

Joerg Rasche
(IAAP, German Association for Analytical psychology)

TRYING TO UNDERSTAND AND EXCUSING IS NOT THE SAME.

Dear colleagues,

I feel honoured to have the chance to speak to you about the history of C. G. Jung and the Jungians in the thirties. It is an honour, and at the same time it means a painful re-encounter with the worst period of the history of my country, of my parents, of my profession. And it is an encounter with you from the IPA who as I suppose don't know so much about Jungian Analysis in general and are very critical about Jung's known or supposed behaviour in the Nazi time and during the incredible outburst of barbarianism. Some of you may be in Berlin for the first time after the war or after the end of the totalitarian eastern system. Some of you may belong to the second or third generation after the holocaust. In many psychoanalytic trainings the memory of persecution, of emigration, of loss, of disappointment are still alive even after generations, passed on from one generation to the other. We know that the collective trauma of a war needs generations to become somehow integrated, and that the trauma of the Holocaust never can be healed. I understand that some Jewish colleagues just want to be accepted and honoured in their grief and mourning. Some don't want to share their mourning with us.

We German Jungians are trying to understand what happened, to be as attentive and aware as possible in what is going on in us and in the unconscious complexes of our society, and to prevent any repetition. And we want to express our remorse and compassion.

Speaking to you as a **German** and a **Jungian Analyst** means speaking about my professional identity in the light and in the shadow of Jungian history in Germany. I want to make two preliminary remarks before I come to what happened in the 19thirties . They are about Analytical Psychology, and about a kind of continuity.

1. Analytical Psychology of today is something different than it was in 1930. In the post-Jungian practise in Germany the interpersonal dimensions of transference and counter transference, the emotional working through of conflicts are certainly more central today, and various Freudian and Neo-Kleinian or developmental concepts have been incorporated and are regarded as important for us as well. Nevertheless the Jungian dream – work, the imaginative and creative techniques, the concepts of the Archetype, of healing symbols and of the Self, the theory of cultural complexes and the Individuation Process are still the common basics of the different Jungian schools of today. A special attentiveness is directed towards what is going on in the collective unconscious. We know, also thanks to the poor example of Jung himself, something about the difficulties in this field.

For up-to-date (post)Jungian movement the work to be done in analysis of the past is essential, especially because Jung himself apparently barely did such work and self critic as regards himself after the war.

The awareness of unconscious tendencies was a special concern of my training analyst Dr. Dieckmann. As a young doctor he had been a soldier in the war, and later on he said that he joined the army as a Nazi. He was very naive. When he came happily back at the end of the war 1945 and saw the first photographs of the Concentration Camps he said: This I didn't know. A comrade answered and said: Of course you knew about this, but you didn't want to know. Dieckmann learned something about mechanisms of defence and resistance and underwent an analytical training. He was always concerned that he could not be aware enough of unconscious tendencies in himself and in the society. In the 70ies he was among the first to explore the suppressed tendencies of the ecological crisis. He went on to become the founder of Berlin C. G. Jung Institute and re-established of the German Association for Analytical Psychology DGAP in 1961. Then, he became the first German president of IAAP, elected in Jerusalem in 1983.

2. Unconscious continuity: My father was a medical doctor who had to go into the army. I woke up politically in the Berlin student movement in the years following 1967 / 68. In this movement we asked our parents what they really had done in the war, and how it was to live during the dictatorship. This had been an absolute taboo in Germany after 1945. A mixture of shame after the defeat, of denying, contesting, of emotional- and even cognitive splitting off had led to a cloudy web of ignorance and a general feeling of unreality. This was my experience during childhood and school. Under this web a paranoid dissociation was lurking in the unconscious cultural complexes of the German society of the 50ies and 60ies – in democratic western Germany as well as in the totalitarian East. The Vietnam War and the breakout of 1968 brought with it a new dynamic. We began facing ourselves with the historical and emotional reality of our own country. Then in the western outpost of West Berlin – surrounded by the eastern barbed wire and watchtowers, after the murder by the police of a student demonstrator -- some of the paranoid atmosphere reminiscent of the time before 1945 came up and there were re-enactments from both sides. But this was also the beginning of a new democratic awareness.

