museum symposium on 1 February 2025, Noreen Giffney and Hannah Zeavin, are not included in this special issue, although we hope that they will soon be published elsewhere. At the risk of prematurely filling in these gaps – something contributors caution against throughout this edition – we include an extended summary of these important encounters here.

Noreen Giffney contributed a reflective paper, “‘We will never know...’ Reflecting on the Experience of Watching Freud’s Last Session’, generated from her associations during and after watching the film. Her paper’s title was taken from the end titles to the film, which explain that we will never know whether the Oxford academic who visited Freud in the last year of his life was, in

fact,

C. S. Lewis. Giffney pointed to the other uncertainties featured in the film, including the nature of Anna Freud's relationship with Dorothy Burlingham, Freud's ambivalence about this relationship, and the protagonists' beliefs in unknowable aspects of the unconscious (Freud) and of God (Lewis). Giffney began her chain of associations with her sense of sadness on learning, from the last lines of the obituary of Pearl King – an important independent British psycho-analyst and author – that King was in a relationship with Tina Carlile, a Canadian artist, for more than 60 years. This relationship could not be spoken about publicly due to the homophobic discourses present in psychoanalysis during the post-war period. A similar silence hung over an International Psychoanalytical Association podcast with Mark St. Germain, author of the play on which *Freud's Last Session* was based, in which Anna Freud's relationship with Dorothy Burlingham was not mentioned.

Giffney's analysis of the use of religious and mythical statues in the film was particularly striking. In one scene, Freud points out that a church statue, identified by a Catholic priest as representing St Brigid, is in fact St Dymphna. Giffney suggested that there is value in an outsider – in this case, Freud as a Jewish man – pointing out errors made by an insider to the discourse – here, the Catholic priest. Both Irish saints have highly symbolic histories. St Brigid has become a queer icon for the Irish LGBTQIA+ community due to her long and intimate relationship with another nun. But her queer history, like Anna Freud's, is impossible to fully know. St Dymphna, on the other hand, fled to France to escape her over-controlling father, but was eventually beheaded by him. Giffney brought the symbolism of Sigmund Freud's intrusion into his daughter's private life further into focus by identifying the phallic imagery of a snake appearing between two mythical statues representing Anna and Dorothy in a dream sequence. She also discussed the film's sequential presentation of analytic couples: first Anna Freud as the patient on her father's couch, then Sigmund Freud as a patient being cared for by

his daughter and, finally, Anna and Dorothy sitting on the couch, coming out as a lesbian couple. Her associations culminated in the suggestion that the film presents psychoanalysis as an idealized object, something that must be protected at any cost. Anything that is seen as a threat is split off, denied, evacuated outside of the discourse, reappearing through repetition compulsion and rigidity. She noted that the same psychoanalytic discourses that were used, in the past, to pathologize lesbians, gay men and bisexual people are now being used against trans people. When psychoanalysis does not facilitate thinking, it becomes a psychic retreat; psychoanalysts who claim to be able to see into the mind of the trans subject should, she concluded, have more humility.

Hannah Zeavin, who has written about the film's historical inaccuracies (2023), presented historical research from her forthcoming book *All Freud's Children: A Story of Inheritance* in a paper titled 'Anna Freud's Children'. Zeavin argued that Anna Freud figures in the movie not as a person in her own right, but as a cipher caught between her father and her 'wife'. Both she and Dorothy are shown as young women in their twenties; yet they were in their mid-forties, and had shared their personal and professional lives for 14 years, in 1939. Crucially, Dorothy's four children, who were co-parented by Dorothy and Anna in Vienna during that time, are missing entirely from the film. Zeavin suggested that what has been called the first boundary violation of psychoanalysis – Sigmund Freud's analysis of his daughter and subsequent development of key theories about sexuality based on this work – has been transmitted through the analytic generations as a hidden practice, including through Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham's development of key theories of child psychoanalysis through their analytic work with Burlingham's children. Anna Freud's theories about the risks of absent fathers to their children's development, which became very influential in child protection caselaw in the United States, were therefore built out of her experiences with the Burlingham children. Zeavin movingly named the Burlingham children, missing from *Freud's Last Session*

and from much of psychoanalytic history: Bob, Michael, Mabbie and Tinky. She also pointed out that both Anna Freud and Melanie Klein were anxious that their male children or stepchildren might be homosexual, linking her arguments to the symposium's premise of examining these mid-century psycho-analytic anxieties. We look forward to the publication of Zeavin's book, which promises to critically examine the role that children of analysts have played in the development of psychoanalytic theory, and the effects that these experiences had on analysts' children.

