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Abstract: An analytical and feeling response regarding the question of Jung’s anti-Semitism is presented. The author calls for a compassionate and understanding approach to Jung’s lifelong development, based on an appreciation of Jung’s religious attitude, which evolved toward a deep acceptance of Judaism and its traditions. Characteristic of analysts as healers is the maxim that individuals grow and change; such was certainly the case with Jung as can be seen clearly in his later sunset years. After all, will we remember Frederick de Klerk as a proponent of apartheid or as the Afrikaaner who shared the Nobel Prize for Peace with Nelson Mandela?
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My thesis, which takes the form of a supposition some may regard as odd, is that the things Carl Jung said and did which got him into trouble, vis-à-vis his alleged anti-Semitism, would not have happened if he had only had a rabbi to review with him what he was planning to say and do beforehand. Early on, Sigmund Freud was such a rabbinical figure for Jung. But as we all know, Jung had to leave this ‘Godless Jew’ (Gay 1987) because Freud was not an actual rabbi like Freud’s paternal grandfather, but rather more like a pseudo-rabbi.

Paradoxically, Freud identified with Moses (whom we most assuredly would characterize as a rabbi, which means in Hebrew ‘master teacher’ and spiritual head of a community). Freud wrote to Jung in 1909 (McGuire 1974, pp. 196–7): ‘If I am Moses, then you are Joshua and will take possession of the promised land of psychiatry, which I shall only be able to glimpse from afar.’ What is most telling is that in Freud’s last major work, ‘Moses and Monotheism’ (Freud 1964), Moses turns out to be from Egypt and is murdered by the Jews. This work foreshadows Freud’s death. Fully lucid, Freud had his internist, Max Schur (Schur 1972, pp. 528–9), kill him on command with two lethal injections of morphine.

Another supposition of mine is that Jung was actually involved in a lifelong quest concerning the archetype of the rabbi, which he came close to actualizing in his sunset years, culminating in the publication Mysterium Coniunctionis (Jung 1955–6). Therefore, to judge Jung finally as anti-Semitic would be sacrilegious toward Jung’s inner achievement, because Jung eventually came to embody the essence of a rabbi, that is, a master teacher and Taoist-like wise old man. Jung, clearly a master teacher, was drawn to Taoism and
the wise old man Lao-tzu. It is noteworthy that Martin Buber (1974, pp. 31–58) was also fond of Taoism. Beginning with Buber’s early essay (1910), the Tao represented a thread of continuity throughout Buber’s life’s work, as it did in Jung’s. Furthermore, Buber (1960, p. 180) writes about ‘the one archetype’, rabbinical if you will, which allows one to master (represent and enact) a consecration of the sacred bond with God (Self or Tao). Buber (1960, p. 179) characterizes ‘the actual force at work’ as ‘the resurgence of an authentic vision of unity and a passionate longing for wholeness’.

The title for this paper came from a conversation I had with Stjepan Mestrovic, a friend and colleague and Professor of Sociology at Texas A&M University. Stjepan was born in Croatia and his paternal grandfather was the well-known sculptor, Ivan Mestrovic. Therefore, Stjepan has a special interest in, and relationship to, Croatia. He has worked hard to help bring peace to this war-torn part of the world (Mestrovic 1994). In this context, Stjepan was telling me about his rabbi who was helping him sort out claims of anti-Semitism levelled at Croatia. Stjepan was concerned that Croatia is still stained by its Ustasa-Nazi collaborationist regime from World War II. He was disturbed that the doctrine of collective guilt still seems to be applied by many to present-day Croatians. In discussions with his rabbi, Stjepan was seeking to find a way in which Croatia might be forgiven for its past association with the Nazis. The basic issue involved how to transform a past transgression into a current reconciliation. While I was listening intently to all of what he told me, I remained fascinated by the fact that Stjepan had a rabbi. Although not expecting an affirmative answer, I asked, ‘Are you Jewish?’ ‘No,’ replied Stjepan. Next I asked the logical follow-up question, ‘Then why do you have a rabbi?’

