

CONVERSATIONS WITH CARL JUNG

Richard I. Evans

Professor of Psychology

University of Houston

Preface

The dialogue represented in this volume, the author feels, provided a vehicle for Dr. Jung which allowed perhaps the most exciting and lucid presentation of many of his fundamental concepts yet recorded. It is hoped that this presentation will not only serve as an introduction to Jung's ideas for students in the behavioral sciences, but also will provide a stimulating look at some of Jung's fundamental contributions to others who have always been discouraged from reading Jung's works because of their alleged obscurity, vagueness, unreasonable complexity, and mysticism.

For the Jungian scholar, the author hopes that a more intimate glance at Jung's thought processes has been provided, as he reacts *spontaneously* to an orderly sequence of questions. Jung insisted on not being briefed on any of the questions prepared for the interviews.

The reactions from Ernest Jones not only provide further interesting elaborations of Freudian theory, some of Jones' personal interests, and his concepts of Sigmund Freud, the man, but they also provide a sharp and final study by which to contrast Jung, the powerful figure whose break with Freud troubled him most, with Jones, Freud's enduringly loyal and devoted follower.

The author, through the recent award of a grant from the National Science Foundation, will be enabled to complete such teaching interviews with many additional distinguished contributors to personality theory. However, he knows that he will never again have a privilege so profound as recording virtually the last thoughts of two individuals who came so directly in contact with the beginning stages of psychoanalysis—perhaps the most significant revolution in thinking concerning the nature of man.

– Richard I. Evans, *Houston, Texas*

Sections

- Part I Prologue to a Challenging Venture - *how the interview was set up*
- Part II Jung And Freud
 - [1. Jung Relating to Freud, Adler, and Rank --- 17](#)
 - [2. Jung's Appraisal of Freudian Psychosexual Development --- 18](#)
 - [3. Jung's Appraisal of Freud's Structural Concepts: Id, Ego, and Super-Ego --- 23](#)
- Part III The Unconscious
 - [4. The Unconscious: Archetypes --- 27](#)
 - [5. The Unconscious: General Conceptualizations --- 31](#)
- Part IV Introvert-Extrovert Theory and Motivation
 - [6. Introver-Extrovert Type Theories --- 37](#)
 - [7. Motivational Concepts --- 44](#)
- Part V Some Reactions Concerning Psychological Testing, Psychotherapy, Mental Telepathy, and Other Personal Insights
 - [8. Jung on Diagnostic and Therapeutic Practices --- 47](#)
 - [9. Jung on Contemporary Psychological Problems --- 56](#)
 - [10. Personal Insights, Reminiscences, and Experiences with Great Figures --- 63](#)

Part I

Prologue to a Challenging Venture

In the section that follows the writer has attempted to trace in some detail the challenging series of events which preceded the interviews with Dr. Jung and Dr. Jones. In this section the writer also articulates his impressions and perceptions of the actual process of completing the interviews, including certain personality insights gained by the author based on limited but unusual contact with these notable figures.

The idea of filming a series of interviews with Dr. Carl Jung, when it first occurred, seemed to be only a remote possibility. We knew that Dr. Jung had been approached unsuccessfully by several commercial television and film producers in the past. Yet, it seemed that this was worth a try.

Some months before this, the University of Houston had received an \$18,700 grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education to explore some new dimensions in university instruction. Dr. John Meaney, who at this time was director of the University of Houston Radio and Television Film Center, was involved with this project when he approached the writer concerning the possibility of utilizing these funds in some project involving psychology. We began to discuss possible approaches which could be pursued if a pilot project in psychology was initiated with these funds.

For years, like many other university professors in Colleges of Arts and Sciences, I had become increasingly aware of the tendency among great numbers of students to become less interested in reading the original writings of great contributors. They were becoming content to merely read "predigested" secondary sources which often did injustice to the intentions of these significant thinkers. For example, it always amazed me to find that a surprisingly large number of even advanced psychology students had never actually read Freud's original writings, but had read instead about Freud through the words of other writers. It seemed that there was a need to motivate the students to look directly at the original writings of such innovators as Freud, if they were to become truly informed and appreciative of their ideas. It then followed that a challenge lay in developing with our grant funds a stimulating technique which would encourage the students to pursue such primary contact with the ideas of important contributors.

Simply making films of lectures by these individuals, wherein they orally presented the same material about which they had already written, did not appear to be the most effective means for our purposes. The potential pitfall in this method is readily discernible in many college television courses. Specifically, the intellectual, in lecturing as in writing, tends to become somewhat pedantic, thereby losing the interest of his audience. It occurred to me that perhaps one technique which might be utilized to avoid this undesirable, imminent possibility was the filmed interview. Through use of the interview, the contributor could present his ideas in an atmosphere of spontaneity which would tend to "humanize" him, providing for the student a more pleasant and stimulating experience than is often allowed by the neutrality of the formal lecture.

The interview, of course, has long been used as a technique in such fields as journalism, law, psychotherapy, counseling and casework, and obviously is a fundamental device in our culture for gaining insight into other people and their ideas. Why could not carefully planned

and filmed interviews be set up with eminent psychologists for instructional purposes? The student, through the interviewer, could be systematically introduced to a great contributor's point of view. We liked the idea.

A course which I had offered for many years, Approaches to Personality, appeared to be a likely vehicle for such an effort, so all that remained was to find a manner in which to launch this technique in as dramatic a fashion as possible. Thus, the idea of interviewing Dr. Carl Jung, the only surviving member of the "big three" (Jung, Freud, and Adler), originated.

Most individuals became very skeptical of our chances for success when we announced that we were going to contact Jung and pursue the possibility of going to Zurich to film a series of interviews to launch our teaching-interview project. Success or failure, however, the idea of interviewing Dr. Jung was too appealing, so we proceeded to prepare to write to him.

The framing of this letter became an unusual task. One asks oneself if he has never met Jung, and knows him only as a near anachronism in the modern world, how his interest in such a project might best be solicited. Also, when one has spent many years of his life studying personality theory and has come to fully appreciate the historical importance of Jung in the psychoanalytic movement, the task of writing to him takes on an air of excitement.

In order to gain perspective for this task, I decided to contact Dr. Joe Wheelwright, a prominent Jungian psychiatrist at the Langley Porter Clinic in San Francisco. He had had considerable contact with Dr. Jung, and could be of much assistance to us as a liaison in our efforts to secure the cooperation of Dr. Jung. Thus, it was with gratification that my colleague and I received not only Dr. Wheelwright's professed interest in the proposed project, but permission from him to mention his support of it in the letter subsequently dispatched to Professor Jung, requesting his participation in the initial interview of our series. That letter read as follows:

April 2, 1957

*Professor Doctor C. G. Jung
Seestrasse 228 Küsnacht-Zürich,
Switzerland*

Dear Professor Doctor Jung:

A prominent United States foundation, The Fund for the Advancement of Education, has awarded us a small grant which will make it possible to begin filming for the use of undergraduate students a psychology course series of lectures and discussions.

In planning a course in psychology on film, it occurred to us that the presence on film of some of the truly great men in psychology would be an inspiration to our American psychology students. Naturally, the first name that came to our minds was yours. We have long been interested in your work, and your presence on film would, in our opinion, add appreciably to the learning of our students.

If you would be willing to participate, we could fly to Switzerland to do the filming at your convenience. We would not request a great deal of

preparation such as formal lectures would require, but rather, we would ask you to participate in a series of four informal interviews. We would, of course, submit the topics to you in advance, and in fact, would welcome your advice in choosing them. This would allow you to reflect fully the many interesting facets of your work. To avoid imposing on your time, these interviews could be spaced so that they could be filmed over a week's time or longer. We would plan to spend a week or more in Switzerland, and, if it will fit into your schedule, could arrive on or around August fifth.

Dr. Joe Wheelwright, with whom we spoke concerning this matter, wishes to express his encouragement to you to work with us on these films. He shares our belief that it would be of great educational value to our psychology students, not only in this university but throughout the United States. Copies of the films could be made available to colleges everywhere in the United States.

Dr. John Meaney, Director of the Radio-TV Film Center at this university, as recipient of the grant, would produce the four films. He has produced many stimulating educational series for professional groups and for educational television. From my own experience working with him, I find him a most sympathetic and understanding student of psychology; so his work, I'm certain, would achieve the best possible results.

If you will permit us to do so and will suggest an appropriate amount, we shall be pleased to arrange for payment of an honorarium to you for your participation in these four films.

We are looking forward hopefully to a reply from you concerning this matter.

Cordially yours, [Richard Evans]

Within ten days we received the following reply from Dr. Jung:

April 1957

*Prof. Richard I. Evans, Ph. D.
University of Houston Cullen Boulevard
Houston 4, Texas*

Dear Prof. Evans,

I am inclined to meet your request, if you can limit yourself to four interviews on consecutive days, beginning on August 5th about 4 P. M.

As to the nature of your questions, I prefer your initiative. I would not know in what aspect of psychology you are particularly interested, I also cannot assume that our interests are the same. An interview should not

last longer than one hour at the most, as I easily get tired on account of my old age.

Since I am not informed about the size of your grant, I should like you to tell me frankly what you intend in the way of an honorarium.

I hope you are sufficiently aware of the unreliability imposed upon me by my age. Whatever I promise is necessarily subjected to the ulterior decision of fate that can interfere unexpectedly.

Sincerely yours, [C. G. Jung]

I'm sure that you can imagine the delight with which we greeted this reply and the haste with which we proceeded in the direction of further planning. The following correspondence between Dr. Jung, myself, and Dr. Jung's secretary, Mrs. Aniela Jaffé, is self-explanatory and traces the lines of events that led us to set up a firm appointment for four days in August of 1957.

April 18, 1957

Dear Professor Doctor Jung,

We were all delighted to receive your letter of April 12. On the day that your letter arrived, it happened that we were discussing some of your contributions to personality theory in my Psychology of Personality class, and when I read your letter to the class, it was, indeed, a dramatic note.

The dates that you indicate that you can see us for the purpose of filming interviews, August 5, 6, 7, and 8, are just fine. Dr. Meaney and I would probably arrive in Zurich a few days prior to this, of course.

In looking over our budget, an honorarium in the amount of five hundred dollars would appear to be feasible. Does this seem to be sufficient? If not, please let us know and we shall make every effort to make some adjustment.

With respect to the content of the interviews and the kinds of questions that I would ask you, it would be our desire to direct the discussion to the level of the undergraduate college student in psychology. Examples of the areas of discussion that would be of interest at this level would be the unconscious, introversion-extroversion and the ways in which these tendencies interact with the factors in your tetrasomy (feeling, thinking, intuition, sensation), the Word-Association Method, views of human personality development and maturity, and so on. Naturally, we shall endeavor in every way to direct our interviews to meet with your complete approval.

On behalf of Dr. Meaney, our psychology department staff, and the University of Houston administration, I wish to thank you for your

graciousness in accepting our proposal, thereby allowing our project to begin on such a distinguished note.

Cordially yours, [Richard Evans]

April 1957

Dear Prof. Evans,

Thank you for your kind letter. The proposed honorarium of five hundred dollars will suit me completely. Thank you also for giving me an outline of the questions you are going to ask. I sincerely hope that I shall not be too complicated. Looking forward to our meeting, I remain,

Yours sincerely, [C. G. Jung]

May 16, 1957

Dear Professor Jung:

We were delighted that the honorarium of five hundred dollars will be satisfactory. We are also pleased that the general discussion areas which we listed will be agreeable. May I raise an additional point? Dr. Meaney, who will, of course, be filming our interviews, would like your opinion of the lighting situation which for film work is very important, as you know. For example, at four in the afternoon during the early days of August when we have our appointments with you, is the lighting outside sufficient so that we may actually film the interviews outside in the front of your house, perhaps? From a technical point of view, this would then make it unnecessary to set up special lighting which might be necessary if the interviews were filmed, perhaps, some place in your home. Sound could also be more effectively recorded outside. Your comments concerning these points will be greatly appreciated.

Incidentally, as a matter of routine, our University requires your signature on the enclosed form. We would appreciate it if you would sign it above your name. The extra copy is for your files. Please return the copy bearing your signature with your reply to this letter.

Needless to say, Dr. Meaney and I are very excited about our trip and the prospects of meeting and spending a few hours with you. Our students are already asking us when our filmed reports of the interviews will be available for them to see. Thank you again for making this venture possible for us.

Cordially yours, [Richard Evans]

May 30, 1957

Dear Dr. Evans,

I assume that you know the chaotic conditions of European weather. Concedente Deo, we have the most beautiful bright sunlight. But, if the Nephelegeretés Zeus prefers to envelop our beloved country in shrouds of mist and rain, it may even happen that we have to put on the lights in the room. If the weather is good and hot, we have a lot of noise near the house on account of a public bathing place. In that case, we should retire to a remote corner of the garden, where there is no electricity. In this case, you would need about 100 yards of wire. —Well, I have to leave these technical decisions to yourself.

Here enclosed you also find the signed declaration. Au revoir in summer!

Sincerely yours, [C. G. Jung]

We decided that it would be expedient as well as valuable, in the interest of our project, to interview another outstanding psychologist while we were in Europe. Acting on this decision, we requested an interview with Anna Freud. She, however, wished to defer to Dr. Ernest Jones, an eminent psychoanalyst and scholar, who had devoted much of his life to supporting the views of Sigmund Freud. The interview with Dr. Jones would be a noteworthy complement to the succeeding interviews with Dr. Jung. Moreover, since both of these distinguished scientists had had primary contact with Freud and had emerged from the contact with divergent points of view, they would provide a provocative contrast for the student for whom these films were intended.

We were fortunate in securing an appointment with Dr. Jones, so our first stop in Europe was Paris, France. When we arrived in Paris to complete our interview with Dr. Jones, a meeting of the International Congress of Psychoanalysis was in session. Upon entering the large auditorium where a general meeting was being held, we saw, seated on the stage among an array of significant figures in the psychoanalytic movement, one gentleman who immediately captured our attention. In his last years, Dr. Jones had grown a beard, changing his appearance and making it look, for just a moment, as if Freud himself was sitting there.

Knowing that Dr. Jones was in extremely poor physical condition, a victim of terminal cancer and a recent coronary attack as well, we would not have been surprised if he had decided not to follow through with the interview. However, initial contact with Dr. Jones dispelled all such solitudes. Though he himself was quite preoccupied at the time with a host of friends and well-wishers who had gathered around him, he quickly referred us to Mrs. Jones, who assured us that her husband would be present at the appointed time and meeting place already arranged for the interview. Officials of a local Houston firm, the Schlumberger Corporation, had been kind enough to make their Paris offices available for the interview, and it was in this setting that we met with Dr. Jones.

The perspicacity and insight with which Dr. Jones approached the interview situation is readily discernible in his illuminating and candid responses to my varied inquiries. The lethal illness which daily pillaged his body of what little strength remained had gained no satisfaction at all over his keen, perceptive intellect; furthermore, as the reader will note, Dr.

Jones' poor health had in no way dulled the pungent sting of his words when he so chose to respond.

Feeling extremely satisfied with the success of the first segment of our mission, my colleague and I bid Dr. Jones farewell and immediately set out for Zurich, the setting for the finale of our venture. How eagerly we anticipated the impending meeting with the prominent, controversial Dr. Carl Jung.

