

ADDENDA 1906-1950

17 July 1914

The present situation is worse, or better, than before. Freud's last regrettable enunciation in the *Jahrbuch*,¹ which clearly bases ΨA on the principle of authority, has not passed unnoticed here. Our president Dr. Maeder has taken the initiative and proposed to the Zurich group that they resign *in toto* from the International Association. This has been done. In explaining the resignation a protest is being made against the principle of authority promulgated by Freud. Consequently we shall not attend the Dresden Congress.² Our moves are merely reactions to the papal policies of the Viennese. Naturally one should do what one can to open people's eyes. But they want to be blind, as was indubitably clear in Munich.³ Vienna is working against me with methods which are so unfair that I cannot defend myself. Personal insinuations are being bandied about—for instance, I had tried at Deuticke's to take over the *Jahrbuch*, and other such shameless lies. In a breach of medical discretion, Freud has even made hostile use of a patient's letter—a letter which the person concerned,

□ (Handwritten.) See Bjerre, 22 Jan. 34 (in vol. 1). For B.'s participation in the early psychoanalytic movement, see *The Freud/Jung Letters*, ed. William McGuire (1974), index, under his name.

¹ This refers to a passage in "On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement" (Standard Edn. 14, p. 43; originally written Jan.–Feb. 1914) where Freud, discussing the problem of his successor, says: "... in favour of Jung were his exceptional talents, the contributions he had already made to psycho-analysis, his independent position and the impression of assured energy which his personality conveyed. In addition to this, he 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. I had no inkling at that time that in spite of all these advantages the choice was a most unfortunate one, that I had lighted upon a person who was incapable of tolerating the authority of another, but who was still less capable of wielding it himself, and whose energies were relentlessly devoted to the furtherance of his own interests."

² On account of the outbreak of the First World War the Congress, planned for Sept. 1914, did not take place until Sept. 1918, when it was held in Budapest.

³ In a letter to Bjerre of 30 Sept. 13, Jung had written: "In the psychoanalytic world there has been a great uproar since Munich. From Vienna the watchword goes forth: We in Zurich have never had any notion of true and correct analysis, we are theological occultists, we introduce ethical demands into the patient which are not his own (!), etc. Not a trace of any desire to understand our viewpoint. Further I have heard that the Viennese did not let things come to an open break in Munich only because they did not want to endanger the existence of the newly founded [1912] *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse*."

JULY 1914 / MARCH 1927

whom I know very well, wrote in a moment of resistance against me.⁴ Supposing I were to publish what people have already told me about Freud!!! These practices are characteristic of Viennese policies. Such an enemy is not worth the name.

I am most grateful to you for the promise of your valuable assistance in connection with our publication.⁵ We shall not have very much to publish, since we are a relatively small group in which not all members are active as writers. This is something to be glad about, really, because nowadays too much is written and too little read.

Perhaps it would be worthwhile for the others if you went to the Dresden Congress and spoke your mind bluntly. It may be that a few people's eyes would then be opened after all.

Yours very sincerely, JUNG

⁴ The letter is published in "On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement," pp. 63f.

⁵ Cf. Maeder, 29 Oct. 13 (where, however, the first volume of the *Psychologische Abhandlungen*, published by Deuticke in 1914, is erroneously attributed to Rascher Verlag, which published the volumes that followed). This first volume of "publications of the Zurich school" contained papers by various writers, but later volumes were devoted almost entirely to Jung's papers.

To Oskar A. H. Schmitz

Dear Herr Schmitz,

7 January 1927

I, too, have been struck by the fact that people are not responding to the last part of your book.¹ There is something there. In some way it does not take hold. It is hard to say why. But I believe it is because you have not found the right "potential." There is too little difference between levels, at least so one feels. Either you have brought the incomprehensible too close to the comprehensible, or you have lifted yourself by means of an inflated balloon to the height of visions. Somehow you are too much on a level with them, so that no tension results. But just here there should be tension, for two worlds, two forms of experience that are in some way incommensurable, are colliding here. These visions formerly constituted the uttermost secret of the mystery! Since you have presented the subject in a very deco-

□ (Handwritten. Translated by Hildegard Nagel.) See Schmitz, 26 May 23 (in vol. 1).

¹ Unascertainable.

rous and dignified manner I cannot say that you have banalized the unexpressible. You have spoken only of the expressible, but in such a way that no one can guess that behind or beneath it the unexpressible secret lies buried, or that you yourself have any such notion. Your method of presentation is apparently complete and satisfying, but it lacks a sense of what lies beyond; one might say also that it is "unimpassioned" and probably hit the mark. *The experience lacks corporeality*, that is why it does not grip us. Somebody has even contested the authenticity of your experience and taken it for a made-up fantasy. This reaction seems to me important. It always seems to me that one says such things more effectively by leaving them unsaid. There is an art, not of speaking of such things, but of keeping silent. But I myself have no assured judgment about this, merely a marked reluctance to present anything in this direction to the public.