I tell you this because the history and meaning of Jungian analysis in Germany can't be understood without reflecting on the lore of tradition with passed-on taboos and crypts of silence, and then of the shame, pain and a subsequent strong commitment to democracy. Jung himself is part of the story.

I want to talk about **Jung and the Jungians in the 19thirties**. The middle 19twenties had initially been a ver short time of recovery and stability in the Weimar Republic with its foreign minister, Stresemann, and of cultural modernity. But there was no stabile basis for democracy. The Hitler party, NSDAP, took political power in 1933, after a period of terror, supported by industry. Open war began in 1939. For us to read some of Jung's utterances in the intervening years is shocking, disgusting and scandalising –and for me as a German shaming, even if Jung was not a German but a Swiss with a different mentality and in a totally different social and political situation.

But worse: As a Swiss citizen he had the chance to make different statements against the Nazis from the beginning.

At the start of the thirties Jung was well known in Europe and America as a Psychotherapist and Psychoanalyst who had left behind the restrictions of Freud's theories. He also was something of a projection carrier for anti-Semitic attitudes and anti-psychoanalytic resentments since the split between him and Freud. Jung himself showed a life long disappointment and reservation towards Freud. He was nearly twenty years younger than Freud and in 1933 when the Nazis took over the political power in Germany he was 58 years old. The following events happened in his late fifties and sixties.

On the other side Jung was part of the cultural recovery of the twenties – after the catastrophe of the first World War. Jung's main personal interest – also in those years – was in symbols of healing and integration, a holistic view of the psyche with the potential of a balanced totality. He later called this the “mysterium coniunctionis”. I think that Jung's great popularity in the 20ies and 30ies, and again after the war – along with the disappointments – had to do with projections onto him that he knew something about the meaning of the times and about a possible healing of the splitting and chaos in society and individuals. He was regarded as a sage. Maybe he became (as we call it) inflated by all these projections. At times he spoke to special questions out of his prejudices and personal prepossessions, not following his analytical experience. He was a big man with a big shadow. Jung in some aspects and moments was not at the level of his own Psychology.

The year **1930** began with the founding of the Eranos meetings in Ascona, and with Jung's election as Honorary President of the Allgemeine Deutsche Ärztliche Gesellschaft für Psychotherapie GGMAP which was an association of many different psychotherapeutic streams. In December **1931** in Berlin Jung's followers founded the Berlin C. G. Jung Association – it was the predecessor of today's German Association for Analytical Psychology DGAP. In **1932** Jung met W. Pauli, the quantum physicist and later Nobel prize winner, which led to a collaboration about the principle of synchronicity.

Then came **1933**. In January the Hitler party took over the political power after an election and immediately started a campaign of murdering oppositional politicians, artists, banning Jewish culture, burning books and arranging mesmerizing mass events.

In June of the same year Jung gave a seminar in Berlin (a general overview about his Analytical Psychology). Prof. Heinrich Zimmer, an Indologist, gave a lecture on “Psychology of the Yoga”. One day before the seminar Jung gave an Interview on the Radio, his interviewer was Adolf Weizsäcker, a Jungian and later member of the NSDAP. Jung spoke among other issues about “the youthfulness” of the German “Volk” (people, nation), but also about the dangers of mass-suggestion and of “hypnotized followers (scharenweise hypnotisierte Mitläufer)”. He spoke also about the “Führer”, the leader principle. One quotation: (I don't want to offend you, but I have to read it -)

“As Hitler recently said the leader must be able to stay alone and must have the courage to walk ahead. But if he doesn't know himself, how will he lead the others? Therefore the true leader is he, who has the courage to be himself (Mut zu sich selbst) and not only to others, but who may before all see into his own eye (der vor allem sich selber ins Auge blicken darf).”

This utterings by the famous Swiss Professor Jung in the radio, shortly after the Machtübernahme and the burning of the books, are at least strange. But it becomes worse. Maybe he wanted to

express something about the dangers of mass suggestion and magic rituals, and maybe he wanted to give a message to Hitler, who certainly heard the interview, about self awareness (to see into ones' own eyes). If this was Jung's idea it was incredibly naive. The interviewer v. Weizsäcker seems to have felt this to be a politically incorrect criticism aimed at Hitler, and he changed the direction of the interview immediately. He asked Jung now about his favourite subject: the difference between his own and Freudian and Adlerian Psychologies. Jung slipped into the trap without awareness or resentment. But this was not naive! It follows a shocking and disgusting passage about the contrast between a hidden Germanic creativity and Freud's and Adler's reductionism onto sexuality or power complex.