The interim involved in the journey to Zurich provided an opportunity for meditation and reflection over the past few months which inevitably led to further consideration of Dr. Jung and his work. Like many American psychologists, I had long respected and been interested in Dr. Jung as an important pioneer and historical figure in the history of psychology. It was equally true, however, that I shared some of the skepticism, abundantly in evidence, that surrounded many of Jung's fundamental notions. On the whole, American psychologists have found Dr. Jung's work too mystical and philosophical to satisfy their criteria for sound, scientific research. In fact, it is interesting to note that Jung's ideas are more characteristically heralded by members of philosophy and English departments in universities than by the inhabitants of psychology departments.

Contemporary psychology, with its emphasis on scientific analysis and procedure, could hardly be expected to embrace such metaphysical concepts, postulated by Dr. Jung, as a "race unconscious" or "transcendental conceptions of the self," much less his suggestion that ancient writings in alchemy can supply knowledge of the growth and development process of the individual. Such concepts as these had led to Jung's persona non grata status among a large number of American psychologists.

Few, if any, denied, however, that certain of Dr. Jung's ideas had become conspicuous contributions in psychology. His introvert-extrovert typology had become part of the active vocabulary of countless numbers who had no formal training in psychology; and such classical terms as "complex," only one of many such terms introduced by Dr. Jung, had been so well-assimilated into our modern language as to make them, in essence, "household" words. Furthermore, as the creator of the "word association" test, he had supplied a tool which most psychologists had found extremely useful.

Also, it would be unfair not to mention that there were a few American psychologists who took Jung's conceptions concerning the nature of human personality more seriously. One notable example was the distinguished, respected, and in my opinion, most provocative Dr. Henry Murray of Harvard University. Dr. Murray, who had considerable contact with Jung, continues to speak highly of him. Also, Drs. Calvin Hall and Gardner Lindzey, in a widely used textbook, *Theories of Personality* (12), had written a chapter on Jung which appeared to me to be one of the most laudatory and positive descriptions of Jung's ideas to be presented in the literature of contemporary American psychology. Thus, Dr. Jung was not entirely without his distinguished following even in this land of skeptics.

As I approached the idea of interviewing Jung, I was compelled to decide what the purpose of the impending interviews should be. Like so many professors in personality courses, I had been teaching Jungian theory for many years; and, of course, the teaching situation implies a context where critical evaluation is very important. In these forthcoming interviews, however, it seemed best not to create an atmosphere where critical assessment of Dr. Jung's work played any crucial role.

In order to present Jung's views objectively, I felt it would be best to present an opportunity for Dr. Jung to set forth his views, particularly those views pertaining to personality theory, in as direct and systematic a fashion as possible. The questions which I

framed would allow him to contrast his views with those of Freud, and expound upon his own unique contributions. (The reader will note that we have often used Jung's reactions to Freudian theory as a means of not only allowing the student to compare the two men, but also as a means of generating a development of Jung's ideas.) This manner of presentation within a framework intelligible to contemporary psychology students would provide an opportunity for greater clarity in communication.

After arriving in Switzerland, we immediately contacted Frau Jaffé, Dr. Jung's secretary. This was in Küsnacht, and the date was August 2. I was delighted to hear from her that Dr. Jung would be very glad to receive me in his garden the next day to talk very briefly about the interviews which were going to be taking place in the following days. In the meantime, Dr. Meaney had the tremendous task of setting up the film equipment in the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, the site of the forthcoming interviews.

The problems of our one-man camera operator, director and co-producer, Dr. Meaney, to get a technical crew together became quite a chore. As he busied himself with these problems the next day, I walked over from our hotel in Küsnacht to Dr. Jung's home, which was but a few blocks away. I was received by Dr. Jung in his garden. His first words to me were, "Why do you American psychologists hate me so much?" I feel sure that I need not express the disconcerting surprise on my part which followed this inquiry, but it is equally true that had I known Dr. Jung even slightly, the impact of surprise would probably have never followed. Even on such short acquaintance, however, I did not react to this disarming statement as seriously as might be expected because of the teasing twinkle I detected in Dr. Jung's eyes as he peered at me through his glasses.

Although Dr. Jung was at this time 82 years of age, he gave all the appearances of being in excellent health. Physically, he was a well-proportioned, over six-foot-tall figure of a man, who carried himself with dignity. His manner was warm and charming, and gaining rapport with him was easily accomplished. I might add further, however, that no element of Dr. Jung's personality was to prove more delightful in the days that followed than that already referred to "twinkle" in his eyes, so much in evidence whenever he wanted to tease or banter about something for a moment.

I answered Dr. Jung's initial question with the only legitimate response available to me; that is, I had to admit that there was certainly a large number of American psychologists, probably the majority in fact, who did not accept many of his ideas, though "hate" was a rather strong term to use with reference to their sentiments.

I also pointed out to him, however, that another group of psychologists existed in America who were quite familiar with his work and much more positive in their evaluation of it.

Ensuing discussion with Dr. Jung revealed that he was indeed aware of the critical scrutiny to which certain of his concepts had been subjected. For example, it was no secret to him that his introversion-extroversion typology, particularly in the past, had served many of our introductory textbooks in psychology well as a kind of "whipping boy" in an attempt to warn the beginning student not to type people or put them into categories, in this case to label them as simply introverts or extroverts. On this point, however, I explained to him that many psychologists, perhaps more familiar with his work, were cognizant that he had never intended these typologies to be anything more than a useful guide in helping to understand the individual.

By now, tea was served, and we sat down to begin discussing a number of different things. Dr. Jung was particularly interested, as the reader may have noted from the content

of his first letter to us, in the educational goals of our project. He wanted to know for whom these filmed interviews would be intended. I expressed a hope that they would be a vehicle for introducing students to his work, which in turn made it necessary that they be couched in a level of language comprehensible to even the very beginning student. He signified a clear understanding of this.

As our conversation progressed, the educational nature of our effort continued to evoke genuine interest from him. At one point, I asked him why he had agreed to participate in these interviews. Interestingly enough, he replied that he somehow intuitively felt that these professors from Houston, the University of Houston, in "Houston, Texas, a new frontier in the United States," would be anxious to handle this situation in a way of which he would approve.

Dr. Jung's English, couched in a charming German accent, was quite excellent; and I began to see a dynamic quality in his mannerisms, his expressiveness, and his colorful phrasing. As we talked, it became very evident that in Carl Jung we had not only a subject who had much to offer intellectually, but an individual who would give an extremely excellent account of himself in a spontaneous interview situation.

I suggested to Dr. Jung that if true spontaneity could be achieved in these interviews, it would be much more exciting and interesting to the student, to which he immediately acknowledged his agreement. As a matter of fact, although I had prepared the questions to be asked during the four one-hour interviews, he did not even want to see them, preferring instead to hear the questions for the first time during the actual interviews.

The stress on spontaneity as a highly desirable goal, coupled with the one-hour time span allotted for each interview, however, created an important consideration to be taken into account. Spontaneity can result in too much irrelevant and digressive conversation, and in this case, since we wanted Dr. Jung's reactions to all the prepared questions, every hour had to count. I pointed this out to him, explaining that in commercial efforts of this type with more interview time available, many hours are often edited down to a few hours in the completed film. In these forthcoming interviews with him, however, we would have virtually no leeway for editing. Again, Dr. Jung signified that he understood.

There were so many exciting aspects of our venture that it would be impossible to chronicle all of them. One which stands out though as having added an interesting note to the proceedings was the assignment of Tom Dozier, a member of the Paris staff of Time Magazine, to cover the story. At the suggestion of our University News Service, we had informed the late William McHale, at that time the Chief of the Time Magazine, Paris Bureau, about the nature of our project as well as our arrival date in Paris. The project, consisting of two University professors seeking out Dr. Carl Jung for this kind of interview effort, had led him to assign a member of his Paris staff to report on the interviews.

Mr. Dozier began preparation for his piece for Time Magazine by first covering the interview held with Dr. Ernest Jones, and then followed us to Zurich where he asked and was granted permission both by us and Dr. Jung to actually sit in and witness the four one-hour filmed interviews. His interesting description of our effort appeared in the August 19, 1957 edition of Time. The following represents extracts from Mr. Dozier's story, prior to editing by Time, which appeared in the Houston Post, September 16, 1957:

"The old man with the wispy white hair and the wisely twinkling eyes leaned back in an armchair, deliberately puffed his pipe. Seemingly unconscious of the microphone around his neck and the camera lens

staring across the room at him, Carl Gustav Jung spoke through the smoke wreathing his head. His voice was strong and booming, his English only slightly tinged with a German accent.

'The world,' said Jung, 'hangs on a thin thread, and that thread is the psyche of man . . . It is not the reality of the hydrogen bomb we must fear, but what man does with it. Suppose certain fellows in Moscow lose their nerve, then the world is in fire and flames. As never before, the world hangs on the psyche of man.' Therefore, explained the wise old man, the study and understanding of man's psyche is more important than ever.

For an hour a day on four different days, analytical psychologist Jung, at a virile 82, the last survivor among the Big Three founding fathers of modern psychology, sat before a television camera in a glass-walled room in Zurich's Federal Institute of Technology, explained the abstruse fine points of the Jungian approach to the study of man's mind. Guided gently by Interviewer Richard Evans of the University of Houston's Department of Psychology, Jung ranged over the whole voluminous complexity of his theories and conclusions about the psyche.

At times he flailed out mildly at his fellow Titans, Freud and Adler, repeatedly corrected what he considered misinterpretations of his ideas, explained in detail his theories on introversion, extroversion, the persona, intuition, the interpretation of dreams and the unconscious symbols called archetypes. . . .

Jung's performance was as rare as it was fascinating. He was appearing for the first time ever before a TV camera, was making his first bow before an American audience since he lectured on psychology and religion at Yale in 1938, and except for lectures in Zurich, his only public declamation in a decade. And despite his hearty good health, onlookers were impressed by the possibility that they might be witnessing the last certain speech of a great and masterful actor . . . a retiring genius who shuns public appearances because 'I have such a hell of a trouble to make people see what I mean. . . .'

. . . Jung quipped and sparkled, seemed to enjoy the whole thing immensely. As Meaney fastened the microphone around Jung's neck and attached the lead-in wire, the old man joked, 'Well, this is the first time anybody ever had me on a leash.' . . . At the studio, his eyes sparkled behind steel-rimmed spectacles, and his bristly white mustache wiggled when he smiled. Since he was lecturing for students and since he is often obscure anyway, much of what he said was highly technical and difficult to translate into everyday English. . . ."

In the course of completing the four one-hour interviews, a number of interesting things happened through interaction with Dr. Jung, which afforded us some intriguing insight into him as a person. The reader might be interested in some of these experiences, keeping

in mind that since these reflect only a limited contact, they could hardly supply the bases for truly profound insight.

Each day, in a rented Plymouth, we would proceed to the site of the four interviews, the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology. I had carefully mapped out the way so that I would encounter no difficulty in locating the Institute, but all this proved to have been unnecessary. I discovered that Dr. Jung was fond of driving all over Europe himself, and he knew every nook and corner of this city. In fact, I learned later that Dr. Jung was the proud possessor of a very "snappy" Mercedes Benz. Every day Dr. Jung would point the way, always showing me a new route, proclaiming, "Everyone knows that Jung never goes the same way twice." Furthermore, each day as we would arrive at the Institute, as I carefully attempted to lead him to an elevator for the trip to the second floor, Dr. Jung would boldly lead the way up the stairs, tiring me with his brisk pace.

Mr. Dozier of Time Magazine sat through all the interviews, paying close attention and making a note of the questions which he would be asking us at the close of the interview in process. On one occasion, as I recall, he drove back from the Institute with us. He had been sitting quietly in the back seat while Dr. Jung and I conversed in an informal, casual manner about Dr. Jung's grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Mr. Dozier interrupted our chat to ask Jung really a very excellent question about some highly technical point which had been discussed in that day's interview. Very firmly, Dr. Jung rejected this very fine representative of a widely-read news weekly by simply declaring, "Sir, we are at the moment talking about something a little bit more important. Why don't you ask Dr. Evans later?"

Time Magazine had previously published some very excellent stories, favorable to Jung, so his behavior in this case was undoubtedly not a specific reflection of hostility toward Time. This incident just very clearly demonstrated Jung's characteristic lack of concern about the usual channels of what might be called societal pressures about which most of us are accustomed to feel concern.

We found that by the fourth day Dr. Jung began to tire somewhat. We were almost ready not to press for the completion of this last interview, but he insisted that he wanted to complete it. In fact, he cheerfully indicated to us that he was really enjoying this a great deal. I could not help but feel that this illustrated that his acceptance of our invitation to be interviewed was a sincere gesture. I think that the process of educating a great number of students in this manner represented a genuine challenge to him. Later we sent him a copy of one of the filmed interviews as a gift. We received the following letter from his secretary, Mrs. Jaffé:

November 28, 1958

*Prof. Richard I. Evans
University of Houston Cullen Blvd.
Houston 4, Texas*

Dear Professor Evans,

I want to tell you how very much we all liked to see your film. It was a great success, and we want to repeat the performance in spring. Prof. Jung asked me to thank you very much indeed for having sent the copy. He himself was not present at this performance, but we hope that he will come the next time. We are sure he will like it.

He asks you whether the film is meant as a gift to him, or whether he has to return it. He should be grateful for a short reply. We heard that you have four such films. Is that true? Thanking you again—

*Sincerely yours,
Aniela Jaffé, Secy.*

We heard subsequently that he really was quite delighted with the way he appeared in these interviews.

Upon returning to the United States, we quickly developed the films and began thinking of a means by which they could be made available to students and other interested groups. Much to our delight, interest in these films has been very great. We have filled requests for prints of them from literally all over the world. A recent request, for example, was from a Jungian group in Perth in Western Australia.

As is so often the case with those of us in the field of psychology, we are not only interested in getting a product, but we want to very carefully evaluate it. Without burdening the reader at this time with an elaborate discussion concerning the evaluations we made of these films, citation of one study we did will suffice as an indication, to some extent, of the success of the project. This study compared matched groups of students who read the transcripts of the interviews and saw the filmed interviews in terms of how much they learned beyond the normal reading of Jung's ideas from other sources. The results of our findings suggested that the interviews not only facilitated more effective communication of Jung's ideas, but also seemed to have definite effect on attitudes and feelings about Jung. Even some of the psychology students who had formerly been extremely inhospitable to Jung and his views seemed to develop a more favorable attitude toward Jung, the man, when confronted with this technique of presenting his ideas. This to us, of course, was most interesting and certainly, for future consideration, seems to suggest that this interview technique has definite promise as an educational tool. In fact, we are presently in the process of testing this possibility with much more thoroughness through an entire series of interviews being completed with a number of the most distinguished of contemporary psychologists. This is being done under the terms of a grant, recently awarded us by the National Science Foundation.

In the pages that follow, we have attempted to organize the materials in the interviews in such a way as to facilitate maximum communication between reader and printed page. We have taken as few liberties as possible with the text. In fact, I don't believe in any instance have we materially modified Jung's answers to the questions in the first three interviews. In the last interview, however, we actually asked Jung very few questions, allowing him to speak quite freely and in an unguided manner. Somewhat naturally, this approach led to a certain amount of rambling and did not seem to elicit the succinct kind of responses which would have been most ideal. Moreover, he mostly elaborates and expands, in this last interview, his earlier answers to questions posed in the first three interviews; thus, we have taken the liberty of synthesizing and reorganizing, to some extent at least, these expansions upon points already made in order to render the text more communicative and readable.