As Zeavin said during her talk, the tour and symposium in early 2025 were both reactive and generative responses to the hugely significant representation of Sigmund Freud's daughter as a lesbian in a major Hollywood movie. The idea that Anna Freud might have been a lesbian can now be mobilized in public discourse, addressed through scholarship, and thought about collectively in a public tour and online symposium organised by the Freud Museum, instead of being discussed in whispers behind closed doors. Zeavin suggested that these queer encounters at the Freud Museum could be a work of restoration and political organisation, a movement from 'no' to 'maybe', or from 'no' to 'we don't know'. At a time of rising global fascism, we don't take for granted the ability to have these conversations; as the contributions to this edition show, there is an urgent political need to continue to create space for deliberately, creatively, enigmatically queer encounters at the heart of psychoanalytic institutions.

Acknowledgements

The editors would like to thank Dr Tom DeRose and Dr Perry Hughes at the Freud Museum London for curating these events so sensitively; the audience who attended the tour and symposium; the symposium speakers Patricia Gherovici, Noreen Giffney and Hannah Zeavin; Matt ffytche for proposing that we publish these outputs in *Psychoanalysis and History*, and for his patience and advice during the editorial process; and the edition's peer reviewers for their helpful feedback and

encouragement.

References

- Azoulay, A.A. (2019) *Potential History: Unlearning Imperialism*. London: Brooklyn, NY: Verso Books.
- Dinshaw, C. (1999) *Getting Medieval: Sexualities and Communities, Pre- and Postmodern*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Freud's Last Session (2024) West End Films.
- Giffney, N. & Watson, E. (2017) *Clinical Encounters in Sexuality: Psychoanalytic Practice and Queer Theory*. Earth, *Milky Way: punctum books*.
- Herzog, D. (2019) Psychoanalysis confronts cognitive disability. *Psychoanalysis and History* 21(2):135–46. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3366/pah.2019.0292>.
- Herzog, D. (2020) Queering Freud differently: radical psychoanalysis and ethnography in the 1970s–1980s. *Psychoanalysis and History* 22(1): 1–14. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3366/pah.2020.0322>.
- Meadows, A. (2022) 'To destroy': Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham in the Freud Archive. *History Workshop Journal* 93(1): 209–24. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/hwj/dbab014>.
- Pavón-Cuéllar, D. & Beshara, R.K. (2025) Psychoanalysis and colonialism: introducing a special issue, *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society* [Preprint]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41282-025-00559-4>.
- Sinclair, V., Punzi, E. & Sauer, M. (eds) (2024) *The Queerness of Psychoanalysis: From Freud and Lacan to Laplanche and Beyond*. S.l.: Routledge.
- Zeavin, H. (2023) 'Psychoanalysis has returned': why 2023 brought a new Freud revival. *The Guardian*, 29 December. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2023/dec/29/freuds-last-session-sigmund-freud-film-psychoanalysis> (Accessed: 3 January 2024).

ABSTRACT

This special edition of *Psychoanalysis and History* emerges from two queer encounters that took place at the Freud Museum London in early 2025: a tour focusing on Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham's shared life in the house that became the Freud Museum, and a symposium the next day that considered the representation of their relationship in the film

Freud's Last Session. Against a backdrop of increasing global fascism, the contributions to this edition interrogate the erasure and ambiguity surrounding this historic relationship, situating questions about it within psychoanalysis' complicity with and potential for resistance to normative forces around gender and sexuality. The contributors work with Kleinian, Lacanian, Laplanchean and psychosocial theory through a queer historiographic lens to explore how archival gaps, fantasies, cinematography and dyadic creativity can unsettle ossified narratives about psychoanalytic history and open space for alternative futures. By interrogating the binaries between repression and radicalism, concreteness and ambiguity, insiders and outsiders, the encounters set in motion by the contributions to this edition align with broader efforts to queer psychoanalysis, confront its colonial and normative legacies, and imagine a psychoanalysis that is responsive to contemporary struggles for gender, sexual, racial and disability justice. In doing so, it asks: what might psychoanalysis yet become in times of political regression?

Keywords: psychoanalysis, history of psychoanalysis, Anna Freud, Dorothy Burlingham, queer historiography, Freud Museum