I think that this official statement in the Radio was the beginning of Jung's career as a "Präsentierariet" (the German - Aryan shield) of the psychotherapeutic movement in Nazi Germany. It was obviously easy to use him for this function. The system needed psychotherapists, but following Hitler's anti - Semitic mania everything Jewish was to be forbidden and eradicated.

August - The same year, **1933**: The first Eranos meeting took place in Ascona Switzerland. The theme was "Yoga and Meditation in East and West". Jung followed his introverted interests giving a presentation about Mandala painting by his patients, "Symbols of the Individuation Process". Jung. The drawing of personal Mandala's became a favourite psychotherapeutic technique among Jungians in those years. Such drawings can have a strong structuring and balancing effect on the psyche.

- Later on in the same year **1933** the president of the "GGMAP" Prof. Kretschmar quit his position, and in September the Swiss citizen and former Honorary President, Jung was chosen by the chair as his successor. Jung being a foreigner became the president of the now "International General Medical Association for Psychotherapy IGMAP". Jung said, that he was asked to help the Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis in Germany to survive. He quoted Freud: The future of Psychotherapy will be decided in Germany.

The presidency of the German member society was assumed by Dr. Mathias Göring, a member of the NSDAP and a distant cousin of the Reichsmarschall Herman Göring. The German group became step by step a so called co-coordinate (gleichgeschaltet) organisation.

In the foreword of the first volume of the Zentralblatt Jung published the following sentences (in my translation):

"The real existent differences between the Germanic and Jewish psychology shall be blurred no more, and this shall be profitable for the scientific approach (- the usual English translation is not correct, J. R.). In psychology there is, more than in other sciences (Wissenschaften), a "personal equation" which if not observed is followed by falsification of the results in practice and theory. But, as I want to emphasize, this does not mean any depreciation of Semitic psychology, as well as it does not mean any depreciation of Chinese mentality if one talks about the specific psychology of the far-east."

At the end of the short text Jung emphasizes the importance of the entirety (totality) of the psyche which contains more than only pathological or only personal residuals.

Dr. Göring wrote in the same international volume of the Yearbook that every German psychotherapist should have read Hitler's book "Mein Kampf". Jung was upset and said that he felt abused by Göring. Nevertheless we must say that the Foreword was in the same direction as the radio interview in June, or worse: To compare a so called "Semitic" psychology with a so

called “Chinese” psychology means, too, to kick it out of the common European context. We may remember what Hannah Ahrendt said –after the Holocaust- that to classifying people in categories is the first step to selecting.

The next year, **1934**: In January Jung publishes an article in the Yearbook of IGMAP, “On the present situation of Psychotherapy” which provokes protest even among Jung’s friends and closest followers James Kirsch and Erich Neumann. Neumann, still in Switzerland, writes to him: “Believe me as a Jew, I love (liebe durchaus) the Germanic germinative faculty (das Germanisch Keimhafte), as far as I can see it, but the equation ‘National Socialism = (equals) Arian Germanic’ is fatal, wrong and I can’t understand how you came to it and whether you must come to it. Maybe your misjudgement is a result of the general ignorance of Jewish things and the medieval horror of them which leads to knowing everything about India 2000 years before and nothing about the Chassidism 200 years ago.”

In the meantime the Nazi - regime took over every aspect of political and cultural life in Germany. Freudian and Adlerian Psychoanalytical terms and thinking were (officially) no longer accepted in the Berlin Institute which was transformed into a “German Institute for psychological studies and Psychotherapy”. A “Deutsche Seelenheilkunde” shall replace the different psychoanalytical and psychotherapeutic approaches. Jewish analysts as well as Jewish doctors lost their permission to practise in Germany. Some of them left Germany at the last moment. Among the Jungian refugees were James Kirsch, Erich and Julie Neumann and Ernest Bernhard, Heinz Westmann, Gerhard Adler and his wife and Max Zeller.