The order in which the questions and answers occurred has at times been changed for purposes of clarity, and, in the same interest, some of the questions have been subject to minor revision to make them more succinct. As a whole, however, the material embodied in the succeeding chapters faithfully reflects Jung's responses to our questions.

As the reader begins to delve into this material, he may notice certain differences in the way an American psychologist would use specific terms and in the way these same terms are used by Dr. Jung. To some degree, this is a function of Jung's German as it influences his English. To cite one example, the word instinct in American psychology today can be simply defined as an unlearned response tendency. Jung uses the term instinct, however, in reference to a learned response in the sense of being a habit.

Also, in perusing this material, the reader will notice that now and then there is a tendency for a phrase to be used which at face value does not appear particularly meaningful. For example, at one point Jung is talking about the unconscious and indicates that we can't really know much about the unconscious because—"... it's really unconscious!" At such times we recall the twinkle in Jung's eyes as he attempts to poke a little humor in the direction of the interviewer, and perhaps to open the door for some further discussion. In other words, the reader should not on many occasions, because of Jung's sense of humor and his unique communication devices, take his expressions too literally. Many of his responses must be understood in the context of the total answer to a given question.

It was with much interest that I recently read in a national magazine, the Atlantic Monthly, and in the book, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (17), some records of Dr. Jung's ideas presented by Frau Aniela Jaffé, Jung's secretary. Her keen insight, perceptiveness, and sensitive understanding of Jung's ideas and Jung as an individual are deserving of a special note of praise and admiration.

In New York City on December 1, 1961, a Jung Memorial meeting was held, sponsored jointly by the New York Association of Analytical Psychology and the Analytical Psychology Club of New York. At this meeting we were particularly taken with the interesting and eloquent comments expressed by Dr. Henry Murray about the late Dr. Carl Jung. We may quote Dr. Murray when he says:

"Jung was humble before the ineffable mystery of each variant self that faced him for the first time, as he sat at his desk, pipe in hand, with every faculty in tune, brooding on the portent of what was being said to him. And he never hesitated to acknowledge his perplexity in the presence of a strange and inscrutable phenomenon, never hesitated to admit the provisional nature of the comments he had to make or to emphasize the difficulties and limitations of possible achievement in the future."

"Whoever comes to me," he would say, "takes his life in his hand." The effect of such a statement, the effect of his manner of delivering his a'vows of uncertainty and suspense is not to diminish but to augment the patient's faith in his positions, invincible integrity, as well as to make plain that the patient must take the burden of responsibility for any decisions he might make."

I approached Dr. Jung not as a patient seeking his help, but as a psychology professor who was there for interviewing purposes. The same qualities ascribed to Jung in the quoted passage above, however, were equally discernible in this very different context. Jung did, indeed, possess humility, the kind that accompanies the broadest expansion of the intellect and the senses. In the text of the interview material to follow, I sincerely hope that the reader will be able to interact with Jung as well as learn from Jung.

Part II

JUNG AND FREUD

In this portion of the interviews, the writer made an effort to probe with Dr. Jung into the events surrounding his initial involvement with Dr. Freud. Also, an attempt was made to trace the line of the skeletal structure of psychoanalytic theory, allowing Jung to react to each part of it.

As Jung responds to questions concerning psycho- sexual development, and the Freudian concepts of the Id, Ego, and Super-Ego, a surprising degree of insight is conveyed to the reader of the manner in which Jung disagreed with Freud, the areas in which they were in concordance, and certain of Jung's ideas which developed as a reaction to Freudian thought.

1. Jung Relating to Freud, Adler, and Rank

Dr. Richard I. Evans: Dr. Jung, many of us who have read a great deal of your work are aware of the fact that in your early work you were in association with Dr. Sigmund Freud, and I know

it would be of great interest to many of us to hear how you happened to hear of Dr. Freud and how you happened to become involved with some of his work and ideas.

Dr. C. G. Jung: Well, as a matter of fact, it was the year 1900, in December, soon after Freud's book about dream interpretation had come out, that I was asked by my chief, Professor Bleuler, to give a review of the book. I studied the book very attentively, and I did not understand many things in it, which were not clear to me at all; but from other parts I got the impression that this man really knew what he was talking about. I thought "this is certainly a masterpiece—full of future. "

I had no ideas then of my own; I was just beginning. It was just when I began my career as assistant in the psychiatric clinic. And then I began with experimental psychology or psychopathology. I applied the experimental association methods of Wundt, the same that had been applied in the psychiatric clinic in Munich, and I studied the results and had the idea that one should go once more over it. So I made use of the association tests, and I found out that the important thing in them has been missed, because it is not interesting to see that there is a reaction—a certain reaction—to a stimulus word. That is more or less uninteresting. But the interesting thing is why people could not react to certain stimulus words, or only react in an entirely inadequate way.

Then I began to study these places in the experiment where the attention, or the capability of this person apparently began to waver or to disappear, and I soon found out that it was a matter of intimate personal affairs people were thinking of, or which were in them, even if they momentarily did not think of them when they were unconscious with other words; that the inhibition came from the unconscious and hindered the expression in speech. Then, in examining all these cases as carefully as possible, I saw that it was a matter of what Freud called repressions. I also saw what he meant by symbolization.

Evans: In other words, from your word association studies, some of the things in *The Interpretation of Dreams* began to fall into place.

Jung: Yes! And then I wrote a book about psychology of dementia praecox, as it was called then— now it is schizophrenia—and I sent the book to Freud, writing to him about my association experiments and how they confirmed his theory thus far. That is how my friendship with Freud began.

Evans: There were other individuals who also became interested in Dr. Freud's work, and one of them was Dr. Alfred Adler. As you remember Dr. Adler, what in your estimation led him to become interested in Dr. Freud's work?

Jung: He belonged; he was one of the young doctors that belonged to his surroundings there. There were about twenty young doctors who followed Freud there, who were—who had a sort of little society. Adler was one who happened to be there, and he learned— he studied Freud's psychology in that circle.

Evans: Another individual, of course, who joined this group was Otto Rank, and he, unlike yourself, Dr. Adler, and Dr. Freud was not a physician; did not have the Doctor of Medicine degree. Was this regarded by your group at the time as something unusual, to have someone become interested in these ideas who was not by training a physician?

Jung: Oh no! I have met many people who represented different faculties who were interested in psychology. All people who had to do with human beings were naturally interested; theologians, lawyers, pedagogues; they all had to do with the human mind and these people were naturally interested.

Evans: Then your group, including Freud, did not feel that this was exclusively an area of interest for the physician? This was something that might appeal to many?

Jung: Oh my, yes! Mind you, every patient you have gets interested in psychology. Nearly everyone thinks he is meant to be an analyst, inevitably.

2. Jung's Appraisal of Freudian Psychosexual Development

Evans: One of the very fundamental ideas of the original psychoanalytic theory was Freud's conception of the libido as a sort of broad, psychic sexual energy. Of course, we all know that you began to feel that Dr. Freud might have laid, perhaps, a little too much stress on sexuality in his theories. When did you first begin feeling this?

Jung: In the beginning, I had naturally certain prejudices against this conception, and after a while, I overcame them. I could do that from the weight of my biological training. I could not deny the impulses of the sexual instinct, you know.

Later on, however, I saw that it was really one-sided because, you see, man is not only governed by the sex instinct; there are other instincts as well. For instance, in biology you see that the nutritional instinct is just as important as the sex instinct. Although in primitive societies sexuality plays a role, food does much more. Food is the all-important interest and desire. Sex—that is something they can have everywhere—they are not tried. But food is difficult to obtain, you see, and so it is the main interest.

Then in other societies—I mean civilized societies—the power drive plays a much greater role than sex. For instance, there are many big business men who are impotent because their full energy is going into money-making or dictating the roles to everybody else. That is much more interesting to them than the affairs of women.

Evans: So in a sense, as you began to look over Dr. Freud's emphasis on sexual drive, you began to think in terms of other cultures, and it seemed to you that this emphasis was not of sufficient universality to be assessed primary importance.

Jung: Well, you know, I couldn't help seeing it, because I had studied Nietzsche. I knew the work of Nietzsche very well. He had been a professor at Basel University, and the air was full of talk about Nietzsche; so naturally I had studied his works. And from this I saw an entirely different psychology, which was also psychology—a perfectly competent psychology, but built upon the power drive.

Evans: Do you think it possible that Dr. Freud was either ignoring Nietzsche, or had perhaps not wanted to be influenced by Nietzsche?

Jung: You mean his personal motivation?

Evans: Yes.

Jung: Of course it was a personal prejudice. It happened to be his main point, you know, that certain people are chiefly looking for this side, and other people are looking for another side. So, you see, the inferior Dr. Adler, the younger and weaker, naturally had a power complex. He wanted to be *the* successful man. Freud was a successful man; he was on top, and so he was interested only in pleasure and the pleasure principle, and Adler was interested in the power drive.

Evans: You feel that it was a sort of function of Dr. Freud's own personality?

Jung: Yes, it is quite natural; it is one of two ways how to deal with reality. Either you make reality an object of pleasure, if you are powerful enough already; or you make it an object of your desire to grab or to possess.

Evans: Some observers have speculated that the patients whom Dr. Freud saw in the Vienna of this period were so often sexually repressed that they may have been representative of a cultural type; or, in other words, since these patients were a part of a Viennese society, believed to have been a rather "repressed" society, Freud's patients, perhaps, demonstrated an undue tendency to react to sexual frustration, reinforcing his ideas of a sexual libido.

Jung: Well, it is certainly so that at the end of the Victorian age there was a reaction going over the whole world against the sex taboos, so-called. One didn't properly understand any more why or why not; and Freud belongs in that time, a sort of liberation of the mind of such taboos.

Evans: There was a reaction, then, against the sort of tight, inhibited culture he was living in.

Jung: Yes, Freud, in that way—on that side, really belonged to the category of a Nietzschean mind. Nietzsche had liberated Europe from a great deal of such prejudices, but only concerning the power drive and our illusions as to motivations of our morality. It was a time critical of morality.

Evans: So Dr. Freud, in a sense, was taking it from another direction—

Jung: Yes. And then, moreover, sex being the main instinct and the dominating instinct in a more or less safe society, when the social conditions are more or less safe, sexuality is apt to predominate because people are taken care of. They have their positions. They have enough food. When there is no question of hunting or seeking food, or something like that, then it is quite probable that patients you meet have more or less all some sexual complex.

Evans: So the sex drive is potentially the drive in that particular society most likely to be inhibited?

Jung: Yes. It is a sort of finesse, almost, when you find out that somebody has a power-drive and their sex only serves the purpose of power. For instance, a charming man whom all

women think is the real hero of all hearts; he is a power-fable, like a Don Juan, you know. The woman is not his problem; his problem is how to dominate. So in the second place after sex comes the power drive, and even that is not the end.

Evans: To proceed further, in the orthodox psychoanalytic view, as you well know, there is much attention paid to what Freud called psychosexual development, in that the individual encounters a series of problems in sequence which he must resolve in order to progressively mature. It appears that one of the earliest problems the individual seems to have centers around, you might say, primitive oral satisfactions; or oral zone experiences, including weaning, represent some of the first frustrations for the infant.

Jung: I think, you see, that when Freud says that one of the first interests, and the foremost interest is to feed, he doesn't need such a peculiar kind of terminology like "oral zone." Of course, they put it into the mouth—

Evans: Then you look at Freud's oral level of development in a less complicated sense without a sexual connotation?

Jung: Science consists to a great extent of meal talk.

Evans: In summary then, Dr. Jung, with reference to the oral level of development, you prefer to look at it rather literally, as a sort of hunger drive or drive for nutrition.

Another rather fundamental point in the development of the ego in the orthodox psychoanalytic view is that the oral level is followed by another critical level, an anal level of development. At this level another crucial, early frustration arises; that is, frustration centering around the problem of toilet-training. In Ego development and later character formation, Freud saw poor resolution of such problems as being rather serious.

Jung: Well, one can use such terminology because it is a fact that children are exceedingly interested in all orifices of the body and in doing all sorts of disgusting things, and sometimes such a peculiarity keeps on into later life. It is quite astonishing what you can hear in this respect. Now it is equally true that people who have such prevalences also develop a peculiar character.

In early childhood a character is already there. You see, a child is not born *tabula rasa* as one assumes. The child is born as a high complexity, with existing determinants that never waver through the whole life, and that give the child his character. Already, in earliest childhood, a mother recognizes the individuality of her child; and so, if you observe carefully, you see a tremendous difference, even in very small children.

These peculiarities express themselves in every way. First, the peculiarities express themselves in all childish activities—in the way he plays, in the things he is interested in. There are children who are tremendously interested in all moving things, in the movement chiefly, and in all things they see that affect the body. So they are interested in what the eyes do, what the ears do, how far you can bore into the nose with your finger, you know. They will do the same to the anus; they will do whatever they please with their genitals. For instance, when I was in school, we once stole the class book where all the punishments were noted, and there our professor of religion had noted, "So-and-so punished with two hours because he was toying with his genitals during the religious hour. "

These interests express themselves in a typically childish way in children. Later on they express themselves in other peculiarities which are still the same, but it doesn't come from the fact that they once had done such and such a thing in childhood. It is the character that is doing it. There is a definite complexity, and if you want to know something about possible reasons, you must go to the parents.

In any case of a child's neurosis, I go back to the parents and see what is going on there, because children have no psychology of their own, literally taken. They are so much in the mental atmosphere of the parents, so much a participation mystique with the parents. They are imbued by the maternal or paternal atmosphere, and they express these influences in their childish way. For instance, take an illegitimate child. They are particularly exposed to environmental difficulties such as the misfortune of the mother, etcetera, etcetera, and all the complications. Such a child will miss, for instance, a father. Now in order to compensate for this, it is just as if they were choosing or nominating a part of their body for a father, a substitution for the father, and they develop, for instance, masturbation. That is very often so of illegitimate children; they become terribly autoerotic, even criminal.

Evans: With reference to the role of the parents in development, one of the central parts of psychosexual development in orthodox psychoanalytic theory is the Oedipal level of development. It is at this level that the problem of premature sexuality relating to the opposite sex parent emerges. This problem, like the earlier ones mentioned, must also be resolved, or it will result in the formation of an Oedipus complex.

Jung: That is just what I call an archetype. That is the first archetype Freud discovered; the first and the only one. He thought that this WAS the archetype. Of course, there are many such archetypes. You look at Greek mythology and you find them, any amount of them. Or look at dreams and you find any amount of them. To Freud, however, incest was so impressive that he chose the term "Oedipus Complex," because that was one of the outstanding examples of an incest complex; though, mind you, it is only in the masculine form, because women have an incest complex too which, to Freud, was not an Oedipus. So it is something else?

He saw this only as a term for an archetypal way of behavior. In the case of a man—a man's relation, say, to his mother. He also means to his daughter because whatever he was to his mother, he will be it to the daughter too. It can be this way or that way.

Evans: Then you believe, in other words, that the Oedipus complex is not as important an influence in itself as Freud did, but that it is only one of many archetypes?

