## Werk

**Titel:** Jung and the Nazis

**Autor:** Masson, Jeffrey Moussaieff

**Ort:** Hamburg

**Jahr:** 1992

**PURL:** https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?886042747_0011|LOG_0020

## Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

info@digizeitschriften.de

# JUNG AND THE NAZIS

Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson

The following essay is an expansion of the first half of a chapter about Jung's psychotherapy in my book on the myth of psychological healing.[1] Since this essay has caused much consternation, especially among Jewish Jungian analysts, I returned to the library and again took out the volumes of the Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie that Jung edited, to make absolutely certain that I was being fair to Jung. My impression is simply strengthened: Jung was involved in an activity that could not but give pleasure to his Nazi hosts and grief to all Jews. For Jung to state that Göring published his remarks without permission is nothing short of hypocrisy. The volume for 1936 prominently displays on the cover both Jung's name and that of Professor Dr. M.H. Göring, as joint editors. Jung is hardly distancing himself from this man. Nor can there be any doubt of Göring's loyalty to Hitler. In that same volume, in an article by Göring titled "Weltanschauung und Psychotherapie," he writes about the differences between Jewish and Aryan patients:

> The question why Aryan patients do not dream and associate in a racial manner can also be answered in another way. Rosenberg, at the 1936 Reichs Party Day, pointed out that in many of the large cities of the world live hundreds of thousands of deracinated intellectuals for whom "Blood" and "Boden" have no meaning. It is precisely these people who do not dream and associate in a racial manner. And precisely

these deracinated people are often our patients. We must guard against using them as examples of the Aryan soul.[2]

Later in the same essay he writes:

> Thus it will be our task in lectures, classes and seminars to attempt to work out a clear distinction between the Jewish and the Aryan-Germanic world view.[3]

At the 7th Congress for psychotherapy, Jung was almost the only non-German to attend. In the report of Göring's concluding remarks we read:

> Reference to Hitler's Mein Kampf: The value of a book does not depend on its scientific statements, but on its internal content. The most important part is the intuitive. I beseech the foreigners in the audience to disseminate the following impression in their own country: The complete agreement on the part of national socialist physicians with the ideas of Hitler, out of love for the Volk.[4]

Göring also began the conference on this note; see his address summarized on p.130, where he actually quotes from Hitler.

Jung seemed to have no problem printing K. Gauger's speech on "Psychotherapy and the Political World View," which begins with these words:

> It is perfectly clear to you that the meaning of my address is a political one, since I appear before you in the uniform of a political soldier, that of an SA man.[5]

It was striking that when I read out the passages from Jung

in German, at the Köln conference in September 1988, many of the participants were deeply shocked to hear Jung's words, which, as Hermann Langbein told me afterwards, could have come from any party hack, so vicious were they.

I should say a word here about the excuses offered by Jewish Jungian analysts. The Journal of Psychology and Judaism devoted a special issue in 1982 to Jung and the Nazis. One article was by James Kirsch, who knew Jung. I am not impressed. Basically Kirsch gives us personal anecdotes as "proof" of Jung's change of heart:

> The first time I saw Jung after the war in July of 1947, the first thing that Jung did was to remember this conversation and to apologize to me [for his statement that there would be a positive outcome of the Nazi movement] and to apologize for some things he had written at that time. I regret very much that this apology was made only to me personally but was never put in public writings.[6]

I regret it too, nor can I regard it as sufficient. Kirsch makes it sound as if Jung's published statements were a personal insult to him, and a rather minor matter after all. But Jung did not owe Kirsch an apology, he owed it to the world. And he did not offer it. Nor was the matter a trivial one. It is impossible to gauge the influence of Jung's remarks over the course of the years. After all, he was the most prominent psychiatrist on the continent to take a pro-German stance, and this fact was widely disseminated and widely known. In the eyes of some members of the public this must have lent a certain legitimacy to the Nazi position. Certainly in the Zentralblatt

itself Jung's racial views were quoted approvingly. As to Jung's motivations, it is of course impossible to know for certain why he did what he did. (Some could legitimately claim that it doesn't matter; the point is that he did it.) Was he anti-Semitic? I rather think not. But this hardly makes him pro-semitic. In light of all the evidence, I find it absurd to claim, as some have, that Jung was simply attempting to protect Jews! I think one has to accuse Jung, in the end, of pure opportunism. But this is hardly a small matter with only personal consequences. Jung's views were the same as those held by leading Nazis, practitioners and theoreticians, and which led directly to the murder of six million Jews.

Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961) was a Swiss psychiatrist who trained in the Burgholzli clinic in Zürich under Eugene Bleuler, and for some years (1907-1912) was closely associated with Sigmund Freud. To the general public his name is second only to Freud, and his fame has spread perhaps even more widely around the world than has Freud's. His first book was published in 1902, his last book posthumously. His collected works have been published in twenty volumes. After breaking with Freud, he went his own way, founding a school called "analytic psychology" that is still active today. It has had a greater impact on the general educated public than it has on psychiatry proper. Nevertheless, most eclectic psychotherapists have incorporated some ideas that originated with Jung.

Many people have accused Jung of having collaborated with Nazi psychiatrists in Germany during the Second World War. Jung and his followers claimed that by accepting the presidency of the International Society for Psychotherapy (until then a uniquely

German society) Jung was only attempting to protect his Jewish colleagues, since they could not become members of the German Society but could become members of the International Society. Here are the facts.

