Contents

HEINRICH ZIMMER: ON THE PSYCHOLOGY OF YOGA

THE BERLIN SEMINAR OF C. G. JUNG

Introduction

G.V.R. SORGE

1. Special Features of the Seminar

When Jung opened the Berlin Seminar in June 1933, one month before his fifty-eighth birthday, he had probably not expected an audience of over one hundred and fifty. His fame by then was considerable, however, and the number of honors went on growing, not only in his own country—in 1932 the city of Zurich had awarded him its Literature Prize—but also abroad, particularly in Germany, Great Britain, the United States, and India, which a few years later would award him with three honorary degrees. The *annus horribilis* which saw, in January, the Nazi rise to power, was a crucial one in Jung's own life. In particular, a few days before arriving in the German capital with his wife Emma and some of his students,[1] he had officially assumed the presidency of the Allgemeine Ärztliche Gesellschaft für Psychotherapie, or General Medical Society for Psychotherapy, a burden whose professional and political implications he was still far from foreseeing. Nineteen thirty-three was marked by his intense activity as a lecturer abroad—and travels. In March he went with his friend Hans Eduard Fierz on a cruise ship to the eastern Mediterranean, visiting Italy, Malta, Turkey, Palestine, Egypt, Greece, and Rhodes.[2] In August, he lectured at the first Eranos conference in Ascona, Canton Ticino—the legendary cross-cultural project regarded by its founder, the Dutch artist and spiritualist Olga Fröbe-Kapteyn (1881–1962), as an "army of constructive forces [. . .] against the destructive ones which seem

[1] See Barbara Hannah, *Jung: His Life and Work: A Biographical Memoir* (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1976), 209ff.

[2] See Andreas Jung, "Carl Jung and Hans Fierz in Palestine and Egypt: Journey from March 13th to April 6th, 1933"; Thomas Fischer, "1933: The Year of Jung's Journey to Palestine/Israel and Several Beginnings," in Erel Shalit and Murray Stein, eds, *Turbulent Times, Creative Minds: Erich Neumann and C. G. Jung in Relationship (1933–1960)* (Asheville, NC: Chiron, 2016), 131–34 and 135–49.

to be ruling the world."[3] So from its very beginning Jung joined, with his fourteen lectures up to summer 1951, an international community of scholars and researchers unified by the wish to create a dialogue both among different disciplines and between East and West—a dialogue that matched profoundly Jung's deepest epistemological concerns—and that also informs the structure of the present seminar. Then in the winter semester of 1933 Jung began a successful cycle of lectures at the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology) in Zurich, which continued through 1941 and was dedicated to discussing his comparative psychology through a variety of topics including ecclesiastical history, Gnosticism, alchemy, comparative symbolism, and Eastern spirituality.[4] In so doing, he was resuming teaching after twenty years: he had resigned his academic post as a lecturer in the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Zurich in 1914, after his split with Freud, his concomitant distancing from psychoanalysis, and his descent into a pioneering "confrontation with the unconscious" which would give birth to the *Liber Novus* (*The Red Book*).[5]

The year of the Berlin Seminar should be linked back to 1928, when Jung's own mythopoetic experiment reached a turning point thanks to the sinologist and missionary Richard Wilhelm's transmission to him of his translation of *The Secret of the Golden Flower*, a Taoist meditation manual on inner alchemy which to the two of them would publish jointly the following year.[6] As explained in the 1959 epilogue to *Liber Novus*, it was

[3] William McGuire, *Bollingen: An Adventure in Collecting the Past* (Bollingen Series CVIII) (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982), 24. On Eranos, in addition to McGuire's book, see particularly: Hans Thomas Hakl, *Eranos: An Alternative Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century*, trans. by Christopher McIntosh with the collaboration of Hereward Tilton (Bristol, CT: Equinox, 2013); Riccardo Bernardini, *Jung a Eranos: Il progetto della psicologia complessa* (Milan: Franco Angeli, 2011).

[4] C. G. Jung, *The History of Modern Psychology: Lectures Delivered at ETH Zurich, Volume 1: 1933–1934*, ed. and trans. by Ernst Falzeder (Philemon Series) (Princeton, NJ: 2019).

[5] C. G. Jung, *The Red Book (Liber Novus)*, ed. by Sonu Shamdasani, trans. by Mark Kyburz, John Peck, and Sonu Shamdasani (New York: W. W. Norton, 2009). See also its actual basis, C. G. Jung, *The Black Books, 1913–1932*, trans. by Martin Liebscher, John Peck, and Sonu Shamdasani, 7 vols (Philemon Series) (New York: W. W. Norton, 2020); and C. G. Jung and Aniela Jaffé, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, recorded and edited by Aniela Jaffé, trans. by Richard and Clara Winston, revised edn (New York: Vintage, 1989 [1963]; henceforth *MDR*), ch. 6; Henri F. Ellenberger, *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry* (New York: Basic Books, 1970), 447–48, 672–73, 889–91.

[6] C. G. Jung and Richard Wilhelm, *The Secret of the Golden Flower: A Chinese Book of Life* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul [1929], 1931 [2nd edn 1962]), *CW* 13.

this treatise that thirty years earlier had eventually lead him to turn to the study of alchemy, in order to confirm his intuitions about the existence of a universal, symbolic psychic structure witnessing a fundamental development process toward unity within the human soul. According to Sonu Shamdasani, "for nigh on forty-five years, in ways that are only now beginning to come clear, he tried to envisage a transformation of psychotherapy and a science of complex psychology that in critical respects were tributaries to his work on the parallel opus of *Liber Novus*."[7] So, after his "confrontation with the unconscious," Jung commenced a "confrontation with the world,"[8] through growing commitments to sharing his thoughts, lecturing, and publication. In 1928 the seminal *The Relations between the I and the Unconscious* was published, a "little book" meant to summon "twenty-eight years of psychological and psychiatric experience," which Jung would later regard as closely tied to his "Commentary on the *Secret of the Golden Flower*" (1929).[9] Equally, in 1928 Jung attended for the first time the (third) Psychotherapy Congress in Baden-Baden; and last but not least, in the fall of that year he started, at the Zurich Psychological Club, a Dream Analysis Seminar (published as *Dream Analysis: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1928–30* [1984], henceforth referred to as *Dream Analysis*; in notes, *DAS*) which lasted through spring 1930, devoted to amplifications and explorations around a long oneiric series of a patient—more precisely, an analysand—of his: the one who also features in the Berlin seminar.

This leads us to indicate the two special features of the Berlin Seminar: first, that it focuses on five dreams which Jung had dealt with in the Dream Analysis Seminar;[10] and second, that it is introduced by the

[7] Sonu Shamdasani, "After *Liber Novus*," *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 57 (2012): 364–77 at 365.

[8] Sonu Shamdasani, "Introduction: *Liber Novus* or '*The Red Book*' of C. G. Jung," in C. G. Jung, *The Red Book (Liber Novus)*, ed. by Sonu Shamdasani, trans. by Mark Kyburz, John Peck, and Sonu Shamdasani (New York: Norton, 2009), 218.

[9] As briefly but conspicuously noted in his 1935 preface to the second edition: "The reader will find a development of the last chapter in my commentary to the *Secret of the Golden Flower*" ("Preface to the Second Edition" [of *The Relations between the I and the Unconscious*], *CW* 7, 123–25 at 124). Jung states a continuity between the two publications: more precisely, between the "last chapter" of the 1928 book—notably dedicated to the "mana personality," and including a discussion on the Self only in its very last pages—and his "commentary" to the Taoist manual, where the Self instead rises to crucial prominence. See also below [ZL], n. 304.

[10] That seminar's final session on June 25, 1930 preceded the beginning of the Berlin Seminar by three years and one day. The above-mentioned five dreams were treated in twelve sessions (from November 7, 1928 to February 28, 1929).

Sanskritist Heinrich Zimmer's lecture "On the Psychology of Yoga." Hence one may wonder,

1. Why take up again the initial dreams from a series already analyzed in a former seminar?
2. Why decide to inaugurate the Berlin Seminar with Zimmer's lecture without supplying any systematic commentary on it?

With regard to the first question, Jung declares that the dreams considered aim at showing "what the path that leads to inner self-development looks like at its inception."[11] In fact the oneiric imagery, once activated by the therapeutic relationship, seems to anticipate the development of a psychic process in an entelechial manner (incidentally, this might be considered consistent with Jung's conviction of the prospective tendency of children's dreams with respect to the unfolding of their subsequent life, a perspective manifestly indebted to the recapitulation theory according to which ontogeny, or the development of an organism, recapitulates phylogeny, or its evolutionary story).[12] Indeed in Berlin, Jung chose to focus on a handful of significant dreams well suited to illustration of the transpersonal aspects of the challenging, labyrinthine journey through the individuation process. Hence the seminar topic allowed him to reconsider a specific oneiric segment in light of his new explorations—including his encounter with Zimmer's work—and give us the chance to take stock of the ongoing development of Jung's hermeneutics, and involvement with Oriental thought.

As for the link between a seminar on dreams and a lecture on the psychology of yoga, Jung likewise gives us an indication at the outset, when he invites the audience to bear in mind the "highest perfections"[13] in Zimmer's description of millennial Hindu efforts to relink the *individuum* to the divine. In contrast to the Eastern perspective outlined by his Sanskritist friend, he expressly adopts an earthier—more chthonic—approach, considering Western psychology still to be occupied with the "beginnings":[14] a perspective that was already familiar, for instance, to the participants in the seminar on the psychology of the Kundalini yoga held together with

[11] See below [MT], 129.

[12] See C. G. Jung, *Children's Dreams: Notes from the Seminar Given in 1936–1940 by C. G. Jung*, ed. by Lorenz Jung and Maria Meyer-Grass, trans. by Ernst Falzeder with Tony Woolfson (Philemon Series) (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008), 1; cf. Sonu Shamdasani, *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology: The Dream of a Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 157–58 and 300.

[13] Below [MT], 128.

[14] Ibid.

Jakob Wilhelm Hauer the previous winter.[15] So Jung sets up his argument in integrative counterpoint to Zimmer's exposition, pointing to the "inexperienced" youth of medical psychology (however impressive its epistemology), which had barely worked itself free of its bonds to philosophy and theology—having only begun, we might say, to penetrate the Baudelarian "symbolic forest" of the realms of the unconscious.[16] And the *via regia* to access it, no differently than for Freud, was the exploration of dreams.