Jung: Yes. It is only one of the many, many ways of behavior. Oedipus gives you an excellent example of the behavior of an archetype. It is always a whole situation. There is a mother; there is a father; there is a son; so there is a whole story of how such a situation develops and to what end it leads finally. That is an archetype.

An archetype always is a sort of abbreviated drama. It begins in such and such a way, extends to such and such a complication, and finds its solution in such and such a way. That is the usual form. For instance, take the instinct in birds of building their nests. In the way they build the nests, there is the beginning, the middle, and the end. The nests are built just to suffice for a certain number of young. The end is already anticipated. That is the reason why, in the archetype, it is hard. There is no time; it is a timeless condition where beginning,

middle, and end are just the same; they are all given in one. That is only a hint to what the archetype can do, you know, but that is a complicated question.

Evans: To discuss more specifically Freud's concept of the Oedipus complex, a rather commonly held belief, again within the confines of orthodox psychoanalytic theory, is that, in a sense, the child's early family behavior patterns with the mother, the father, etc., are to some extent repeatedly relived, and can be regarded as a "repetition compulsion." For example, when the young man gets married, he may react to his wife as he did to his mother, or he may be searching for someone like his mother. Likewise, the daughter, as she looks for a husband, may be searching for a father. This will be repeated over and over again. This appears to be the heart of what the early Freudians were theorizing. Now, does this type of recapitulation of the very early Oedipus situation fit in with your conceptions?

Jung: No. You see, Freud speaks of the incest complex just in the way you describe, but he omits completely the fact that with this Oedipus complex, he is only giving the contrary—namely, the resistance against it. For instance, if the Oedipus pattern were really predominant, we would have been suffocated in incest half a million years ago, at least.

But there is a compensation. In all of the early levels of civilization you find the marriage laws, namely, exogamic laws. The first form, the most elemental form, is that the man can marry his cousin on the maternal side. The next form is that the man can only marry his cousin in the second degree, namely, from the grandmother. There are four systems; quarter marriages, systems of 8 and 12, and a 6-system. In China, there are still traces of both a 12-system and of a 6-system. And those are developments beyond the incest complex and against the incest complex. Now if sexuality is predominant, particularly incestual sexuality, how can it develop?

These things have developed in a time long before there was any idea of a child—say of my sister. That's all wrong. On the contrary, it was a royal prerogative as late as the Caanite kings in Persia, and among the Egyptian Pharaohs, that the Pharaoh had a daughter from his sister; he married that daughter and had a child with her, and then married his granddaughter. Because that was royal prerogative. You see, the preservation of the royal blood is always a sort of attempt at the highly appreciated incestuous restriction of the numbers of ancestors, because this is loss of ancestors. Now, you see, that must be explained too. There is not only the one thing that shows its compensation. You know this plays a very great role in the history of human civilization.

Freud is always inclined to explain these things by external influences. For instance, you would not feel hampered in any way if there were not a law against it. No one is hampered by one's self. And that's what he never could admit to me.

3. Jung's Appraisal of Freud's Structural Concepts: Id, Ego, and Super-Ego

Evans: Going still further into the development of Dr. Freud's theory, which you acknowledge as a significant factor in the development of many of your own early ideas, Dr. Freud, of course, talked a great deal about the unconscious.

Jung: As soon as research comes to a question of the unconscious, things become necessarily blurred, because the unconscious is something which is really unconscious! So you have no object—nothing. You only can make inferences because you can't see it; and so you have to create a model of this possible structure of the unconscious.

Now Freud came to the concept of the unconscious chiefly on the basis of the same experience I have had in the association experiment; namely, that people reacted—they said things—they did things—without knowing that they had done it or had said it. This is something you can observe in the association experiment; sometimes people cannot remember afterward what they did or what they said in a moment when a stimulus word hits the complex. In the word association reproduction experiment, you go through the whole list of words. You see that the memory fades when there is a complex reaction or block. That is the simple fact upon which Freud based his idea of the unconscious.

There is no end of stories, you know, about how people can betray themselves by saying something they didn't mean to say at all; yet the unconscious meant them to say just that thing. That is what we can see, time and again, when people make a mistake in speech or they say something which they didn't mean to say; they just make ridiculous mistakes. For instance, when you want to express your sympathy at a funeral, you go to someone and you say, "I congratulate you"; that's pretty painful, you know, but that happens, and it is true. This is something that goes parallel with Freud's whole idea of the psychopathology of everyday life.

In Paris there was Pierre Janet who worked out another side of the understanding of unconscious reactions. Now, Freud refers very little to Pierre Janet, but I studied with him while in Paris and he very much helped form my ideas. He was a first class observer, though he had no systematic, dynamic psychological theory; his is a sort of physiological theory of the unconscious phenomena.

There is a certain depotentiation of the tension of consciousness; it sinks below the level of consciousness and thus becomes unconscious. That is Freud's view too, but he says it sinks down because it is helped; it is repressed from above. That was my first point of difference with Freud. I think there have been cases in my observations where there was no repression from above; those contents that became unconscious had withdrawn all by themselves, and not because they were repressed.

On the contrary, they have a certain autonomy. They have discovered the concept of autonomy in that these contents that disappear have the power to move independently from my will. Either they appear when I want to say something definite; they interfere and speak themselves instead of helping me to say what I want to say; they make me do something which I don't want to do at all; or they withdraw in the moment that I want to use them. They certainly disappear!

Evans: And this then is independent of any of the, you might say, pressures on the consciousness as Freud suggested?

Jung: Yes. There can be such cases, sure enough, but besides them, there are also the cases that show that the unconscious contents acquire a certain independence. All mental contents having a certain feeling tone that is emotional have the value of an emotional affect— have the tendency to become autonomous. So, you see, anybody in an emotion will say and do things which he cannot vouch for. He must excuse himself of a mistake; he was *non compos mentis*.

Evans: Dr. Freud suggested that the individual is born under the influence of what he called the Id, which is unconscious and undeveloped, a collection of animal drives. It is not very easily understood where all these primitive drives—all these instincts—come from.

Jung: Nobody knows where instincts come from. They are there and you find them. It is a story that was played millions of years ago. Their sexuality was invented, and I don't know how this happened; I wasn't there! Feeding was invented very much longer ago than even sex, and how and why it was invented, I don't know. So we don't know where the instinct comes from. It is quite ridiculous, you know, to speculate about such an impossibility. So the question is only—where do those cases come from where instinct does not function. That is something within our reach, because we can study the cases where instinct does not function.

Evans: Could you give us some rather specific examples of what you mean by cases where instinct does not function?

Jung: Well, you see, instead of instinct, which is a habitual form of activity, take any other form of habitual activity. Consider a thing that is absolutely controlling which fails to function; then it's worse, and suddenly we can't think of any other thing. For instance, a man who writes fluently suddenly makes a ridiculous mistake; then his habit hasn't functioned. Also, when you ask me something, I'm supposed to be able to react to you; but certainly if I am pushed beyond, or if you succeed in touching upon one of my complexes, you will see that I become absolutely perplexed. Words fail me.

Evans: We haven't seen you very perplexed yet, Dr. Jung.

Jung: I am a good example of psychology, you know, a fellow who knows his stuff quite well—the professor asks him and he cannot say a word.

Evans: To continue, another part of Dr. Freud's theory, of course, that became very important, to which we have already alluded, was the idea of the conscious; that is, out of this unconscious, instinctual "structure," the Id, an Ego emerges. Freud suggested that this ego resulted from the organism's contact with reality, perhaps a product of frustration as reality is imposed on the individual. Do you accept this conception of the ego?

Jung: If man has an ego at all, that is your question. Ah, that is again such a case as before; I wasn't there when it was invented. However, in this case, you see, you can observe it to a certain extent with a child. A child definitely begins in a state where there is no ego, and about the fourth year or before, the child develops a sense of ego—"I, myself."

There is, in the first place, a certain identity with the body. For instance, when you ask primitives, they emphasize always the body. When you ask—who has brought this thing here—the Negro will say "I brought it," no accent on the "I," simply "brought it." Then if you say—why have YOU brought it—he will say, you know, ME, ME, Yes, I, MYSELF, this given object, this thing here. So the identity with the body is one of the first things which makes an ego; it is the spatial separateness that induces, apparently, the concept of an ego.

Then, of course, there are lots of other things. Later on there are mental differences and other personal differences of all sorts. You see, the ego is continuously building up; it is not ever a finished product—it builds up. You see, no year passes when you do not discover a new little aspect in which you are more ego than you have thought.

Evans: Dr. Jung, there has been much discussion about how certain experiences in the early years influence the formation of the ego. For example, one of the most extreme views concerning such early influences was advanced by Otto Rank. He spoke of the birth trauma and suggested that the trauma of being born would not only leave a very powerful impact on the developing ego, but would have residual influence throughout the life of the individual.

Jung: I should say that it is very important for an ego that it is born; this is highly traumatic, you know, when you fall out of heaven.

Evans: However, do you take *literally* Dr. Otto Rank's position that the birth trauma has a profound psychological effect on the individual?

Jung: Of course it influences you. If you believe in Schopenhauer's philosophy, you say, "it is a hellish trauma to be born." Well, there is a Greek saying that "it is beautiful to die in youth, but the most beautiful of all things is not to be born." Philosophy, you see.

Evans: But you don't take this as a *literal* psychic event?

Jung: Don't you see, this is an event that happens to everybody that exists—that each man once has been born. Everybody who is born has undergone that trauma, so the word has lost its meaning. It is a general fact, and you cannot say "it is a trauma"; it is just a fact, because you cannot observe a psychology that hasn't been born—only then you could say what the birth trauma is. Until then, you cannot even speak of such a thing; it is just a lack of epistemology.

Evans: In his later writing, in addition to the ego, Freud introduced a term to describe a particular function of the ego. That term was the Super-Ego. Broadly speaking, the super-ego was to account for the "moral restrictive" function of the ego.

Jung: Yes, that is the super-ego, namely that codex of what you can do and what you cannot do.

Evans: Built-in prohibitions which Freud thought might be partly acquired and partly "built-in."

Jung: Yes. However, Freud doesn't see the difference between the "built-in" and the acquired. You see, he must have it almost entirely within himself; otherwise, there could be no balance in the individual. And who in Hell would have invented the Decalogue? That is not invented by Moses, but that is the eternal truth in man himself, because he checks himself.

Part III

THE UNCONSCIOUS

Perhaps the area of greatest concentration and analysis in Jung's theory is the area of the unconscious. In contrast to Freud's development of a single unconscious, which, particularly in his earlier work, was the source of all pleasure-seeking, instinctual urges within the individual and the domain of repressed material as well, Jung postulated both a personal unconscious and a race or group unconscious, perhaps his most controversial contribution. Of particular importance in the race unconscious is Jung's contention that Archetypes, innate behavior potentials, inherited in what might best be described as a quasi-Lamarckian sense, are the crucial determiners of human development.

In these interviews, Jung explicitly explains archetypes and related concepts such as Persona, the Ego, and the Self. The reader will note that Freud's concept, the Ego, which to Freud is the unifying core of human personality, is essentially what Jung means by the Self.

4. The Unconscious: Archetypes

Evans: You mentioned earlier that Freud's Oedipal situation was an example of an archetype. At this time would you please elaborate on the concept, archetype?

Jung: Well, you know what a behavior pattern is, the way in which a weaver bird builds its nest. That is an inherited form in him. He will apply certain symbiotic phenomena, between insects and plants. They are inherited patterns of behavior. And so man has, of course, an inherited scheme of functioning. You see, his liver, his heart, all his organs, and his brain will always function in a certain way, following its pattern. You may have a great difficulty seeing it because you cannot compare it. There are no other similar beings like man, that are articulate, that could give an account of their functioning. If that were the case, we could—I don't know what. But because we have no means of comparison, we are necessarily unconscious about the whole conditions.

It is quite certain, however, that man is born with a certain functioning, a certain way of functioning, a certain pattern of behavior which is expressed in the form of archetypal images, or archetypal forms. For instance, the way in which a man should behave is expressed by an archetype. Therefore, you see, the primitives tell such stories. A great deal of education goes through story-telling. For instance, they call together the young men, and two older men act out before the eyes of the younger all the things they should not do. Then they say, "Now that's exactly the thing you shall not do." Another way is they tell them all of the things they should not do, like the Decalogue, "Thou shalt not," and that is always supported by mythological tales.

That, of course, gave me a motive to study the archetypes, because I began to see that the structure of what I then called the *collective unconscious* was really a sort of agglomeration of such typical images, each of which had a unique quality.

The archetypes are, at the same time, dynamic. They are instinctual images that are not intellectually invented. They are always there and they produce certain processes in the unconscious that one could best compare with myths. That's the origin of mythology. Mythology is a pronouncing of a series of images that formulate the life of archetypes. So the statements of every religion, of many poets, etc., are statements about the inner mythological process, which is a necessity because man is not complete if he is not conscious of that aspect of things. For instance, our ancestors have done so and so, and so shall you do. Or such and such a hero has done so and so, and that is your model. For instance, in the teachings of the Catholic church, there are several thousand saints. They show us how to do—They have their legends—And that is Christian mythology.

In Greece, you know, there was Theseus and there was Heracles, models of fine men, of gentlemen, you know; and they teach us how to behave. They are archetypes of behavior. I became more and more respectful of archetypes, and that naturally led me on to a profound study of them. And now, by Jove, there is an enormous factor, very important for our further development and for our well-being, that should be taken into account.

It was, of course, difficult to know where to begin, because it is such an enormously extended field. And the next question I asked myself was, "Now, where in the world has anybody been busy with that problem?" I found that nobody had except a peculiar spiritual movement that went together with the beginning of Christianity, namely, the Gnostics; and that was the first thing actually that I saw. They were concerned with the problem of archetypes, and made a peculiar philosophy of it. Everybody makes a peculiar philosophy of it when he comes across it naively, and doesn't know that those are structural elements of

the unconscious psyche. The Gnostics lived in the first, second and third centuries; and I wanted to know what was in between that time and today, when we suddenly are confronted by the problems of the collective unconscious which were the same two thousand years ago, though we are not prepared to admit that problem. I was always looking for something in between, you know, something that would link that remote past with the present moment.

I found to my amazement that it was alchemy, that which is understood to be a history of chemistry. It was, one could almost say, nothing less than that. It was a peculiar spiritual movement or a philosophical movement. They called themselves philosophers, like Narcissism.

And then I read the whole accessible literature, Latin and Greek. I studied it because it was enormously interesting. It is the mental work of 1,700 years, in which there is stored up all they could make out about the nature of the archetypes, in a peculiar way that's foolish. It is not simple. Most of the texts are no more published since the middle ages, the last editions dated in the middle or the end of the sixteenth century, all in Latin; some texts are in Greek, not a few very important ones. That has given me no end of work, but the result was most satisfactory, because it showed me the development of our unconscious relation to the collective unconscious and the variations our consciousness has undergone; why the being's unconscious is concerned with these mythological images.

For instance, such phenomena as in Hitler, you know. That is a psychical phenomenon, and we've got to understand these things. To me, of course, it has been an enormous problem because it is a factor that has determined the fate of millions of European people, and of Americans. Nobody can deny that he has been influenced by the war. That was all Hitler's doing—and that's all psychology, our foolish psychology. But you only come to an understanding of these things when you understand the background from which it springs. It is just as though, as if a terrific epidemic of typhoid fever were breaking out, and you say, "That is typhoid fever— isn't that a marvelous disease!" It can take on enormous dimensions and nobody knows anything about it. Nobody takes care of the water supply, nobody thinks of examining the meat or anything like that; but everyone simply states, "This is a phenomenon." —Yes, but one doesn't understand it.