In 1930, the German psychiatrist Ernst Kretschmer became president of the Allgemeine Ärztliche Gesellschaft für Psychotherapie (the General Medical Society for Psychotherapy), which had been founded two years earlier with Carl Jung as the vice-president. In 1933, when a general ruling was proclaimed in Germany that all societies had to conform to Nazi ideology (Gleichschaltung), Kretschmer, who was not a Nazi and who also wished to keep psychotherapy under the control of psychiatry, resigned his position. Jung became the president of the International Medical Society for Psychotherapy, and Matthias Heinrich Göring (1879-1945), a cousin of Hermann Göring, became the president of the German branch of the society. The main function of the society, apart from meetings, was the publication of a German-language journal (published in Leipzig) entitled Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie und ihre Grenzgebiete (Journal for Psychotherapy and Related Disciplines), of which Jung now became the editor-in-chief. In the volume published in December 1933, in which this announcement was made, two things appeared that captured the world's attention, and that have continued to be written about over the years. The first was that Göring published a momentous statement:

> It is expected of all members of the Society who write articles, that they will have read through with great scientific care the path-breaking book by Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf, and will recognize it as essential

[to their work].[7]

Equally important is an editorial that Jung himself wrote. It is less than one page long. He explained that he had come to take over the presidency of the Society and the editorship of the Zentralblatt. He spoke of the prevailing confusion in psychotherapy "not unlike the previous state of affairs in politics," a pointed reference to Hitler and a subtle commendation of the "accommodation process," since he was hinting that the confusion had now ended. Then Jung made the statement for which he has been so bitterly condemned over the years:

> The differences which actually do exist between Germanic and Jewish psychology and which have long been known to every intelligent[8] person are no longer to be glossed over, and this can only be beneficial to science.[9]

The storm broke a few months later, when a Swiss psychiatrist and psychoanalyst, Gustav Bally, published an article in the Neue Zürcher Zeitung, 27 February 1934, in which he quoted Göring's words, pointed out that the journal had been gleichgeschaltet (made to conform to Nazi ideology) and that a Swiss national, Jung, had become the editor. Jung responded at length on 13, 14, and 15 March. Among other things, Jung wrote:

> Should I, as a prudent neutral, withdraw into security this side of the frontier and wash my hands in innocence, or should I -- as I was well aware -- risk my skin and expose myself to the inevitable misunderstandings which no one escapes who, from higher necessity, has to make a pact with existing political powers in Germany?[10]

The "higher necessity" that forced Jung to "make a pact with the existing political powers in Germany" apparently was the fear that psychotherapy was in danger of disappearing in Nazi Germany:

> As conditions then were, a single stroke of the pen in high places would have sufficed to sweep all psychotherapy under the table. That had to be prevented at all costs for the sake of suffering humanity, doctors, and - last but not least - science and civilization.[11]

Jung then explained that he had been told that the statements by Göring would appear in a special German issue, and would not be included in the international issue with his name on the cover:

> In this way my name unexpectedly appeared over a National Socialist manifesto, which to me personally was anything but agreeable. And yet after all - what is help or friendship that costs nothing?

"Medicine," Jung went on to say, "has nothing to do with politics...and therefore it can and should be practiced for the good of suffering humanity under all governments....The doctor who, in wartime, gives his help to the wounded of the other side will surely not be held a traitor to his country."[12] Jung was no doubt aware of the real charge, namely that the "other side" to which he had given his help was not the victim, the Jew, but the oppressor, the Nazi:

> Admittedly I was incautious, so incautious as to do the very thing most open to misunderstanding at the present moment: I have tabled the Jewish question. This I did deliberately....The Jewish problem is a

> regular complex, a festering wound, and no responsible doctor could bring himself to apply methods of medical hush-hush in this matter.[13]

But if we go back to the words that Jung actually wrote in the journal in 1933, he had not raised the "question" (a few lines later to become the "problem") of the Jews in order to help them, or to convince the Germans that their attitude was a pernicious one. For whom was the "Jewish problem" a problem, a "festering wound"? The very terms, even here, in his so-called explanation (it is certainly not intended as an apology), were cast in the language of the aggressor. Jung then said that "my public will object, why raise the Jewish problem today of all days and in Germany of all places?" Jung justified himself by pointing out that he had made similar statements earlier in his career: "If I am to be exploited for political ends, there's nothing I can do to stop it." But Jung could easily have stopped it by not having made the statements in the first place, or he could have stopped it by taking an explicit position against the persecution of the Jews, something he did not do. Yet in the same article Jung wrote that "I must confess my total inability to understand why it should be a crime to speak of 'Jewish' psychology." This lack of awareness does not absolve Jung, it simply adds ignorance (which is another form of oppression) to opportunism.

Had Jung really been outraged, as he claimed, he could have announced his immediate resignation. In fact Jung remained editor until 1939. In a letter to the head of the Society's Danish branch, Dr. Oluf Bruell, dated 2 March 1934, Jung wrote of Göring's manifesto as if it were only "a tactical blunder" and

states that he will "try everything possible in the future to eliminate political influences from the Zentralblatt."[14] His own statements about "Jewish" and "Aryan" psychology Jung did not consider political.