What follows is a summary of Stjepan’s long answer. The rabbi had been a colleague of Stjepan’s in the same university department. He was fond of Stjepan’s primary work, which was on Emile Durkheim (the son of a rabbi and descended from eight generations of rabbis) (Mestrovic 1988, 1992). The rabbi once told Mestrovic that he was not only struck by the fact that he studied a Jew, but that his scholarly method was Talmudic. One thing led to another and Stjepan became the rabbi’s good friend. Stjepan gained not only a good friend but also his own personal rabbi and he was not even Jewish! So that is where the connection is made with Jung and the title of this paper.

I persisted (knowing Stjepan also had researched and written about Durkheim and Jung, as well as some of the similarities in their work): ‘Does the rabbi know you are fond of Jung’s work?’ I asked. ‘No,’ answered Stjepan. I explained that I knew the rabbi didn’t like Jung because of his purported anti-Semitism. Stjepan was stunned because he had never thought of Jung as anti-Semitic.

I shared with Stjepan that I thought there was hope because the rabbi’s
view of Jung was less negative than that of a Freudian analyst I encountered when I went to work at the University of Rochester Medical Center in 1982. When I told the Freudian that I was a Jungian and offered to participate in the Western New York Psychoanalytic Meetings, he simply stated, ‘Jung was a Nazi,’ and walked away. Case closed. Fortunately, for the rabbi and countless others, the case is still open. First of all, without any doubt Jung was not a Nazi. Regarding his alleged anti-Semitism, Jung did things and said things that were easy to construe as anti-Semitic even though he himself denied this interpretation of them. This is why I wish Jung had had a rabbi; but he did not.

There would have been a different outcome, if only Jung could have made Leo Baeck his personal rabbi from the mid-1920s on. Leo Baeck (1873–1956) was a rabbi and Professor of Religion in Berlin. Jung and Baeck knew each other rather well from meetings of the School of Wisdom in Darmstadt, Germany, during the 1920s. There was a genuine friendship and mutual respect between the two men. Either of the two devout Jews (Erich Neumann and James Kirsch), who were very close to Jung, could have served the function of Rebbe for Jung.\(^1\) Rebbe is a term used by Rabbi Levi Meier (1991, p. 152), for his Jungian analyst, James Kirsch. The Rabbi considered James Kirsch to be his Rebbe (like a rabbi, but more of a personal spiritual guide or mentor). Jung’s dear friend and colleague, Erich Neumann, attempted to play the Rebbe role for Jung but he was not listened to; Jung’s ‘blind spot’ or shadow problem became a ‘deaf spot’ or psychological deafness. Neumann pleaded with Jung before he left Zurich for Palestine to wake up to the dangers of Nazi Germany. Neumann had left Germany after Hitler was elected. Neumann’s son, Micha, says the following,

My father told me he tried to convince Jung of the terrible danger of the Nazi movement, of the brutality and inhumanity of the Nazis. He asked Jung to express himself openly and clearly against their ideologies and especially their anti-Semitic ideas and policies. He admitted that he failed to change Jung’s attitude. My father warned him that if he kept quiet at such a bad time for the Jews, then it would always be remembered and he would never be forgiven. Jung, believing in the qualities of the German collective unconscious, insisted that something positive might emerge from the situation.

(Neumann 1991, p. 374)

This is an example of Jung not listening to Erich Neumann, and it persisted after Neumann got to Palestine. At that time in his life (1933–1946) Jung was deaf to Shema Yisroel (‘Hear, O Israel’) (Altmann 1991, p. 51–70). Since James Kirsch had lived in Berlin and knew Jung well from 1929–1961, he too could have served in a Rebbe capacity for Jung. Echoing Neumann’s warnings to Jung that fell on deaf ears, Kirsch (1991, p. 79–80) maintained that Jung simply did not believe him when he told him about the Nazi terror directed against the Jews. Understandably, Jung, as characteristic of his own
psychology and of the individuation process itself, had to find his own way to the inner archetypal rabbi. That process started after the break with Freud when Jung fell into the morass of the collective unconscious.