This double specificity (a unicum with respect to Jung's other seminars) which inserts, so to speak, an old *fabula* in a new structure, has been taken into account in the layout of the present edition. Compared with the seminar on the psychology of Kundalini yoga, in which Jung provided a thorough commentary on the exposition of Jakob Hauer, Zimmer's overture to the Berlin seminar relates to it by way of a lighter, more suggestive connotation. His lecture, already notable for a good deal of psychological sensitivity, draws on the *Yoga-sutra*s, the *Bhagavadgita*, and Tantric texts, thus providing an inspiring background scenario for the Jung's subsequent analysis.

On the top of that, Zimmer's contribution is germane to Jung's epistemological understanding of, as he termed it in the 1930s, a "complex psychology," hence making of this seminar a significant step in the development of a metapsychology grounded upon a comparative, interdisciplinary, cross-cultural base. By expanding its clinical and epistemological tenets, Jung was looking to de-provincialize Western psychotherapy, by means of a dialogic approach toward a variety of disciplines (from among both the natural and the human sciences), worldviews, and different cultural traditions—as Eastern spirituality was at that time considered. In this dialogue with the widest range of differing declensions of "otherness," he

[15] See C. G. Jung, *The Psychology of Kundalini Yoga: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1932*, ed. by Sonu Shamdasani (Bollingen Series XCIX) (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996): e.g., 65–67, and Hauer's English lecture, October 8, 1932, in ibid., Appendix 3, 108–10.

[16] One can even think of the unusual relation between micro- and macrocosms underpinning a text such as the *Brihad-Aranyaka-Upanishad* (5.5.3–4), one of the earliest Upanishads about the Atman, in which the realms of "Earth," "Mid-heaven," and "Heaven" (*bhuh*, *bhuvas*, *svah*) referred to in the hymnody of the Gayatri Mantra (see below [ZL], nn. 324 and 325) are correlated respectively with the head, the arms, and the feet of the person. It has been noted that "[t]his hints at an archaic teaching about the human being springing from Heaven (involution) rather than from an earthly womb (evolution). The work of Yoga consists in finding our feet, or roots, in Heaven" (Georg Feuerstein, *The Deeper Dimension of Yoga: Theory and Practice* [Boston, MA: Shambala, 2003], 301). Cf. "The Philosophical Tree" [(1945) 1954], *CW* 13, esp. chs 11, 12, and 19.

nonetheless did not seek a generalizing syncretism, but rather maintained a rootedness within the historical (and psychohistorical) tenets of the West. Such was, with all its strengths and weakenesses, lights and shadows, Jung's specific, differentiated approach to "the East."

With this seminar in the German capital Jung was furthermore giving a signal to the country he considered crucial to the development of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. In this he found himself in line with Freud, who in 1920 had chosen to found the first Psychoanalytic Institute, which would serve as model for the subsequent training institutes (also those for Jungians), not in his native Vienna, but in Berlin. Germany indeed was the land which a few years before had seen the founding of the first official association intended to represent all the various strands of psychotherapy. It was also, however, the land which was about to give birth to an unparalleled totalitarian regime.

2. Germany, 1933: A Bird's-Eye View

The year 1933 falls in the midst of a period of dramatic sociopolitical turmoil. Among the consequences of the Great Depression that stemmed from the financial crash of 1929, ending the so-called Roaring Twenties, was an exacerbation of the nationalistic, militaristic, and authoritarian tendencies which, in the wake of Italian fascism, were emerging across a swathe of European countries. Between the two world wars, in Hungary, Poland, the Baltic republics, Yugoslavia, Greece, Albania, Spain, Romania, and Portugal, liberal and democratic regimes were supplanted by authoritarian ones. To these should be added, of course, the case of communist revolutionary Russia, which fascist systems aimed to counteract. On January 30, 1933 Adolf Hitler, riding the wave of the resentment that had hamstrung the fragile Weimar republic (fueled by a sense of injustice at the Versailles treaty and concomitant discredit for the "Allied conspiracy"), took power in Germany. After his advent as chancellor, propaganda blaming the communists for the Reichstag fire on February 27 and a vote giving him full powers on March 23 provided the context to foster an increasing dehumanization of all "racial" and political opponents. The insertion of the "Aryan paragraph" in the Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service enacted that April finalized the expulsion of "non-Aryan" citizens, especially Jews, as well as political enemies such as social democrats and communists, from any positions of public and state authority. Subsequent laws, among which was one against the reconstitution of political parties, enacted on July 14, completed the Nazi Party's

totalitarian conquest of power: by then the regime corresponded to the state. Its campaign of race propaganda, intensified by the promulgation of the Nuremberg Laws on September 15, 1935, would eventually culminate in the extermination camps. In addition to the extermination of approximately six million Jews, around five million non-Jewish civilians were murdered, among them Roma, Poles, Jehovah's Witnesses, homosexuals, other supposed "anti-socials," and a host of intellectuals and other opponents of various kinds.

The scale of the enormity that was to be perpetrated, first in Germany itself and subsequently across its occupied territories, goes beyond human understanding and imagination. The Holocaust would become an unprecedented emblem of evil, and a watershed in the history of Western civilization. "To write poetry after Auschwitz," Theodor Adorno declared in his *Negative Dialectics* (1966), "is barbaric"; while the very notion of theodicy was challenged by intellectuals and survivors such as Primo Levi—see his *The Drowned and the Saved* (1986)—or philosophers such as Hans Jonas, who in *The Concept of God after Auschwitz* (1984) affirmed that the Holocaust had irremediably challenged the omnipotence of God.[17]

In 1933, of the approximately sixty-seven million inhabitants of the German Reich (including the Saar region still under the administration of the League of Nations), the Jewish communities constituted less than 1 percent (mostly settled in urban centers, primarily in Berlin, where they comprised at most 160,000 people). Such relatively small numbers did not prevent the Nazis from regarding them as the ideal scapegoats for all that was considered to afflict the *Herrenrasse*, or "master race."[18] All evils were subsumed, as Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke aptly observes, into the notion of

> a monstrous Jewish plot to destroy Germany. Only the total destruction of the Jews could thus save the Germans and enable them to

[17] For an analysis of the scholarly discussion around the (controversial) unicity of the Nazi phenomenon, see Ian Kershaw, *The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems and Perspectives of Interpretation* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015 [1985]), esp. chs 1, 2, and 5. Hannah Arendt's classic *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (London: Penguin, 2017 [1951]) also retains considerable value in regard.

[18] For more on this, see George L. Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich*, with a critical introduction by Steven E. Aschheim (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2021 [1964]), esp. ch. 7. "Antisemitism could conveniently encompass the charges of racial adulteration, economic sabotage, and absolute enmity to the German *Volk*. It could also, just as conveniently, picture the Jews as the incarnation of the inferior race, as capitalism, or as Bolshevism" (288).

> enter the promised land. The chiliastic promise of a Third Reich echoed medieval Joachite prophecy and remained a potent metaphor in the fantasy-world of so many in Germany who bemoaned the lost war, the harsh terms of the peace settlement, and the misery and chaos of the early Weimar Republic.[19]

The "German revolution" was imbued with cleverly channeled salvific expectations. Philosophy graduate Joseph Goebbels in his capacity as minister of propaganda substantially contributed to the creation of the myth of the Führer as a new "Aryan" messiah by means of a demonically orchestrated propaganda machine and impressive mass demonstrations, exploiting the mass media and new technologies—and finding an ideal aid in the radio, which he termed "the eighth power."

Moreover, in the general context of the eugenics movements that had been flourishing in most of western Europe and the United States, as well as in the Soviet Union, a peak was reached in Nazi "racial hygiene" (*Rassenhygiene*) policies, resulting in the infamous euthanasia program Aktion T4, involving the deliberate, planned suppression of so-called "unworthwhile lives": a label applied not only to those afflicted by congenital "feeblemindedness," but also sufferers from "illnesses" that included mental defects and antisocial behavior. The allegedly scientific body of thought behind this—foreshadowed, by way of example, in the influential tract by psychiatrists Karl Binding and Alfred Hoche, *Permission for the Destruction of Life Unworthy of Life* (1920)—envisaged the need to "enhance" the process of natural selection and to separate the "unfit," or *Minderwertigen* (literally, "less valuable") from the rest of society, for the *Gesundheit* (health) of the latter: an "ethical" task, indeed, in line with Nazi biological populism and the motto "Gemeinnutz geht vor Eigennutz" (approximately "the common good before self-interest") which, sadly, frequently met with sympathy and support from a broad range of intellectuals, philosophers, literati, and even clerics, convinced that the authoritarian regimes could serve as a bulwark against the socialist or communist threat.[20]

Such socio-cultural upheaval, magisterially interpreted by Nietzsche, dated back at least to the previous century, and was intensified by the

---

[19] Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, *The Occult Roots of Nazism* (London: Tauris Parke, 2005), 203.

[20] See Léon Poliakov, *The Aryan Myth: A History of Racist and Nationalist Ideas in Europe*, trans. by Edmund Howard (London: Chatto & Heinemann for Sussex University Press, 1974), 290–304; Michael Burleigh, *The Third Reich: A New History* (London: Macmillan 2000), 166–67 and passim.

Great War. Along with widespread cultural pessimism in terms of the failure of the myth of the progress, and antimodernist critique of the West as famously explicated in Oswald Spengler's successful (though barely readable) *Decline of the West* (1918) and Hermann Graf Keyserling's equally successful *Travel Diary of a Philosopher* (1919), which conterpoused declining Europe to the ancient, supreme wisdom of China and India, the notion of decadence came to be invoked not only within an intellectual, literary, and artistic elite, but also amongst "ordinary people" frustrated by the implosion of meaning, the *Entzauberung* (disenchantment) explored by Max Weber, and feelings of a *Fragmentierung* (fragmentation) and *Zerrissenheit* (approximately, being "torn" or "disjointed"): sick components, that is, of the nexus of forces generally ascribed to "modernization." There was, as J. J. Clarke puts it,

> a fascination with ideas of degeneration and decadence, and a willingness to explore new seas of thought. The very speed of progress, the rapid transformation from traditional to modern social and economic formations, the growth of science-inspired materialist philosophies, and the ever-slackening hold of ancient religious beliefs and rituals, all of these combined to create a mood of discontent with the comforts and promises of western civilization, and to encourage a search for more satisfying and meaningful alternatives.[21]

The crisis which was spreading through interwar Europe catalyzed expectations for a renewal of the West, considered to be suffering from a progressive, fatalistic "decay of values," to which a broad array of "diseases of civilization" (a notion enhanced by a social-Darwinistic scientific patina that gained wide currency outside medical circles) bore witness: the products of an urban lifestyle that came to be counterposed to the natural, rural, primeval life.[22] Meanwhile, the trend of extending medical (especially psychiatric and later also psychoanalytic) categories to the "diagnosis" of the condition of society as a whole developed to a hitherto unmatched extent. In this cultural humus various forms of palingenetic myth were nurtured by authoritarian political movements seeking, and presenting themselves as, a third way between capitalism and

[21] J. J. Clarke, *Oriental Enlightenment: The Encounter between Oriental and Western Thought* (London: Routledge, 1997), 96.

