of the human phenomenon. Easy slippage from one perspective to another is, in my view, either lazy or sloppy and avoids the pain and uncertainty or inevitable contradictions, paradoxes, and tensions arising between and among theoretical orientations and emphases. This aspect of the book resonates with Schafer's ongoing diatribe against analytic authority. Beating this drum, as such, is entirely appropriate, but Schafer seems to drive the issue to an extent that any claim for special knowledge, competence, perspective or understanding on the part of the analyst is put up for challenge. We miss here too the more subtle dialectic and tension between authentic knowledge and authority, on one hand, and the countertransferential abuse of the analyst's prerogatives to the disregard, devaluation, even disadvantage of the patient, on the other. There is a difference, but Schafer does not tell us much about it.

I would add a particular word about the Kleinian connection. In some part, I would applaud this effort since the positive dimension of Kleinian clinical intuition has been too often glossed over and overshadowed by fussing over Klein's methodological mishaps. I welcome Schafer's calling our attention to the neo-Kleinian contributions and their potential clinical integration, an effort I attempted on my own terms a score of years ago (Meissner, 1978, 1981, 1986). From my perspective, that's the good news. The bad news comes in the form of total countertransference. Schafer uses it to good advantage, as do the Kleinians, but they pay a heavy price to my way of thinking. Everything becomes either transference or countertransference—the problem being that not everything fits (without procrustean modification) and the conceptual homogenizing deprives us of an array of tools that might serve us better in given clinical contexts. Paradoxically, Schafer touches on this theme at points where he appeals to other aspects of the analytic relation that facilitate therapeutic engagement with transference-countertransference impasses, such as reinforcement of the therapeutic frame. I have tried to focus this dimension of the therapeutic interaction and its differentiation from transference and countertransference in relation to the therapeutic alliance (Meissner, 1996).

All of which is to say—perhaps it does not need saying—that reading Roy Schafer is not only a stimulating pleasure, but a challenging exercise for anyone who takes the understanding of analytic psychology and the therapeutic process seriously.

Chestnut Hill, MA

W. W. MEISSNER, S. J., M.D.


These two volumes are essential reading for anyone interested in understanding
Jungian analytic psychology, the history of psychoanalysis, modern concepts of mythology and the new-age religions. Written by a Lecturer in the History of Science at Harvard University, we finally have an exposition that explains where Jung was coming from and what he hoped to achieve. In addition the author provides us with an enlightening view of the intellectual climate that led not only to the development of Jungian ideas, but also to the rise of Nazi ideation, much of which Jung shared.

Originally from a Roman Catholic family, his grandfather abandoned this faith to become deeply involved with the Evangelical Protestants and Pietists who played an important role in the development of Volkish self-consciousness or the concept of a German nation—for previously what is now Germany was politically highly fragmented. At the same time, he became deeply involved with the esoteric (illuminati) aspects of Masonry. In addition, the grandfather was rumored to be the illegitimate son of Goethe. The significance of this family history lies in the fact that Carl Jung believed in “ancestor possession” and therefore felt he had incorporated into himself the values and genius of his forebears. At other times, he expressed the opinion that he had himself been Goethe in a previous incarnation, and not only Goethe, but also Meister Eckhart. During his formative years, he was deeply involved in spiritualism, and while he abandoned this during his medical training, he returned to it at a later date with a vengeance. In the Turm (Tower) which Jung built in 1923 at his home on the banks of Lake Zurich, there is an unsettling mural that covers the entire wall of the bedroom. This painting depicts his first spirit guide, Philemon, the “transpersonal entity” whom Jung met in visions—an old man with a long white beard who is a sort of Gnostic-Mithraic guru that lived or lives in timeless space or what Jung called the “Land of the Dead.” It was from his discussions with this “spirit guide” that Jung received his most profound insights about the nature of the human psyche, his ideas about the collective unconscious and the notion of archetypes. Aware of the fact that such concepts were unacceptable in the scientific world, he renamed the spirits “complexes,” and the spirit world of the mediums, the “unconscious.”