Unlike other writings on the alleged anti-Semitism of Jung, I will not go into everything Jung said and did. Most of this, I think, is well documented and discussed (Jung 1934, 1970, 1973, 1975; Cocks 1979; Sherry 1986; Jaffé 1989; von der Tann 1989; Guggenbühl-Craig 1991; Harms 1991; Kirsch 1991; Maidenbaum & Martin 1991; Jacoby 1992; and Samuels 1992). Two recent articles (Samuels 1993 and von der Tann, Samuels & Shamdasani 1993) provide more evidence of Jung’s past missteps. My inner reaction, however, has been not to want more and more evidence that Jung did not see the political implications of what he was doing clearly enough, with consequences not only hurtful to himself, but rather to look in another – feeling – direction for psychological answers. The key questions boil down to: Are we compassionate psychological healers? Will we be legalistic and condemning judges or will we be understanding forgiving analysts?

Although the thinking part of me wants the record to be accurate, the feeling part does not find the proper evaluation of Jung’s character in rehashing the record of what he did and did not say and tends even to agree with van der Post when he said:

It is time that this nonsense stopped. There may have been cause in the desperate and confused years of the thirties which led up to the Second World War, in the horror of the war itself and the turmoil of spirits, voices, explanations, and counter-explanations that followed it, for people to believe the charge that Jung was anti-Semitic. But since then, this particular ghost has been exorcised, laid to rest and buried under a mound of freely accessible evidence and testimony.

(van der Post 1989, p. 103)

I take this as a correct feeling call, even though Jung is not quite as exonerated by the available evidence as van der Post wants us to believe. Nevertheless, there was no raging fire of anti-Semitism in Jung’s heart, but there certainly was some smoke. And the smoke persisted even after the war.

But back to my friend Stjepan Mestrovic. Why was he focused on Durkheim and Jung? Was he, too, questing for the inner rabbi? I then asked Stjepan if he was Semitic. His answer surprised me but it seemed right, ‘Yes.’ It turned out that he has some Muslim background. At that point I said, ‘Well you, your rabbi and I all share the same father, Abraham. We are all Semitic.’ Although I am of Jewish background, I meant my ‘we’ to include Christians as well, since the archetypal forefather, Abraham, is a Christian forebear too – and from that point of view Jung had deep Judaeo-Christian roots and was also finally Semitic. It just took him a long time to discover and accept it. With this perspective, for Jung to have been anti-Semitic would have meant that he was acting against himself and potentially self-destructive. Actually, this seems to have been the case from 1913 to 1946 (particularly
during the early part of that period). He went through a suicidal crisis in December of 1913 and underwent what I call egocide (Rosen 1993, pp. 61-84) prior to contacting his inner Elijah (Jung 1963, pp. 179-81). In a dream Jung teamed up with a dark-skinned savage and they shot and killed Siegfried. When he awoke a voice within Jung said, ‘You must understand the dream ... at once! If you do not understand [it], you must shoot yourself!’ Jung tells us that he was frightened because in the drawer of his night table lay a loaded revolver. Fortunately for him, and us, the moment of egocide came and Jung realized, ‘The dream showed that the attitude embodied by Siegfried, the [German] hero, no longer suited me. Therefore, it had to be killed.’ So Jung and a representative of his ‘primitive shadow’ psychically murdered this negative aspect of his ego-image and identity. Jung then fell deeper into the depths of the archetypal unconscious, where he met Elijah (truly a rabbinical figure as well as a prophet).

Jung’s struggle with his ‘Jewish complex’, as James Kirsch (1991, p. 86) called it, was inseparable from his father complex, shadow problem, and relationship with Freud. According to Jung’s psychology, at the core of this ‘Jewish complex’ would be the archetype of Rabbi with its light and dark sides. Like the Great and Terrible Mother archetype, for Jung there was a Great and Terrible Rabbi originally projected onto Freud as the ‘Great Rabbi’ or ‘Moses’ figure and around the time of the break with Freud an enantiodromia occurred and Freud was the ‘Terrible Rabbi’. Eventually Jung was able to resolve this complex and agonizing split in his personality.