On the same day, 2 March, Jung also wrote Walter Cimbal, a German psychiatrist who was secretary of the German General Medical Society for Psychotherapy from 1933 to 1935. Jung certainly did not complain vociferously of the "blunder" in including Göring's manifesto but only asked for some influence on the make-up of the Journal, and promises that he will not "under any circumstances use this influence for the publication of anything that is politically inadmissible," a promise he was to keep.[15]

It is useful to keep in mind the person that Jung was addressing. Walter Cimbal joined the Nazi party in 1933. An article Cimbal wrote for the Deutsche Seelenheilkunde concludes with a warm recommendation of Mein Kampf.[16] Freudian psychoanalysis was under vicious attack, most notably by Julius Streicher, the Nazi editor of Der Stürmer. Jung must have been aware of this. He must also have known that these attacks were often led by the very men who were responsible for the Zentralblatt that he edited, since these men were appointed by Göring. To his European colleagues, Jung attempted to play down the significance of these affiliations. Thus he reassured the Dutch psychiatrist J. H. van der Hoop by writing, in a letter dated 12 March 1934, that "you can be assured that the Nazi outpourings of the German members are due to political necessity rather than to the religious convictions of the gentlemen in question."[17]

Jung wanted very much to convince others and perhaps himself that what was happening in Germany was unrelated to real persecution. In a letter dated 26 May 1934, Jung attempted to defend himself to James Kirsch, one of his Jewish students who was then living in Palestine: "Neither have I addressed Hitler over the radio or in any other manner, nor have I made any political statements."[18] Jung evidently did not consider his earlier comments to be political. In the same letter his anger showed when he wrote "As you know, Freud previously accused me of anti-Semitism because I could not abide his soulless materialism. The Jew directly solicits anti-Semitism with his readiness to scent out anti-Semitism everywhere."[19]

After the war, of course, Jung claimed that he often spoke up for Jewish doctors in Germany and elsewhere. But I have not been able to find contemporary evidence supporting this claim. A letter Jung wrote to Eric Benjamin Strauss, a British psychiatrist who was a member of the organizing Committee for the 10th International Medical Congress for Psychotherapy at Oxford in 1938, suggests that there was some objection on the part of the German members to Jews being permitted to speak at the Congress. Jung wrote: "I cannot and shall not exclude non-Aryan speakers." However, he went on to state: "The only condition on which I insist is that everybody, Aryan or non-Aryan, refrains from airing remarks apt to arouse the political psychosis of our days."[20] In other words, Jung was taking what he claimed to be a strictly neutral position in public. By not speaking out, Jung was eloquently silent <u>for</u> the Nazis. Moreover, he was closely associated with men who were, in his own Society, demanding that Jews not be heard. <u>All</u> of the Germans with whom Jung worked in

the Society were Nazis or Nazi collaborators.[21] Thus the German psychiatrist, Gustav Richard Heyer, was a staunch supporter of the regime from the beginning, becoming a party member in 1937. His colleagues recall him as an enthusiastic Nazi (Cocks, p. 61). He was also a student of Jung (see Jung's letter to him dated 20 April 1934). Hans von Hattingberg, another member of the inner circle connected with Jung's journal, "responded enthusiastically to the events of 1933; if he had reservations then, or regrets later, we do not know about them."[22]

In 1934, in the Zentralblatt again, Jung returned to the "Jewish problem" so important to his German colleagues, in an article entitled "The State of Psychotherapy Today" (CW, 10, pp. 157-173): "The Jews have this peculiarity in common with women; being physically weaker, they have to aim at the chinks in the armor of their adversary." Jung's next passage ranks as one of the most disturbing things he has ever written:

> The Jewish race as a whole -- at least this is my experience -- posses an unconscious which can be compared with the "Aryan"[23] only with reserve. Creative individuals apart, the average Jew is far too conscious and differentiated to go about pregnant with the tensions of unborn futures. The "Aryan" unconscious has a higher potential than the Jewish; that is both the advantage and the disadvantage of a youthfulness not yet fully weaned from barbarism. In my opinion it has been a grave error in medical psychology up till now to apply Jewish categories -- which are not even binding on all Jews -- indiscriminately to Germanic and Slavic Christendom.

Because of this the most precious secret of the Germanic peoples -- their creative and intuitive depth of soul -- has been explained as a morass of banal infantilism, while my own warning voice has for decades been suspected of anti-Semitism. This suspicion emanated from Freud. He did not understand the Germanic psyche any more than did his Germanic followers.[24] Has the formidable phenomenon of National Socialism, on which the whole world gazes with astonished eyes, taught them better? Where was that unparalleled tension and energy while as yet no National Socialism existed? Deep in the Germanic psyche, in a pit that is anything but a garbage-bin of unrealizable infantile wishes and unresolved family resentments. A movement that grips a whole nation must have matured in every individual as well. That is why I say that the Germanic unconscious contains tensions and potentialities which medical psychology must consider in its evaluation of the unconscious. Its business is not with neuroses but with human beings -- that, in fact, is the grand privilege of medical psychology: to treat the whole man and not an artificially segregated function.[25] And that is why its scope must be widened to reveal to the physician's gaze not just the pathological aberrations of a disturbed psyche development, but the creative powers of the psyche laboring at the future; not just a dreary fragment but the meaningful whole.[26]

Lest it be lost on his audience that he is agreeing with the

common Nazi criticism of Freudian (i.e., Jewish) psychoanalysis, Jung, on the next page, is more explicit:

> The poison of the 'low-down'[27] interpretation has bitten so deeply into the marrow of these people's bones that they can no longer think at all except in the infantile-perverse jargon of certain neurotics who display all the peculiarities of a Freudian psychology.[28]

Jung writes that Jews are over-intellectual compared to the "decent" German:

> And if he [the Freudian] degrades everything to the level of a 'dirty joke' psychology,[29] then we must not be surprised if the patient becomes spiritually blighted and compensates for this blight by incurable intellectualism ....To treat such people reductively, to impute ulterior motives to them, and to suspect their natural wholesomeness of unnatural obscenities is not only sinfully stupid but positively criminal.[30]

Jung's claim that he was duped into accepting Heinrich Göring's praise for Hitler becomes highly suspect when we examine the actual issues of the Zentralblatt published under Jung's name, form 1933 to 1939. In reading through the issues, the first thing that struck me was that the infamous comment by Göring that psychotherapists must from now on take as their scientific model Hitler's Mein Kampf, was actually made in the section titled "News" (Aktuelles), on the very first page of the issue of January 1933 (the year in which a party-directed boycott against Jewish businesses, doctors, and lawyers took place for four days in April), right after Jung's short announcement

containing firstly the statement that he is taking over both the presidency of the Society and the editorship of the Journal, and secondly, his cri de guerre that Jewish and Aryan differences will no longer be dissimulated.