I have already pretty well worked out my Darmstadt lecture² and found that I am scarcely able to include everything that would be desirable.

With the best wishes for the New Year,

Yours sincerely, C. G. JUNG

² Cf. Keyserling, 21 May 27, n. □.

To Mary Foote

[ORIGINAL IN ENGLISH]

Dear Miss Foote,

19 March 1927

I rather prefer to have you come to Zurich about the middle of October for the winter term. Age is of no importance. As long as you live, you have all the problems of the living, only different ones than with 20.

Sincerely yours, C. G. JUNG

□ (1887–1968), American portrait painter, living in Peking in 1927. In Zurich 1928–1958. Beginning in 1929, she edited and supervised the private publication of most of the transcripts ("Notes") of Jung's English seminars.—This letter and those of 28 Mar. 33, 18 Dec. 29, and 12 July 37 are published by courtesy of the Beinecke Library, Yale U. They were previously published in an article by Edward Foote, "Who Was Mary Foote," *Spring*, 1974.

JULY 1927 / MARCH 1933

To Oskar A. H. Schmitz

Dear Herr Schmitz,

21 July 1927

There is something still a little unclear about the relation to woman, in spite of the great "hit" you made with Fräulein Wolff.¹ In this direction something needs to be added. This belongs to that idea that constantly obtrudes itself in you, about the man who "is master of all his functions." Goethe, too, was a great bluffer. Not only during his lifetime but in particular posthumously he has had an increasingly bedazzling effect. I doubt the genuineness of the "complete man." It is too much of a concoction. What was his marriage really like?

Because of your negative mother complex, all sorts of unrealized safeguards against feminine influence were still to be expected. The penitent's shirt beneath and the red habit outside² are surely necessary forms of transition, but at the same time symbols of the bodily and spiritual celibate. Woman is world and fate, that is why she is so important to the man. Your present image in this respect is still eighteenth century. It is remarkable how Keyserling, too, connects with Cagliostro³—to say nothing of Faust.

I still have to gather breath to get started. I ought to write, but the sunshine is still too good to be sitting at a desk. With best wishes,

Yours truly, C. G. JUNG

□ (Handwritten. Translated by Hildegard Nagel.)

¹ Cf. Kirsch, 28 May 53, n. 1.

² This seems to refer to a dream which cannot be ascertained.

³ Count Allesandro Cagliostro (1743–95), Italian adventurer who posed as a physician, alchemist, magician, etc.

To James Kirsch

Dear Colleague,

temporarily at Bollingen, 19 August 1929

The picture is really unsatisfactory and seriously dissociated. In such cases it is always advisable not to analyse too actively, and that means letting the transference run its course quietly and listening sympathetically. The patient obviously needs you as a father and you have to take up the attitude of a father towards her. Really as a

□ (Handwritten.) Cf. Kirsch, 26 May 34 (in vol. 1). — Published (in K.'s tr.) in *Psychological Perspectives*, III:1 (spring 1972).

father, with exhortation, reproof, loving care, paternal interest, etc. No technical-analytic attitude, please, but an essentially human one. The patient needs you in order to unite her dissociated personality in your unity, calm, and security. For the present you must only stand by without too many therapeutic intentions. The patient will get out of you what she needs. Without rectification of her relationship to the father she cannot put her love problem in order either. She must first become at peace with the father in a human relationship built on confidence.

Yours ever, C. G. JUNG

To Mary Foote

[ORIGINAL IN ENGLISH]

My dear Miss Foote, Bollingen, Ct. St. Gallen, 18 December 1929

Here is one Seminar.¹ Now please do tell me whether you gave me more than one, f.i. the Astrology Seminar. I can't find it here. I thought I had taken all with me that you gave me—but it *might* be that I have left something more at home. If that is the case, please tell Mrs. Jung, who is actually at home, that the missing parts are either in my studio or on the big desk in my library. She should send them right away. I hope I forgot nothing.

Cordially yours, C. G. JUNG

□ (Handwritten.) Cf. Foote, 19 Mar. 27, n. □.

¹ Evidently the Notes on either the Autumn 1928 or Winter and Spring 1929 part of Jung's seminar on *Dream Analysis*, prepared by F. and other members of the seminar. Content indicates that the "Astrology Seminar" mentioned in the next sentence is the Autumn 1929 part. The *Dream Analysis* seminar continued into Spring 1930.

