

Thomas Aichhorn, Christian Gaillard, Alain Gibeault, Jörg Rasche

***FREUD AND THE FREUDIANS JUNG AND THE JUNGIANS
DURING THE THIRTIES AND THE NAZI REGIME.***

IPA/IAAP panel at the 45th International IPA Congress in Berlin, 25-28 July 2007 on the theme “*Remembering, repeating and working through in Psychoanalysis and Culture today*”.

Work in progress

This meeting between Freudian and Jungian analysts during an international Congress of the I. P. A. was part of a fairly recent but now well-established series of discussions between the I. P. A. and the I. A. A. P. (the International Association for Analytical Psychology, which at present has 52 national or regional Societies of Jungian analysts, 20 Developing Groups world-wide and a hundred or so Individual Members).

The programme committee of the I. P. A. Congress in New Orleans asked us to organize the first of these meetings, a task we were delighted to accept. That Congress took place in 2004, i.e. just 90 years after the split between Freud and Jung in 1914. Our meeting, like the others that followed on from it, was devoted to one of the main issues common to both groups yet one which continues to prove divisive: our respective theoretical and clinical approaches to the work of symbolization. The Freudian analysts who took part in that meeting were Svi Lothane (American Psychoanalytic Association), Alain Gibeault (Paris Psychoanalytical Society) and Marcio de Freitas Giovanetti (Brazilian Psychoanalytic Society of Sao Paulo); the Jungian analysts were Murray Stein (Chicago Society of Jungian Analysts) and Christian Gaillard (French Society of Analytical Psychology).

In that same year, 2004, we met again for an in-depth discussion of

these issues at a Freud / Jung panel during the I. A. A. P. international Congress in Barcelona. In addition to the two authors of the present note, Gert Sauer (Association of Graduate Analytical Psychologists of the C. G. Jung Institute in Zurich), Jean Kirsch (Society of Jungian Analysts of Southern California in Los Angeles), Marcio de Freitas Giovanetti, and Monique Gibeault (Paris Psychoanalytical Society) took part in that meeting.

We continued to work along these lines the following year, at the 2005 I. P. A. Congress in Rio de Janeiro, on the topic of trauma and symbolization. The Freudian analysts who took part in those discussions were Marcio de Freitas Giovanetti, Sonia Abadi (Argentine Psychoanalytic Association) and Alain Gibeault, while the Jungian analysts were John Beebe (Society of Jungian Analysts of Southern California in Los Angeles) and Christian Gaillard.

This year, 2007, saw our fourth meeting, this time in Berlin where the I. P. A. international Congress took place. On that occasion we did some work on another issue of crucial significance for all of us: the present-day implications of the attitudes of Freudians and Jungians respectively in the 1930s, confronted with the rise of Nazism in Germany and in other European countries. We invited a German Jungian analyst, Jörg Rasche, and an Austrian Freudian analyst, Thomas Aichhorn, to share with us their analyses of the events of that time and the reflections to which they have given rise in those countries and in our international groups. Our idea was to initiate a frank and open discussion which, ideally, would not be distorted by prejudice or projection.

A frank, detailed, and constructive dialogue followed on from the reports of these two analysts. The reader will be able to consult them here, as they were presented in Berlin, and thereby continue the discussion. In our view, it is important to continue thinking deeply about such issues, in particular as to the extent to which our different ways of understanding problem situations can help us to cope with such

devastating events as those that occurred in the 1930s -- and perhaps with any contemporary form of totalitarianism.

The fifth such meeting also took place in 2007, this time during the I. A. A. P. international Congress in Cape Town, South Africa. On that occasion, we discussed another set of issues of interest to both parties: the questions arising from the continuing enigmas posed by prehistoric art. We invited the well-known palaeoanthropologist, David Lewis-Williams, professor at the Rock Art Research Institute of the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, to tell us about his research work and the sometimes animated debates that his ideas have stirred up. Two analysts joined the two of us on that occasion and shared with us their own points of view on the subject: Sally Weintrobe (British Psychoanalytical Society) and Peter Ammann (Swiss Society of Analytical Psychology).

Professor Lewis-Williams's lecture and the four discussion papers written by the Freudian and Jungian analysts will be published in the *Proceedings* of that Congress by Daimon Verlag, Einsiedeln, Switzerland as well as in various Jungian or Freudian journals.

These meetings, discussions and debates, together with others that are scheduled to take place in the future, are thus part of an ongoing project that is both intensive and varied; it is being carried out in a spirit of genuine inquiry that aims to take full account both of what we have in common and of the differences in our respective approaches.

Christian Gaillard Alain Gibeault