Of course, I cannot tell you in detail about alchemy. It is the basic of our modern way of conceiving things, and therefore, it is as if it were right under the threshold of consciousness. This is a wonderful picture of how the development of archetypes, the movement of archetypes, looks when you look upon them with broader perspective. Maybe from today you look back into the past and you see how the present moment has evolved out of the past. It is just as if the alchemistic philosophy— That sounds very curious; we should give it an entirely different name. Actually, it has a different name. It is also called Hermetic Philosophy, though, of course, that conveys just as little as the term alchemy. —It was the parallel development, as Narcissism was, to the conscious development of Christianity, of our Christian philosophy, of the whole psychology of the middle ages.

So you see, in our days we have such and such a view of the world, a particular philosophy, but in the unconscious we have a different one. That we can see through the example of the alchemistic philosophy that behaves to the medieval consciousness exactly like the unconscious behaves to ourselves. And we can construct or even predict the unconscious of our days when we know what it has been yesterday.

Or, for instance, to take a more concise archetype, like the archetype of the ford—the ford to a river. Now that is a whole situation. You have to cross a ford; you are in the water; and there is an ambush or a water animal, say a crocodile or something like that. There is

danger and something is going to happen. The problem is how you escape. Now this is a whole situation and it makes an archetype. And that archetype has now a suggestive effect upon you. For instance, you get into a situation; you don't know what the situation is; you suddenly are seized by an emotion or by a spell; and you behave in a certain way you have not foreseen at all—you do something quite strange to yourself.

Evans: Could this also be described as spontaneous?

Jung: Quite spontaneous. And that is done through the archetype that is concerned. Of course, we have a famous case in our Swiss history of the King Albrecht, who was murdered in the ford of the Royce not very far from Zurich. His murderers were hiding behind him for the whole stretch from Zurich to the Royce, quite a long stretch, and after deliberating, still couldn't come together about whether they wanted to kill the king or not. The moment the king rode into the ford, they thought, "Murder!" They shouted, "Why do we let him abuse us?" Then they killed him, because this was the moment they were seized; this was the *right* moment. So you see, when you have lived in primitive circumstances, in the primeval forest among primitive populations, then you know that phenomenon. You are seized with a certain spell and you do a thing that is unexpected.

Several times when I was in Africa, I went into such situations where I was amazed afterwards. One day I was in the Sudan and it was really a very dangerous situation, which I didn't recognize at the moment at all. But I was seized with a spell. I did something which I wouldn't have expected and I couldn't have intended.

You see, the archetype is a force. It has an autonomy, and it can suddenly seize you. It is like a seizure. So, for instance, falling in love at first sight, that is such a case. You have a certain image in yourself, without knowing it, of the woman—of any woman. You see that girl, or at least a good imitation of your type, and instantly you get the seizure; you are caught. And afterwards you may discover that it was a hell of a mistake. You see, a man is quite capable, or is intelligent enough to see that the woman of his choice was no choice; he has been captured! He sees that she is no good at all, that she is a hell of a business, and he tells me so. He says, "For God's sake, doctor, help me to get rid of that woman." He can't though, and he is like clay in her fingers. That is the archetype. It has all happened because of the archetype of the anima, though he thinks it is all his soul, you know. It is like the girl—any girl. When a man sings very high, for instance, sings a high C, she thinks he must have a very wonderful spiritual character, and she is badly disappointed when she marries that particular "letter." Well, that's the archetype of the animus.

Evans: Now Dr. Jung, to be even a bit more specific, you have suggested that in our society, in all societies, there are symbols that in a sense direct or determine what a man does. Then you also suggest that somehow these symbols become "inborn" and, in part, "inbred."

Jung: They don't become; they *are*. They are to begin with. You see, we are born into a pattern; we are a pattern. We are a structure that is preestablished through the genes.

Evans: To recapitulate then, the archetype is just a higher order of an instinctual pattern, such as your earlier example of a bird building a nest. Is that how you intended to describe it?

Jung: It is a biological order of our mental functioning, as, for instance, our biological-physiological function follows a pattern. The behavior of any bird or insect follows a pattern, and that is the same with us. Man has a certain pattern that makes him specifically human, and no man is born without it. We are only deeply unconscious of these facts because we live by all our senses and outside of ourselves. If a man could look into himself, he could discover it. When a man discovers it in our days, he thinks he is crazy—really crazy.

Evans: Now would you say the number of such archetypes are limited or predetermined, or can the number be increased?

Jung: Well, I don't know what I do know about it; it is so blurred. You see, we have no means of comparison. We know and we see that there is a behavior, say like incest; or there is a behavior of violence, a certain kind of violence; or there is a behavior of panic, of power, etc. Those are areas, as it were, in which there are many variations. It can be expressed in this way or that way, you know. And they overlap, and often you cannot say where the one form begins or ends.

It is nothing concise, because the archetype in itself is completely unconscious and you only can see the effects of it. You can see, for instance, when you know a person is possessed by an archetype; then you can divine and even prognosticate possible developments. This is true because when you see that the man is caught by a certain type of woman in a certain very specific way, you know that he is caught by the anima. Then the whole thing will have such and such complications and such and such developments because it is typical. The way the anima is described is exceedingly typical. I don't know if you know Rider Haggard's *She*, or *L'Atlantide* by Benoît—*c'est la femme fatale*.

Evans: To be more specific, Dr. Jung, you have used the concepts, anima and animus, which you are now identifying in terms of sex, male or female. I wonder if you could elaborate perhaps even more specifically on these terms? Take the term "anima" first. Is this again part of the inherited nature of the individual?

Jung: Well, this is a bit complicated, you know. The anima is an archetypal form, expressing the fact that a man has a minority of feminine or female genes. That is something that doesn't appear or disappear in him, that is constantly present, and works as a female in a man.

As early as the 16th century, the Humanists had discovered that man had an anima, and that each man carried female within himself. They said it; it is not a modern invention. The same is the case with the animus. It is a masculine image in a woman's mind which is sometimes quite conscious, sometimes not quite conscious; but it is called into life the moment that woman meets a man who says the right things. Then because he says it, it is all true and he is the fellow, no matter what he is. Those are particularly well-founded archetypes, those two. And you can lay hands on their bases.

5. The Unconscious: General Conceptualizations

Evans: Dr. Jung, to pursue our discussion of the unconscious further, let us take the particular situation of a dream and its interpretation. It is my understanding that, in your view of the unconscious, what you would find in the dream would not necessarily be an image or symbol of what has happened in the past to the individual.

Jung: Oh no! It just is a symbol of the—the symbol, you see, this is a special term— It is the manifestation of the situation of the unconscious, looked at from the unconscious. You see, I tell you, for instance, something which is my personal subjective view. Then if I ask myself, "Now are you really quite convinced of it," well, I must admit I have certain doubts. There are certain doubts, not in the moment when I tell you, but these are doubts in the unconscious. When you have a dream about it, these doubts come to the forefront. That is the way the unconscious looks at the thing. It is as if the unconscious says, "It is all very well what you are stating, BUT you omit entirely such and such a point.

Evans: Now if the unconscious acts on the present situation, looking at this in broad motivational terms, this effect of the unconscious is not something which is a result of repression in the way the orthodox psycho- analyst looks at it at all. Then...

Jung: It may be, you know, that what the unconscious has to say is so disagreeable that one prefers not to listen, and in most cases people would be probably less neurotic if they could admit the things. But these things are always a bit difficult or disagreeable, inconvenient, or something of the sort; so there is always a certain amount of repression. But that is not the main thing.

The main thing is that they are really unconscious. If you are unconscious about certain things that ought to be conscious, then you are dissociated. Then you are a man whose left hand never knows what the right is doing, and counteracts or interferes with the right hand. Now such a man is hampered all over the place.

In 1918, I wrote a disquisition about the relation between the ego and the unconscious. There I tried to formulate the experiences that are more or less observable in cases where consciousness is exposed to unconscious data, to interferences or intrusions; where the unconscious is considered as an autonomous factor that has to be taken seriously; where one doesn't say any more or under-value the unconscious by assuming that it is nothing but discarded remnants of consciousness. It is a factor in its own dignity, and a very important factor, because it can create most horrible disturbances.

When I wrote that pamphlet in 1918, it was published in French and nobody understood it. I saw, however, the reason why nobody understood it. It was because nobody had had a similar experience, because the question had to be pursued to such an end. To pursue that end, one has to take the unconscious seriously and consider it as a real factor that can determine human behavior to a very considerable degree.

Evans: Looking at the unconscious in this way, as you say, "If it's unconscious, how do we know about it?" But just as an illustration let us consider a particular individual, for example, one who has been brought up in a culture such as the culture of India. Would this individual in India, if we could examine his unconscious, be in many respects similar to the unconscious of a particular individual who, let us say, has lived in Switzerland all his life? You spoke earlier about these universals.

Would there be quite a lot of equivalence between the unconscious of a particular individual who was raised in one culture, and another individual who was raised in an entirely different culture?

Jung: Well, that question is also complicated because when we speak of the unconscious, Jung would say, "Which unconscious?" We say, "Is it that personal unconsciousness which is characteristic for a certain person, for a certain individual?"

Evans: You have talked in your writings about a personal unconsciousness as being one kind of unconscious.

Jung: Yes. In treatment, for instance, the treatment of neuroses, you have to do with that personal unconsciousness for quite a while, and then only when dreams come that show the collective unconscious can it be touched upon. As long as there is material of a personal nature, you have to deal with the personal unconscious; but when you get to a question, to a problem which is no more merely personal but also collective, you get collective dreams.

Evans: Now the distinction between the personal unconscious and the collective unconscious, then, is that the personal could be more involved with the immediate life of the individual, and the collective would be universal—the unconscious realm composed of elements which are the same in all men?

Jung: Yes, collective. For instance, the psyche has collective problems, collective convictions, etc. We are very much influenced by them, and there are examples to prove it. You belong to a certain political party, or to a certain confession; that can be a serious determinant of your behavior. Now if there arises a matter of personal conflict, the collective unconscious isn't touched upon. There is no question and it doesn't appear. But the moment you transcend your personal sphere and come to your unpersonal determinant—say you respond to a political question, or to any other social question which really matters to you—then you are confronted with a collective problem; then you have collective dreams.

Evans: Another very interesting concept or idea in your work is the "persona." This seems to be highly relevant to the daily living of the individual. I wonder if you would mind elaborating a bit more about how you construe this term, "persona."

Jung: It is a practical concept we need in elucidating people's relations. I noticed with my patients, particularly with people that are in public life, that they have a certain way of presenting themselves. For instance, take a doctor. He has a certain way; he has good beside manners, and he behaves as one expects a doctor to behave. He may even identify himself with it, and believe that he is what he appears to be. He must appear in a certain form, or else people won't believe that he is a doctor. And so when one is a professor, he is also supposed to behave in a certain way so that it is plausible that he is a professor. So the persona is partially the result of the demands society has.

On the other side, it is a compromise with what one likes to be, or as one likes to appear. Take, for instance, a parson. He also has his particular manner and, of course, runs into the general societal expectations; but he behaves also in another way which combines with his persona that is forced upon him by society in such a way that his fiction of himself, his idea about himself, is more or less portrayed or represented.

So the persona is a certain complicated system of behavior which is partially dictated by society and partially dictated by the expectations or the wishes one nurses oneself. Now this is not the real personality. In spite of the fact that people will assure you that this is all

quite real and quite honest, yet it is not. Such a performance of the persona is quite all right, as long as you know that you are not identical to the way in which you appear; but if you are unconscious of this fact, then you get into sometimes very disagreeable conflicts. Namely, people can't help noticing that at home you are quite different from what you appear to be in public. People who don't know it stumble over it in the end. They deny that they are like that, but they *are* like that; they are it. Then you don't know—now which is the real man? Is he the man as he is at home or in intimate relations, or is he the man that appears in public? It is a question of Jekyll and Hyde. Occasionally there is such a difference that we would almost be able to speak of a double personality, and the more that it is pronounced, the more people are neurotic. They get neurotic because they have two different ways; they contradict themselves all the time, and inasmuch as they are unconscious of themselves, they don't know it. They think they're all one, but everybody sees that they are two. Some know him only for one side; others know him only for the other side. And then there are situations that clash, because the way you are creates certain situations with people in your relations, and these two situations don't chime; in fact, they are just dishonest. And the more that is the case, the more the people are neurotic.

Evans: Actually, would you say that the individual may even have more than two personae?

Jung: We can't afford very well to play more than two roles, but there are cases where people have up to five different personalities. In cases of dissociation of personality, for instance, the one person—call him A— doesn't know of the existence of the person B, but B knows of A. There may be a third personality, C, that doesn't know of the two others. There are such cases in the literature, but they are rare.

Evans: Very rare?

Jung: In ordinary cases, it's just an ordinary dissociation of personality. One calls that a systematic dissociation, in contradistinction to the chaotic or unsystematic dissociation you find in schizophrenia.

Evans: What is the difference between the term "ego" as you see it and the term "persona"?

Jung: Well, you see, the ego is supposed to be the representative of the real person. For instance, in the case where B knows of A, but A doesn't know of B. In that case one would say the ego is more on the side of B, because the ego has a more complete knowledge, and A is a split-off personality.

Evans: You also use the term "self." Now the word "self"—does it have a different meaning than "ego" or "persona"?

Jung: Yes. When I say "self," then you mustn't think of "I, myself," because that is only your empirical self, and that is covered by the term "ego"; but when it is a matter of "self," then it is a matter of personality and is more complete than the ego, because the ego only consists of what you are conscious of, what you know to be yourself. For instance, let's take our example again of B who knows A, but A who doesn't know B. B is relatively in the position of the self; namely, the ego is on the one side and the self is on the other side, the unconscious

personality which is in possession of everybody—not in possession— Very often it is just the other way around; the unconscious is in the possession of consciousness. That is a different case.

Now you see, while I am talking, I am conscious of what I say; I am conscious of myself, yet only to a certain extent. Quite a lot of things happen. When I make gestures, I'm not conscious of them. They happen unconsciously. You can see them. I may say or use words and can't remember at all having used those words, or even at the moment I am not conscious of them. So any amount of unconscious things occur in my conscious condition. I'm never wholly conscious of myself.

While I am trying, for instance, to elaborate an argument, at the same time there are unconscious processes that continue, perhaps a dream which I had last night; or a part of myself thinks of God knows what, of a trip I'm going to take, or of such and such people I have seen. Or say when I am writing a paper, I am continuing writing that paper in my mind without knowing it. You can discover these things, say in dreams; or if you are clever, in the immediate observation of the individual. Then you see in the gestures or in the expression in the face that there is what one calls "une arriere pensée," something behind consciousness. You have finally the feeling, well, that that man has something up his sleeve, and you can ask him, "What are you really thinking of? You are thinking all the time something else." Yet he is unconscious of it, or he may be.