The volume begins with Göring's statement that the new society was founded on 15 September 1933, under the guiding principles of National Socialism (Nazism), continues with the comment about Hitler, and goes on to name the new members of the committee. Since the remark about Hitler is embedded in a commentary providing news to the membership of the Society, it would seem that contrary to Jung's claim, this message was never intended to be published in a separate issue, but was obviously meant for this place, right after Jung's remarks. If this is true, it would mean that Jung was not deceived by Göring, or any other member of the committee, into believing that this statement about Hitler would not be published in "his" journal.

The evidence for Jung's collaboration continues to mount. The subsequent volumes display the influence of Hitler and the racism that Jung explicitly claimed, after the war, could not have been tolerated in a journal of which he was editor-in-chief. Volume 7 of the Zentralblatt, in 1934, was the first with Jung's name on the cover. It contains an account of the first Congress that was held in Bad Nauheim, 10-13 May 1934. On Friday, 11 May 1934 the congress was opened by three speeches. One was by Dr. R. Sommer on the history of psychotherapy, one by Jung, and one by M.H. Göring in which he speaks of the "impregnation of German psychotherapy through the ideas of the Führer" (Befruchtung der deutschen Psychotherapie durch die Ideen des Führers) (p. 130). In that same issue, on page 168, is an article by K. Gauger,

entitled "Psychotherapy and a Political World View" which contains these words:

> Since Adolf Hitler, the words Volk, and country, discipline, fidelity and honor have regained their biological importance in Germany....All in all, medicine in the new Germany has taken on a political significance that no one would have dared to imagine previously. I have only to point to the grand political designs in regard to population, which are medically oriented, on the part of the Führer, his extraordinarily significant measures in regard to racial hygiene, and other matters.

This is clearly a reference to the plans that Hitler carried out, with the help of German psychiatrists, of sterilizing mental patients.[31]

A Danish Nazi sympathizer, the psychiatrist Oluf Bruell, published an article in the same issue (pp. 277-286) with the title "Psychotherapy in the North," an account of a young blond northerner who is "traumatized" by seeing a film about the Hunchback of Notre Dame. The author ends by saying:

> As we saw, the case presented is concerned with a person of northern Germanic extraction of exceptional racial purity, who, in her tender childhood was exposed to an artificial-psychic traumatization in which the ugliness of life (i.e., the existence of dark, deformed human beings) swept over her budding idealism. In contrast many individuals who are not as high-bred could have weathered similar experiences with ease.[32]

So here, in a journal of which Jung was editor-in-chief,

and at the very congress where he was to become the president, racist comments were made, Hitler was praised, and Northern, as opposed to Jewish, psychology was recognized. Could Jung claim that he had no idea this was going to happen, or that he could not prevent the publication of these articles in his journal?

In 1936 (a year after the enactment of the Nuremberg Laws, where Jews were defined as a separate race whose marriage or sexual contact with "Aryans" was forbidden by Law; illegal sexual relations were called Rassenschande, or "race defilement"),[33] with Jung's name again on the cover, M.H. Göring has an article in which he quoted extensively from Hitler, and then wrote:

> Whoever lives in the national-socialist state and supports it, must recognize racial contrasts and act accordingly. It certainly is understandable that the Party looked with great suspicion on everything connected with psychotherapy because the idea of a racial world view is totally alien to psychotherapy.[34]

Jung, as is completely clear from these quotations, had to be aware of the deep anti-Semitism of the organization of which he had now become president. His claims, after the war, that he was only trying to help the Jews, ring deeply hollow and false to whoever takes the trouble to go back and examine what was actually printed.

It is clear to me that Jung's views, at the time, were often in sympathy with those of the Nazis.[35] Thus he gave an interview on Radio Berlin on 21 June 1933 to his student Adolf Weizsäcker, a German neurologist and psychiatrist.[36] The interviewer introduced Jung by stressing his Protestant background, in contrast to the Jewish background of Freud and Adler. He then

said that the Germans were surrounded by misunderstanding on the part of the other European nations. Jung was sympathetic and explained that the German people's "enthusiasm for the reconstruction of the German community remains incomprehensible to Western Europeans." Then Jung quoted Hitler, and I believe it is the only time he ever did:

> Only the self-development of the individual, which I consider to be the supreme goal of all psychological endeavor, can produce consciously responsible spokesmen and leaders of the collective movement. As Hitler said recently, the leader must be able to be alone and must have the courage to go his own way.[37]

In October 1938, just before Kristallnacht, Jung was interviewed by the American correspondent H.R. Knickerbocker. The interview was published in Hearst's International-Cosmopolitan for January 1939, and brought Jung's name to the attention of many people in the United States.[38] What is so extraordinary about this interview is Jung's clear admiration for Mussolini and his decidedly positive words about Hitler. About Mussolini he said that he was a man of style and good taste, who was "warm," and "human," "I couldn't help liking Mussolini." His comments about Hitler are no less disturbing:

> There is no question but that Hitler belongs in the category of the truly mystic medicine man. As somebody commented about him at the last Nuremberg party congress, since the time of Mohammed nothing like it has been seen in this world. This markedly mystic characteristic of Hitler's is what makes him do things which seem to us illogical, inexplicable, curious and

unreasonable.... So you see, Hitler is a medicine man, a form of a spiritual vessel, a demi-deity or even better, a myth....

