If I recall correctly, then Jung wrote that an embracing of the shadow or moves in that direction was leading towards healing. I have yet to find statements by Jung that advocate a denial of the shadow as a path towards healing. In my book such denial leads to schizoid splitting. As far as Jung's anti-Semitism is concerned, my experience as a German Jungian analyst suggests that the Jungian community really has lived far too long with that. It is this splitting by some Jungians that truly inhibits healing.

Equally perplexing are Rosen's thoughts on forgiving. I wonder in whose authority he thinks he speaks. Has he been given any authority to speak in the name of the millions murdered in the Holocaust whilst Jung tried to remain an innocent bystander? Can he really speak in the name of all those who have suffered persecution fuelled by racial hatred?

And, finally: where does Rosen get the authority to do psychotherapy with Jung? Does he really think Jung needs his brand of 'healing'? Did Jung, who has been dead for thirty-five years now, communicate with the author from the spirit plane, as it were, or is this an unsolicited example of a furor therapeutics? Does Rosen seriously presume he can grant forgiveness to someone of Jung's stature? Should that not rather be left to Jung himself to work out between him and his maker?
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From David Rosen
20 September 1996

Again, my comments seem to have invited misunderstanding. First, a response to Andrew Samuels's letter. For the record, I do not think that intellectual historians are non-feeling and without the capability to be understanding, compassionate, and forgiving. I regret that my remarks gave any other impression.

Sonu Shamdasani and I have different perspectives. I was attempting to convey that my article was focused on feeling and a particular kind of healing. Though it would have been wonderful, I would not expect an intellectual historian to have the same orientation and views that I have. While my objective was to clinically understand, be compassionate and forgiving, it seems like Shamdasani misinterpreted my process and purpose. Regarding Samuels's remark about 'previous conversations' with Shamdasani, these conversations did take place in London in September 1989, and in
March 1994. The membership of the Executive Committee of the International Association for Analytical Psychology is public record. Finally, it is interesting that 'enough is enough' is a passage I took out of my paper in response to Shamdasani. Now it reappears in Samuels's letter. In retrospect, I wish I'd left it in my paper, because it's true.

My response to Gottfried Heuer's letter will be even briefer. I never suggested that people do not have shadows and I show how Jung's shadow got him into trouble. However, by eventually embracing his shadow Jung achieved healing late in his life. The Holocaust was unforgivable. I do not attempt to do psychotherapy with Jung, but rather I apply his psychology to himself, which is something Anthony Stevens has done rather successfully in his book, On Jung (Penguin paperback, 1991). I never say that it is my place to forgive Jung and then he will be magically forgiven; I merely quote, and concur with, a statement by James Kirsch.