There are, of course, great individual differences. There are individuals who have an amazing knowledge of themselves, of the things that go on in themselves. But even those people wouldn't be capable of knowing what is going on in their unconscious. For instance, they are not conscious of the fact that while they live a conscious life, all the time a myth is played in the unconscious, a myth that extends over centuries, namely, archetypal ideas—this dream of archetypal ideas that goes on through one individual through the centuries. Really it is like a continuous stream, one that comes into daylight in the great movements, say in political movements or in spiritual movements. For instance, in the time before the Reformation, people dreamt of the great change. That is the reason why such great transformations could be predicted.

If somebody is clever enough to see what is going on in people's minds, in their unconscious minds, he will be able to predict. For instance, I could have predicted the Nazi rising in Germany through the observation of my German patients. They had dreams in which the whole thing was anticipated, and with considerable detail. And I was absolutely certain—in the years before Hitler, before Hitler came in the beginning; I could say the year, in the year 1919—I was sure that something was threatening in Germany, something very big, very catastrophic. I only knew it through the observation of the unconscious.

There is something very particular in the different nations. It is a peculiar fact that the archetype of the anima plays a very great role in Western literature, French and Anglo-Saxon. But in Germany, there are exceedingly few examples in German literature where the anima plays a role. . . . She must have a title; otherwise she hasn't existed. And so it is just as if—now mind you, this is a bit drastic, but it illustrates my point—in Germany there really are no women. There is Frau Doctor, Frau Professor, Frau the grandmother, the mother-in-law, the daughter, the sister. That is the idea, you see, no woman—*la femme n'existe pas*. Now that is an enormously important fact which shows that in the German mind there is going on a particular myth, something very particular. Psychologists really should look out for these things, but they prefer to think, "I am important."

Evans: This is of course a very interesting and remarkable set of statements here. How would you look at Hitler in this light? Would you see him as a personification, as a symbol of "father"?

Jung: No, not at all. I couldn't possibly explain that very complicated fact that Hitler represents. It is too complicated. You know, he was a hero figure, and a hero figure is far more important than any fathers that have ever existed. He was a hero in the German myth, mind you, a religious hero. He was a savior; he was meant to be a savior. That is why they put his photo upon the altar even. And that's why somebody declared on his tombstone that he was happy that his eyes had beheld Hitler, and that now he could lie in peace. Hitler was just a hero myth.

Evans: To get back more specifically to the idea of the self. . . .

Jung: The self is merely a term that designates the whole personality. The whole personality of man is indescribable. His consciousness can be described; his unconsciousness cannot be described, because the unconscious—and I repeat myself—is always unconscious. It is really unconscious; he really does not know it. And so we don't know our unconscious personality. We have hints and certain ideas, but we don't know it really. Nobody can say where man ends. That is the beauty of it, you know. It is very interesting. The unconscious of man can reach—God knows where. There we are going to make discoveries.

Evans: What seems to be a very fundamental part of your writing and one of your main ideas is reflected in the term "mandala." How does this fit into the context of our discussion of the self?

Jung: Mandala. . . . Well, it is just one typical archetypal form. It is what is called *ultimo exquadra circulae*, the square in the circle, or the circle in the square. It is an age-old symbol that goes right back to the pre-history of man. It is all over the earth and it either expresses the Deity or the self; and these two terms are psychologically very much related, which doesn't mean that I believe that God is the self or that the self is God. I made the statement that there is a psychological relation, and there is plenty of evidence for that.

It is a very important archetype. It is the archetype of inner order; and it is always used in that sense, either to make arrangements of the many, many aspects of the universe, a world scheme, or to arrange the complicated aspects of our psyche into a scheme. It expresses the fact that there is a center and a periphery, and it tries to embrace the whole. It is the symbol of wholeness. So you see, in a moment during a patient's treatment when there is a great disorder and chaos in a man's mind, the symbol can appear, as in the form of a mandala in a dream, or when he makes imaginary and fantastical drawings, or something of the sort.

A mandala spontaneously appears as a compensatory archetype during times of disorder. It appears, bringing order, showing the possibility of order and centralness. It means a center which is not coincident with the ego, but with the wholeness—it is wholeness—the wholeness which I call the "self"; this is the term for wholeness. I am not whole in my ego as my ego is but a fragment of my personality; so you see, the center of a mandala is not the ego.

It is the whole personality, the center of the whole personality, and the very great role that it plays can be seen, for instance, in the culture of the East, past and present. In the

Middle Ages it played an equally great role for the West; but there it has been lost now and is thought of as a mere sort of allegorical, decorative motif. As a matter of fact, however, it is highly important and highly autonomous, a symbol that appears in dreams, etc., and in folklore. It is, we should say, the main archetype.

Part IV

INTROVERT-EXTROVERT THEORY AND MOTIVATION

Perhaps Dr. Jung's most widely known contribution is his type theory in which he sets up the dichotomy of the introvert and the extrovert. As was pointed out in the first chapter, Jung was quite distressed over the misinterpretation of his ideas by Americans, and was furthermore quite aware that his introvert-extrovert typology had been the recipient of much of this misinterpretation. In these interviews, Jung reflects his lack of patience with this distortion of his intended meaning and usage of these terms.

He takes pains to explain in great detail the interrelationship which exists between what he refers to as the four functions—thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition—and what he designates as the introversion and extroversion orientations. Particularly difficult to fully understand is his introvert-intuitive type, so he gives some intriguing case material to illustrate this orientation in an individual.

In discussing his motivational conceptions, primarily his view of the libido, he explains his unique concept of energy as manifested in the individual. He also seems to support the importance of historical factors in understanding the individual, but not to the exclusion of emphasis on understanding the current events influencing the person, viz., the importance of a field approach.

6. Introvert-Extrovert Type Theories

Evans: Dr. Jung, another set of ideas, original with you and very well known to the world, center around the terms "introversion" and "extroversion." I know that you are aware that these terms have now become so widely known that the man on the street is using them constantly in describing members of his family, his friends, and so on. They have become probably the psychological concepts most often used by the layman today.

Jung: Like the word "complex"—I invented it too, you know, from the association experiments—this is simply practical, because there are certain people who definitely are more influenced by their surroundings than by their own intentions, while other people are more influenced by the subjective factor. Now you see, the subjective factor, which is very characteristic, was understood by Freud as a sort of pathological auto-egotism. Now this is a mistake. The psyche has two conditions, two important conditions. The one is environmental influence and the other is the given fact of the psyche as it is born.

As I told you yesterday, the psyche is by no means tabula rasa here, but a definite mixture and combination of genes, which are there from the very first moment of our life; and they give a definite character, even to the little child. That is a subjective factor, looked at from the outside. Now if you look at it from the inside, then it is just so as if you would observe the world. When you observe the world, you see people; you see houses; you see the sky; you see tangible objects. But when you observe yourself within, you see moving images, a world of images generally known as fantasies.

Yet these fantasies are facts. You see, it is a fact that the man has such and such a fantasy; and it is such a tangible fact, for instance, that when a man has a certain fantasy, another man may lose his life, or a bridge is built. These houses were all fantasies. Everything you do here, all this, everything, was fantasy to begin with, and fantasy has a proper reality. That is not to be forgotten; fantasy is not nothing. It is, of course, not a tangible object; but it is a fact nevertheless.

Fantasy is, you see, a form of energy, despite the fact that we can't measure it. It is a manifestation of something, and that is a reality. That is a reality, like for instance, the Peace Treaty of Versailles, or something like that. It is no more; you can't show it; but it has been a fact. And so psychical events are facts, are realities. And when you observe the stream of images within, you observe an aspect of the world, of the world within, because the psyche, if you understand it as a phenomenon that takes place in so-called living bodies, is a quality of matter, as our bodies consist of matter. We discover that this matter has another aspect, namely, a psychic aspect. And so it is simply the world from within, seen from within. It is just as though you were seeing into another aspect of matter. That is an idea that is not my invention. The old credos already talked of the spiritus *atomis*, namely, the spirit that is inserted in atoms. That means psychic is a quality that appears in matter. It doesn't matter whether we understand it or not, but this is the conclusion we come to if we draw conclusions without prejudices.

And so you see, the man who is going by the external world, by the influence of the external world—say society or sense perceptions—thinks that he is more valid, you know, because this is valid, this is real; and the man who goes by the subjective factor is not valid, because the subjective factor is nothing. No, that man is just as well based, because he bases himself upon the world from within. And so he is quite right even if he says, "Oh, it is nothing but my fantasies." And of course, that is the introvert, and the introvert is always afraid of the external world. This he will tell you when you ask him. He will be apologetic about it; he will say, "Yes, I know, those are my fantasies." And he has always resentment against the world in general.

Particularly America is extroverted. The introvert has no place, because he doesn't know that he beholds the world from within. That gives him dignity, and that gives him certainty, because it is the psyche of man. Nowadays particularly, the world hangs on a thin thread. Assume that certain fellows in Moscow lose their nerve or their common sense for a bit; then the whole world is in violent flames. Nowadays we are not threatened by elemental catastrophes. There is no such thing as an H-bomb; that is all man's doing. We are the great danger. The psyche is the great danger. What if something goes wrong with the psyche? And so it is demonstrated to us in our days what the power of psyche is, how important it is to know something about it. But we know nothing about it. Nobody would give credit to the idea that the psychological processes of the ordinary man have any importance whatever. One thinks, "Oh, he has just what he has in his head; he is all from his surroundings; he is taught such and such a thing, believes such and such a thing, and particularly if he is well housed and well fed, then he has no ideas at all." And that's the great mistake, because man is just that which he is born, and he is not born as tabula rasa but as a reality.

So I began an examination of the human attitudes, namely, how our consciousness functions. I couldn't help seeing, for instance, the difference between Freud and Adler, a typical difference. The one assumed that things evolve along the line of the sex instinct. The other assumed that things evolve along the line of power drive. And there I was, in between the two. I could see the justification of Freud's view, and also could see the same for Adler; and I knew that there were plenty of other ways in which things could be envisaged. And so I considered it my scientific duty to examine first the condition of the human consciousness, that which is the originator of ways of envisaging. It is the factor that produces attitudes, conscious attitudes, towards certain phenomena. So when you know, for instance, that there are people who see the difference between red and green, you can take it for a fact that everybody sees that difference? Not at all. There are cases of color blindness. You know, the one sees this: the other sees that.

Thus, I tried to find out what the principal differences were. That is the book about the types. I saw first the introverted and extroverted attitudes, then certain functional aspects, and then which of the four functions is predominant.

Evans: Of course, one of the very common misconceptions, at least in my opinion, about your work among some of the writers in America is that they have characterized your discussion of introversion and extroversion as suggesting that the world is made up of only two kinds of people, introverts and extroverts. I'm sure you have been aware of this. Would you like to comment on it? In other words, do you perceive of the world as one made up only of people who are extreme introverts and people who are extreme extroverts?

Jung: Bismarck once said, "God may protect me against my friends; with my enemies I can deal myself alone." You know how people are. They have a catch- word, and then everything is schematized along that word. There is no such thing as a pure extrovert or a pure introvert. Such a man would be in the lunatic asylum.

Those are only terms to designate a certain penchant, a certain tendency. For instance, the tendency to be more influenced by environmental influences, or more influenced by the subjective fact—that's all. There are people who are fairly well-balanced who are just as much influenced from within as from without, or just as little. And so with all the definite classifications, you know, they are only a sort of point to refer to, points for orientation. There is no such thing as a schematic classification.

Often you have great trouble even to make out to what type a man belongs, either because he is very well- balanced or he is very neurotic. The last one is hard because when you are neurotic, then you have always a certain dissociation of personality. And then too, the people themselves don't know when they react consciously or when they react unconsciously. So you can talk to somebody, and you think he is conscious. He knows what he says, and to your amazement you discover after a while that he is quite unconscious of it, doesn't know it.

It is a long and painstaking procedure to find out of what a man is conscious and of what he is not conscious, because the unconscious plays in him all the time. Certain things are conscious; certain things are unconscious; but you can't always tell. You have to ask people, "Now are you conscious of what you say?" Or, "Did you notice?" And you discover suddenly that there are quite a number of things that he didn't know at all. For instance, certain people have many reasons; everybody can see them. They themselves don't know it at all.

Evans: Then this whole matter of extremes—introvert and extrovert—you say is a schematic approach, a frame of reference.

Jung: My whole scheme of typology is merely a sort of orientation. There is such a factor as introversion; there is such a factor as extroversion. The classification of individuals means nothing at all. It is only the instrumentality, or what I call "practical psychology," used to explain, for instance, the husband to a wife, or vice versa.

It is very often the case, for instance—I might say it is almost a rule, but I don't want to make too many rules in order not to be schematic— that an introvert marries an extrovert for compensation, or another type marries a countertype to complement himself. For example, a man who has made a certain amount of money is a good business man, but he has no education. His dream is, of course, a grand piano at home and being around artists, painters or singers or God knows what, and intellectual people; and he marries accordingly a wife of that type, in order to have that too. She has it, and she marries him because he has a lot of money. These compensations go on all the time. When you study marriages, you can see it easily. And, of course, we analysts have to deal a lot with marriages, particularly those that go wrong, because the types are too different sometimes and they don't understand each other at all.

You see, the main values of the extrovert are anathema to the introvert, and he says, "To hell with the world, I think." His wife interprets this as his megalomania. But it is just as if an extrovert said to an introvert, "Now, look here fellow; these here are the facts; this is reality." And he's right! And the other says, "But I think, I hold—," and that sounds like

nonsense to the extrovert because he doesn't know that the other one, without knowing it, is beholding an inner world, an inner reality; and that other one may be right, as he may be wrong, even if he found himself upon God knows what solid facts. Take, for instance, the interpretation of statistics. You can prove almost anything with statistics. What is more a fact than a statistic?

Evans: Of course, tied in with your typology of introversion-extroversion, we know of your four functions of thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition. It would be very interesting to hear some expansion of the meaning of these particular terms as related to the introvert-extrovert orientations.

Jung: Well, there is a quite simple explanation of these terms, and it shows at the same time how I arrived at such a typology. Namely, sensation tells you that there is something. Thinking, roughly speaking, tells you what it is. Feeling tells you whether it is agreeable or not, to be accepted or not, accepted or rejected. And intuition—there is a difficulty because you don't know ordinarily how intuition works. When a man has a hunch, you can't tell exactly how he got that hunch, or where that hunch came from. It is something funny about intuition.

I will tell you a little story. I had two patients. The man was a sensation type, and the woman was an intuitive type. Of course, they felt attraction, so they took a little boat and went down to the lake of Zurich. And there at the lake were those birds that dive after fish, you know, that come up again after a certain time, only you can't tell where they will come up. My two patients began to bet about who would be the first to see the bird. Now you would think that the one who observes reality very carefully, the sensation type, would win out. Not at all. The woman won the bet completely. She was beating him on all points because by intuition she knew it before. How is that possible? You know, you can really find out how it works by finding the intermediate links. It is a perception by intermediate links, and you only get the result of the whole chain of associations. Sometimes you succeed in finding out, but more often you don't.

My definition then is that intuition is a perception, beyond ways or means of the unconscious. That is near as I can get it. This is a very important function, because when you live under primitive conditions, a lot of unpredictable things are likely to happen. There you need your intuition because you cannot possibly tell by your sense perceptions what is going to happen. For instance, you are walking in primeval forests. You can only see a few steps ahead, and perhaps you go by the compass. You don't know what there is ahead; it is uncharted country. If you use your intuition, then you have hunches; and when you live under such primitive conditions, you instantly are aware of hunches. There are places that are favorable and there are places that are not favorable. You can't tell for your life what it is, but you better follow these hunches, because anything can happen, quite unforeseen things. For example, at the end of a long day you approach a river. You had not known that there was a river there, but unexpectedly you come upon this river. For miles there is no human habitation. You cannot swim across; it is all full of crocodiles. So what? Such an obstacle hasn't been foreseen. It may be though that you have a hunch that you should remain in the least likely spot and wait for the following day; or that you should build a raft or something of the sort; or just a hunch that you should wait and look out for possibilities.