Indeed, at the congress of the IGMAP in May 1934 in Bad Nauheim Jung made clear that Jewish colleagues who lost their membership in the German member association could become members of international IGMAP to save their professional and social status (the so called Rosenbaum statutes, because the formulations were made by Jung’s Jewish lawyer Wladimir Rosenbaum). This would be what Jung in the future will always mention to demonstrate his non – Anti Semitism. But in the same time period he wrote letters with a strange ironic and anti-Semitic quality to some of his German followers. In one letter to Kranefeldt Jung asks: “How does it come that German doctors always fall in love with the Jewish anima?” (We may remember Sabina Spielrein)

In Zurich Jung was accused openly by Gustav Bally, a Swiss psychoanalyst, of sympathising with the Nazi regime. Jung explained and defended himself thus: I am not an enemy of the Jewish people, but I don’t agree with Freud. “If Freud would have been more tolerant of other’s ideas I would still stand at his side” (letter to Cohen, 26. March 1934). Jung writes that he wants to give up his presidency of IGMAP as soon as possible.

In August **1934** at the IPA conference in Luzern Ernest Jones said, that it would be easy to stage an indignant protest against the treatment of the Jewish colleagues in Germany, but “this would surely be useless and maybe detrimental”. The question behind this seems to be the problem of the political positioning of analysts and their associations in general and of appeasement /or political resistance. This was, as far as I see, the problem of IPA, too. The few analysts in active illegal resistance were regarded as dangerous for their patients and for the survival of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy in Germany. (as Edith Jacobson, Rittmeister)

Before going on I want to make the following statement:

It is clear for all of us that C. G. Jung made a number of big and inexcusable mistakes. He obviously tried to help psychotherapy in Nazi Germany to survive by taking over the chair and changing it into an international organization – to provide an institutional framework for Jewish colleagues. At the minimum he acted with a sense of appeasement – not to do anything that could be understood by Hitler as a provocation. But Jung used the same language. He spoke about differences in the psychic background of (so called) Jewish and (so called) Germanic people in the time when the Nazis began their racist program of genocide. Jung was obviously impressed (I would not say fascinated), at least in the early thirties, by what he understood as the open constellation of a creative archetypal pattern out of the very difficult psychological, social and political situation in Germany. The twenties in Germany had been a very confusing time, after the lost war and the horrifying experiences there; the disappointment after the treaty of Versailles; the loss of orientation after the resignation of the emperor; the economic crisis with millions of non employed people, and the general atmosphere of confusion, mistrust and paranoia. Nevertheless Jung, of course, wasn't a Nazi. He always emphasised the importance of the individual, the individuation process, the importance of consciousness. So he was not at all in favour of masses and warned always about the possible dangers of hypnotized mass movements (the "scharenweise hypnotisierte Mitläufer"). The unconscious in his conception contains helpful as well as dangerous and destructive aspects. Therefore the conscious ego and his moral and ethical position are essential. This means Individuation. But the core of ethical behaviour – for Jungians- is not only the intellect, but also the conscious acknowledgement, if not integration, of ones own shadow. The basic items of Analytical Psychology are radically incompatible with any totalitarianism.

From the beginning on Jung's knowing of the people and of Analytical Psychology should have led him to other conclusions – should have led him to radically resisting the Nazis.

In his publications of 1933 and 1934 however Jung shows himself as somebody who is at least not aware of what really was happening under the Nazi regime. Maybe he really wanted to save Psychotherapy in Nazi Germany, but maybe he also wanted to bring his own Psychology into the first line. If this last was the case then his opportunistic positioning was really problematic. If this was the case it was the worst thing he could do, even if he was not consciously aware of how much he supported the Nazi regime by his public statements.

In the following years another aspect of Jung's personality came more into the foreground: He **avoided confronting himself** with the suffering of the victims of the Nazi – regime. He seems to have avoided any empathic feeling and began to style himself as an independent diagnostician. I think, too, that he fell more and more into the suction of Swiss appeasement policy. The fate of the victims of the racist persecution in Germany was a generally taboo subject in Switzerland. The Swiss borders where closed to refugees. Many of them were sent back to Germany.

