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Shamdasani has misinterpreted what I have written. For example, I did not
assume that the two most recent articles, one of which he co-authored, were
legalistic and condemning. And, of course I favour documenting the historical
truth and Shamdasani knows this from previous conversations. Although I
realize that more material may become available about Jung’s alleged anti-
Semitism, I believe that I have thoroughly reviewed the considerable amount
of information that is now available. My view is not an either/or position,
but rather a both/and perspective. A central maxim of analytical psychology
is to contain and hold the opposites. I am merely advocating that we apply
Jung’s psychology to Jung himself, which only makes sense from the vantage
point of healing.

While Shamdasani’s report about Jung’s reaction to his autobiography
(Memories, Dreams, Reflections) is interesting, it is also archetypal and repre-
sents an enantiodromia. I can see and hear Jung, the rabbi-like Taoist master,
strongly approving and disapproving his autobiography. All this tells me is
that Jung was human and therefore inconsistent. However, like the sage he
was, Jung was aware of his inconsistencies and he owned them – character-
istic of both wisdom and integrity.

It seems that Shamdasani missed the whole point of my article, which is
about feeling. Perhaps that is to be expected when a non-analyst (non-healer)
intellectual historian comments on a paper calling for the reader to be
analytical, understanding, compassionate, and forgiving. I am at peace with
what I have written, which is a part of a larger work, The Tao of Jung.
Finally, I know that the ultimate reaction and commentary will be generated
by this Journal’s readers and I have faith in them and the healing process.
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