After the break with Freud, Jung plunged into the ‘dark depths’ of his collective unconscious where he encountered an ‘old man with a white beard’ who said he was Elijah (Jung 1963, ch. vi, p. 181). Jung’s Elijah was with a ‘beautiful young girl’ who was a blind Salome. Jung calls them a ‘strange couple’ who had a black serpent living with them that had an attraction for Jung. Jung saw a parallel with Lao-tzu and the dancing girl (p. 182). Lao-tzu remained a lifelong master teacher, rabbi-like Taoist, and wise old man figure for Jung. Jung felt ‘distinctly suspicious’ of Salome and he ‘stuck close to Elijah because he seemed to be the most reasonable of the three [with] a clear intelligence’ (p. 181). Jung saw Elijah as ‘the figure of the wise old prophet.’ He saw Salome as a blind anima figure as ‘she does not see the meaning of things’ (p. 182). Jung’s anima could not see until he worked through his anima problem as reflected in his troubled relationships with Sabina Spielrein (who was also Jewish) and Toni Wolff.

Philemon then developed out of the Elijah figure. Jung said, ‘Philemon was a pagan and brought with him an Egypto-Hellenistic atmosphere with a Gnostic coloration’ (Jung 1963, p. 182). Finally, out of Philemon there was ‘the emergence of yet another figure’ whom Jung called ‘Ka’ (p. 184). Ka’s expression was ‘demonic [and] Mephistophelian’ (p. 185). Jung viewed Ka as a trickster demon like Mercurius. I think Ka was the source of the problematic statements and actions by Jung during the Nazi period. In
contrast, Philemon was seen as the 'spiritual aspect or meaning' of his psyche (p. 185). Jung notes that 'In time I was able to integrate both figures through the study of alchemy' (p. 185). Jung made attempts to integrate his split in the 1935 and 1936 Eranos papers on alchemy (published in 1944 as Psychology and Alchemy, CW 12), but he was successful in the 1955 publication of his magnum opus: Mysterium Coniunctionis (CW 14).

James Kirsch (1991, p. 76) provides commentary that this actually transpired, 'I could see that [Jung] had grown out of that frame of mind [and the Ka-based anti-Semitic statements], and ... I knew to what great extent he had become conscious of his own Jewish psychology ... (See “Answer to Job”, CW 11; Mysterium Coniunctionis, CW 14, paras 591-5, 619). He [also] shows a deep understanding of the psychological causes of anti-Semitism (CW 14, para. 646).'

Erich Neumann had a similar view of Jung’s ‘Answer to Job’, as revealed in letters which also show that Jung was very conscious of his own individuation process (Neumann 1991, p. 286). ‘On December 5, 1951 Neumann wrote to Jung about his not yet published ‘Answer to Job’: ‘This is a book that conquered me to my depth. I think it is the most beautiful and deepest of your writings ... it is a dialogue and dispute with God, similar to that of Abraham, when he argued with God about the fate of Sodom. For me personally it is like an accusation sheet against God, who allowed six million of his people to be killed.’

Jung’s reply to Neumann’s letter came soon, on 5 January 1952: ‘I thank you very much for your friendly letter and the way you understand me. This compensates for a thousand misunderstandings.’