- **1935**: Jung is called professor at the ETH (Swiss Federal Institute). He is now 60 years old. He gives lectures in England with great success. In Zurich he is engaged in Seminars like the Zarathustra – Seminar (the quest for meaning, the good and the bad aspects of the god – image, the basic problem of the German culture as personified in Goethe's Faust and Nietzsche). It seems a bit as if he stands outside of the political reality around.

The general assembly of IPA in December 1935 suggests the Jewish members of the German Psychoanalytical Society DPG to quit their membership to save the organisation. Following the example given by Jung in Bad Nauheim, individual membership in the International Association should be possible.

- **1936:** In March Jung publishes “Wotan”, a sketch about an archetypal wind - god image whose reappearance could be seen in the actual German uprising and confusion. It is a sarcastic text, full of resentment. It is neither something supporting the dictatorship nor something against it. It is written in the style of a “grotesque”, a text about how myths may emerge. Shortly afterwards Jung is invited to the USA and receives an honorary doctorate degree from Harvard University. This was really something. He meets Mary Mellon, who some years later together with Mary Bancroft will arrange Jung’s contact with Allan W. Dulles, the European leader of OSS, the later head of the CIA. From 1942 on Jung will be in cooperation with the OSS. He will be regarded as the one who understands Hitler and the Germans best. Dullas later on said: “Nobody will ever know how much Jung did for the Allies during the war.”

In summer 1936 Franco starts the Spanish civil war by a revolt. Fascist Germany supported him immediately. The Swiss government under its foreign minister Giuseppe Motta (1920 – 1940) was openly in favour of Franco and the Nazis. Soon in August 1936 the Swiss Bundesrat made laws against any support for democratic Spain. Following this there was a strict censorship in Switzerland against anything which could be understood as critical or provocative about Hitler. I suppose that this was not without influence on Jung. The main political anxiety in Switzerland was the fear of the brutal communist system of Stalin. The fascistic regimes in Germany, Italy and Spain were regarded as a protection against Stalin. One can take into account, also, that all the other western and democratic countries followed an official policy of appeasement until 1938/39. They all joined the Olympic Games 1936 in Berlin, one of Hitler’s greatest mass events.

- **1937:** Jung goes to Berlin to speak about Archetypes. He sees Hitler and Mussolini standing on a tribune at a mass ritual. He utters: “The archetypes are walking on the streets here”. Then again he is in the USA giving lectures at Yale University. Later on he travels to India for some weeks (together with Fowler McCormick). Jung there speaks about Alchemy, he visits the sacred sites of Sanchi and studies the problem of good and evil in Christianity and Buddhism. Along the way Jung gets the honorary doctorate degrees of the Universities of Allahabad and Benares.

- **1938:** October, shortly before the anti-Semitic pogrom of the so called “Kristallnacht”: Jung gave an Interview to the USA journalist H. R. Knickerbocker. “Diagnosing the Dictators” Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin. The journalist asked: What manner of men are these masters of millions who are changing the map of Europe today – Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin?

Jung said: “In Germany everything goes by revelation.” Hitler always follows his “Voice” which is the “Voice” of the German inferiority complex. He represents in himself the collective unconscious of the Germans. Jung compares Hitler (in the original English version of the interview) with some patients who hear voices, too. “Hitler is his Voice”. The German inferiority complex is the complex of the younger brother, who always comes too late to the feast. This cultural complex was, as Jung said, activated by the defeat in the war and the following

depreciation / devaluation of the German psyche as well as its currency. Jung emphasises the magical practises of Hitler and his party as the hypnotic mass rituals. Hitler became inflated by the collective projections and acted as leader and “medicine man” in the collective nightmare. But Jung doesn’t mention the terror nor the suffering of its victims.

The Knickerbocker interview is again a provocation. The most scandalising for me is Jung’s attitude of an independent diagnostician. Jung doesn’t mention the terror, the real criminal policy of this regime; he never does mention the victims or the opponents. It seems that his diagnosis, his interpretation is an expression of defence or resistance. Jung was a younger brother in psychoanalysis himself. His emphasising the German inferiority complex describes something really important, but he also seems to project some own personal inferiority complex onto the Germans.

To bring Jung’s diagnosis of Hitler to the point: Hitler was inflated by the projections of the people. He acted as a “seer” without moral or ethical boundaries. In our terms we would conclude: Hitler was mentally ill, he was a psychotic and a criminal. So the interview was immediately understood. As a reaction to the interview Jung in 1939 came onto a black list by the Nazis. His books were no longer allowed to be sold in the occupied France or in Germany.