You can also have intuitions—this constantly happens—in our jungle called a city. You can have a hunch that something is going wrong, particularly when you are driving an automobile. For instance, it is that day when nurses appear in the street. At one corner a

nurse runs in front of the automobile. Now they always try to get something interesting, like a suicide, you know; to be run over, that's too barbarous apparently. And then you get a peculiar feeling really, for at the next corner a second nurse runs in front of the automobile. A multiplicity of cases, that is the rule, that such chance happenings come in groups.

So you see, we have constantly warnings or hints, that consist partly in a slight feeling of uneasiness, uncertainty, fear. Now under primitive circumstances you would pay attention to these things; they would mean something. With us in our man-made, absolutely, apparently, safe conditions, we don't need that function so very much; yet we have seen it and used it. So you will find that the intuitive types, some bankers, Wall Street men, follow hunches, you know, diagnoses of all descriptions. You find that type very frequently among doctors because it helps them in their prognoses. Sometimes a case can look quite normal, as it were, and you don't foresee any complications; yet a little voice says, "Now you look out here, because there is something not quite all right."

You cannot tell why or how, but we have a lot of subliminal perceptions, sense perceptions, and from these we probably draw a great many of our intuitions. But that is perception by way of the unconscious, and you can observe that with intuitive types. You see, intuitive types very often do not perceive by their eyes or by their ears; they perceive by intuition. For instance, once it happened that I had a woman patient in on a morning at nine o'clock. Now I often smoke my pipe and have a sort of smell of tobacco or a cigar. When she arrived, she said, "But you begin earlier than nine o'clock; you must have somebody at eight o'clock." And I said, "How do you know?" You see, there had been a man there at eight o'clock already. And she said, "Oh, I just had a hunch that there must have been a gentleman with you this morning." I said, "How do you know it was a gentleman?" And she said, "Oh well, I just had the impression that the atmosphere was just like a gentleman here." All the time, you know, the ashtray was under her nose, and there was an unsmoked cigar in it; but she doesn't notice it. So you see, the intuitive is a type that doesn't see the stumbling block before his feet, but he smells the hunt for ten miles.

Evans: How did you develop your conceptualizations of these four functions?

Jung: Now mind you, these four functions were not a scheme I had simply invented and applied to psychology. On the contrary, it took me quite a long time to discover them. Take the thinking type for example, as I thought my type to be. Of course, that is human. Is it not? There are other people who decide the same problems that I am faced with and have to decide about, but they make their decisions in an entirely different way. They look at things in an entirely different way; they have entirely different values. They are, for instance, feeling types.

And so, after a while I discovered that there are intuitive types. They gave me much trouble. It took me over a year to become somewhat clear about the existence of the intuitive types. And the last, and the most unexpected, was the sensation type. And only later I saw that those are naturally the four aspects of conscious orientation.

You see, you get your orientation, you get your bearings, in the chaotic abundance of impressions through the four functions, these four aspects of total human orientation. If you can tell me any other aspect by which you get your orientation, I'm very grateful. I haven't found more and I tried. But those are the four that covered the thing.

For instance, the intuitive type, to discuss it once again, which is very little understood, has a very important function because he is the one going by hunches. He sees around corners;

he smells a rat a mile away. He can give you perception and orientation in a situation where your senses, your intellect, and your feelings are no good at all. When you are in an absolute fix, an intuition can show you the hole through which you can escape. This is a very important function under primitive conditions or wherever you are confronted with vital issues that you cannot master by rules or logic.

So, through the study of all sorts of human types, I came to the conclusion that there must be many different ways of viewing the world through these type orientations—at least 16, and you can just as well say 360. You can increase the number of guiding or underlying principles, but I found that the most simple way is the way I told you, the division by four, the simple and natural division of the circle. I didn't know the symbolism of this particular classification. Only when I studied the archetypes did I become aware that this is a very important archetypal pattern that plays an enormous role.

Evans: Do you make a distinction between an intuitive extrovert and an intuitive introvert?

Jung: Yes, all those types cannot be alike.

Evans: More specifically, what would be an example of the difference between an intuitive extrovert and an intuitive introvert?

Jung: Well, you have chosen a somewhat difficult case, because one of the most difficult types is the intuitive introvert. The intuitive extrovert you find in all kinds of bankers, gamblers, etc., which is quite understandable. The introvert is more difficult because he has intuitions as to the subjective factor, namely the inner world; and, of course, that is very difficult to understand because what he sees are most uncommon things, things which he doesn't like to talk about if he is not a fool. If he did, he would spoil his own game by telling what he sees, because people won't understand it.

For instance, once I had a patient, a young woman about 27 or 28. Immediately after I had seated her, she said, "You know, doctor, I came to you because I've a snake in my abdomen." What! "Yes, a black snake coiled up in the bottom of my abdomen." I must have made an awful face at her, so she said, "You know that I don't mean it literally." I then replied, however, "If you say it was a snake, it was a snake."

In a later conversation with her, which took place about in the middle of her treatment, treatment that only lasted for ten consultations, she reminded me of something she had foretold me. She had said, "I come ten times and then it will be all right," to which I responded with the question, "How do you know?" "Oh, I've got a hunch," she said. Now at about the fifth or sixth hour she said, "Doctor, I must tell you that the snake has risen; it is now about here." A hunch.

Then on the tenth day I said, "Now this is our last hour, and do you feel cured?" Just beaming, she replied, "You know, this morning it came up, came out of my mouth, and the head was golden." Those were her last words.

When it comes to reality now, that same girl came to me because she couldn't hear the step of her feet any more, because she walked on air, literally. She couldn't hear it, and that frightened her. When I asked for her address, she said, "Oh, Pension so and so. Well, it is not just called a pension, but it is a sort of pension." I had never heard of it." I have never heard of that place," I said. She replied, "It is a very nice place. There are only young girls there; they are all very nice young girls, very lovely young girls, and they have a merry time. I

often wish they would invite me to their merry evenings." And I said, "Do they amuse themselves all alone?" "No," she replied, "there are plenty of young gentlemen coming in; they have a beautiful time, but they never invite me." It turned out that this was a private brothel. She was a perfectly decent girl from a very good family, not from here. She had found that place, I don't know how, and she was completely unaware that they were all prostitutes. I said, "For heaven's sake, you fell into a very tough place; you'll hasten to get out of it."

She didn't see reality, but she had hunches like everything, *vraiment*. Such a person cannot possibly speak of her experiences because everybody would think she was absolutely crazy. I myself was quite shocked, and I thought, "For heaven's sake, is that case a schizophrenic?" You don't normally hear that kind of speech; but she assumed that the old man, of course, knew everything and did understand such kind of language.

So you see, if the introverted intuitive would speak what he really perceives, practically no one would understand him; he would be misunderstood. Thus they learn to keep things to themselves. You hardly ever hear them talking of these things. In a way, that is a great disadvantage, but in another way it is an enormous advantage that these people do not speak of their experiences, both their inward experiences and those which occur in human relations. For instance, they may come into the presence of somebody they don't know, not from Adam, and suddenly they may have inner images. Now these inner images may give them a great deal of information about the psychology of that person they have just met. That is typical of cases that often happen. They suddenly know an important piece of the biography of that person, and if they did not keep things to themselves, they would tell the story. Then the fat would be in the fire! So the intuitive introvert has in a way a very difficult life, although it is a most interesting one. It is quite difficult to get into their confidence.

Evans: Yes, because they are afraid people will think . . .

Jung: They are sick. The things that they hint at are interesting to them, are vital to them, and are utterly strange to the ordinary individual. A psychologist, however, should know of such things.

When people make a psychology, as a psychologist ought to do, it is the very first question—is he introverted or extroverted? The psychologist must look at entirely different things. He sees the sensation type; he sees the intuitive type; he sees thinking and feeling types.

These things are complicated. They are still more complicated because the introverted thinking, for instance, is compensated by extroverted feeling, inferior, archaic, extroverted feeling. So an introverted thinker may be crude in his feeling, like for instance the introverted philosopher who is always carefully avoiding women may be married by his cook in the end.

Evans: So we can take your introvert-extrovert orientations and describe a number of types; the sensation-introvert and extrovert types, the feeling-introvert and extrovert types, thinking-introvert and extrovert types, and the intuitive-introvert and extrovert types. In each case these combinations do not represent a concrete category but simply, as you have indicated, a model that can be helpful in understanding the individual.

Jung: It is just a sort of skeleton to which you have to add the flesh. One could say that it is like a country mapped out by triangulation points, which doesn't mean that the country

consists of triangulation points; that is only in order to have an idea of the distances. And so it is a means to an end.

It only makes sense as a scheme when you deal with practical cases. For instance, if you have to explain an introverted-intuitive husband to an extrovert wife, it is a most painstaking affair because, you see, an extrovert-sensation type is furthestest away from the inner experience and the rational functions. He adapts and behaves according to the facts as they are, and he is always caught by those facts. He himself is those facts.

But if the introvert is intuitive, to him that is hell, because as soon as he is in a definite situation, he tries to find a hole where he can get out. To him, every given situation is just the worst that can happen to him. He is pinched and feels he is caught, suffocated, chained. He must break those fetters, because he is the man who will discover a new field. He will plant that field, and as soon as the new plants are coming up, he's done; he's over and no more interested. Others will reap what he has sown. When those two marry, the extrovert-sensation and the introvert-intuitive, there is trouble, I can assure you.

7. Motivational Concepts

Evans: One question which is quite important as we attempt to understand the individual centers around the problem of motivation, why the person does what he does. To some degree you have already talked about this when you discussed archetypes. However, to go further into this problem, earlier when we discussed the libido, that which Freud considered a psychic, sexual energy, you may recall your suggestion that it was more than just sexual energy. You suggested that it could be something much broader. You have certain principles concerning psychic energy which are very provocative, and one of these principles, I believe you refer to as the principle of entropy.

Jung: Well, I alluded to it. The main point is to take the standpoint of energetics as applied to psychical phenomena. Now with psychical phenomena you have no possibility to measure exactly, so it always remains a sort of analogy.

Freud uses the term "libido" in the sense of sexual energy, and that is not quite correct. If it is sexual, then it is a power, like electricity or any other form or manifestation of energy. Now energy is a concept by which you try to express the analogies of all power manifestations; namely, that they have a certain quality, a certain intensity, and there is a flow in one direction, viz., to the ultimate suspension of the opposites. Low-high-height —a lake on a mountain flows down until all the water is down, you know, then it is finished. And you see something similar in the case in psychology.

We get tired from intellectual work or from consciously living, and then we must sleep to restore our powers. Then by sleeping through the night, it is as if the water were pumped from a lower level to a higher level, and we can work again the next day. Of course, that simile is limping too, so it is only in an analogous way that we use the term "energy."

I used it because I wanted to express the fact that the power manifestation of sexuality is not the only power manifestation. You have a number of drives, say the drive to conquer or the drive to be aggressive, or any number of others. There are many forms. For instance, you take animals, the way they are building their nests, or the urge of the traveling birds that migrate. They all are driven by a sort of energy manifestation, and the meaning of the word "sexuality" would be entirely gone if all these different urges and drives were included in its definition. Freud himself says that this is not applicable everywhere, and later on he corrected

himself by assuming that there are also ego drives. That is something else, another manifestation.

Now in order not to presume or to prejudice things, I speak simply of energy, and energy is a quantity of energy that can manifest itself via sexuality or via any other instinct. That is the main feature, not the existence of one single power.

Evans: Many approaches to motivation in our academic psychology today emphasize what is sometimes referred to as a biocentric theory. It suggests that the individual is born with certain inborn physiological, self-preserving types of drives, such as the drive for hunger, thirst, etc. Sex is just one of them. In the case of all these drives, however, their satisfaction is necessary to the maintenance of the organism.

Then as the individual is influenced by reality and the culture in which he lives, these primary drives are modified in terms of the society in which he functions. For example, as a result of specific cultural influences, the general hunger drive is supplemented by a specific urge for certain kinds of food. Later, if this is important in the culture in which he lives, he may develop needs for social approval, influencing further his food preferences, and so on. Would this general approach to the understanding of the development of motivations be consistent with your ideas? Would you say that basic, innate, instinctual patterns are modified by the environment or culture to which they are subjected?

Jung: Yes, certainly.

Evans: Also, concerning motivation, or the condition which arouses, directs, and sustains the individual, there appear to be two views found in much of our psychology in America today. One might be called an historical view, as illustrated by the biocentric theory just discussed, where we try to look at the history and development of the individual for answers as to why he is doing a certain thing at the moment.

Then we have another view, postulated and discussed by Dr. Kurt Lewin, which is a field theory. He did not believe that the history—the past—was the most important element in motivation. Instead he suggested that all the conditions which affect the individual at a given moment help us to best understand the individual and predict his behavior. Do you think that the "present field" idea of Dr. Lewin has any virtue?

Jung: Well, obviously I always insist that even a chronic neurosis has its true cause in the moment now. You see, the neurosis is made every day by the wrong attitude the individual has. On the other hand, however, that wrong attitude is a sort of fact that needs to be explained historically, by things that have happened in the past. But that is one-sided too, because all psychological facts are oriented, not only to course, but also to a certain goal. They are, in a way, physiological; namely, they serve as a purpose, so the wrong attitude can have originated in a certain way long ago. It is equally true, however, that it wouldn't exist today any more if there were not immediate causes and immediate purposes to keep it alive today. Because of this, a neurosis can be finished suddenly on a certain day, despite all causes. One has observed in the beginning of the war cases of compulsion neuroses which had lasted for many years and suddenly were cured, because they got into an entirely new condition. It is like a shock, you see. Even the schizophrenic can be vastly improved by a shock because that's a new condition; it is a very shocking thing, so it shocks them out of their habitual

attitude. Once they are no more in it, the whole thing collapses, the whole system that has been built up for years.

Evans: You have brought up many interesting and provocative ideas here. Another concept related to motivational development is the process of individuation, a process to which you frequently refer in your writing. Would you like to comment about this process of individuation, how all these factors move toward a whole— a totality?

Jung: Well, you know, that's something quite simple. Take an acorn, put it into the ground, and watch it grow and become an oak. That is man. Man develops from an egg, and develops into the whole man; that is the law that is in him.

Evans: So you think the psychic development is in many ways like the biological development.

Jung: The psychic development is out of the world; it is something else, or maybe an opinion. It is a fact that people develop in their psychical development on the same principle as they develop in the body. Why should we assume that it is a different principle? It is really the same kind of evolutionary behavior as the body shows. Consider for instance, those animals that have specially differentiated anatomical characteristics, those of the teeth or something like that. Well, they have a mental behavior which is in accordance with those organs.

Evans: So as you see it, there is no need to bring in other types of ideas, other types of theories to explain development. The basic biological law is still—

Jung: The psyche is nothing different from the living being. It is the psychical aspect of the living being. It is even the psychical aspect of matter. It is a quality.