The key transcendent function of Jung’s alchemy was his heart (Plato thought the heart was a seat of the soul). Jay Sherry (1986, pp. 170, 173) has put forward the view that Jung’s heart attack (what I would also term a soul attack) in 1944, which occurred after a fall, was based on the realization that he had been wrong about the German psyche (and his own). It was only a year later when he wrote, ‘After the catastrophe’, (Jung 1945, paras. 400-43). In this paper, Jung comes very close to making a confession about being mistaken regarding the Nazis. He does refer to ‘stopping [up his] ears’ which would relate to his inability to hear the warnings of his Jewish colleagues and friends. Jung sums it up when he says:

While I was working on this article I noticed how churned up one still is in one’s own psyche, and how difficult it is to reach anything approaching a moderate and relatively calm point of view in the midst of one’s emotions. No doubt we should be cold-blooded and superior; but we are, on the whole, much more deeply involved in the recent events in Germany than we like to admit ... I must confess that no article has ever given me so much trouble, from a moral as well as a human point of view. I had not realized how much I myself was affected ... This inner identity or participation mystique with events in Germany has caused me to experience afresh how painfully wide is the scope of the psychological concept of
collective guilt. So when I approach this problem it is certainly not with any feelings of cold-blooded superiority, but rather with an avowed sense of inferiority. (Jung 1945, para. 402)

The visions that Jung had during his heart (and soul) attack are so meaningful that they are worth reviewing. Jung thought his nurse in the hospital was ‘an old Jewish woman [who] was preparing ritual kosher dishes for [him]’. Jung confided, ‘When I looked at her, she seemed to have a blue halo around her head (Jung 1963, p. 294)’. The most telling scene of all followed when Jung saw himself in the Pardes Rimmonim (the garden of pomegranates)² and the wedding of Tifereth and Malchuth was taking place. Then Jung stated an archetypal truth, ‘Or else I was the Rabbi Simon ben Jochai, whose wedding in the afterlife was being celebrated. It was the mystic marriage as it appears in the Cabbalistic tradition ... At bottom it was I myself: I was the marriage. And my beatitude was that of a blissful wedding’ (p. 294). Spiegelman (1990) has commented on the depth of integration of Judaism such a vision must have represented in Jung.

Jung himself reflected on this memory, which seems to have been a moment of epiphany:

There is something else I quite distinctly remember. At the beginning, when I was having the vision of the garden of pomegranates, I asked the nurse to forgive me if she were harmed. There was such sanctity in the room ... There was a pneuma of inexpressible sanctity ... whose manifestation was the mysterium coniunctionis. (Jung 1963, ch. x, p. 295)

In this individuating attack on Jung’s own heart and soul, Jung found that ‘to experience defeat is also to experience victory’ (Jung 1963, p. 297). Now it is clear why as we near the end of his autobiography (p. 355) we find ‘a fine old story about a student who came to a rabbi and said, “In the olden days there were men who saw the face of God. Why don’t they any more?” The rabbi replied, “Because nowadays no one can stoop so low.” ’

By the end of his life, Jung had learned how to stoop low. In the last two pages of Memories, Dreams, Reflections Jung states:

I am satisfied with the course my life has taken ... Much might have been different if I myself had been different. But it was as it had to be; for all came about because I am as I am ... I regret many follies which sprang from my obstinacy³ but without that trait, I would not have reached my goal. And so I am disappointed and not disappointed.... I am astonished, disappointed, pleased with myself. I am distressed, depressed, rapturous. I am all these things at once, and cannot add up the sum ... Life is – or has – meaning and meaninglessness. I cherish the anxious hope that meaning will preponderate and win the battle. (Jung 1963, ‘Retrospect’, pp. 358–9)

Marie-Louise von Franz (personal communication, 5 April 1994) maintained that in his last decade Jung vowed not to identify with any archetype especially that of the wise old man, which Jung had defined as the ‘archetype ... of meaning’ (CW 91, para. 79). The above statement ‘Life is
– or has – meaning and meaninglessness’ suggests that von Franz was correct: Jung was not identified with either pole of the archetype, neither positive (meaning) nor negative (meaninglessness), but rather conceived of both possibilities. Therefore, Jung was consciously holding the tension of the opposites for the Wise Old Man archetype in the service of his individuation process.

