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Years ago, I remember coming across Jung’s comment that every generation should exceed the one that came before it as it is privileged to sit on the shoulders of the previous generation. It is my fondest hope that this edition will indeed serve that function as well in its examination of Jung and the shadow of anti-Semitism.

Aryeh Maidenbaum, Ph.D.

**Introduction**

*by Dr. Stephen A. Martin*

In the more than 10 years since the original publication of *Lingering Shadows* there has been no lessening of the pertinence and persistence of the complicated question of anti-Semitism in relationship to C. G. Jung, the man, and Jung, the psychologist. In fact, in a world far more multi-cultural and conscious of and sensitive to issues of racial and psychological, political, and national differences, clarifying Jung’s position and freeing his psychology of the unconscious to be a creative force in the individuation of our world seems essential. By revisiting this difficult issue in a far more mature and expanded fashion with new information, new research, and new and varied voices raises the debate far above cults of personality and illuminates a darkness we Jungians call “shadow” so that this new volume becomes a tool for greater consciousness and dialogue.

To this end, I am proud to have my introduction included in it.

There has been an obvious collective shift in the debate about Jung and anti-Semitism over the last 20 years. On more than one occasion while I was doing my doctoral work in a major Eastern medical school in the 1970s, upon learning that I was a “Jungian,” professors and students alike confronted me with a smug question that was really an accusation: “Wasn’t Jung a Nazi?” Now, in 2002, I no longer hear such accusations. Instead, Jung and his psychology have entered the mainstream to the point where books by Jungian authors hug the tops of best seller lists, and he is being cited more and more in a range of literature from every academic, clinical, and popular avenue. In some respects, I myself feel smug in having trusted the inherent value of Jungian psychology and expected its versatility and relevance to grow, and with this growth a lessening of interest in slanderous accusation by both the informed
they revealed the perils of fascination among intellectual luminaries who, more than anyone, must maintain a critical, rational, and ethical distance from destructive enthusiasms, recognizing the crucial difference between saying “This is amazing” and saying “This is wrong.”
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Jung, Anti-Semitism and the Weimar Years (1918-1933)

Jay Sherry received a master’s degree in psychology from the New School for Social Research, studied at the Jung Institute in Zurich and is actively interested in the interdisciplinary field of psychohistory. His research and expertise on the issue of Jung and Anti-Semitism led to his unique contributions to Lingering Shadows: Jungians, Freudians and Anti-Semitism. He is currently finishing a book about Jung’s Swiss-German background and his relationship to the European avant-garde.

C. G. Jung’s attitudes toward Jews and National Socialism have been the subject of debate since the 1930s. Much of it has focused on what he said and did in the aftermath of Hitler’s assumption of the German chancellorship on January 30, 1933. In June he assumed the presidency of the General Medical Society for Psychotherapy, an organization that brought together most non-psychoanalytic therapists in Germany, as well as members from other European countries. In the December 1933 issue of the Society’s journal, he made his most controversial remark when he said that it was important to openly discuss the differences that actually existed between Germanic and Jewish psychology (see “Significant Words and Events” in Appendix A). He developed what he meant by this in more detail in “The State of Psychotherapy Today,” his contribution to the January 1934 issue of the journal. This article ignited the controversy that still reverberates today. Jung never quite understood what all the fuss was about. Responding to his first major critic, Jung wrote in...
differentiated Alexandrian.” The only change was the substitution of the newly popular word “Nordic” for the more general “Germanic.”

In April, 1927, the School of Wisdom held its most important conference. The theme was “Man and Earth” and attracted a group of speakers that included Jung, Wilhelm, Frobenius, the psychologist Hans Prinzhorn, and the philosopher Max Scheler. Appreciation for the landscape had been one of the chief characteristics of German Romantic painting. (Besides being one of Jung’s acknowledged forerunners in psychology, Carl Gustav Carus [1789–1869] was also a talented landscape painter who authored an important series of essays on the subject.) In the late 19th century, interest in landscape shifted with the growth of German nationalism and the efforts of writers to define the relationship of the German people to their land. This became the domain of volkisch writers who glorified the pagan virtues of their barbarian ancestors at the expense of the Judaic-Christian heritage of European civilization. One core metaphor in this way of thinking was “rootedness,” the degree to which a people were psychically connected to their native land. Another current of interest in “the earth” stemmed from the mass of information collected by anthropologists in the newly acquired colonies of the European powers. Any definition of Man now needed to include what had been learned about the beliefs and social institutions of “primitives.”

Jung had read widely in all this literature and was, in addition, deeply influenced by the Taoist literature that he had been introduced to by Richard Wilhelm. This encounter did not just stimulate Jung intellectually, but had a profound personal effect on him after he began to consult the I Ching in the early 1920s. In later years, this would lead to major new theoretical formulations like his concept of synchronicity. At the time of the conference Jung was taken up with the relationship of the ideograms “Yin” and “Yang” to his archetypes of anima and shadow. Yin relates to the dark, feminine powers of the earth and something of this sensibility is conveyed in the title of Jung’s lecture “Der Erdbedingtheit der Psyche” (literally translated, “The Earth-Conditioning of the Psyche”). The original appeared in the 1927 issue of Der Leuchter and later as “Mind and Earth” in Contributions to Analytical Psychology (1928). It was then divided into two articles, “The Structure of the Unconscious” (CW 8) and “Mind and Earth” (CW 10).