Asked how the Allied could stop Hitler Jung said: “Let him go east, to Russia (...) Our interest in it is simply that it will save the West.” Jung than mentioned the appeasement policy of the western states. “No nation keeps its words”. He also said: “America must keep big armed forces to help keep the world at peace, or to decide the war if it comes. You are the last resort of Western democracy.”

- Not knowing what to do

The final sentences of the Knickerbocker interview are significant. Knickerbocker writes: “The telephone rang. In the stillness of the study and a windless day outside, I could hear a patient cry that a hurricane in his bedroom was about to sweep him off his feet. ‘Lie down on the floor and you will be safe’, advised the doctor. It is the same advice the sage physician now gives to Europe and America, as the high wind of Dictatorship rages at the foundations of Democracy.” This was 1938. Jung had no idea what to do.

In the same year 1938, the year of the racist pogrom “Kristallnacht”, Switzerland stopped granting working permits to foreigners. Therefore many refugees from Germany had to leave Switzerland for other countries. Among them was Michel Fordham who went back to London. After the pogrom Erich Neumann sent an urgent request to Jung to make an open statement to help the Jewish people in Germany. Jung wrote to Erich Neumann in Tel Aviv: I am very busy arranging permissions and passage for all my Jewish friends to go to England or America. - The annexation of Austria by the Reich brings Freud and his family in immediate danger. It is said that Jung sent the son of Riklin to Vienna with money but Freud “didn’t want to accept help of his enemies”. He left Vienna for London in June.

- 1939: The war begins. Hitler and Stalin sign their Non–Aggression–Treaty. After the occupation of Poland 1939 and of France 1940 Hitler was at the height of his career and popularity. The war against Russia began 1941.

In 1939 Freud finished his “Moses and Monotheism”. In Switzerland Jung was informed one day that his own name was on a black list of the Nazis, and that the German army would attack Switzerland very soon. The Swiss felt they were being encircled by hostile armies from all sides. Jung sent his family up to the mountains. - Freud died in London September 23. 1939.

Trying to understand does not signify excusing.

Jung obviously had a very complex personality. To make a conclusion:

1. When he took over the presidency of the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy in 1933 – perhaps he wanted to do the best for psychoanalysis as well, – or he may have had the idea to bring his own Analytical Psychology forward as the premier theory. If the latter is true, this then was opportunistic and constituted a form of support for the Nazi regime.
2. His anti - Semitic utterances are always in the context of his criticisms of Freud’s personality and the Freudian psychoanalysis. He was not an anti-Semite in general, but he did show anti-Jewish attitudes even towards his own patients (like Rosenbaum, maybe this began much earlier with Sabina Spielrein – “Why do German doctors always fall in love with the Jewish anima?”)
3. What Jung said in the Knickerbocker interview about Hitler’s magic appeal and the German inferiority complex makes some sense. Seen from Switzerland, the emergence of the Nazi regime out of the German depression was something astonishing. But maybe Jung was projecting his own inferiority complex onto the Germans. The Nazis easily could misuse him as a prominent foreign “Aryan” psychologist in their propaganda.
4. Maybe Jung’s strong transference onto Freud became a “personal equation” for him. Early in the Nazi – regime he was the “Präsentierarier” (the German - Aryan shield) of the psychotherapeutic movement as he has been the German - Christian shield for the psychoanalytic movement earlier.

I would now like to add some aspects of the discussions among German Jungians:

We spoke about Jung’s personal complexes and about his conflicts with Freud and Abraham. (- it became a triangle). We spoke about his strong personal need for healing symbols and for the feeling of wholeness in the totality of the psyche. We spoke also about Jung’s later cooperation with the US-Intelligence service and the Allies.

Another issue was the question of Ethics.

Erich Neumann, the Jewish student and friend of Jung, in his exile in Palestine wrote a book “**The New Ethic**” as a critic and moral for Jung, saying that everyone is also responsible for what he does unconsciously. Jung then helped Neumann to publish this book in 1949. He seems to have understood the message and wrote his own book “**Answer to Job**” (1952), to emphasize that everybody is responsible even for his or her image of God.