Jung reduced an entire political ideology and a murderous political reality to a psychological interpretation:

> You could say that he has a tremendous mother complex, which means that he will be under the domination either of a woman or of an idea. Idea is always female.

Does this mean that Hitler's "idea" of killing the Jews, mental patients, homosexuals, gypsies and slave is "feminine"?[39] In these passages, Jung did not distance himself in any way from the men he is discussing. Later, as we shall see, he stated that his intention was to warn people of the dangers he saw. Jung claimed, for example that he warned the world about the German's identification with Wotan early on. Here is a passage from this 1938 interview:

> Again, you take the widespread revival in the Third Reich of the cult of Wotan. Who was Wotan? God of wind. Take the name "Sturmabteilung" -- Storm Troops. Storm, you see -- the wind.... And all these symbols together of a Third Reich led by its prophet under the banners of wind and storm and whirling vortices point to a mass movement which is to sweep the German people in a hurricane of unreasoning emotion on and on to a destiny which perhaps none but the seer, the prophet, the Führer himself can foretell -- and perhaps, not even he.[40]

After the war Jung's tone changed entirely. His most famous

piece is entitled "After the Catastrophe" and was published in Zürich in the Neue Schweizer Rundschau in 1945.[41] Because of the controversy that had raged over Jung's earlier statements, there can be little doubt that he wrote this piece as a response. Indeed, in his Preface he more or less explicitly acknowledged this: "My statements have evidently led to all manner of misunderstandings...."[42] Although Jung did not have to wait until the end of the war to explain his position (he could easily have done so, from neutral Switzerland, before or during the war) he was surprised that people took his silence badly:

> ...it certainly never occurred to me that a time would come when I should be reproached for having said absolutely nothing about these things before 1945.[43]

"After the Catastrophe" has a peculiarly impersonal quality to it. Jung is writing from a certain distance, as if it had nothing to do with his own personal conduct during the war. And clearly Jung, to judge from the two passages quoted above, knew that his response would be judged as an explanation for his personal behavior. But Jung sought to avoid this aspect of the essay when he explained his reasons for writing: "Questions are being asked on all sides about the meaning of the whole tragedy. People have even turned to me for an explanation, and I have had to answer them there and then to the best of my ability."

Now Jung heaped contempt on Hitler and the Germans. He called what happened "the most monstrous crime of all ages." He mentioned, several times, the concentration camps. Hitler he called a "megalomaniac psychopath,"[44] "a psychic scarecrow ... rather than a human being,"[45] "he was an utterly incapable, unadapted, irresponsible, psychopathic personality, full of

empty, infantile fantasies, but cursed with the keen intuition of a rat or a guttersnipe."[46] Then Jung launched a sudden, unexpected diatribe against modern painting, atonal music and James Joyce, exclaiming that "here we already have the germ of what was to become a political reality in Germany." But far from explaining Nazism, this is remarkably similar to Nazi writing during the war about the corrupting effect of modern art. Jung also complained bitterly that his warnings were not recognized and he feels like the lonely prophet,[47] though the passages we have seen earlier could hardly be considered to contain a prophetic warning. The following lines may offer some clue as to what Jung was evading:

> If only people could realize what an enrichment it is to find one's own guilt, what a sense of honor and spiritual dignity! But nowhere does there seem to be a glimmering of this insight. Instead, we hear only of attempts to shift the blame on to others -- 'no one will admit to having been a Nazi.'[48]

Who is the very best example of this complete lack of insight if not Jung himself. For nowhere in the essay did Jung apologize for anything he ever did or failed to do. No matter what his explanation was, surely Jung must have realized that many of his remarks before and during the war could be used against the Jews. As we will see below, Jung's words were actually quoted by Nazi authors and thus added to the general climate in which it was considered permissible first to denounce Jewish values, and eventually to destroy the Jews themselves. The main point of Jung's essay was that "the history of the last twelve years is the case-chart of an hysterical patient" (p.209)

but this psychiatrization only served to screen Jung all the more from any direct involvement.[49] Surely "hysteria," with its overtones of "unconscious" lying, etc., is irrelevant when one considers what Jung did, in fact, quite consciously say.

Jung's student and secretary, Aniela Jaffé, wrote an article, "C.G. Jung and National Socialism,"[50] in which she attempted to defend Jung. Her claim, unsupported by any evidence, is that Jung acted correctly since "there was no other conceivable way in which his German-Jewish colleagues might have been helped." But she did have the honesty to say that what Jung did was a "grave human error."[51]

Jaffé stated that Jung "was pitiless in his public criticism" but she admits that this only becomes clear from his writings "after the gruesome drama was over."[52] Clearly Ms. Jaffé, herself Jewish, did not feel good about what Jung did and even about his later pronouncements. However, she has a remarkable explanation:

> Three decades have passed since the Hitler terror. Jung died in 1961, and in retrospect even his mistakes at that period fall into place in his life and work without diminishing the stature of his personality. To adopt the language of analytical psychology, one could speak of a manifestation of his shadow which, as an archetype, clings to every man and is often all the blacker the brighter the light his personality sheds. Jung gave mankind too much for his shadow ever to dim his spiritual significance and his greatness as a man.[53]