To Mary Foote

[ORIGINAL IN ENGLISH]

[Rhodes,] 28 March 1933

Dear Mary, here are some greetings from the enchanted island of roses; more than that—here I found a piece of my spiritual ancestry.

Affectionately yours, C. G.

□ (Handwritten.) Postcard, showing a photograph of the city of Rhodes; postmarked Cyprus, 29 March. Jung was on a trip to Egypt and Palestine.

JULY 1937 / SEPTEMBER 1943

To Mary Foote

[ORIGINAL IN ENGLISH]

Dear Mary,

Bollingen, 12 July 1937

The hut is erected and looks good as a studio. There are no trees and bushes close to the window.

I shall be in all Thursday and any time will suit me for you to come and deposit your tools. Then on the 17th I am ready for you to start work.¹

Very sincerely yours, C. G.

¹ Mary Foote painted a portrait of Jung, now hanging in the Beinecke Library, Yale U.

To Henry A. Murray

[ORIGINAL IN ENGLISH]

My dear Murray,

6 October 1938

You have misunderstood my letter completely. I didn't suspect you for one moment of having talked such nonsense about me. I only wanted to get a written statement from you which I could use to prove that you never said such a thing and that the "man from Princeton" was a positive liar. Maybe my letter was too short and I took it too much for granted that you would understand it. I can only assure you that the thought never entered my head that you could have been the fountainhead of childish rumours.

I don't think that I have paranoid delusions about persecution. The difficulty is very real. Whatever I touch and wherever I go I meet with this prejudice that I'm a Nazi and that I'm in close affiliation with the German government. I had very real proof of this and corresponding difficulties this summer in England. Even in India¹ I discovered that a faked photograph with my name had been sent to scientific societies years ago from Vienna. On this photo, which I possess, I'm represented as a Jew of the particularly vicious kind. Such experiences are no delusions.

Hoping that my more longwinded explanations this time have allayed your suspicions, I remain,

Yours cordially, C. G. JUNG

□ See Murray, 2 May 25 (in vol. 1).

¹ During his visit to India earlier in 1938 for the Silver Jubilee Session of the Indian Science Congress. Cf. *Memories*, pp. 274ff./256ff.

To Henry A. Murray

[ORIGINAL IN ENGLISH]

My dear Murray,

19 December 1938

The origin of the story about myself being seldom at home and a frequent guest at Berchtesgaden has been traced back to Dr. Hadley Cantril.¹ He is the head of the Institute of Propaganda Analysis at Princeton University and he told Dr. Beatrice Hinkle² at a luncheon that the tale was "so sincerely believed because Dr. Murray told him Freud himself told it to Dr. Murray."

I should like very much to know what on earth has prompted this man to tell such a cock and bull story, mixing up your name with it. Could you write and ask Dr. Cantril what his idea was? It isn't ordinary fussiness that I insist upon knowing of such tales that are spread over the world. There must be something behind it.

With best wishes for the new year, I remain,

Yours cordially, C. G. JUNG

¹ Hadley Cantril (1906–1969), professor of psychology, Princeton U., president of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis and later director of the Princeton Public Opinion Research Council; author of *The Invasion from Mars: A Study in the Psychology of Panic* (Princeton, 1940); cf. CW 9, i, par. 227, n. 22.

² See Hinkle, 6 Feb. 51.

To Henry A. Murray

[ORIGINAL IN ENGLISH]

My dear Murray,

6 March 1939

Thank you very much for the thorough exploration of the Hitler case. Quite a number of Germans who have heard the story said that they wished it were true. I recently had news from Germany which confirm that all is not well in Berchtesgaden.

Cordially yours, C. G. JUNG

To H. K. Fierz

Dear Colleague,

Bollingen, 16 September 1943

I have read your paper¹ with interest and pleasure. You will find a few notes in the margin. I have been busying myself with the 3 of the

princess:² the 3, being uneven, is masculine; also the 5. Here the 3 cannot refer to the functions but has the significance of a set of three. From the archaic point of view that is a unity, namely "the *one* set of three," therefore a *triad* and, better still, a *Trinity* (*trinus*!). The princess is the Lady Soul, in the *Orient* (for example, the *ὄρνις περσικός*,³ the rooster, comes from Persia). The three as the masculine companion of the anima is, on the chthonic level, the phallus + 2 testes = 3, and on the psychic level a divine triad that has creative cosmogonic significance. Hence the three is nothing less than the divinity, the *demiurge*. The *fight* is that of *Jacob with the angel* (i.e., with the might of Yahweh) at the ford of the Jabbok. He himself had previously behaved demiurgically, i.e., deceptively (Esau!), and had to wrestle with an angry God. He was able to hold his own against the angel. Then, in Gen. 32:28 comes the new name (Israel = warrior of God); then comes in 30f.: "And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel (i.e., the face of God) for *I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved.*" 31: "And as he passed over Peniel *the sun rose upon him; and he halted upon his thigh* (motif of dislocating the arm! Cf. *Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido*).⁴ The 3 consists of three equal units; there you see the natural foundation of the *ὁμοούσία* (*τῷ πατρὶ*),⁵ Christi, Patris & Spir. Sancti, and at the same time you see why Arius⁶ was an arch heretic, for the doctrine of *ὁμοούσία* (*ὁμοουσιος τῷ πατρὶ*) is just false. And the liberal parsons who deny the divinity of Christ are even more damnable heretics. *Anathema sit!*