[22] See Volker Roelcke, *Krankheit und Kulturkritik: Psychiatrische Gesellschaftsdeutungen im bürgerlichen Zeitalter (1790–1914)* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1999).

communism—and often displaying, in the wake of Italian fascism, a totalitarian tendency with religious or para-religious significance.[23]

Roger Griffin in his seminal *The Nature of Fascism* observes,

> Whether we approach the question from the point of view of comparative religion, the history of ideas, sociology, political science or psychoanalysis, there is no shortage of theories which can be adduced to suggest that the convinced fascist is to be seen as someone whose flight from inner chaos has found expression in a powerful elective affinity with an intensely mythic ideology of national regeneration. This ideology, though objectively representing just one partial system of values among so many others he (and even on occasion she) experiences affectively as an absolute vehicle of personal salvation. By promising to redeem the nation from the quagmire "demo-liberalism," fascism offers its converts the prospect of a renewed sense of meaning, of transcendence, of ritual time, of imminent rebirth in a world otherwise threatened with inexorable decadence, a decadence which, however real the objective factors of social disfunction at the time, at bottom was no more than their inner world of anxiety and chaos projected on to contemporary history.[24]

Influential intellectuals and proponents of social Darwinism such as—to cite just two names from two centuries—French aristocrat and anthropologist Arthur de Gobineau, author of the (in)famous *Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races* (1853–1855) and German zoologist and philosopher Ernst Haeckel, popularizer of the recapitulation theory but also the founder in 1906 of the (racially oriented) Monist League—had propagated the conviction that different human beings represent different

[23] Nazi ideologist Alfred Rosenberg proclaimed in his *Myth of the Twentieth Century*, "Today a new faith is awakening: the myth of blood, the faith that the divine essence of mankind is to be defended through blood; the faith embodied by the fullest realization that Nordic blood represents the mystery which has supplanted and surmounted the old sacraments" (Alfred Rosenberg, *Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts: Eine Wertung der seelisch-geistigen Geszaltenkämpfe unserer Zeit* [Munich: Hoheneichen, 1930], cited by Richard Steigmann-Gall, "Nazism and the Revival of Political Religion Theory," in Constantin Iordachi, ed., *Comparative Fascist Studies: New Perspectives* [London: Routledge, 2010], 297–315 at 305). See on this subject Karla Poewe, *New Religions and the Nazis* (New York: Routledge, 2006). It might be recalled here that in 1945, the year of his death, Ernst Cassirer argued, "It's probable that the most important and unnerving aspect of modern political thought is the apparition of a new power: the power of mythical thinking" (Ernst Cassirer, *The Myth of the State* [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, (1946) 1966], 3).

[24] Roger Griffin, *The Nature of Fascism* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 199.

levels of evolution, thus paving the way for the idea of the supremacy of the "Nordic-Aryan" race. Nazism responded to pessimistic views of degeneracy and the inevitability of racial contamination by investing the chosen *Volk* with a vision and a fated task.[25] The *völkisch* ideology channeled gloomy social-darwinistic conceptions toward the bright lure of a mission imbued by the mystical longing for the salvation of a *Gemeinschaft*, or community, emphasizing the virtues of a (rural) "rootedness" as the regenerative natural state of creative (German) man, in contrast to the materialistic, individualistic worldview and "uprootedness" that characterized the Jew.

The "Jewish doctrine" of psychoanalysis, regarded as the wellspring of a materialistic and individualistic mentality, with the aggravating factor of its alleged Bolshevik tendencies, became one of the favorite targets of Nazi anti-Semitism, branded with the stereotype of the *wurzellose jüdische Seele*, or "rootless Jewish soul," and relentlessly attacked as antithetical to the *deutscher Geist* or "German spirit" especially because of its "pansexuality." As each scientific organization was eventually forced into "Aryanization" or "self-Aryanization" (the so-called *Gleichschaltung* or *Selbstgleichschaltung*, as Regine Lockot thoroughly explains),[26] which imposed conformity at least upon its board, in November 1933 the three Jewish board members of the German Psychoanalytic Society—Max Eitingon, Ernst Simmel, and Otto Fenichel—were replaced by the "Aryan" psychoanalysts Felix Boehm and Carl Müller-Braunschweig. This decision, approved by Freud himself, was needed to prevent the dissolution of the Society and to allow the practice of psychoanalysis to survive.[27] In 1935 the non-Jewish members were invited to "voluntarily" resign. The Society was eventually suppressed in 1938 (when Freud, after the German annexation of Austria, fled to London, where he was to spend his last year of life). Perhaps more emblematic of the development of psychoanalysis in

[25] See Mosse, *Crisis of German Ideology*, cit.: "Idealized and transcendent, the *Volk* symbolized the desired unity beyond contemporary reality. It was lifted out of the actual conditions in Europe onto a level where both individuality and the larger unity of belonging were given scope. The *Volk* provided a more tangible vessel for the life force that flowed from the cosmos; it furnished a more satisfying unity to which man could relate functionally while being in tune with the universe. *Völkisch* thought made the *Volk* the intermediary between man and the 'higher reality'" (17; see also passim).

[26] Regine Lockot, *Erinnern und Durcharbeiten: Zur Geschichte der Psychoanalyse und Psychotherapie im Nationalsozialismus* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2002 [1985]), ch. 5.

[27] Karen Brecht, Friedrich Volker, Ludger H. Hermanns, Isidor J.Kaminer, and Dierk H. Juelich, eds, *"Hier geht das Leben auf eine sehr merkwürdige Weise weiter . . .": Zur Geschichte der Psychoanalyse in Deutschland* (Giessen: Psychosozial-Verlag, 2009 [exh. cat. 1985]), 94–95. See also Lockot, *Erinnern und Durcharbeiten*, cit., 110ff.

Nazi Germany is what happened to the Berliner Psychoanalytisches Institut, founded in 1920 by Karl Abraham and Max Eitingon; in 1936 it was closed and incorporated in the newly founded Institut für psychologische Forschung und Psychotherapie, the so-called "Göring Institute": an institution run by Matthias Heinrich Göring, a neuropathologist with Adlerian training and a cousin of the notorious Feldmarschall, who became overnight the ideal man to ensure for psychotherapy a significant degree of independence and security whilst remaining in accordance the regime's directives. This institution, along with the protection of the Society for Psychotherapy, was to some extent instrumental in a continuation of the teaching and practice of the discipline (including, notwithstanding all the difficulties and dangers, psychoanalysis), in line with Nazis' refusal to "apply a racial-biological standard to Aryans who exhibited lesser, and more common, neurotic conflict," for such "mental disorder within the master race could not be genetic or essentially organic," as assumed by psychiatric paradigms, but should be correctable.[28]

3. "Where danger is . . .": The (Obscure) Background of the Seminar

A few days before the seminar, Jung wrote to the student of Jewish origin to whom he was closest, the Hungarian-Swiss Jolande Jacobi,

> I shall be traveling to Berlin next week, to conduct a week-long seminar on the interpretation of dreams. After feeling the full pressure of the political suspense during the winter, this will allow me to take in the new German atmosphere. I ask myself, more and more often, what else is going to be distilled from Europe's smoldering cauldron. In Germany, we are currently experiencing an eruption of the *puer aeternus* that is truly unforeseeable. The new regime's foreign policy antics would be pretty amusing if they weren't fueled by quite so much dangerous enthusiasm. Sometimes it almost feels as if preparations were underway for a new Blood Wedding [*Bluthochzeit*].[29]

[28] Geoffrey Cocks, *Psychotherapy in the Third Reich*, 2nd revised and expanded edn (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1997 [1985]), 12–13. On the Göring Institute and its leader, see respectively ch. 6 and 110–21; Lockot, *Erinnern und Durcharbeiten*, cit., 79–87 and ch. 6.1. See also Geoffrey Cocks, "Repressing, Remembering, Working Through. German Psychiatry, Psychotherapy, Psychoanalysis, and the 'Missed Resistance' in the Third Reich," *The Journal of Modern History* 64 (1992) (Supplement: "Resistance against the Third Reich"): 204–16.

[29] Jung to Jacobi, June 19, 1933, JA (Hs 1056:2142).

Despite his worries, hinted at by a thoughtful nod toward the Saint Bartholomew's Day massacre,[30] Jung's gaze at the situation sounded somehow remote—almost *per speculum alchemiae*, one might venture to say, considering his references to the cauldron and distillation—and featured a sense of expectation toward a vital "eruption of the *puer aeternus*" in contrast to the political stalemate of the hobbled Weimar Republic.[31] In a series of lectures held in February 1933 in Köln and Essen, the Swiss psychologist had diagnosed the current age as "a time of dissociation and sickness,"[32] and compared it to the twilight phase of the Roman Empire. Although the contemporary condition of collective suffering and turmoil was affecting every social, political, religious, and philosophical aspect of life, he was sensing—or hoping for—a rejuvenating potential in the crisis, for "the sickness of dissociation in our world is at the same time a process of recovery, or rather, the climax of a period of pregnancy which heralds the throes of birth."[33] He went on to recall that when "les extrêmes se touchent," that is, when a given tendency climaxes, its opposite germinates, in accordance with the law of the Tao.