What Jung did was wrong. To call this wrong-doing a

Diese Seite fehlt in der Vorlage

This page is missing in the book

translated, misquoting him on the subject: his phrase `looking with amazed eyes` [at the trend of events in Europe] had been transcribed as `looking with admiring eyes.` He became so outspoken in the criticisms of Germany that Mrs. Jung was afraid he would get into trouble, with so much German influence in Zürich. Referring to the rumors of his so-called Nazi sympathies, C.G. told me that his name was on the black list in Germany because of his views, and that he would certainly have been shot at once had he fallen into Nazi hands.[55]

If we look at Jung's address to the Oxford Congress we do not find any criticism of Nazism, indeed, no mention of Germany at all.[56] Nobody has ever confirmed that Jung's name was on a blacklist, and in fact, we know, from his own account, that he met Goebbels in Berlin, that he had been invited by Hitler's doctors to examine him, and finally that "a student of Jung's, Wolfgang Kranefeldt, has recalled that when he went to Berlin in 1935 to give a series of lectures on archetypes, he was received with great joy and admiration, especially by Heinrich Göring, specifically because of his affiliation with Jung."[57] Most of those who knew Jung do not want to deal with the matter of Jung's association with the Nazis in any way. Thus Barbara Hannah in her book Jung: His Life and Work[58] wrote: "To anyone, who, like myself, was with Jung in Berlin in July, 1933, and who saw and heard him frequently during the next twenty-eight years, the libel that Jung was a Nazi is so absurd and so entirely without foundation that it goes against the grain to take it seriously enough to contradict it." The fact is that Jung made statements

and took actions that harmed Jews and others, and whether he joined the Nazi party or not is irrelevant. Jung's words speak loud and clear and the message they give is one of collaboration. The reason it is so important to recognize this fact is that Jung's psychotherapy contains attitudes that are compatible with his own collaboration. With its coercion and disdain for the real traumas that people experience, there is a deep strain of fascism running through Jung's psychotherapy.

Surely what Jung did, at this critical moment in history, was central to who Jung was. Jung did not take a principled stance against fascism, ever. He did not speak out for the suffering of the Jews or any other group persecuted by the Nazis.[59] I get the impression from reading what Jung wrote that his actions haunted him for the rest of his life. Because never again, after 1945, did Jung write about the Second World War, or Hitler, in any sustained fashion, in all the many years of writing that lay ahead of him until his death in 1961.

I know that Jung had many Jewish pupils both before and after the war. I know too, that Harvard in 1936 gave him an honorary doctorate, and so did Oxford in 1938 and that in 1937 he was invited to give the Terry Lectures at Yale University. I know that Jung's life was filled with honors too many to mention. But I also know that he never fully faced what he had done, and that, almost as much as the actions themselves, is inexcusable.[60]

NOTES

1. Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson, Against Therapy: Emotional Tyranny and the Myth of Psychological Healing (New York:

Atheneum, 1988).

2. M.H. Göring, "Weltanschauung und Psychotherapie," Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie und ihre Grenzgebiete 9: 293, 1936: "Die gestellte Frage, warum arische Patienten nicht rassisch träumen und assoziieren, kann auch auf eine andere Weise beantwortet werden. Rosenberg hat auf dem Reichsparteitag 1936 darauf hingewiesen, dass in den Weltstädten hunderttausende wurzellos gewordene Intellektuelle leben, für die Blut und Boden keine Bedeutung haben. Gerade diese werden nicht rassisch denken, träumen und assoziieren. Gerade solche Entwurzelte sind oft unsere Patienten. Wir mussen uns hüten, diese als Beispiel für arisches Seelenleben hinzustellen."

3. Göring, "Weltanschauung," 1936: "Es wird also unsere Aufgabe sein, in den Vorträgen, Vorlesungen und Kursen zu versuchen, eine Scheidung zwischen jüdischer und arisch-germanischer Weltanschauung herauszuarbeiten."

4. M.H. Göring, "Schlussansprache," Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie und ihre Grenzgebiete 7: 133, 1934: "Hinweis auf Hitlers Mein Kampf; Pflicht für jeden Psychotherapeuten, es zu studieren. Der Wert eines Buches hängt nicht von wissenschaftlichen Ausdrücken ab, sondern vom inneren Gehalt. Am wichtigsten ist das Intuitive. Bitte an die Ausländer, ihre Eindrücke in ihrem Heimatland zu verbreiten: voller Einsatz der nationalsozialistischen Ärzte für die Idee des Führers aus Liebe zum Volk."

5. K. Gauger, "Psychotherapy and the political world view," Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie und ihre Grenzgebiete 7: 158, 1934: "Es ist also klar angegeben, dass der Sinn meiner Ausführungen ein politischer ist, wie ich ja auch in der Uniform des Soldaten der Politik, des SA - Mannes, vor Ihnen stehe."

6. James Kirsch, "Carl Gustav Jung and the Jews: the real story," Journal of Psychology and Judaism 6 (2): 113-43, 1982.

7. As we shall see below, Göring never hesitated to cite Hitler in this journal, as Jung well knew. The Nazi party daily, the Völkischer Beobachter, in 1938 reported a speech by Göring in which he mentions an exchange of telegrams with Hitler, quotes approvingly from Mein Kampf, praises hereditary biology, and decries the former influence of Jews in the field of depth psychology. This is cited in Geoffrey Cocks, Psychotherapy in

the Third Reich: The Göring Institute. (New York: Oxford University press, 1985), p. 115.