I will recommend your MS to Morgenthaler.⁷ But I am afraid it is

□ (Handwritten. Translated by Hildegard Nagel.) Heinrich Karl Fierz, M.D., Swiss psychiatrist and analytical psychologist, medical director of the Klinik am Zürichberg; cf. his *Klinik und analytische Psychologie* (1963).

¹ "Zur Entstehung und Bedeutung von Zwangsgedanken," paper read to the Swiss Society for Practical Psychology.

² The initial dream of the male patient, discussed in the lecture, was about the dismemberment of a young girl. The final dream of the treatment to which Jung refers was of the patient's wedding to a Persian princess in a great castle. He had to defend her, successfully, against her three brothers. — In Dr. F.'s discussion of the dream with the patient he pointed out that a legitimate relationship to the anima had been achieved which, however, had still to be protected, with regard to both the sexual and the spiritual aspects.

³ = Persian bird.

⁴ Cf. *Symbols of Transformation*, CW 5, pars. 356, n. 50, and 524.

⁵ Cf. Niederer, 23 June 47, n. 6.

⁶ Arius of Alexandria (c. 260–336), founder of Arianism, the doctrine of homoiouisia, was condemned as heretic at the Councils of Nicaea (325) and Constantinople (381).

too long. You will have to arrange that somehow with him. Send it to him direct. I am no longer on the editorial staff, but merely "collaborator"—*Dei gratia*. With best wishes,

Yours sincerely, C. G. JUNG

¹ W. Morgenthaler, Swiss psychiatrist, editor of the *Schweizer Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, which he had founded together with Jung and the Geneva psychologist Jean Piaget. — The paper was eventually published in the *Schweizer Medizinische Wochenschrift*, 1944, and again in Fierz's book (n. □).

To Philip Wylie

[ORIGINAL IN ENGLISH]

Dear Mr. Wylie:

19 February 1947

I have owed you a letter for a long time. Unfortunately your *Generation of Vipers*¹ has been hidden from my sight for quite a time, and when I began to read it last fall I fell seriously ill—your book was not the cause of it!—and now I'm just slowly recovering. No sooner could I open my eyes again that I continued reading your book and have read it from cover to cover with the most intense interest. You can shock people sky-high, and apparently they need it.

I have enjoyed your book thoroughly, although I must confess I felt critical at certain passages. For instance: The affair of the ecclesiastical Jesus is not so damn simple as your critique seems to suggest. Half of the picture you paint is absolutely true and I can subscribe to every word of it. All that dogmatic stuff heaped around the figure of the Redeemer can be brushed aside easily if you swing your rationalistic broom, but you overlook entirely the fact that out of that philosophic and speculative scholasticism something has grown which you cannot wipe off the slate, and that is science and the scientific attitude, which is characterized by sincerity, devotion, and honesty. As William James rightly said: "Our scientific temper is devout."²

Although your book is modest enough not to claim to be more than a *Kulturkritik* of America, it is valid also for our European civiliza-

□ (1902–1971), American author. Jung had met him in the U.S.A. in 1936 and had visited him at the time of his Terry Lectures on "Psychology and Religion" at Yale U. in 1937. — This letter and Wylie 27 June 47 are published by courtesy of Princeton University Library and Mrs. Philip Wylie.

¹ Pub. 1942. Cf. White, 19 Dec. 47, for further comment.

² *Pragmatism* (1907), p. 15.

JUNE 1947

tion, if one is still allowed to speak of such a thing. With some slight variations your book is applicable to almost any cultured nation. I'm now busy spreading its fame over here in Switzerland, and I try to get it known as much as possible.

At the moment when I had finished reading the *Generation of Vipers* your book *On Morals*³ arrived, which I'm going to read at once.

In a further edition of your *Generation of Vipers* you should add an illustration of Grant Wood's wonderful painting: *Daughters of Revolution*.⁴

I hear complaints from all sides that my books are not getatable in the U. S. I can tell you now that an English firm is going to publish all my books in a decent form as a complete edition.⁵ But that will take its time, particularly under the present economic conditions prevailing in England.