For Jung, the Taoist master seemed to serve to move Jung closest to a conscious understanding of the archetype he had identified with so profoundly when he imagined he was Rabbi Simon ben Jochai. It is significant that Jung closes his autobiography with a quote by Lao-tzu: ‘All are clear, I alone am clouded’. Here he comes very close to using that ancient Taoist sage as what I would call his personal rabbi, or more accurately his Rebbe. Jung explains:

he is expressing what I now feel in advanced old age. Lao-tzu is the example of a man with superior insight who has seen and expressed worth and worthlessness, and who at the end of his life desires to return into his own being, with the external unknowable meaning. The archetype of the old man who has seen enough is eternally true ... The more uncertain I have felt about myself, the more there has grown up in me a feeling of kinship with all things. In fact it seems to me as if that alienation which so long separated me from the world had become transferred into my own inner world, and has revealed to me an unexpressed unfamiliarity with myself.

(Jung 1963, ‘Retrospect’, p. 359)

Related to Jung’s closing reflection, I am reminded of ‘another Taoist rabbi’, Chuang-tsu’s wise statement:

When there is separation, there is coming together. When there is coming together, there is dissolution. All things may become one, whatever their state of being. Only he who has transcended sees this oneness. He has no use for difference and dwells in the constant. To be constant is to be useful ... to be useful is to realize one’s true nature. Realization of one’s true nature is happiness. When one reaches happiness, one is close to perfection, so one stops, yet does not know that one stops. This is Tao.

(Chuang-tsu 1974, p. 30)

At this point van der Post’s continued statement makes more sense (remember that van der Post did not meet Jung until after World War II and that their friendship developed when Jung was well on his way to achieving his alchemical task of turning psychological lead to gold):

It was always preposterous to those of us who knew Jung that he should be thought of as ‘anti’ anything, least of all anti-Semitic. He was just not an ‘anti’ spirit. His whole life was one dedicated, not to the passing of judgment and dispensation of justice in life, but to the understanding of human beings, their innermost spirit and motivations, and the shadows they and their communities cast. ... He regarded the task of seeking the totality, and understanding it objectively, as truly religious. ... Once understood, he stressed, it was wonderful how generous and rewarding life became.

(van der Post 1989, pp. 103-4)
Until everyone realizes that Jung was not, in his religious attitude, anti-Semitic, how do we respond to the issue which often comes up regarding Jung’s alleged political anti-Semitism? I think Thomas Kirsch’s wise recommendations are very helpful:

(1.) One can offer the personal fact there were many Jewish people working with Jung during those times of the 1930s and 1940s. (2.) Jung’s concepts of the archetypes and collective unconscious are not racially or nationally bound, and Jung is talking about universals in mankind. (3.) The attacks on Jung and allegations of anti-Semitism are a way to discount Jung’s theories, and therefore one does not have to read him: ‘Oh, Jung, he was a Nazi, so you don’t need to know him.’ This was one of the major findings of the ‘Lingering Shadows’ Conference.” Jung is dismissed because one doesn’t need to know him and thus one does not need to feel guilty about that. (4.) Analytical psychology is no longer the work of one person, so that one should study the field and not the person.

(T. Kirsch 1991, p. 352)

In closing this paper I realize that it surely would have been easier if Jung had only had a rabbi during the period of the late 1920s to the late 1940s. However, as Jung maintained, that would have been forced and not where he was at. His attitude parallels a Taoist maxim of Chuang-tsu’s:

Do not force things ... flow with whatever may happen and let your mind be free; stay centered by accepting whatever you are doing. This is the ultimate. How else can you carry out your task? It is best to leave everything to work naturally, though this is not easy.

(Chuang-tsu 1974, p. 74)

Let us now celebrate that Jung was involved in actualizing the wise old man archetype in both a Taoist and a rabbincical way – no easy feat. I am sure that is why – in part – there were and are so many Jews involved in analytical psychology. Currently there are four Jewish analysts out of ten analyst members on the Executive Committee of the International Association for Analytical Psychology. There is an Israel Association of Analytical Psychology, with thirty-eight members, that hosted the International Congress for Analytical Psychology held in Jerusalem in 1983. And it explains why there are two rabbis (David Freeman in England and Sonny Herman in Holland) who are Jungian analysts and why I found these two books: *Jewish Values in Jungian Psychology* by Rabbi Levi Meier (1991) and *Judaism and Jungian Psychology* by Jungian analyst J. Marvin Spiegelman (1993).