Jung's (meta)psychological conception envisaged the faculty of the destructive forces of unconscious, constellated in times of crisis, of being able to reverse into something new. After all, he maintained, a spiritual rebirth followed Rome's breakdown. Maybe the new "barbarians" could usher in a renovation: indeed, at the end of the First World War Jung had already sought a reappraisal of the "genuine barbarian in us."[34] He valorized a confrontation with "otherness" to compensate the narrowness of the

[30] The massacre on Saint Bartholomew's Eve was carried out in Paris between 23 and 24 August 1572 by the Catholic faction against Parisian Huguenots in revenge for defeat at the Battle of Lepanto. The slaughter occurred six days after the marriage of Margherita, the king's sister, to the Protestant Henry III of Navarre (later Henry IV of France).

[31] In a later interview Jacobi referred to Jung's response to a letter of hers addressing her concerns about Nazism: "'Keep your eyes open. You can't reject the evil because the evil is the bringer of the light.' Lucifer means light-bringer. [. . .] For him this [the Nazi movement] was an inner happening which had to be accepted as a psychological pre-condition for rebirth" (Jolande Jacobi interview, December 23, 1969, C. G. Jung Biographical Archives, Rare Books Department, Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, p. 24).

[32] "The Meaning of Psychology for Modern Man" [1933/1934], *CW* 10, § 290. See also Fischer, "The Year of Jung's Journey," cit., 136, and n. 2.

[33] Ibid., § 293.

[34] "The Role of the Unconscious" [1918], *CW* 10, § 19. Jung also addressed "the chthonic quality [which] is found in dangerous concentration in the Germanic peoples" whereby "the Jew lives in amicable relationship with the earth, but without feeling the power of the chthonic. [. . .] This may explain the specific need of the Jew to reduce everything to its material beginnings" (§ 18). Then, referring to "Freud's and Adler's reduction of

Western civilization, and possibly for the sake of its spiritual renewal: just as, in his estimation, the introverted Eastern basic attitude could help the hyper-extroverted attitude of the West, so the enhancement (and reanimation) of the instinctive, primordial dynamism of the collective psyche could counterbalance the rationalistic one-sidedness he ascribed to the Western mentality. And addressing the psychohistorical split in the German psyche, he had argued in a letter to Oscar A. H. Schmitz (author of *Psychoanalyse und Yoga*) in 1923 that "every step beyond the existing situation has to begin down among the truncated nature-demons. In other words, there is a whole lot of primitivity in us to be made good." He maintained that cultural development relies on going "back behind our cultural level, thus giving the suppressed primitive man in ourselves a chance to develop [. . .] for only out of the conflict between civilized man and the Germanic barbarian will there come what we need: a new experience of God."[35] Much later, in his essay "Wotan," tinged with gloomy forebodings, Jung would interpret the phenomenon of Nazism as a revival of a specifically German-pagan archetype, and characterize the condition of the Germans as one of possession—or being fatally gripped or seized (*ergriffen*)—by such collective unconscious forces; however, as has been noted, Wotan notoriously "did not cure himself."[36]

Although admitting that it was "exceedingly difficult to judge events that are happening right under our noses," Jung blatantly underestimated the unprecedented gravity of certain events, while assessing them as pathological "symptoms." Among these were the bonfires of "forbidden" books conducted by the German student union under the auspices of the "Campaign against the Un-German Spirit," with the aim of purging the *Volk* of Jewish, 'decadent' literature—including works of Freud and Adler.[37]

---

everything psychic to primitive sexual wishes and power-drives," he maintained that "these specifically Jewish doctrines are thoroughly unsatisfying to the Germanic mentality" (§ 19).

[35] C. G. Jung, *C. G. Jung: Letters*, ed. by Gerhard Adler with Aniela Jaffé, trans. by R.F.C. Hull, 2 vols (Bollingen Series XCV) (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1973), 1:40 (May 26, 1923).

[36] Giuseppe Maffei, "Jung e il nazismo," in Patrizia Puccioni Marasco, ed., *Jung e l'ebraismo* (Florence: Giuntina, 2002), 41–71 at 63. See "Wotan" [1936], *CW* 10.

[37] In the session of May 10, 1933 during his Visions Seminar, Jung commented contemptuously on the burnings of the works of psychoanalyst, activist, and homosexual Magnus Hirschfeld "because I happen to know something of that stuff"; he then turned to focus on the fact that "it is not very far from the burning of books to the burning of witches. If that should follow after a while it would also be interesting, not for the people at the stake, but as a good specimen for any museum. You see that it is obviously a symptom" (C. G. Jung,

This can suffice, perhaps, for us to infer that Jung's initial view derives from an unfortunate extension of his hermeneutics of individual psychic development (together with the persuasion of the need of a rediscovery of the "primitive" springs of the collective psyche) to the contemporary socio-political arena, against the background of cyclical, mythic, palingenetic view. This was supported by a Heraclitean enantiodromic principle, in line with Hölderlin's famous lines, so dear to him: "Where danger is, there / arises salvation also";[38] which may indeed meet the case in terms of individual compensatory psychic dynamics, as long as the process is supported by and directed toward a responsible enlargement of consciousness. But what were the chances of historical renovation stemming from a truly chaotic situation exacerbated by authoritarian tendencies? And of the

Visions: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1930–1934, ed. by Claire Douglas, 2 vols [Bollingen Series XCIX] [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997], 1:971. The same day about twenty-five thousand books were burnt in Berlin under the slogan "Against the overvaluation of instinctual urges that destroy the soul, for the nobility of the soul" and to celebrate, as proclaimed by the pamphlet "Wider den undeutschen Geist!" (Against the un-German spirit), a "symbol of the revolution" and a "sign of victory of a new value belief" (Volker Dahm, "Die nationalsozialistiche Schrifttumspolitik nach dem 10. Mai 1933," in Ulrich Walberer, ed., *10. Mai 1933: Bücherverbrennung in Deutschland und die Folgen* [Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1983], 36–83 at 36). Yet May 1933 was still regarded as a joyous time by many, including clerics prone to regard the new outburst of official anti-Semitism with favor and to believe that the Nazi "Holy Crusade could be accommodated within the Christian dogma" (Mosse, *Crisis of German Ideology*, cit., 308).

[38] Jung often invoked this passage from Hölderlin's poem "Patmos" (1802–3): in *Symbols of Transformation* [1912/1952], *CW* 5, § 630, for example, and, notably, in "The Spiritual Problem of Modern Man" ([1928/1931], *CW* 10), an essay about the transformations of his time. "Instinctively," he wrote, "modern man leaves the trodden paths to explore the by-ways and lanes, just as the man of the Greco-Roman world cast off his defunct Olympian gods and turned to the mystery cults of Asia. Our instinct turns outward, and appropriates Eastern theosophy and magic; but it also turns inward, and leads us to contemplate the dark background of the psyche" (§ 192). Contextually he affirmed: "If we are pessimists, we shall call it a sign of decadence; if we are optimistically inclined, we shall see in it the promise of a far-reaching spiritual change in the Western world" (§ 191). Jung evidently tended toward the second option, by exhibiting enthusiasm, perhaps with a kind of vitalistic, Nietzschean tone, for the regenerating qualities of the unconscious. He regarded the growing interest in psychic research and psychoanalysis as symptoms of a healthy counter-movement to the overextroverted attitude of the West, and welcomed the increasing attention to the body, sport, and modern dance, but also jazz and cinema: in sum the tuning up of the West for "a more rapid tempo—the American tempo—the exact opposite of quietism and world-negating resignation" (§ 195). Then, after quoting the Hölderlin verses (ibid.), he concluded the essay by proclaiming, "An unprecedented tension arises between outside and inside, between objective and subjective reality. Perhaps it is a final race [*ein letzter Wettlauf*] between aging Europe and young America; perhaps it is a healthier or a last desperate effort to escape the dark sway of natural law, and to wrest a yet greater and more heroic victory of waking consciousness over the sleep of the nations. This is a question only history can answer" (§ 196).

development of a collective consciousness or individuality, which in a letter to Erich Neumann loaded with psychological and theological implications Jung would define as "a *contradictio in adjecto*"?[39]

4. The Seminar, the Radio Berlin Interview, and the Society for Psychotherapy

One must bear in mind that the Berlin Seminar coincided with Jung's decision to take on the presidency of the Society for Psychotherapy, as we shall see in greater detail. In relation to Jung's other seminars in those years, this one took place during an interlude in the Visions Seminar held between 1930 and 1934 at the Psychological Club.[40] It also followed the so-called German Seminars of 1930 and 1931, held respectively at his home and then at the Hotel Sonne in Küsnacht, and which included two closely related lectures on "Indian Parallels," devoted to Tantric yoga and the symbolism of the chakras, whose main sources were most likely the work of two brilliant popularizers of the treasure of Tantra, Arthur Avalon (pseudonym of the British orientalist—and High Court judge at Calcutta—Sir John Woodroffe) and Henrich Zimmer.[41] In the winter of 1932, along with Sanskritist and former missionary Jakob Wilhelm Hauer,[42] Jung gave, at the Psychological Club, the aforementioned seminar

[39] Jung to Neumann, April 27, 1935, in Martin Liebscher, ed., *Analytical Psychology in Exile: The Correspondence of C. G. Jung and Erich Neumann* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015), 98–109 at 108. Cf. Liard's reflections on Jung's tendency to interpret the regressive character of the socio-cultural events of those years as possible "seeds of a higher culture" (Veronique Liard, *Carl Gustav Jung, "Kulturphilosoph"* [Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2007], 107 and passim).

[40] See Jung, *Visions*, cit.

[41] See Jung, *Psychology of Kundalini Yoga*, cit., 71 n. 1 and Sonu Shamdasani, "Introduction: Jung's Journey to the East," in Jung, *Psychology of Kundalini Yoga*, cit., xvii–xlvi at xxxiv, and n. 65. The 1930 text "Indian Parallels" is in Appendix 1 of *Psychology of Kundalini Yoga*, 71–87. The *Bericht über das Deutsche Seminar von Dr. C. G. Jung 5–10 Oktober 1931 in Küsnacht-Zürich*, compiled by Olga von Koenig-Fachsenfeld (Stuttgart, 1932) is forthcoming with the title *On Active Imagination: Jung's 1931 German Seminar*, ed. by Ernst Falzeder, trans. by Ernst Falzeder with Tony Woolfson (Philemon Series) (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press). On the seminars of 1930 and 1931, see Hannah, *Jung: His Life and Work*, cit., 202–3.