It is not easy to talk about all this – and certainly not easy for you to hear all this.

Obviously Jung in 1933 was not able to see (as nearly no one else was in those years) what would come. In "After the Catastrophe" (1945/46) he wrote about Hitler's psychosis as a "pseudologia phantastica", and about his own shadow as well as about the collective's. "In Hitler every German should have had to see his own shadow, his own worst danger" (BBC interview November 3, 1946). Jung was not a German himself, and his statement is also emphasizing distance. He speaks also about the collective guilt of the Swiss, but his formula of the "collective guilt" seems to be an avoidance of seeing and acknowledging personal guilt.

Gershom Scholem reports another impression from Leo Baeck (the chief Rabbi of Berlin before the war), who had survived the concentration camp Theresienstadt at the age of 70 years. Jung visited him after the end of the war, and after a long discussion Jung confessed: Yes, I slipped (Ich bin ausgerutscht). Baeck accepted Jung's confession of personal guilt and even went in 1947 as a lecturer to Jung's Eranos Conference. Gershom Scholem, who was an Eranos lecturer from 1949 - 1966 wrote later on in a letter to Aniela Jaffe that he didn't want to enlarge nor to reduce the image of Jung. He said that with great men one easily falls into blind admiration as well as into exaggerating the reality of their existing faults.

- Answer to Job

Jung's major text about his darkest years is "Answer to Job" (1952). Jung then was 77 years old. He wrote about the shadow side of the God Archetype itself. Jung tried to understand the consequences of the Christian god image in which the dark side is suppressed and excluded. This book became essential reading for students of Analytical Psychology in the following decades. "The Book of Job represents (as E. Edinger wrote 1986) an individual ego's decisive encounter with the Self, the Greater Personality. The ego is wounded by this encounter which provokes a descent into the unconscious, a nekyia. Because Job perseveres in questioning the meaning of the experience his endurance is rewarded by a divine revelation. The ego, by holding fast to its integrity, is granted a realization of the Self."

It can be read as a critique on Jung's behaviour in the early thirties as when Edinger writes: "We might ask what does Jung mean by Job's "moral behaviour"? I think he refers to Job's refusal to accept responsibility for events that he knows he did not cause. Job's intellectual honesty, his loyalty to his own perception of reality, his integrity in maintaining the distinction between subject and object, between man and God – all these go to make up Job's moral behaviours, which has forced God to reveal himself."

This then is really a big task: To maintain the distinction between subject and object.

In trying to understand Jung progress will not be made without trying to understand what happened with the Germans and with Hitler. It is very hard to talk about this with the ever-present shadow of what happened to all the Jewish and other people murdered by the Nazis and the German soldiers.

These are some reflections about a core of darkness. I hope they will not be misunderstood as a kind of excuse for Jung. Trying to understand is not excusing. But even "understanding Jung" is not easy, especially in times as horrible as the Nazi time, the cultural darkness in the thirties, the German psychosis, and the beginning Holocaust.

- Jungian and Freudian Analysis

I want to offer a last personal remark:

When I see photos from the war and from Concentration Camps my capacity for emotional reaction is often blocked by the incredible cruelty of what happened. I realize this is an experience linked to individual and collective trauma. In addition, the German language of the time was contaminated by the Nazi jargon. I know the impulse to look aside and to avoid the encounter. This maybe very similar to what Dr. Dieckmann experienced in the war. **During the dictatorship it was about how to survive. One way then is the splitting off and freezing of emotional reactions. Today we are trying to integrate what happened, and to revitalise the feelings and emotions.** We are happy to live today and to have this opportunity and task.

To cope with a trauma, as we know today, positive visualisations and images are important. Emotional recovery will often be a late step in the work. Classical Analytical Psychology was very close to images, but had difficulties in working through emotions. This was due in part to Jung's personal equation, but it has special values. Jungian Psychoanalysis today, especially if understood as an intersubjective exchange, is warmer and closer to the personal and relational emotions. This links it to some contemporary psychoanalytic approaches. Jungian Analysis has needed to become especially aware of ethical questions. Ethical behaviour doesn't naturally come out of archetypal images or an unconscious which contains good and bad. Jung's own history can teach us to attend to the importance of a well functioning, conscious ego complex. If you don't simply condemn Jung, but try to understand what his Psychology was to mean for him and in his time – as a compensation for personal breakdown and the breakdown of European political, social and emotional orders, of paranoid confusion and schizoid totalitarian regimes – and what it could mean for us today, then Analytical Psychology can be a useful and necessary member of the dynamic psychologies as well as in relation to Freudian psychoanalysis. Analytical Psychology has a lot to offer.