Finally, there is forgiveness. And remember, forgiveness is a gift to yourself. I think Jung modelled this process for us. He could have only reached out to Rabbi Leo Baek in 1946 if he had forgiven himself (or at least had started to forgive himself). Jung told Leo Baek that he had made a mistake (Jaffé 1989, p. 100). Based on this admission, and their long discussions, Baek forgave Jung and later told Professor Gershon Scholem to accept the invitation to speak at the Eranos meeting in Ascona. As James Kirsch said ‘If Rabbi Leo Baek, a leader of German Jews during the Nazi time and
survivor of a concentration camp, found it in his heart to forgive Jung... it should be possible for all Jews to forgive him and to start reading his books.’ And ‘Like Aniela Jaffé, Rabbi Leo Baeck, Erich Neumann and other Jews,’ I can find it in my heart to forgive Jung and to thank him for what he did for Jews like me during the Nazi time and for the great new knowledge which became a luminous key for my self-understanding as a Jew’ (J. Kirsch 1991, p. 76, 83).
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1 After reviewing an early draft of this paper, Robert Hinshaw suggested that neither Kirsch nor Neumann could have served as a Rebbe for Jung. Hinshaw maintained that they were his students, so it involved the issue of the father not listening to his sons. Ironically, it represented what had happened to Jung when Freud could not hear and accept what he was saying. However, to Jung’s credit he kept the relationships alive with these two analysts and worked through his conflicts and ended up very close to both of them.

Also after reviewing a draft of this paper Rabbi Levi Meier shared this: ‘I believe that Jung can still have a posthumous relationship with a Rebbe, through a Rabbi studying his writings and applying them to Judaic thought. I feel that what I do is a form of that process.’ Most meaningfully, Rabbi David Freeman, who is also a Jungian analyst, concurred with Rabbi Meier’s sentiment.
2. This is footnoted in Memories, Dreams, Reflections, 'Pardes Rimmonim' is the title of an old Cabbalistic tract by Moses Cordovero (sixteenth century). In Cabbalistic doctrine Malchuth and Tifereth are two of the ten spheres of divine manifestation in which God emerges from his hidden state. They represent the female and male principles within the Godhead' (Jung 1963, p. 294).

3. During Siegmund Hurwitz's analysis with Jung, Hurwitz (a deeply committed Jew) told Jung how troubled he was by some of Jung's earlier writings such as the 1934 article entitled 'The state of psychotherapy today', in which Jung discusses the differences between 'Jewish' and 'German' psychology. In Jung's reply to Hurwitz he said that he now considered that article to be 'nonsense' (Maidenbaum 1991, p. 295).

4. Thomas Kirsch (psychiatrist and Jungian analyst like his late father, James) was the past President of the International Association for Analytical Psychology.

5. Many of Jung's Jewish colleagues of the 1930s and 1940s have been mentioned already but some have not; therefore (to the best of my knowledge) I list them all: James and Hilde (an analyst in her own right) Kirsch, Max Zeller, Erich Neumann, Gerhard Adler, Ernst Bernhard, Rivkah (Schaerf) Kluger, Anielia Jaffé, Siegmund Hurwitz, and Jolande Jacobi.


7. Jung (CW 10, para. 361) was being true to his own words, 'We should not try to "get rid" of a neurosis, but rather to experience what it means, what it has to teach, what its purpose is. We should even learn to be thankful for it, otherwise we pass it by and miss the opportunity of getting to know ourselves as we really are.'

8. When reviewing this paper Rabbi David Freeman conveyed to me that it really was 'beyond forgiveness'. In other words, beyond the ego and related to the Self. I thought this was an intriguing concept.

9. Like myself and many more – maybe even Stjepan Mestrovic's rabbi!
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