[42] Jackob W. Hauer (1881–1962) would found in the following year the "German Faith Movement" (Deutsche Glaubensbewegung) intended to embody the deep meaning of National Socialism and seeking a Germanic—that is, "Aryan"—religious renaissance. Jung would interpret Hauer's movement in his essay "Wotan" (1936) as symptomatic of the contemporary psychic condition of the German *Volk* (*CW* 10, § 397ff.). According to the sources, Jung and Hauer kept in contact until 1938. For more on this, see Poewe, *New Religions and the Nazis*, cit., and Petteri Pietikainen, "The *Volk* and its Unconscious: Jung,

"The Psychology of Kundalini Yoga," at which he addressed "Western Parallels to Tantric Symbols."[43] Furthermore, in 1934 Jung was to inaugurate the Zarathustra Seminar, dedicated to a thorough analysis of Nietzsche's powerful, visionary book, his relationship to the Persian prophet, and his concept of the Superman or Overman (*Übermensch*).[44]

The transcript of the Berlin Seminar was printed in cyclostyle for private distribution (as was customary for Jung's seminars), in a sole edition in 1933. Besides the transcript of the six daily sessions (Monday, 26 June to Saturday, 1 July), the *Report* included the "Lecture by Heinrich Zimmer 'On the Psychology of Yoga' to the C. G. Jung Society on June 25, 1933" and a transcription of the "Colloquy between Dr. C. G. Jung and Dr. A. Weizsäcker from the Berlin Radio broadcast of June 26, 1933."[45] This interview is omitted here as it has already been published and is readily available.[46]

Hauer and the 'German Revolution'," *Journal of Contemporary History* 35, no. 4 (2000): 523–39.

[43] Shamdasani, "Introduction: Jung's Journey," cit., xxxviii n. 83.

[44] C. G. Jung, *Nietzsche's Zarathustra: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1934–1939*, ed. by James L. Jarrett, 2 vols (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988). On Jung and Nietzsche, see Paul Bishop, *The Dionysian Self: C. G. Jung's Reception of Friedrich Nietzsche* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995); Martin Liebscher, *Libido und Wille zur Macht: C. G. Jungs Auseinandersetzung mit Nietzsche* (Basel: Schwabe, 2011); Gaia Domenici, *Jung's Nietzsche: Zarathustra, The Red Book, and "Visionary" Works* (London: Palgrave, 2019).

[45] *Bericht über das Berliner Seminar von Dr. C. G. Jung vom 26. Juni bis 1. Juli 1933. Anhang: Zwiegespräch Dr. C. G. Jung und Dr. A. Weizsäcker in der Funkstunde Berlin am 26. Juni 1933. Vortrag Prof. H. Zimmer: 'Zur Psychologie des Yoga' in der C. G. Jung-Gesellschaft am 25. Juni 1933, Berlin, 1933*. There also exists a version, likewise printed in 1933, including only Jung's seminar. No preparatory notes for the seminar, nor related photographic material, are preserved in either JFA or JA (with thanks to Andreas Jung and Ulrich Hoerni). Jung's personal copy of the seminar protocol deposited at the JFA bears in its first half a few comments along with a fair number of marks, underlinings, and minor corrections, primarily of foreign terms, in Jung's hand (which have been reported or else silently corrected in the present edition). Thus one may surmise a plan for a second, corrected edition of the seminar, which was never produced.

[46] The broadcast's English translation—with the title "An Interview on Radio Berlin"—is in William McGuire and R.F.C. Hull, eds, *C. G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters* (Bollingen Series XCVII) (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977), 59–66. The interview (entitled "Ziegespräch, wiedergegeben auf Schallplatte in der Berliner Funkstunde am 26. Juni 1933," *Bericht über das Berliner Seminar*, cit., 166) appears to have been broadcast in fact on July [*sic*] 26, 1933, with the title "Aufbauende Seelenlehre: Ein Gespräch über die neuen Aufgaben der Psychologie [Constructive psychology (lit., "soul doctrine" or "soul teaching"): a conversation about the new tasks of psychology]. C. G. Jung/A. Weizsäcker." Unfortunately, no tape recording or transcription of it is preserved in the archives of the *Deutscher Rundfunk* (my thanks to the archivist, Jörg Wyrschowy).

The volume does not identify the transcriber in its front matter: this is another peculiarity of this seminar. Barbara Hannah merely stated that the transcription was made "in an unusually good stenogram and multigraphed for the use of the class in almost verbatim form."[47] The transcription may plausibly be ascribed to Olga von Koenig-Fachsenfeld, a German psychologist and teacher who produced other transcripts.[48] Omitted from the *Report* were also the names of participants—with the exceptions of Heinrich Zimmer and Gustav Schmaltz[49]—who interacted during the sessions; an additional unusual fact that can be hypothetically attributed to the intention of preserving the participants' anonymity in consideration of the political situation.

The Berlin Seminar was organized by the Gesellschaft für Analytische Psychologie, or Society for Analytical Psychology, founded on September 24, 1931 in Berlin by the German analysts Eva Moritz, Wolfgang Müller Kranefeldt, and Hanna Kummerlé, with the aim, according to an early manuscript chronicle, of encouraging "interest in C. G. Jung's psychology in a convivial social setting."[50] For ten years, until its suppression by the Nazis in 1941, the Society promoted lectures, courses, and seminars on various subjects related to Jung's depth psychology.[51] This

[47] Hannah, *Jung: His Life and Work*, cit., 215. Included in Jung's personal copy is a typescript index written by Max Silber, but their correspondence (in the JA) makes no reference either to this or to Silber's possible involvement in the transcription.

[48] Ernst Falzeder has observed that the typewriter used for this seminar's transcript matches the one for the German Seminar, and that "the style of the title page, the presentation as a whole, as well as the wording of the prefatory note are nearly identical." See Falzeder's "Introduction" to Jung, *On Active Imagination*, cit. [forthcoming]. He also informs me that the Koenig-Fachsenfeld family archive retains no documentation from Koenig-Fachsenfeld concerning the Berlin Seminar. Olga von Koenig-Fachsenfeld began analysis with Jung in 1929. Subsequently, she worked as a member of the "Göring Institute," directing its Educational Counseling Service department from 1939 to 1942. See Cocks, *Psychotherapy in the Third Reich*, cit., 185 and passim; Falzeder, "Introduction," cit.

[49] Gustav Schmaltz (1884–1959), German engineer and physician, owner of a machine-tool factory, and director of a woodworkers' association. He was interested in astrology and mandala symbolism, and underwent analysis with Emma Jung. Jung wrote a foreword to his *Komplexe Psychologie und körperliches Symptom* (Stuttgart: Hippokrates, 1955): see *CW* 18, § 839–40.

[50] "Chronik der Gesellschaft für Analytische Psychologie," unnumbered, JFA. This is a manuscript volume, a gift from the Society to Jung, recounting the Society's activities—lectures and seminars—up until 1934, and including a list of thirty-one members (for the years 1931–33).

[51] Among the speakers during the first few years were W. M. Kranefeldt, H. Zimmer, J. W. Hauer, G. R. Heyer, J. Kirsch, G. Schmaltz, H. Schmid-Guisan, K. Bügler, A. Weizsäcker, E. Rousselle, and H. Keyserling. For more on the Berlin Society, see Lockot, *Erinnern und Durcharbeiten*, cit., 50–52.

being the first of its seminars to be held by Jung himself, the occasion was extremely well attended, and was celebrated on June 25 by the conferring upon Jung of the title *Ehrenvorsitzender* (honorary president) of the Society.

The event was arranged by Eva Moritz, in collaboration with Wolfgang Kranefeldt and Toni Wolff. Jung initially relied on Moritz to propose the choice of topic, reportedly in deference to her knowledge of the audience and the general situation.[52] On account of his heavy workload, the seminar was almost canceled in April, but a few weeks later was reinstated.[53] In the (in places incomplete) set of organizational correspondence Jung appeared somewhat dubious of its feasibility and even reluctant to proceed. His main reservation concerned the risks he feared for the Berlin Society as a consequence of an equation of his psychological system with that of psychoanalysis. In a letter to Moritz he lamented the boycott of his theory "for decades" by Freud's and Adler's followers, and hoped that the seminar would not perpetuate such "confusion" [*Verwechslung*] and "deceit" [*Betrug*], so as to "protect the Berlin Club from the possibility that, as a result of the abolition of Freud's ideology, it would disappear under the table."[54] In the same vein he wrote to Otto Curtius, a psychotherapist close to him, that his "main concern" about running the seminar was that "this would give the Berlin Club a dangerous opportunity for publicity, because I'm a little worried that our cause [*Sache*: literally, "thing"], which is as anti-Jewish as possible [*sic*], might end up being lumped in [*in einen Topf geworfen (werden könnte)*: literally, "thrown into a pot"] with Freudian psychoanalysis, as frequently happens."[55] This

[52] Toni Wolff wrote to Kranefeldt: "Ms. Moritz asked me something concerning the seminar. I wrote to her at the request of Dr. Jung that she should choose the subject. She ought to do it, Jung decidedly prefers it that way, as he does not know the people. From that one should spare him [. . .]. Dr. Jung will surely take into account the situation there" (Wolff to Kranefeldt, March 25, 1933, AZ, correspondence W. Kranefeldt, Sign. Ms Z VII 395).

[53] As in the letter of Jung to J. Kirsch of May 6, 1933, in Ann Conrad Lammers, ed., *The Jung–Kirsch Letters: The Correspondence of C. G. Jung and James Kirsch*, trans. by Ursula Egli and Ann Conrad Lammers (London: Routledge, 2011), 37.

[54] Jung to Moritz, May 6, 1933, JA (Hs 1056:2527), quoted in Giovanni Sorge, *Psicologia analitica e anni Trenta: Il ruolo di C. G. Jung nella "Internationale Allgemeine Ärztliche Gesellschaft für Psychotherapie" (1933–1939/40)* (dissertation, University of Zurich, 2010/2018), 138 n. 601.

[55] Jung to Curtius, May 6, 1933, JA (Hs 1056:2331), quoted in Giovanni Sorge, *Bestandbeschrieb der Akten zur Geschichte der Präsidentschaft von C. G. Jung in der Internationalen Ärztlichen Gesellschaft für Psychotherapie, 1933–1940 im Nachlass von C. A. Meier* (ETH Zürich Research Collection, 2016 [online]), 74 and n. 147.

phrase gives an idea of the extent of Jung's propensity to "take into account the situation there" (to repeat the expression used by Wolff in her letter to Kranefeldt quoted previously): that is, to adjust (at least) his semantics to the anti-Semitic propaganda for reasons surely ascribable, though not limitable, to a strategic agenda. Curtius, who had good political connections,[56] is credited with having arranged Jung's mysterious, reportedly short encounter with Joseph Goebbels during his stay in Berlin.[57] This encounter, as the correspondence permits us to infer, was the direct result of Curtius's unrealized plan to invite Goebbels himself to the seminar, which Jung reportedly agreed to.[58] What today cannot but appear as at least grotesque—the participation of an infamous Nazi criminal in a Jung seminar—was evidently considered by those involved an attempt to seek some form of protection from a high-ranking government official.