Psychotherapy is always a response to the problems of its time. The Jungian dream work, the imaginative techniques, the theory of cultural complexes, the concept of the Individuation process as basic elements of Analytical Psychology can help us cope with basic problems of our patients and of our selves today. It is not only about survival, but also about emotionally integration and ethical behaviour.

My wish is that one day we will stop comparing the faults of Freud and Jung and keeping their conflicts alive. Then both of their concepts, as has been developed up to the present, in their different approaches and views, may help us to offer to our patients what they really need: **to survive in a-disoriented world, to integrate the emotions and to live as related and responsible individuals.**

This paper is made for the panel at the IPA congress, July 25, 2007 in Berlin: Freud and the Freudians / Jung and the Jungians in the Thirties and during the Nazi time.

Co-Chairs: Alain Gibeault (Paris Psychoanalytical Society, IPA); Christian Gaillard (French Association for Analytical Psychology, President of IAAP).

Keynote speakers: Thomas Aichhorn (Viennese Psychoanalytical Society, IPA); Joerg Rasche (German Society for Analytical Psychology, IAAP)

I want to thank Tom Kirsch and Joe Cambray for their help. Tom sent me some papers and documents, also about the letters between his father James Kirsch and C. G. Jung. Joe was very helpful to brush my thoughts and my English. I also want to thank Hildemarie Streich, Berlin, for her memories of the dark years and her encouragement, and Ludger Hermanns and Regine Lockot for their support.

I wrote this in memory of Arvid Erlenmeyer.

Literature:

I can't list here all the texts I've read about Jung's political statements and their inner and outer context. Most of them are in German language. The following is a selection:

- Bair, Deirdre: C. G. Jung. Eine Biographie. Knaus, München 2003 (engl.: Jung. A Biography. Little, Brown and Company, New York 2003)

- Dreifuss, Gustav : Opferer und Opfer. Analytische Psychologie 16/1/1985

- Erlenmeyer, Arvid u. von der Tann, Matthias (Hg) : C. G. Jung und der Nationalsozialismus, Texte und Daten. Im Auftrag der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Analytische Psychologie zusammengestellt und eingeleitet. Berlin 1991

- Erlenmeyer, Arvid: Jung und die Deutschen. Analytische Psychologie 1992;23: 132-161

- Gaillard, Christian (ed.): Jung et l'histoire, les années 30. Cahiers Jungiens de Psychoanalyse Nr.82, Paris 1995

- Gaillard, Christian : L'altérité au présent. In : Crise et histoire, Cahier Jungiens de Psychanalyse Nr.96, Paris 1999

- Jaffé, Aniela : C. G. Jung und der Nationalsozialismus. Analytische Psychologie 16/1/1985

- Kirsch, James: Jungs sogenannter Antisemitismus. Analytische Psychologie 16/1/1985

- Kirsch, Thomas B.: Cultural Complexes in the History of Jung, Freud and their Followers. In: Kimbles, Samuel, and Singer, Thomas (ed.): The Cultural Complex. Contemporary Jungian Perspectives on Psyche and Society. Brunner-Routledge, New York 2004

- Lockot, Regine: Erinnern und Durcharbeiten. Zur Geschichte der Psychoanalyse und Psychotherapie im Nationalsozialismus, Fischer, Frankfurt/Main 1985

- Neumann, Micha: Die Beziehung zwischen C. G. Jung und Erich Neumann auf Grund ihrer Korrespondenz. In: Zur Utopie einer neuen Ethik. Kongressband Österreichische Gesellschaft für Analytische Psychologie, Wien 2005 (2006)

- Roazen, Paul: The Exclusion of Erich Fromm from the IPA. Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 37(1):5-42, 2001

- Wilke, H.-J.: NS-Vergangenheit, ein Aktualkonflikt. Analytische Psychologie 16/1/1985