8. Actually the German word is einsichtig, which means reasonable, sensible, discerning; since the word comes from Einsicht, literally "insight," it also connotes psychiatric wisdom, i.e., Jung is making a psychiatric statement here. The quotations come from Volume 10 of the Collected Works of C.G. Jung: Civilization in Transition, 2nd ed., trans. R.F.C. Hull (Bollingen Series XX) (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970; first published in 1964). Most of the material related to these issues is contained in the Appendix. For comparison with the German text, I have used Gesammelte Werke, vol. 10: Zivilisation im Übergang, edited by Lilly Jung-Merker and Elisabeth Ruf (Olten: Walter-Verlag, 1974).

9. C.G. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 533.

10. C.G. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 535-6.

11. C.G. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 536.

12. C.G. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 538-9.

13. C.G. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 539.

14. C.G. Jung to Oluf Bruell, 2 March 1934, in Gerhard Adler and Aniela Jaffé (eds.) C. G. Jung Letters, trans. R.F.C. Hull, vol. 2 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), p. 144-45.

15. C.G. Jung to Walter Cimbal, 2 March 1934, in Letters, p. 145-46.

16. Cited in Cocks, Psychotherapy in the Third Reich, p. 83.

17. C.G. Jung to van der Hoop, 12 March 1934, in Letters, p. 146-47.

18. Letters, p. 160-63.

19. The reference to Freud is no doubt to "On the History of the Psycho-Analytical Movement" which was published in 1914, where Freud writes (Standard Edition), vol. 14, p. 43: "[Jung] seemed ready to enter into a friendly relationship with me and for my sake to give up certain racial prejudices which he had previously permitted himself."

20. C.G. Jung to E.B. Strauss, 1938, Letters, p. 242.

21. The members of the managing committee were: Walter

Cimbal, Carl Haeberlin, Hans von Hattingberg, Gustav Richard Heyer, Fritz Kunkel, I.H. Schultz, Harald Schultz-Hencke, Leonhard Seif, and Viktor von Weizsäcker. For information on the Nazi activities of these men, see Cocks, Psychotherapy in the Third Reich, [passim], and the 1983 issue of the German journal Psyche (vol. 37). One eye-witness account of a meeting in 1936 or 1937 at which Jung was present, tells of a German psychiatrist who "went up to the speaker's place in an SS uniform. He stretched out his hand and started out with 'Heil Hitler'." See the outstanding book by Lenny Lapon, Mass Murderers in White Coats: Psychiatric Genocide in Nazi Germany and the United States (Springfield, MA: Psychiatric Genocide Research Institute, 1987), p. 147.

22. Cited in Cocks, Psychotherapy in the Third Reich, p. 70.

23. The quotation marks are only due to the squeamishness of the translator, as if to indicate that Jung was using the word in a special sense. But he was not. The German text (p. 190), has das sich mit dem arischen nur bedingt vergleichen lässt...., which makes it clear that Jung uses the word without quotation marks. It is not capitalized in German only because it is an adjective, and adjectives are not capitalized in German.

24. The German text (Jung: Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 191) is stronger: Nachbeter is pejorative, not just a follower, but a parrot, somebody who repeats uncritically or thoughtlessly.

25. The German reads nicht nur behandeln darf, sondern auch soll, which is omitted from the English. This means that medical psychology "not only can but should treat" the whole person.

26. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 166.

27. Entwertende Deutung, that is, a "devaluating" interpretation, one that debases the individual.

28. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 167.

29. The translator has omitted a phrase here. Jung (Gesammete Werke 10, 192) actually writes: "...alles und jedes in den infantil-perversen Sumpf einer obszönen Witzpsychologie," i.e., the analyst drags "everything into the swamp of the infantile and perverse morass of an obscene joke psychology."

30. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 168.

31. The subject of the mass killing of mental patients (estimates are 350,000 killed) has been dealt with, first by Alexander Mitscherlich and Fred Mielke, The Death Doctors (London: Elek Books, 1949). Mitscherlich, a German psychoanalyst, was shunned by his colleagues after writing this book, as he explains in the Preface. Frederick Wertham has a chapter on it in his 1969 book, A Sign for Cain: An Exploration of Human Violence (New York: Basic Books, 1986). But the best book I have seen is by Lenny Lapon, Mass Murderers in White Coats, which he had to publish himself: (Psychiatric Genocide Research Institute, PO Box 80071, Springfield, MA 01138-0071). Wertham notes that one young psychiatrist, Dr. Theo Lang, "...made a serious attempt to stem the whole program. He was at that time in Germany and later became chief physician of the institution Herisau in Switzerland. On 20 January 1941 he obtained an interview with Dr. M.H. Göring at the German Institute for Psychological Research and Psychotherapy. His plan was to get Dr. Göring to sign a declaration against the extermination of mental patients. When he tried to tell Dr. Göring the whole story of the program, which at that time had been going on for more than a year, he found that Dr. Göring knew all about it and confirmed its truth. However, he refused to sign the declaration."(p.174) Whether Jung knew about the killings has never been addressed.

32. Oluf Bruell, Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie und ihre Grenzgebiete 7: 277-86, 1934.

33. See Sarah Gordon, Hitler, Germans and the Jewish Question (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), p.121.

34. M.H. Göring, "World view and psychotherapy," Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie und ihre Grenzgebiete 9: 292, 1936.