There is a real need of books like yours, because somebody ought to wake up, since mankind has now reached the straight road to hell.

Thank you for your honesty and courage!

Yours sincerely, C. G. JUNG

³ *An Essay on Morals* (1947); see Wylie, 27 June 47, par. 2.

⁴ Wood (1891-1942) was known for his paintings of the American scene. *Daughters of Revolution* satirizes bigoted mother-types.

⁵ Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London, and the Bollingen Foundation, through Pantheon Books Inc., New York, collaborated in publishing the *Collected Works*.

To Philip Wylie

[ORIGINAL IN ENGLISH]

Dear Mr. Wylie:

27 June 1947

Through Mrs. Baumann¹ I became acquainted with your letter to her. It was most enlightening! You must take into account that we have been cut off from the rest of the world for about five years, and I had no possibility to get informed about the remarkable intelligence of your countrymen. I'm just beginning to open my eyes. I understand your point of view thoroughly now. You are quite right and I beg to inform you of the fact that I agree completely with your attitude. Your way is obviously the right one, which I didn't know before, being, as I said, uninformed about American public opinion.

In the meantime I have read your book *An Essay on Morals*.² I

¹ Carol F. Baumann, an American pupil of Jung's, living in Zurich.

² See Wylie, 19 Feb. 47, n. 3.

think it's a perfectly heroic attempt to teach a nation a simple truth. I must say your book is difficult. I have read it carefully from cover to cover and time and again I was struck by the fact that I couldn't imagine how you can hope to overcome the prejudice and short-sightedness of your public by a rather abstract demonstration of the moral issues of my ideas. I think the most comprehensible point is the fact you hammer in, namely that man is an animal. And even this most obvious of all facts collides in the most violent way with the most sacred prejudices. It is such a simple truth that it is exceedingly difficult to grasp it, because people are twisted and not simple. I definitely cannot see how you lead them on from the state of such an insight to a state of humanity. In other words: how can man become human? This is the problem that has confronted me every day in my practical work. When I was in Africa in the Kavirondo country,³ the older people said of the younger ones, who, under the influence of the missions, didn't submit any longer to the traditional initiations (circumcision etc.), that they remained mere animals. Now where are our initiations, or the equivalent of them? I find that without a very thorough analysis people cannot even see that they have a shadow—and from the shadow down to the animal there is a very long way indeed. People don't know that the only true servants of God are the animals. Now what are you going to do to bring up your Methodists and Baptists and so on to the understanding that any lousy dog is much more pious than they are? But please don't get discouraged! I'm profoundly grateful to you for your valiant attempt and I fervently hope that you will succeed for the good of our foolish and hopelessly blindfolded humanity.

I'm sorry I never acknowledged personally the receipt of your former books (*When Worlds Collide*, *After Worlds Collide*, *Gladiator*, and *Finnley Wren*).⁴ They were sent to me by Farrar & Rinehart and I was under the impression that it was their initiative and not yours. I have read them and I can tell you that after the many years that have gone by since, the picture of the colliding worlds is still vividly impressed upon my mind. It has hit the head of an unconscious nail in me, which I hadn't succeeded in eradicating completely.

Sincerely yours, C. G. JUNG

³ For Jung's visit to East Africa in winter 1925–26, see Kuhn, 1 Jan. 26, and *Memories*, ch. IX, iii.

⁴ Published respectively 1933, 1934, 1930, and 1934. The first two are "science fiction" fantasies. Cf. Jung, "Flying Saucers: A Modern Myth of Things Seen in the Skies" (1958; CW 10).

JUNE 1947

To Medard Boss

Dear Colleague,

27 June 1947

Please forgive me for not thanking you sooner for the inaugural dissertation¹ you so kindly sent me. And also many thanks for the inaugural lecture² which has arrived in the meantime. I have now studied them both and am allowing myself a few comments.

As regards your book on sexual perversions, I find your observations very good and to the point. I am less able to say the same of your theoretical disquisitions, since their philosophical language shows a striking disproportion to the exactness of your observations.