Jung's interview with Radio Berlin on the eve of the seminar must likewise be considered in the light of his strategy to distinguish his own psychological system—and perspective—from that of psychoanalysis *also* for the sake of his colleagues in Germany, although it ended up sounding, to an extent at least, like a species of endorsement of the new political course. Jung was introduced by his student, the neurologist, psychiatrist (and Nazi Party member) Adolf Weizsäcker as "the most progressive psychologist of modern times."[59] Jung portrayed a sort of divergence between the old guard, trapped in an intellectualistic mentality and unable

[56] Curtius's brother Julius had been former chancellor and foreign minister for the Deutsche Volkspartei, a conservative-liberal political party during the Weimar Republic (Cocks, *Psychotherapy in the Third Reich*, cit.,129; Jay Sherry, *Carl Gustav Jung: Avant-Garde Conservative* [New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010], 104). From 1935, Nazi Party member Otto Curtius would serve as a German editor of the *Zentralblatt*, the official journal of the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy.

[57] See Hannah, *Jung: His Life and Work*, cit., 211; Cocks, *Psychotherapy in the Third Reich*, cit., 129; Deirdre Bair, *Jung: A Biography* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Co., 2003), 424–25; and Sherry, *Carl Gustav Jung*, cit., 104–5.

[58] As reported in a letter of Jung's secretary to Curtius of May 29, 1933, JA (Hs 1056:2332) (quoted in Sorge, *Bestandbeschrieb der Akten*, cit., 73–74).

[59] "Zwiegespräch Dr. C. G. Jung und Dr. A. Weizsäcker," in *Bericht über das Berliner Seminar*, cit., 166–73 (henceforth "Zwiegespräch"), 166; Tilman Evers, *Mythos und Emanzipation: Eine kritische Annäherung an C. G. Jung* (Hamburg: Junius, 1987), Anhang 1, 241–77 at 241; "An Interview on Radio Berlin," in McGuire and Hull, *C. G. Jung Speaking*, cit., 59–66 at 60. This followed a short announcer presentation (not included in the English version in *Jung Speaking*, cit.), which described Jung as the "psychologist who countered Sigmund Freud's corrosive [*zersetzende(n)*] psychoanalysis with his constructive theory of the soul" ("Zwiegespräch," cit., 166; Evers, *Mythos und Emanzipation*, cit., 241). For more details (also about Weizsäcker's background), see Sherry, *Carl Gustav Jung*, cit., 104–8.

to comprehend the "integral man," and the new movement, regarded as an eruption of collective psychic forces constellated in a particular historical *kairos*; for Germany, as a young nation still constructing its unity and, as he was accustomed to say, suffering from a long-lasting inferiority complex, was catching up with the rest of Europe. Contextually he affirmed that

> [t]imes of mass movement are always times of leadership [*Führertum*]. Every movement culminates organically in a leader [*gipfelt organisch im Führer*], who embodies in his whole being the meaning and purpose of the popular movement. [. . .] The need of the whole always calls forth a leader regardless of the form a state may take.[60]

This attestation of unquestionable, almost naturally justified leadership, was followed by one of Jung's most controversial declarations:

> Only in times of aimless quiescence does the aimless conversation of parliamentary deliberations [*ziellose Konversation parlamentarischer Beratungen*] drone on, which always demonstrates the absence of a stirring in the depths or of a definite emergency.[61]

At the same time, he called for a "self-development [*Selbstentwicklung*] of the individual": that is,

> the supreme goal of all psychological endeavor, [that] can produce consciously responsible spokesmen and leaders of the collective

---

[60] "Zwiegespräch," cit., 173; Evers, *Mythos und Emanzipation*, cit., 246; "An Interview on Radio Berlin," cit., 65. Jung here echoed, and went beyond, the core thesis of Gustav Le Bon's influential *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* (1895) with regard to the emotional, rather than rationally based, depersonalizing power of mass psychology. See Shamdasani, *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology*, cit., 286–87.

[61] "Zwiegespräch," cit., 173; Evers, *Mythos und Emanzipation*, cit., 246; "An Interview on Radio Berlin," cit., 65–66; Sherry, *Carl Gustav Jung*, cit., 104ff. Jung continued, "Even the most peaceable government in Europe, the Swiss Bundesrat, is in times of emergency invested with extraordinary powers, democracy or no democracy. It is perfectly natural that a leader should stand at the head of an elite, which in earlier centuries was formed by the feudal [*feudale*; omitted in the English version] nobility. The nobility believes by the law of the nature in the blood and exclusiveness of the race [an das Blut und an Rassenausschliesslichkeit]. Western Europe doesn't understand the special psychic emergency of the young German nation because it does not find itself in the same situation either historically or psychologically." This could resonate easily with Jung's audience since, as observed by Mosse, the German "revolution" was expected to be "democratic but not parliamentary. *Völkisch* thought had always been concerned with having all the people participate in the *völkisch* destiny and at the same time preventing the *Volk* from being atomized into political parties" (Mosse, *Crisis of German Ideology*, cit., 285).

> movement. As Hitler said recently, the leader must be able to be alone and must have the courage to go his own way. But if he doesn't know himself, how is he to lead others? That is why the true leader is always one who has the courage to be himself, and can look not only others in the eye but above all himself [an expression we'll find repeated in the seminar, in relation to the Shadow].[62]

At this point it is worth observing that the biennium 1933–34 presents us with Jung's most problematic and controversial remarks with regard to politics and collective (especially national) psychologies—including such considerations about alleged differences between Jewish and German psychologies as, by way of example, "the Jew, who is something of a nomad, has never created a cultural form of his own," counterposed to evocation of the youthfulness of the "Aryan" unconscious, which contains creative tension and "seeds of a future yet to be born."[63] Such differentiations belonged to a larger epistemological plexus inherent to Jung's notion of a phylogenetically stratified unconscious, including levels such as nation and race.[64] Yet although he had already previously voiced the distinction of his system from the Freudian,[65] grounded in his broader opposition to nineteenth materialism and positivism, he now seems to have been insufficiently aware that his call—notably in the *Zentralblatt*, official organ of the Psychotherapeutic Society he had just begun to direct—for recognition of the "scientific validity" of such differences, far from being neutral, in fact had

---

[62] "Zwiegespräch," cit., 171; Evers, *Mythos und Emanzipation*, cit., 245; "An Interview on Radio Berlin," cit., 64. See below [MT], 156 and 174. One year later Jung wrote to Kirsch that his interview didn't "express anything concerning politics" (Jung to Kirsch, May 29, 1934, in Lammers, *The Jung–Kirsch Letters*, cit., 44–47 at 45). In a later statement he would affirm, "Hitler has never gained a healthy relationship to this female figure, which I call the anima. The result is that he is possessed by it. Instead of being truly creative he is consequently destructive. This is one reason why Hitler is dangerous, he does not possess within himself the seeds of true harmony [. . .]. I [do not] think he will turn into a normal human being. He will probably die in his job" ("Jung Diagnoses the Dictators" [*The Psychologist*, London, May 1939], in McGuire and Hull, *C. G. Jung Speaking*, cit., 136–40 at 140).

[63] See "The State of Psychotherapy Today" [1934], *CW* 10, § 353. See also Jung's "Editorial" [1933], *CW* 10.

[64] For the broad intellectual, anthropological, ethnological, and philosophical context of such notions, see Shamdasani, *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology*, cit., 158–59, 182–89, 213–27, and 232–43. See also Nicholas Adam Lewin, *Jung on War, Politics and Nazi Germany: Exploring the Theory of Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* (London: Karnac Books, 2009), ch. 5; and Michael Vannoy Adams, *The Multicultural Imagination: "Race," Color, and the Unconscious* (New York: Routledge, 1996).

[65] In, e.g., "The Role of the Unconscious" [1918], *CW* 10, and his lecture at the fourth General Medical Congress for Psychotherapy, "The Aims of Psychotherapy" [(1929) 1931], *CW* 16. Cf. Poliakov, *The Aryan Myth*, cit., 304–25.

an inevitable political echo.[66] On top of this, despite his explicit statement that he did not intend any devaluation of Jewish psychology, his argument concerning a different Jewish relationship to the earth in the end could not but reflect the *völkish* topos that attributed to the Jews a lack of rootedness, in contrast to the purely instinctual nature of the Germans.

We can surmise that Jung must have had such (mis)judgments in mind when, in 1947, he would admit to the educator and community leader Rabbi Leo Baeck that he had "slipped up"—as reported in a letter of Gershom Scholem to Aniela Jaffé,[67] Jung's loyal secretary who in turn judged his choice to distinguish, at that historical moment, between Jewish and non-Jewish psychology as "a grave human error."[68]

Jung himself admitted in 1935 that he like others was "affected" by the events which were upfolding in Germany when he was there.[69] And after the war, he avowed that

> [a]t that time, in Germany as well as in Italy, there were not a few things that appeared plausible and seemed to speak in favor of the regime. An undeniable piece of evidence in this respect was the disappearance of the unemployed, who used to tramp the German highroads in their hundreds of thousands. And after the stagnation and decay of the post-war years, the refreshing wind that blew through the two countries was a tempting sign of hope.[70]

---

[66] According to Cocks, such statements "fit both his own anthropological tendency toward national and racial characterization as well as the practical demands of the moment" (*Psychotherapy in the Third Reich*, cit., 131). They also "reveal a destructive ambivalence and prejudice that may have served Nazi persecution of the Jews. But Jung," Cocks concludes, "conceded much more to the Nazis by his words than by his actions" (134). Cf. Sherry, *Carl Gustav Jung*, cit., ch. 4.