The earth/spirit dyad was one of the defining themes in Jung’s relationship with Keyserling. Jung’s reservations about the Count’s spiritual pretensions led him to accentuate his interest in the “archaic” dimension of the psyche as manifested in his field trips to Africa and America (the “primitive” of the present) and his fascination with course of events in Germany (the “primitive” of the past reactivated). This all connects Jung to a group of intellectuals taken up with the role of the “telluric” or “chthonic” forces in human history. This had its immediate roots in the writings of Jacob Bachofen (1815–1887), a native of Basel like Jung, whose research into early Roman history led him to postulate the existence of a period of matriarchy prior to the rise of patriarchy in human history. This sparked the interest of such diverse individuals as Friedrich Engels and Ludwig Klages, the graphologist and anti-Semitic renegade from the Circle around Stefan George, Germany’s most important poet of the early 20th century.

Bachofen’s theories gained wider exposure in the mid-1920s with the new edition of his 1859 book on grave symbols brought out by Klages and C. A. Bernoulli, one of his students, another Basel native who had written a book about Nietzsche. Jung was certainly familiar with Bachofen’s works but did not rely upon them for confirmation of his theories. His influence on Jungian psychology is most evident in Toni Wolff’s work The Structural Forms of the Feminine Psyche which discussed the formative influence of such figures as the Amazon and the Hetaira, both of whom can be found in Bachofen.

Most of Jung’s long paper is an exposition of his theory of the collective unconscious and relies on his familiar mix of cultural and clinical examples (the solar phallus man makes a cameo appearance). At the point where the published article was subsequently divided, Jung described the archetypes as “essentially the chthonic portion of the mind—if we may use this expression—that portion through which the mind is linked to nature, or in which, at least, its relatedness to the earth and the universe seems most comprehensible. In these primordial images the effect of the earth and its laws upon the mind is clearest to us.” He then goes on to develop his thoughts on “night religion,” participation mystique, and the anima.

Jung concludes by relating the theme of the earth-conditioning of the psyche to the wider world. He focuses on his findings from analytical work with Americans and his personal experiences in the United States. He summed up his highly original insights by saying that “the American presents a rare picture—a European with Negro manners and an Indian soul!” Among the mannerisms that he identifies are the distinctly American styles of laughing, talking, and walking. The role of the Indian is less obvious but equally significant and functions as a hero-ideal which is manifested in the American passion for competitive sports.


1989–1992. The operative sentences of that letter state: “There is no question that today we regret the events in the Club of that time. In other respects we sincerely hope—and unfortunately it is only a hope—that all discrimination against anybody, especially anti-Semitism, is a matter of the past.”

For Transgressions Against God, the Day of Atonement Atones; But for Transgressions of One Human Being Against Another, The Day of Atonement Does Not Aton until They Have Made Peace with One Another...

—The Mishnah

On January 10, 1994, I responded to the Analytical Psychology Club of Zurich as follows:

Jerome S. Bernstein, M.A.P.C., NCPsyA.
January 10, 1994

Dear Members of the Executive Committee, The Study Group, and Club Members:

I wish to thank you for your personal correspondence to me dated 12 July 1993 regarding the historical issues of the Jewish quota in the Club during the 1930s through 1950. I particularly found details of the Report of the Study Group of interest since it contained some information of which I was not aware.

My apologies for not responding sooner. I have waited until now to respond to your July communication to me because I wanted to let it sit and digest—I wanted to be clear about how I felt—before responding.

I appreciate the sentiment expressed in the last paragraph of the Memorandum dated July 12, 1993 and signed by the Executive Committee of the Club. It feels sincere and genuinely concerned with healing wounds resulting from that period in the Club’s history. As a result, I consider the charge of following up on some act of atonement on the part of the Club as having been met and that I have no further formal role in this matter.

It is satisfying to know that colleagues in the Club faced an unpleasant shadow issue with integrity. I was personally touched by the symbolism of having received what appears to be an original copy of the Memorandum of the Executive Committee signed in ink by all members. I take that symbolic statement as a recognition of the nature of my initial contacts with the Club and therein feel some personal healing with you.

I send you best wishes for the New Year and look forward to meeting some of you at the next International in Zurich.

Sincerely,
Jerome S. Bernstein, M.A.P.C., NCPsyA.
Chairman, Workshop on Jung and Anti-Semitism
XIth Congress of the IAAP
cc: John Beebe
Thomas B. Kirsch, M.D., President, IAAP

More Lingering Shadows: Shadows Closer to Home

Unfortunately, there are still lingering shadows concerning the politics surrounding the issue of Jung’s alleged anti-Semitism—specifically, the role of the Jungian collective in clarifying and bringing information to light and/or in suppressing relevant information. Providing light where there has been none may be of some help.

In the fall of 1993, I received an inquiry from the Association of Graduate Analytical Psychologists of Zurich (AGAP) regarding further developments that had transpired since the XIIth Congress in Chicago in August 1992. (AGAP is a professional association of Jungian analysts who are graduates of the C. G. Jung Institute of Zurich. It is separate from the Analytical Psychology Club of Zurich, whose membership consists of lay individuals as well as graduate analysts.) In a response dated December 6, 1993, to an inquiry from AGAP, I observed:

The experience in pursuing this matter was an extraordinary one for me. What I found so astounding (in retrospect I shouldn’t have) was the inability of not only the club’s president, but a number of other colleagues, in particular the then-president of the IAAP, to have a feeling relationship to the issue nor to be able to perceive that the actions taken by the Club during the period in question had relevance today, had caused injury, then and now, to colleagues, non-Jewish as well as Jewish. There seemed to be no recognition or concern that there were “lingering shadows” over this issue which raised fundamental ethical questions not only about the Club, but about Dr. Jung and about the ethical integrity of the larger Jungian community as well as our profession. There seemed to be no awareness or concern for how this issue would sit in the history of the analytical psychology move-
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