The same thing struck me in your lecture. For example, the case of anxiety neurosis you describe (p. 14)³ is in my opinion quite insufficiently explained by your general philosophical views. There you dealt in detail with Freud's way of looking at things, but not with how I would see such a case. Of course I would not expect anything of that sort, except that you had already referred to me critically.⁴

It is going rather too far that you feel you have to reproach me for a certain narrow-minded prejudice. Obviously you are not aware that as long as 30 years ago I expressed, against Freud, doubts about a purely causalistic interpretation, in consequence of which the Freudians pilloried me as totally unscientific. It seems equally unknown to you that I have suggested a conditional approach. Archetypes have never been for me pure *causae*, but conditions [*Bedingungen*]. From your conclusions I find that you have completely misunderstood my concept of archetypes. You are utterly mistaken in saying that I have described the archetypes as given with the brain structure. Is the fact that the body also expresses character totally unknown to you, or do you be-

□ (Translated by Hildegard Nagel.) Medard Boss, M.D. (1903–), Swiss existential psychoanalyst; professor of psychotherapy at the U. of Zurich. Cf. his *Psychoanalysis and Daseinsanalysis* (New York, 1963).

¹ *Sinn und Gehalt der sexuellen Perversionen* (Bern, 1947). — The English tr., *Meaning and Content of Sexual Perversions* (New York, 1949), is a second edition and contains many changes.

² "Psychotherapie in daseinsanalytischer Sicht," unpublished.

³ In *ibid.*

⁴ This seems to refer to a passage in the unpublished lecture. The preface to the 2nd, English edition, after some appreciative remarks on Jung's concepts of the self and individuation, has a sentence (on p. xi) which may contain the gist of B.'s criticism: "Jung's descriptions, however, were still loaded with the remnants of the old mechanistic exact-scientific way of thinking and with many outdated biological theories."

lieve that the pattern of behaviour familiar to biologists is not somehow expressed in the biological structure? You yourself say that the human body is not only a thing of nature, but "one of the possible manifestations of human nature itself." The body as a whole, so it seems to me, is a pattern of behaviour, and man as a whole is an archetype. You believe you have discovered a contradiction when you find that I think of the archetype at one time as structure and at other times as psychic organ, or vessel, or quality [*Eigenschaft*], or as instinct, etc., and do not perceive that I am giving just as many descriptions of the archetype as can be illustrated by facts, as you might have learned, for instance, from our curatorium meetings.⁵ I have no theory about the archetype and have never maintained that it is pure causality. It is a condition [*Bedingung*] and as such it has a certain *efficacitas causalis*, for only that which has effects has reality.⁶ If it had none it would be mere show. But this does not mean that it is limited to a causal effect. On the contrary it has many modalities, expressed in a variety of symbols. Here I am supported by verifiable phenomena and not merely by such things as fantasies. I have no philosophy regarding the archetype, only the experience of it.

You believe that you have discovered something entirely new and unknown to psychology in your "pre-given world pattern"⁷ and are not aware that by this somewhat fulsome phrase you are describing exactly what I mean by the archetype. It has also escaped you that in the description of the self presented more than once at curatorium meetings—quite apart from my published work—I made a connection between the subject and the world and said that here lies the special significance of the self as opposed to the purely subjectivistic ego. It happened with you as with our colleague Trüb,⁸ who also did not notice that I differentiate between ego and self, though I have said it plainly in I don't know how many pages in I don't know how many books.

You will understand, dear colleague, that such elementary misun-

⁵ Jung and others founded (May 1938) a "Teaching Institute for Psychotherapy" at Zurich U., directed by a curatorium of 9 doctors including Boss. Its aim was to foster cooperation among various analytical schools; however, it did not succeed and was dissolved in 1948. Cf. van der Hoop, 14 Jan. 46, n. 1.

⁶ The German play on words "nur was wirkt ist wirklich" is untranslatable.

⁷ B. took over the term "pre-given world pattern" (*vorgegebener Weltentwurf*) from Martin Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit* (1947; tr., *Being and Time*, 1962).—The German philosopher Heidegger, greatly influenced by the writings of Kierkegaard, has exerted an important influence on modern existentialism.

⁸ Cf. Bovet, 9 Nov. 55, n. 3.

derstandings are not very encouraging to me. I have taken all possible trouble, as witnesses assure me, to say these things as clearly as possible, not only in the curatorium, but also in my books and indeed so often that in the end I felt that I was repeating myself to an odious degree. But it still seems to have been insufficient. This is one of the reasons why I feel that the discussions in the curatorium are unsatisfactory. You, for example, though you have a different viewpoint, have never tried to interpret for us one of the fantasy-series in terms of existential philosophy and prove that this approach hits the core of the matter better than my modest comparative-psychological efforts. Similarly, Herr Trüb has never been moved to announce that he sees no difference between the ego and the self. I should not want to be maneuvered into a situation where it would look as if I wanted *à tout prix* to preach my doctrine (which isn't one) to unwilling listeners who later, in my absence, hold a discussion, and eventually present their lack of understanding in writings and lectures to the public. I had pictured these discussions as something quite different. As I always said, it was never my intention to promulgate my ideas, it was rather to collaborate. But when the other side does not participate and essential things are left outside, no fruitful discussion can develop. I have therefore written Dr. Bally⁹ that my collaboration is illusory if no contrasting opinions or better concepts on the part of others are brought into the discussion.