[67] Jung's words were, according to Scholem, "Jawohl, ich bin ausgerutscht" (Indeed, I stumbled); in Aniela Jaffé, *Parapsychologie, Individuation, Nationalsozialismus: Themen bei C. G. Jung* (Einsiedeln: Daimon, 1985), 163–64. Scholem's letter was published in full in Gershom Scholem, *Briefe II: 1948–1970*, ed. by Thomas Sparr (Munich: Beck, 1995), 94–95, and is translated into English in Aniela Jaffé, "C. G. Jung and National Socialism," in Jaffé, *From the Life and Work of C. G. Jung*, trans. by R.F.C. Hull and Murray Stein, expanded edn (Einsiedeln: Daimon, 1989), 78–102 at 100.

[68] Ibid., 86. Conversely, Jaffé praised Jung's decision to collaborate with an "incriminated nation" in the interests of a "co-existence" (ibid., 82).

[69] "I saw it coming, and I can understand it because I know the power of the collective unconscious. But on the surface it looks simply incredible. Even my personal friends are under that fascination, and when I am in Germany, I believe it myself, I understand it all, I know it has to be as it is. One cannot resist it. It gets you below the belt and not in your mind, your brain just counts for nothing, your sympathetic system is gripped" (*The Tavistock Lectures* [1935], *CW* 18, § 164).

[70] "After the Catastrophe" [1945], *CW* 10, § 420.

In retrospect he stated that since Hitler's seizure of power he had realized that "a mass psychosis was boiling up in Germany"; nonetheless he felt confidence in "one of the most differentiated and highly civilized countries on earth, besides being, for us Swiss, a spiritual background to which we were bound by ties of blood, language, and friendship."[71] He added that during his Berlin stay he had

> received an extremely unfavorable impression both of the behaviour of the Party and of the person of Goebbels. But I did not wish to assume from the start that these symptoms were decisive, for I knew other people of unquestionable idealism who sought to prove to me that these things were unavoidable abuses such as are customary in any great revolution. It was indeed not at all easy for a foreigner to form a clear judgment at that time.[72]

Jung's optimism is hardly explicable without considering his medical-clinical attitude for, as he himself stated,

> [i]t is part of the doctor's professional equipment to be able to summon up a certain amount of optimism even in the most unlikely circumstances, with a view to saving everything that it is still possible to save. He cannot afford to let himself be too much impressed by the real or apparent hopelessness of a situation, even if this means exposing himself to danger.[73]

Let us recall, in terms of context, that less than a week before the seminar, on June 21, the summer solstice, Jung had officially assumed the presidency of the General Medical Society for Psychotherapy, which at that time represented psychotherapy's medical avant-garde. Founded in Germany in 1927, the society was characterized by a predominantly conservative- and nationalist-oriented membership with a substantial interest in religious questions (for example, how psychotherapy related to the *Seelsorge*, or cure of souls). Psychotherapists aspired to a proper, autonomous, epistemological status and adequate recognition from the medical establishment, in particular the much longer-established field of academic psychiatry, which was predominantly concerned with hereditarian and organicist factors in the etiology of psychic disorders, whereas psychotherapy primarily engaged with unconscious, socio-cultural, interrelational, and

[71] Epilogue to "Essays on Contemporary Events" [1946], *CW* 10, § 472 and § 474.
[72] Ibid., § 472.
[73] Ibid., § 474.

also spiritual factors. Conversely, a somewhat holistic approach of this type could end up being consistent with, and manipulable in terms of, the *völkisch* tenets underlying Nazi ideology, imbued as these were with post-romantic aspirations towards a unity of body and soul for the sake of *Gemeinschaftsgefühl* (a sense of community), in the context of so-called national "psychic hygiene." The main obstacle here was the need to "free" psychotherapy from its alleged "Jewish roots," implicit in the indisputable leadership assumed by psychoanalysis from the early years of the century, by establishing a nationalistic, Germanic version—hence the "Aryan" Jung, with his emphasis upon the unfathomable depths of the psyche, was deemed fit to play a leading role. Jung accepted the presidency (having served as a vice-president since 1930) following the leading psychiatrist Ernst Kretschmer's resignation in response to "harassing" pressure from German colleagues concerned by the risk of an imminent dissolution of the Society or its incorporation into the much more powerful German Psychiatric Society.[74] The latter in fact would continue in the years that followed to plan such an amalgamation, and this would be in large measure prevented by Jung (in this finding himself at one with M. H. Göring). Jung's decision was not in the event immediate and unreserved. He accepted the office "provisionally" and with it the "special [that is, Aryan] commission" which had been meanwhile been formed under the guidance of psychiatrist Johannes Heinrich Schultz in order to ensure the continuance of the Society.[75]. In so doing, he displayed an

[74] On the top of such pressures there came a letter, dated April 21, 1933, JA (Hs 1056:1997), from the neuropsychologist Walter Cimbal, a co-founder of the Society and an active supporter of the psychotherapeutic cause. Cimbal, who that year joined the Nazi party, although without fully sharing its commitment to eugenic and sterilization policies, skillfully pushed on all the buttons in an effort to convince the Jung: the fatally uncertain moment; Jung's responsibility before psychotherapy itself, its future, and its new—Germanic—course; the risk of the dissolution of the Society and the guarantee of the full inviolability of Jung's "geistige Führung," or spiritual leadership; the intrinsically Germanic connotations of Jung's psychology; the importance of the German revolution in putting a stop to the narcissism and the degradation embodied in Jewish influence and in turn propagated by psychoanalysis. (See Sorge, *Psicologia analitica e anni Trenta*, cit., ch. 2, 2.3; and Ann Conrad Lammers, "Professional Relationships in Dangerous Times: C. G. Jung and the Society for Psychotherapy," *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 57, no. 1 [2012]: 99–119).

[75] Following Jung's decision communicated on June 8 (Jung to Cimbal, June 8, 1933, JA [Akz. 2022-18, C. G. Jung–W. Cimbal letters, as yet uncatalogued]) the official announcement of his formal assumption of the presidency, on June 21, was then disclosed by Walter Cimbal, as the newly re-named general secretary of the Society, in a circular letter to the members of the above-mentioned commission on June 27 (Cimbal to Herrn Vorsitzenden und den Mitgliedern der geschäftsführenden Vorstandskommission der AAGP, June 27,

attitude marked by a kind of *Realpolitik*, as echoed in his appeal to the biblical injunction "Give to Caesar what belongs to Caesar, and to God what belongs to God,"[76] which we find, for instance, in his letter written to approve the subsequent foundation on September 15 of the national German Society for Psychotherapy, under the presidency of Matthias Heinrich Göring, which was subject both to the regime's rules and to the General (soon to be International) Society headed by Jung himself. Here Jung once again—or still—remained sanguine with regard, notably, to the capacity of the psychotherapeutic profession to acclimatize itself to every political wind:

> For me it is wholly self-evident that a dominating political movement pulls everything into its sphere. It is completely senseless for individuals to resist, I wish to say, this metereological condition. Just as psychotherapy must prove itself worthy of all different kinds of patients, so must it also rise to all outward realities.[77]

Returning to the progress of actual events: once assured of the continuation of the German Society as a section of the General Medical Society, in May 1934 Jung refounded the latter as the Internationale Allgemeine Ärztliche Gesellschaft für Psychotherapie, or International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy (IGMSfP); that is, as a supranational, apolitical, non-confessional federation. He oversaw the byelaws of the statutes with the assistance of the famous Jewish lawyer Wladimir Rosenbaum, establishing a limitation upon the voting power of the larger sections (first and foremost the German one) and the authority to enroll members independently of their own national groups (the so-called rule of the *Einzelmitglieder*, or individual members, a measure specifically to benefit German Jews). Together with his student the Swiss psychiatrist C. A. Meier (1905–1995)—later to be Jung's successor as professor of psychology at the ETH Zurich—in his role as general secretary of the Society, in the years to follow Jung fostered the foundation of national psychotherapeutic Societies in Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, Austria, and Great Britain, promoted three international congresses (in Bad Nauheim in 1935, Copenhagen in 1937, and Oxford in 1938), and co-organized an

1933, JA [Akz. 2022-18, Jung–Cimbal letters, as above]), the second day of the seminar here presented. On Schultz, see Cocks, *Psychotherapy in the Third Reich*, cit., 72–76.

[76] Mark 12:17.

[77] Jung to Cimbal, September 3, 1933, quoted in Giovanni Sorge, "Jung's Presidency of the International General Medical Society of Psychotherapy: New Insights," *Jung Journal: Culture & Psyche* 6, no. 4, (2012): 31–53 at 35.

international symposium in Basel (1936). He also supervised publication in the official organ of the Society, the *Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie und ihre Grenzgebiete* together with Meier as managing editor (and with the German editors, first Walter Cimbal and then Otto Curtius; in 1936 Göring would become co-director of the journal).

Jung embarked on this endeavor both to promote his own system and to support psychotherapy at a very critical moment. Demonstrating an increased awareness of his role *super partes*, he counterbalanced the predominance of the German Society branch through a remarkable enlargement of the federation, and managed to retain its presidency until 1939, subsequently remaining in office as honorary president until 1940, when Göring, whose power steadily grew also thanks to the ministerial support he obtained for his Institute, managed to take over the headquarters and run the Society from Berlin.