35. A Canadian psychiatrist, George MacLean, in an article "Jung the 'Protector'," published in Midstream (April, 1987, p.39-41) notes the parallels between the comments by Jung cited above, and very similar quotations from Hitler's Mein Kampf. He quotes Hitler: "Of two forms the strongest is the Aryan....the Jew was never in the position of a culture of his own,...for his spiritual activity has always been furnished by others at all times. His intellect has developed through the culture that

surrounds him. Never did the reverse process occur." Jung, in "The State of Psychotherapy Today" which was published in the German Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie und ihre Grenzgebiete in 1934 (Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 165) says something very similar: "The Aryan unconscious, on the other hand, contains explosive forces and seeds of a future yet to be born, and these may not be devalued as nursery romanticism without psychic danger. The still youthful Germanic peoples are fully capable of creating new cultural forms that still lie dormant in the darkness of the unconscious of every individual -- seeds bursting with energy and capable of mighty explosion. The Jew, who is something of a nomad, has never yet created a cultural form of his own and as far as we can see never will, since all his instincts and talents require a more or less civilized nation to act as host for their development." It seems hard to avoid the conclusion that Jung, aware of Hitler's remarks, was echoing them deliberately in a publication which would certainly catch the eyes (in 1934) of the Nazi authorities.

36. William McGuire and R.F.C. Hull (eds.), C.G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), p. 59-66.

37. C. G. Jung Speaking, p. 64.

38. Jung's remarks have been published in McGuire and Hull, C.G Jung Speaking, p. 115-135, under the title "Diagnosing the Dictators."

39. Later, in 1945 (Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p.204) Jung will say, about Hitler: "It is also difficult to understand how his ranting speeches, delivered in shrill, grating, womanish tones, could have made such an impression."

40. C.G. Jung, in McGuire and Hull, C.G. Jung Speaking, p. 118.

41. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 194-217. Jung collected three of his essays, written between 1936 and 1945, and published them together in 1946. these were brought out in England as Essays on Contemporary Events, trans. by Elizabeth Welsh, Barbara Hannah, and Mary Briner (London: Kegan Paul, 1947), with a Preface and an Epilogue by Jung.

42. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 177.

43. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 236.

44. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 201.

45. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 204.

46. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 223.

47. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 201.

48. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 202.

49. "When I say that the Germans are physically ill it is surely kinder than saying that they are criminals." (p.209). Fortunately the world chose, in the Nuremberg trials, to avoid psychology and apply the law.

50. Aniela Jaffé, "C.G. Jung and National Socialism," in From the Life and Work of C.G. Jung, trans. R.F.C. Hull (New York: Harper & Row, 1971, first published in German in 1968), p. 81.

51. Jaffé, "C.G. Jung," p. 85.

52. Jaffé, "C.G. Jung," p. 91.

53. Jaffé, "C.G. Jung," p. 95.

54. Random House, 1975, p. 195.

55. Meetings with Jung (Zürich: Daimon, 1985).

56. Jung, Civilization in Transition, vol. 10, p. 564-67.

57. Cited in Cocks, Psychotherapy in the Third Reich, p. 12.

58. G.P. Putnam, 1976, p.213. An early article in defense of Jung was written by a child psychotherapist Ernest Harms, who knew both Jung and Freud: "Carl Gustav Jung - Defender of Freud and the Jews: A Chapter of European Psychiatric History Under the Nazi Yoke." Psychiatric Quarterly 20: 199-230, 1946. This was the first article to quote many of the letters and important passages from Jung's writings. Nevertheless, the conclusions are based more upon Harms' personal association with Jung than with the objective evidence: "From the days when Jewish psychiatrists in Germany were disqualified Jung made every attempt to help them, as he fought against anti-Semitism in general whenever it was possible to do so without endangering his own moves to help. Anyone who, like this present author, has tried to learn from Dr. Jung, must have been struck by the fine distinction expressed through his actions and in the restraint imposed upon the spoken word" (p.222). But the distinction was so fine that I was unable to uncover it. I have not been able to discover the details of the help that Jung supposedly gave to individual Jews.

59. Lapon, Mass Murderers in White Coats, draws attention

to the Nazi killings of mental patients in the 1930s. I cannot believe that Jung knew nothing about it, given his close association with doctors high in the psychiatric hierarchy of Germany. Needless to say, he never mentions it and we will probably never know whether this is because he knew nothing about it or chose not to reveal what he knew.

60. Some other accounts of this episode in Jung's life can be found in Edward Glover's excellent Freud or Jung? (New York: Meridian Books, 1956); Paul J. Stern, C.G. Jung: The Haunted Prophet (New York: Braziller, 1976) gives a fair, balanced account; Henri Ellenberger has a long chapter with much documentation: "Carl Gustav Jung and Analytical Psychology" (pp. 657-748) in his The Discovery of the Unconscious (New York: Basic Books, 1970); a defense of Jung is to be found in E.A. Bennet in his C.G Jung (London: Barrie & Rockliff, 1961), p. 56-62; Gerhard Wehr's Carl Gustav Jung (Munich: Kösel Verlag, 1985) is the latest complete biography. As far as I know, Freud never made any public statement about Jung's actions. However, his student Franz Alexander apparently spoke to Freud about it, for he writes in The History of Psychiatry (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p.409: "What moved Jung to play a prominent role in a newly racially oriented psychological movement? Since it was obviously neither racial prejudice nor Nazi conviction, what was it then? It is difficult to evade the answer that it was sheer opportunism. Freud's suspicion was that Jung, to achieve acclaim, was not immune to allowing his views to be influenced by public writings during the Hitler era." (Emphasis in original.)