Please allow me a few more details: on p. 9¹⁰ I would simplify "body and vital sphere inaccessible to all conscious decision and responsibility. . . ." One could as well say "unconscious." Instead of "existential centre" one could say "centre of the personality." You mean by this something similar to what I expressed as the self.

Freud's dilemma, conscious-unconscious,¹¹ is no *abbreviation* but a powerful fact, into which in my opinion he has not "squeezed" anything whatever, but which he met with and which could not be stated better nor more clearly.

In closing I may perhaps allow myself the observation that in spite of all existential philosophy the opposition between ego and world, subject and object, is not annulled. That would be too simple. Then

⁹ Cf. van der Hoop, 14 Jan. 46, n. 1.

¹⁰ of the unpublished lecture.

¹¹ Ibid. — This, according to a communication from Prof. Boss, refers to "Freud's belief that objects could only become conscious when connected with a word. At the same time he admitted that children frequently had not yet words for objects but that nevertheless one could not call them unconscious."

we would need no further psychotherapeutic efforts; instead, intoxicated with the prodigiously stilted jargon of this philosophy we could reach the point of national community.¹²

With best thanks I am enclosing the MS you were kind enough to send me. With collegial greetings,

Sincerely, C. G. JUNG

¹² This is an allusion to the Nazi concept of the "people's community" (the German term used by Jung is "Volksgemeinschaft"). — Regarding Jung's negative attitude to Heidegger (who had been sympathetic to National Socialism) cf. Meinertz, 3 July 39, and Künzli, 16 Mar. 43.

To Medard Boss

Dear Colleague,

5 August 1947

Many thanks for your informative letter,¹ which I have read very attentively. It shows me that assuredly you had no intention of expressing yourself polemically. Had that been so, I should not have objected. All I permitted myself to remark was that for me it was a great disappointment to learn of such opinions only indirectly and not in the curatorium,² where, as it seemed to me, I had offered every opportunity for discussion and gladly welcomed every stimulating response from you.

Your "interpretations" in the light of existential philosophy are so entirely different from Freud's or my approach, which seeks only to "interpret" facts, that I do not even understand what you mean by them. In my view you could easily have brought up your divergent opinions for discussion in the curatorium. I should not like to be maneuvered into a false position in which I would appear as the one with whom it is impossible to discuss any divergent opinion whatever. Under these conditions it seemed the only course for me to withdraw from the meetings. Discussion has no meaning unless all participants contribute the best knowledge they have to offer. That is all I do myself. I admit without further ado that I do not comprehend your

□ (Translated by Hildegard Nagel.)

¹ B., in a long letter of 17 July 47, expressed his feeling that Jung had misunderstood his true intention, which had been only to clarify certain formulations of Jung's, and that in fact he had "the greatest possible admiration for your scientific achievement."

² Cf. Boss, 27 June 47, n. 5.

existential philosophy but will gladly let myself be taught better if this can be done in a logical way and sustained by facts.

I believe I may conclude from your letter that you wish to continue the curatorium sessions. If that is the case I will ask Dr. Katzenstein³ to lend us again the picture series which I used to develop my concepts. Then I would have to ask you to elucidate the methods and interpretations of existential philosophy by discussion of this case. For no participant is to get the feeling that I have rejected his possibly divergent ideas in a bossy fashion. Dr. Trüb⁴ has already accused me of a flagrant disregard of his opinions. Have you ever seen Dr. Trüb let himself be drawn into presenting his opinions? You will understand that such an attitude makes any discussion impossible.

I have tried seriously to form some picture of your philosophical concepts from your letter but found myself step by step entangled in contradictions. I am just no philosopher. For example, I do not know the difference between "explaining" and "interpreting," nor can I recognize anything tangible in the "world-image" of a patient. And in your inaugural address I never found out what you mean by an "existential-analytic" way of looking at things. That implies, if I understand you rightly, somehow concepts of a new and different sort that do not agree with previous ones which you therefore oppose. Surely one is glad to hear something new and more comprehensive about these things that have brought on so many headaches. For a long time I have marvelled how philosophers can make so many apparently enlightening statements about facts they have no knowledge of, and how stupid we are never to notice it. How, for instance, does Heidegger know so much about the world plan and *the* world image? I have not achieved those heights by a long shot. But these are just the things we philosophers should know something about. It would certainly be worth while if you no longer withheld this knowledge from us. You can see what trouble I take to learn more than has been possible with the methods so far available. You must not let yourself become discouraged, but have patience with our lack of understanding and show us how and where our horizon will be expanded by the existential-philosophical approach. That can probably be best achieved by the absolutely objective Katzenstein material. For I did not pick it out in order to illustrate my own concepts.