At the turn of the century, psychopathology was primarily seen to be the result of hereditary degeneration, which explains the emphasis in that era on nosology, and which also created a hopeless attitude resulting in few cures; and, indeed, Jung feared such traits were present in his own family. Jung originally became attracted to Freud’s work because he saw in psychoanalysis a way to circumvent or overcome the stigmata of hereditary degeneration in his institutionalized patients, for Freud had shifted the focus from the biological to the psychodynamic. When he finally met with Freud in 1907, he rapidly developed a “religious crush” with erotic overtones. (He had an earlier homosexual experience with a mentor he admired.) At the same time, he saw in psychoanalysis the possibility of a mass movement that would liberate European culture from its ties with Christianity—that, indeed, it would be a religion in its own right. This, combined with Jung’s rising interest in the occult and spiritualism, was bound to lead to the break with Freud.
By 1909 (the split with Freud occurred in 1913) Jung was developing his ideas about the collective unconscious. Much influenced by Darwinian theory and, especially, by this theory as presented in Europe by Haeckel, he applied the principle of “ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny” to the unconscious. It was this conviction which led Jung to study the myths of the ancients and to see in the beliefs of the ancients (as then understood) the true and proper religion for man. Common to the primitive was the practice of sun worship and, hence, his conviction that the true life force, the source for spiritual sexual energy, is best symbolized by the sun which, indeed, he himself began to worship. After all, if the unconscious was the residua of what primitive and innocent man believed, it was to these beliefs that we should return and integrate into our lives in a process he later called “individuation.” This process, which can only be summarized in outline, led Jung to write that “if one honors God, the sun or the fire, then one honors one’s own vital force, the libido.” For Jung, God was not the transcendent absolute god of Judeo-Christianity, but instead the libido that lives within us. As for Christianity (or Judaism), it has erected barriers of repression that resulted in this inner libido becoming unknown to us. At the same time, it was the evolutionary process that led to and produced the German “Volkish self-consciousness,” which was different from that which developed in the Jewish races. Herein lay Jung’s anti-Semitic tendencies. (Jung also cultivated a special relationship to Wotan whom he believed to be the true god of the Germanic peoples and, indeed, he had visions with this entity.)

In 1913, Jung deliberately and repeatedly induced trance states using methods he had learned from his experience with spiritualism. This technique, which he would later call “active imagination,” sparked a series of intense visionary experiences that Jung interpreted as his direct mystical initiation into one of the most ancient of the pagan mystery cults. As a result, his head turned into that of a lion and he became a god, the Deus Leontocephalus, relating back to the mystery cult of Mithras. It was after this that he resigned from his position at the university and gathered around him a faithful following to whom he taught “complex psychology,” mythology, the psychological types, and that analysis was an initiation into the mysteries of the impersonal, transpersonal, or collective unconscious. It was also at this time that he became convinced that polygamy was healthy and normal, and began to indulge in sexual relationships with his female patients.

By 1932, Jung (along with Wilhelm Hauer, founder of the German Faith Movement) was giving lectures aimed at replacing traditional Christianity with an Aryanized Christ, to replace worship of the Jewish God with the worship of a Mother Goddess and to develop what can only be called a cult based on the Grail legend as interpreted by Wagner. Analysis, that is, Jungian analysis, was a direct encounter with the transcendental realm of the gods. He was convinced that his own visionary experiences were the path to redemption or as he later called it, “individuation,” and further that this could be taught to others. Analysis became an initiatory process, a descent into the unconscious mind in order to spark a
process of individual transformation. For those who survived an encounter with the god or gods within, Jung promised rebirth as a true “individual,” free from all the repressive mechanisms of conventional beliefs about family, society, and deity. The successful survivors of such pagan regeneration became reborn as spiritually superior “individuated” beings. Such individuals working together could eventually bring about the “new man” and would save the world.

Enough has been said to demonstrate the importance of these two books. It should be further noted that the author is not engaged in an attempt to debunk Jung. He is neither a Freudian nor a fundamentalist Christian. What he presents is a serious historical study and reassessment of Jung’s life and work, one that cannot be ignored by the serious student. At the same time one is not surprised that Jung’s family did everything it could to suppress The Jung Cult and to discredit the author. We are fortunate that they were unsuccessful in achieving this.

Greenwich, CT

RAMA COOMARASWAMY, M.D.


This sad, poignant, and gripping collection of the correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sandor Ferenczi during World War I is as fascinating and revealing a publication as one can imagine. Freud is often criticized for having blndered badly into a boundary crossing, demanding that Ferenczi choose between the two women he “loved” (a mother and her daughter, both of whom were his analysands!) by marrying the mother, who was eight years older than Ferenczi. This occurred at the same time Ferenczi was putatively an analysand of Freud’s, having experienced some short periods on the couch representing this “psychoanalysis” that Freud considered “finished, not terminated, but rather broken off because of unfavorable circumstances” (p. 153).

The personalities of the two correspondents emerge dramatically in their letters. Ferenczi is mercurial, unstable, passionate and neurotic. He addresses Freud as “Dear Professor”; Freud in turn writes to him as “Dear Friend.” Freud is solid, stable and somewhat gloomy, as well as consistent, mature, and dedicated. His intense internal struggle to maintain a certain analytic distance from Ferenczi is quite manifest, while at the same time his need for the friendship and his appreciation for Ferenczi’s warmth and devotion to him is apparent.

All this occurs against the background of being on the losing side in World War I, with the miseries and frustrations that obviously entailed. Freud at one point had three sons in uniform and was very much worried about each of them; Ferenczi’s career was continually disrupted by calls to serve as a military physician, a disruption that made it almost impossible for him to dedicate himself to psychoanalysis. He was so determined to continue this dedication that he even attempted...