Overall, Jung's attitude confronted by an objectively complex situation showed a continuous balancing between resistance and conformity, along with considerable diplomatic and twisting and turning, and no little Machiavellianism in his efforts to maintain a "neutral" position, seeking at least to "save what could be saved." The profile of events briefly sketched here presents lines of both continuity and discontinuity. For instance, while Jung was little concerned that his differentiations between Jewish and German psychologies in 1933–34 might be adding fuel, indirectly, to the *völkisch* and even anti-Semitic fire, at the 1938 Oxford conference he presented a list of "fourteen points of common understanding" arising from a combined effort in the "democratic spirit of Switzerland," and aimed at promoting the principles shared by the different psychotherapeutic schools.[78] Despite his unceasingly sympathetic yet watchful concern for Germany, from time to time he firmly rejected requests from his German colleagues: such as, for example, to dedicate an international conference to the topic of race, or to host a review of Alfred Rosenberg's infamous book *The Myth of the Twentieth Century* in the pages of the *Zentralblatt*. Thus the man who seemed to serve as the ideal figurehead for the *neue deutsche Seelenheilkunde* ("new German soul treatment" [psychotherapy]) ended up being reproached by Matthias Heinrich Göring as "too

[78] "Vierzehn Punkte gemeinsamen Einverständnisses." See "Presidential Address to the 10th International Medical Congress for Psychotherapy, Oxford, 1938" [1938], *CW* 10, § 1072–73; Sorge, *Psicologia analitica e anni Trenta*, cit., ch. 6, 3.1. Subsequently the list, which echoed the list of principles for peace famously presented by President Woodrow Wilson in 1918 to the United States Congress, did not attract much attention.

old" to understand the German revolution (in a 1940 letter which condemned Jung's newly published *Terry Lectures*).[79]

Any measured assessment of the vexed question of Jung's alleged philo-Nazism and anti-Semitism must take into account the intersections between the institutional and the theoretical planes. As for the latter, the principal landmarks surely include, in addition to the Radio Berlin interview and his writings from 1933–34 quoted above, the essays "Wotan" (1936) and "Psychology and National Problems" (1936), the *Terry Lectures* ([1937] 1938/1940), his interview "Diagnosing the Dictators" ([1938] 1939), and "After the Catastrophe" (1946).[80] In these a gradually increasing level of criticism is perceptible, directed against mass movements, dictatorships, and "-isms," although in tandem with a persistent tendency to gloss over the concrete role played by a cunningly

[79] Göring to C. A. Meier, October 9, 1940, JA (Hs 1069:1424), cited in Sorge, "Jung's Presidency," cit., 44 and in Sorge, *Psicologia analitica e anni trenta*, cit., 294. In the *Terry Lectures* Jung referred provocatively to "the adventurious Germanic tribes with their characteristic curiosity, acquisitiveness, and recklessness," and addressed "the amazing spectacle of states taking over the age-old totalitarian claims of theocracy, which are inevitably accompanied by suppression of free opinion. Once more we see people cutting each other's throats in support of childish theories of how to create paradise on earth. It is not very difficult to see that the powers of the underworld—not to say of hell—which in former times were more or less successfully chained up in a gigantic spiritual edifice where they could be of some use, are now creating, or trying to create, a State slavery and a State prison devoid of any mental or spiritual charm" ("Psychology and Religion" [(1937) 1938/1940], *CW* 11, § 83). Lockot notes that although the *Lectures* included "only an indirect criticism, Jung was placed on the Nazi 'blacklist'" (*Erinnern und Durcharbeiten*, cit., 108). Jung's stance here appears to be consistent with that of Eric Voegelin, who is credited with being among the first (with Raymond Aron) to introduce the concept of "political religion" into sociopolitical analysis, referring to authoritarian political systems seeking and promising an imminent, "Gnostic" incarnation into a transcendent world ("When God is invisible behind the word, the contents of the word will become new gods," Voegelin proclaimed in *The Political Religions*: see *The Collected Works of Eric Voegelin*, 34 vols, vol. 5: *Modernity without Restraint: The Political Religions; The New Science of Politics; and Science, Politics, and Gnosticism*, ed. by Manfred Henningsen [Columbia, MO: University of Missouri, 1999], 60). On this subject, see Emilio Gentile, "The Sacralization of Politics," in Iordachi, *Comparative Fascist Studies*, cit., 257–89; as well as Gentile's key monograph *Politics as Religion* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006). For more on the scholarly debate on the nature of the Nazis' "theology of race," see Steigmann-Gall, "Nazism and the Revival," cit.

[80] The essays are in *CW* 10. See moreover "Diagnosing the Dictators," *Hearst's International Cosmopolitan*, January 1939, in McGuire and Hull, *C. G. Jung Speaking*, cit., 115–35. It may be added here, quoting Stanley Grossmann, that 1937 represented "a clear shift in [Jung's] opinions" (Grossman, "C. G. Jung and National Socialism," in Paul Bishop, ed., *Jung in Context: A Reader* [London: Routledge, 2003 (1999)], 9–21 at 113–14), probably linked to his September sojourn in Berlin to deliver (still unpublished) lectures on archetypes, and coincidental with Mussolini's visit to Germany, which gave him the opportunity

orchestrated propaganda machinery capable of manipulating symbols and mythic narratives to sustain a political agenda. That was the other "side of the picture" that George Mosse, quoting Jung's essay on Wotan, highlighted as crucial factor, besides the "preoccupation with the Ur forces, the primeval instincts, combined with a mystically oriented dynamic" investigated by Jung; for "[t]he ideology was formalized. The archetypes were not allowed free play. And as the ideology was tamed, it came to express itself through an internal logic of its own which took on concrete, outward forms."[81]

Finally, this picture would be not be complete without also taking into consideration Jung's subsequent collaboration with the controversial Bern-based director of the US Office of Strategic Services, Allen Welsh Dulles.[82]

---

to observe the two dictators closely (as reported in his later Knickerbroker interview). So, while in 1936 Jung had not yet excluded the possibility that National Socialism could represent a sort of "reculer pour mieux sauter" ("Wotan" [1936], *CW* 10, § 399), and that "an era of dictators, Caesars, and incarnated states" could have "accomplished a cycle of two thousand years" such that "the serpent" could meet "with its own tail" again ("Psychology and National Problems," [1936], *CW* 18, § 1342), the following year he saw nothing but an "interregnum" full of dangers in which the hubris of the Western world, various -isms, and "superhuman" personalities were successfully taking over ("Psychology and Religion" [(1937) 1938/1940], *CW* 11, § 144).

[81] Mosse, *Crisis of German Ideology*, cit., 317.

[82] On this, see Allen Dulles, *Germany's Underground: The Anti-Nazi Resistance* (New York: Macmillan, 1947), the book by his wartime colleague (and mistress) Mary Bancroft, *Autobiography of a Spy* (New York: William Morrow, 1983), and Deirdre Bair, *Jung: A Biography*, cit., ch. 31 ("Agent 488"), 481–95. For a closer look at the whole matter, see two pivotal, groundbreaking works—both deeply informed by archival documentation—already cited above: Cocks, *Psychotherapy in the Third Reich*, and Lockot, *Erinnern und durcharbeiten*. Among the large body of available literature I select for mention: Aryeh Maidenbaum and Stephen A. Martin, eds, *Lingering Shadows: Jungians, Freudians, and Anti-Semitism* (Boston, MA: Shambhala, 1991), and Grossman, "C. G. Jung and National Socialism," cit. Regarding Jung and politics, see also Walter Odajnyk, *Jung and Politics: The Political and Social Ideas of C. G. Jung* (New York: New York University Press, 1976), Lewin, *Jung on War*, cit., and the accurate analysis of Jung's intellectual, social, and editorial network by Jay Sherry (Sherry, *Carl Gustav Jung*, cit.), which argues for Jung's proximity to the line of thought of the "conservative revolution" (as it was termed by political theorist Armin Mohler in his *The Conservative Revolution in Germany 1918–1932* [1989]). See also the essays included in the monographic issue *Jung Journal: Culture & Psyche* 6, no. 4 (2012); William Schoenl and Linda Schoenl, *Jung's Evolving Views of Nazi Germany: From the Nazi Takeover to the End of World War II* (Asheville, NC: Chiron, 2016); my inventory of (and introduction to) the records of Jung's and Meier's activity in the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy preserved in the JA: Sorge, *Bestandbeschrieb der Akten*, cit.; and Sorge, *Psicologia analitica e anni Trenta*, cit. For an insightfully critical analysis, see Carrie B. Dohe, *The Wandering Archetype: C. G. Jung's "Wotan" and Germanic-Aryan Myth and Ideology* (London: Routledge, 2016).

5. The Participants and the Analysand

We can now turn to the Berlin Seminar in more detail. The six daily sessions following Zimmer's lecture took place regularly from 5 to 7 p.m. at Harnack-Haus, a prestigious venue built in 1929 in the Dahlem district.[83] The manuscript chronicle of the Gesellschaft contains a list of 153 signatures of seminar participants.[84] They came mainly from Germany, but also from Austria, Switzerland, Sweden, England, and America; most were physicians and professionals in psychotherapy, including members of the Society for Psychotherapy such as Otto Körner, Hans von Hattingberg, and Ernst Speer, as well as the aforementioned Johannes Heinrich Schultz, whose successful book on autogenic training had been published the previous year.[85] Harnack Haus's guest record bears a list of eighteen guests registered for the so-called "Tagung der Gesellschaft für analytische Psychologie," including a "Dr. Read" from London (on June 26–27) who can probably be identified as Sir Herbert Edward Read, a British scholar of art history and poet, later co-editor of Jung's *Collected Works*.[86] Other participants included clerics, teachers, and counselors (for instance, Pastor Ivan Alm, Assilie Kollwitz, Hildegard Stackmann, Felicia Froboese-Thiele, and Charlotte Geitel). Some participants had already attended the Dream Analysis Seminar (including Toni Wolff, Barbara Hannah, Gustav Schmaltz, and James and Hilde Kirsch). Importantly, practically all Jung's Jewish German students were present. All of these with the exception of Käthe Bügler (who was half-Jewish, and remained in Germany under the protective wing of G. R. Heyer, whom we'll encounter again below), were soon to leave the country: Erich Neumann together with his wife Julie (later emigrants to Palestine), James Kirsch and his wife Hilde Silber (later to leave for Palestine, London,

[83] S. Eckart Henning, *Das Harnack-Haus in Berlin-Dahlem: "Institut für ausländische Gäste", Clubhaus und Vortragszentrum der Kaiser-Wilhelm-/Max-Planck-Gesellschaft* (Munich: Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, 1996). As attested by circular letter by Eva Moritz of May 1, 1933, the first choice had been the (smaller) Haus der Presse's conference room. The advertised price was thirty-two German marks, and there was no mention of Zimmer's lecture (Bundesarchiv Koblenz, Kleine Erwerbungen, dossier 173, 275). For more on the context, see Jörg Rasche, "C. G. Jung in the 1930s: Not to Idealize, Neither to Diminish," *Jung Journal: Culture & Psyche* 6, no. 4 (2012): 54–73.

[84] "Chronik der Gesellschaft für Analytische Psychologie," unnumbered, JFA (see above, n. 50).

[85] J. H. Schultz, *Das Autogene Training (konzentrative Selbstentspannung): Versuch einer klinisch-praktischen Darstellung* (Leipzig: Thieme, 1932).

[86] Harnack-Haus guest registry for June 1933, signature 1, Rep. 1A, No. 2513/2, 51–52, HHA. My thanks to the archivist, Marion Kazemi.

(continued...)

Index

Page numbers in *italic* refer to figures