You can grasp the extent of my non-comprehension by the fact that

³ Erich Katzenstein, M.D., Zurich neurologist.

⁴ Cf. Bovet, 9 Nov. 55, n. 3.

I do not in the least understand why you ascribe to me exist.-phil. assumptions. Man as archetype is after all a purely empirical matter, without a tinge of philosophy. You are acquainted with the ubiquitous image of the *ἄνθρωπος*. It is also an empirical fact that the archetype has a causal or conditional effect. If this were not so, it could never have been observed at all. So it is not a theory but pure observation of facts. Is there any exist.-phil. reason why this should not be so? Or why do you think it is a theory? It is only a formulation of observable connections that naturally, like macrophysics, cannot get along without the concept of causality. Causality is inapplicable only in the realms of microphysics and unconscious processes. Neither is *any longer directly observable*.

I refer to this only to show how far our concepts differ and how advisable it would be for you to acquaint us with the exist.-phil. approach. With collegial regards,

Yours sincerely, C. G. JUNG

To Christian Stamm

Dear Herr Stamm,

23 April 1949

Best thanks for your kind letter. I would answer your questions¹ as follows:

It is better not to try to loosen up the unconscious, though "an honest drink would none forbid" has been held sacrosanct from time

□ Gächlingen, Switzerland.

¹ The addressee had sent Jung a list of questions, as follows. (Those which are not of general interest have been omitted together with Jung's answers.)

"Do you consider the loosening up of the unconscious through the moderate enjoyment of alcohol or other narcotics as relatively useful or as a mistake?

How does a person born blind dream of mandalas?

Might not mandalas be derived from actual factors: roundness of the pupil of the eye, and projection of a general striving for harmony into space (geometry) and time (rhythm), both united in mechanical representations?

How far do individuation dreams depend on race, tradition, character, experience? Are there, besides psychological types, also dream-types?

Do you know Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, a dream elaborated in literary form? (The city shone so dazzlingly that people could look at it only through (!) mirrors that lay around for this purpose.)

My six-year-old boy dreamt of a painting-book with a beautiful picture in it: a ring and a blue flower. Isn't that too early to dream of a mandala?

When I 'should' dream of a horse, it is generally a motorcycle!"

immemorial. Wine = son of the earth (Christ the vine, Dionysus the wine, soma in India).

I do not know how a blind person dreams of mandalas. Mandalas are also formed with the hands, danced, and represented in music (for instance Bach's *Art of Fugue*, on which as we know he was working when he died).

When a mandala is being formed, everything round and square known to man works on it too. But the impetus for its formation comes from the unconscious archetype *per se*.

Everything living dreams of individuation, for everything strives towards its own wholeness. This has nothing whatever to do with race and other things. There are typical dreams but no dream-types, since the collective unconscious is not a type but contains types, namely the archetypes.

Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*² is a literary book of devotion making use chiefly of Christian symbolism. The symbol of the mirror refers to Paul's "For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face."³ The symbol of the mountain is found among the Victorines.⁴

It is quite in order that your boy should have a mandala dream. Such dreams occur normally and not too infrequently between the ages of 4 and 6. The mandala is an archetype that is always present, and children, who are not yet spoiled, have a clearer vision for divine things than adults, whose understanding is already ruined. The mandala should really have 4 colours to be complete. The reason for the absence of the fourth colour may be either that he is already going to school, or that he is the son of a teacher who has an instinctive interest in the differentiation of the functions.

Nowadays animals, dragons, and other living creatures are readily replaced in dreams by railways, locomotives, motorcycles, aeroplanes, and suchlike artificial products (just as the starry sky in the southern hemisphere, discovered relatively late by European navigators, contains many nautical images).⁵ This expresses the remoteness of the modern mind from nature; animals have lost their numinosity; they

² John Bunyan (1628-88), *The Pilgrim's Progress from This World to That Which is to Come* (1678). Cf. M. Esther Harding, *Journey into Self* (New York, 1956).

³ I Cor. 13:12.

⁴ Cf. van Dijk, 25 Feb. 46, n. 2.

⁵ Among the southern constellations are: Octans (Octant), Sextans (Sextant), Telescopium, Microscopium, Triangulum, Circinus (Compass for describing a circle).

have become apparently harmless; instead we people the world with hooting, booming, clattering monsters that cause infinitely more damage to life and limb than bears and wolves ever did in the past. And where the natural dangers are lacking, man does not rest until he has immediately invented others for himself.

Yours sincerely, C. G. JUNG