Part V

SOME REACTIONS CONCERNING PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING, PSYCHOTHERAPY, MENTAL TELEPATHY, AND OTHER PERSONAL INSIGHTS

In these interviews Jung traces his pioneering efforts in the area of projective personality testing, specifically his word association test. He reacts positively to the general value of projective tests, although he indicates some reservations concerning the originality of Hermann Rorschach.

As he addresses himself to his work with patients, he discusses at some length the value of dream and fantasy material to the therapeutic process.

The reader will be interested in the strong feelings concerning mental telepathy which Jung possessed and his rather favorable reaction to the work of J. B. Rhine in this respect. He attempts to discuss his own complex contribution to understanding in this field by presenting his concept of synchronicity.

Jung's reaction to theories of psychosomatic medicine and tranquilizers alike reflect his reservations concerning how much progress American medicine and American psychology has really made. He cites his work with tubercular patients fifty years ago as evidence of his early understanding of psychosomatic medicine, for example, pointing out how slow the American psychologist was in accepting such a view. Also of unusual interest to the reader in this section may be Jung's comments on his contact with Einstein and Toynbee, and his feelings concerning the relative importance of statistics and a knowledge of the humanities for the budding student of psychology.

8. Jung on Diagnostic and Therapeutic Practices

Evans: We American psychologists do a great deal of testing, utilizing "projective tests." As we discussed earlier, you certainly played a major role in developing projective testing with your word association method. What led you to develop the Word Association Test?

Jung: You mean the practical use of it?

Evans: Yes.

Jung: Well you see, in the beginning when I was a young man, I was completely disoriented with patients. I didn't know where to begin or what to say; and the association experiment has given me access to their unconscious. I learned about the things they did not tell me, and I got a deep insight into things of which they were not aware. I discovered many things.

Evans: In other words, from such association responses you discovered complexes or areas of emotional blocks in the patient? Of course, the word "complex," which originated with you, is used very widely now.

Jung: Yes, complex—that is one of the terms which I originated.

Evans: Did you hope that from these complexes or emotional blocks which you were uncovering as you administered this word association test to get at materials in the personal unconscious or the racial unconscious?

Jung: In the beginning there was no question of collective unconscious or anything like that. It was chiefly the ordinary personal complexes.

Evans: I see. You weren't expecting to get into such depth.

Jung: Among hundreds of complex associations, there might appear an archetypal element, but it wouldn't stand out particularly. That is not the point. You know, it is like the Rorschach, a superficial orientation.

Evans: You knew Hermann Rorschach, I believe, did you not?

Jung: No. He has circumvented me as much as possible.

Evans: But did you get to know him personally?

Jung: No. I never saw him.

Evans: In his terms, "introtensive" and "extrotensive," of course, he is reflecting your conceptions of introversion and extroversion, in my own estimation that is.

Jung: Yes, but I was the anathema, because I was the one to first outline the concepts; and that, you know, is unforgivable. I never should have done it.

Evans: So you really didn't have any personal contacts with Rorschach?

Jung: No personal relations at all.

Evans: Are you familiar with Rorschach's test which uses ink-blots?

Jung: Yes, but I never applied it, because later on I didn't even apply the Word Association Test anymore. It just wasn't necessary. I learned what I had to learn from the exact examinations of psychic reactions; and that, I think, is a very excellent means.

Evans: But would you recommend that other psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, and psychoanalysts use these projective tests, such as your Word Association Test or Rorschach's test?

Jung: Well, perhaps. For the education of psychologists who intend to do actual work with people, I think it is an excellent means to learn how the unconscious works.

Evans: So you feel that the projective tests have a function in training psychologists?

Jung: Yes. They are exceedingly didactic. With these tests one can actually demonstrate repression or the amnesic phenomenon, the way in which people cover their emotions, etc. It takes place like an ordinary conversation, but the tests provide certain principles and criteria which serve as guides and measuring devices for what one sees and hears. It is all so interesting. You observe all the things which you observe in a conversation with another person. For instance, in conversation when you ask a person something or begin to discuss certain things, you can observe certain things, little hesitations, mistakes in speech, etc.; all those things come to the fore. Then, what is more, in the experimental setting they are measurable.

I think I don't over-rate the didactic value of projective tests. I think very highly of them in this capacity, that is, for educating young psychologists. And sometimes, of course, they are useful to any psychologist. If I have a case who doesn't want to talk, I can make an

experiment and find out a lot of things through the experiment. I have, for instance, discovered a murder.

Evans: Is that right? Would you like to tell us how this was done?

Jung: You see, you have that lie detector in the United States, and that's like an association test I have worked out with the psycho-galvanic phenomenon. Also, we have done a lot of work on the pneumograph which will show the decrease of volume of breathing under the influence of a complex. You know, one of the reasons for tuberculosis is the manifestation of a complex. People have very shallow breathing, don't ventilate the apices of their lungs anymore, and get tuberculosis. Half of tuberculosis cases are psychic.

Evans: In working with a patient, would you say that it is essential for him to recapitulate his past life in order to help him deal with his present neurosis, as Freud did, or do you feel that you can deal situationally with his problem without going back and probing into things that happened to him during his early life?

Jung: There is no one-and-only system in therapy. In therapy you treat the patient as he is in the present moment, irrespective of causes and such things. That is all more or less theoretical. Sometimes I can start right away with posing the problem. There are cases who know just as much about their own neurosis as I know about it in a way.

For instance, let us take the case of a professor of philosophy, an intelligent man, who imagines that he has cancer. He shows me several dozen x-ray plates that prove there is no cancer. He says, "Of course, I have no cancer, but nevertheless, I'm *afraid* I could have one. I've consulted many surgeons and they all assure me there is none; and I know there is none but I might have one." You see? That's enough. Such a case can stop from one moment to the next, just as soon as the person who has the sickness stops thinking such foolish things, but that is exactly what he cannot do.

In such a case, I say, "Well, it is perfectly plain to you that it is nonsense what you believe. Now why are you forced to believe such nonsense? What is the power that makes you think such a thing against your free will? You know it is all nonsense." It's like a possession. It is as though a demon were in him, making him think like that in spite of the fact that he doesn't want to. Then I say, "Now you have no answer; I have no answer. What are we going to do?" I add, "We will see what you dream for a starting point, because a dream is a manifestation of the unconscious side."

In this case our philosopher has never heard of the unconscious side, so I must explain to him about the existence of the unconscious; and I must explain to him that the dream is a manifestation of it. Thus, if we succeed in analyzing the dream, we may get an idea about that power, which is distorting his thinking. In such a case one can begin right away with the analysis of dreams, and the same is true for all cases that are a bit serious. Mind you, this is not a simple case, but a very difficult and serious case, in spite of the simplicity of the phenomenology of the symptomatology.

In all cases after the preliminaries such as taking down the history of the family, the whole medical analysis, etc., we come to that question, "What is it in your unconscious that makes you wrong in your thinking, that hinders you from thinking normally?" Then we can begin with the observation of the unconscious, and the day by day process of analyzing the data produced by the unconscious. Now that we have discussed the first dream, the whole

problem takes on new perspective, and he will have other dreams, each of which will have something to add until we have the whole picture. Now when we have the full picture, if he has the necessary moral stamina, he can be cured. In the end it is strictly a moral question, whether a man applies what he has learned or not.

Evans: Does your type approach, based on introversion-extroversion constructs, help you in this analytical process?

Jung: Yes. I find in the study of the "type," that it supplies a certain lead as to the personal nature of the unconscious, the personal quality of the unconscious in a given case. If you study an extrovert, you find that his unconscious has then an introverted quality. This is because all the extroverted qualities are played in consciousness, and the introverted qualities are all played in the unconscious; therefore, the unconscious has introverted qualities. The reverse composition, of course, is equally true. That knowledge gave me a lead of diagnostic value. It helped me to understand my patients. When I saw their conscious type, I got ideas as to their unconscious attitudes.

Now the neurotic is just as much controlled and influenced by the unconscious as he is by the conscious, so he may appear to be a type which actually is not a true diagnosis at all. In certain cases it is almost impossible to distinguish between conscious material and unconscious material, because you just cannot tell at first sight which is which. This has helped me to understand more the patients in terms of the Freudian emphasis (based on the past) as well as in Adlerian terms, which are more, as you say, concerned with the present situation of the patient.

In the course of years, I got quite a lot of empirical material about the peculiar way in which conscious and unconscious contents interact. I could do this by watching individuals who were actually going through analytical treatment. You see, there is a point when you try to integrate unconscious contents into consciousness; or you confront the patient who is holding a definite conscious attitude with the related unconscious attitude that is counteracting the conscious one. This process, of course, is perpetuating his neurosis; and it is just as though another personality of the opposite type were influencing him or disturbing him.

Evans: So, Professor Jung, you gradually developed through your typologies a sort of theory, a psychology of opposites, where the conscious revealed the qualities of one type and the unconscious revealed the qualities of the other type in a given individual. This would be a very important way, then, of helping you to analyze and understand the individual.

Jung: Yes, from a practical point of view, it is diagnostically quite important. The point I wanted to elucidate is that in analyzing a patient you create the expression of typical experiences during the therapeutic process. There is a sort of typical way in which the integration of consciousness takes place. The average way is that through the analysis of dreams, for instance, you become acquainted with the contents of the unconscious.

To begin with, you want to know all personal, subjective material about the individual, what sort of difficulties the individual has encountered in adapting to environmental conditions, etc. Now, it can be regularly observed that when you talk to an individual and this individual gives you insight into his inner preoccupations, interests, emotions, etc., or in other words, hands over his personal complexes, you get slowly and willynilly into a situation of a

kind of authority. You are in possession of all the important items in a person's development, and you become a point of reference, because you are dealing with things which are very important to the person. I remember, for instance, that I analyzed a very well-known American politician, who told me any number of the secrets of his trade. Suddenly he jumped up and said, "My God, what have I done! You could get a million dollars for what I have told you now!" I said, "Well, I'm not interested. You can sleep in peace, because I shall not betray you. I'll forget it in a fortnight." So you see, that shows that the things people hand out are not merely indifferent things. When it comes to something emotionally important, they are handing out themselves. They are investing in the analyst big emotional value, just as if they were handing you a large sum of money or trusting you with the administration of their estate; they are entirely in your hands. Often I hear things that could ruin these people, utterly and permanently ruin them, things which would give me, if I had any blackmailing tendencies, unlimited power over them.

You can see that this kind of a situation creates an emotional relationship to the analyst, and this is what Freud called "transference," a central problem in analytic psychology. It is just as if these people had handed out their whole existence, and that can have very peculiar effects upon the individual. Either they hate you for it, or love you for it; but they are not indifferent. Thus, a sort of emotional relation between the patient and the doctor is fostered.

When a patient discusses such material, the content of it is associated with all the important persons in the life of that patient. Now the most important persons are usually father and mother in going back into a person's childhood. The first troubles are with the parents as a rule. So, when a patient hands over to you his infantile memories about the father or mother, he also sees in you, the analyst, the image of that mother or father. Then it is just as if the doctor had taken the place of the father, or even of the mother. I have had quite a number of male patients that called me "Mother Jung," because they had handed over to me the image of their respective mothers, curiously enough. But you see, that's quite irrespective of the personality of the analyst. In this case, the personality of the analyst is simply disregarded. You now function as if you were the mother or father—the central authority. That is what one calls transference; that is projection. Now Freud doesn't exactly call it projection. He calls it transference, which is an illusion to an old, superstitious idea that if you have a disease, you can transfer the disease to an animal; or you can transfer the sin onto a scapegoat, and the scapegoat takes it out into the desert and makes it disappear. Thus, the patients hand over themselves in the hope that I can swallow that stuff and digest it for them. I am *in loco parentis* and I have a high authority. Naturally, I am also persecuted by the corresponding resistances, by all the manifold emotional reactions they have had against their parents.

Now that is the structure you have to work through first in analyzing the situation, because the patient in such a condition is not free; he is a slave. He is actually dependent upon the doctor like a patient with an open abdomen on the operating table. He is in the hands of the surgeon, for better or for worse, so the thing must be finished. This means that we have to work through that condition in the hope that we will arrive at a different condition where the patient is able to see that I am not the father, not the mother, that I am an ordinary human being. Now everybody would assume that such a thing would be possible, that the patient could arrive at such an insight when he or she is not a complete idiot, that they could see that I am just a doctor and not that emotional figure of their fantasies. However, that is very often not the case.

I had a case once which involved an intelligent young woman, a student of philosophy who had a very good mind. One would easily think that she would be able to see that I was not her parental authority, but she was utterly unable to get out of this delusion. Now in such a case, one always has recourse to the dreams. She says through the conscious, "Of course, I know you are not my father, but I just feel like that. It is like you are my father; I depend upon you." Then I say, "Now we will see what the unconscious says." From that point, we work very hard in analyzing her dreams, and I begin to see that the unconscious is producing dreams in which I assume a very curious role.

In her dreams she is a little infant, sitting on my knee, and I am holding her in my arms. I have become a very tender father to the little girl, you know. More and more her dreams become emphatic in this respect; namely, I am a kind of giant, and she is a very little, frail human thing, quite a little girl in the hands of an enormous being. Then the final dream occurs in the series. In that dream, I was out in the midst of nature, standing in a field of wheat, an enormous field of wheat that was ripe for harvesting. I was a giant and I held her in my arms like a baby, with the wind blowing over the field. Now as you know, when the wind is blowing over a wheat field, it waves; and with these waves I swayed, putting her to sleep. She felt as if she was in the arms of a god, of the "Godhead." I thought, "Now the harvest is ripe, and I must tell her," so I said, "You see, what you want and what you are projecting into me, because you are not conscious of it, is that unconsciously you are feeling the influence of a deity which does not 'possess' your consciousness; therefore, you are seeing it in me." That clicked, because she had a rather intense religious education, that enabled her to understand. Of course, it all vanished later on and something disappeared from her world. The world became merely personal to her and a matter of immediate consciousness. That religious conception of the world was to her no longer existent, apparently. This makes sense, you see, because the idea of a deity is not an intellectual idea. It is an archetype, an archetypal idea, that catches hold of your unconsciousness, and once she could understand that consciously, the archetype could no longer control her.

You find this type of archetypal image practically everywhere under this or that name. Even when it comes forth in the form of "Manna," it has an all-powerful, extraordinary effect or quality; it doesn't matter whether it is personal at all or not. In the case of this girl, she suddenly became aware of an entirely heathenish image, an image that comes fresh from the archetype. She had not the idea of a Christian God, or of an *Old Testament Yahweh*, but of a heathenish God—a God of Nature, a God of Vegetation. He was the wheat itself. He was the spirit of the wheat, the spirit of the wind; and she was in the arms of that Pnuma. Now that is the living experience of an archetype.

When that girl came to understand what was happening in her, it made a tremendous impression upon her. She saw what she really was missing, that missing value which she was projecting into me, making me indispensable to her. Then she came to see that I was not indispensable, because, as the dream says, she is in the arms of that archetypal idea. That is a Numinous experience, you see, and that is the thing that people are looking for, an archetypal experience which is in itself an incorruptible value.

Until they have the experience and understand it, they depend upon other conditions; they depend upon their desires, their ambitions. They depend upon other people, because they have no value in themselves. They are only rational, and are not in possession of a treasure that would make them independent. Now when that girl could hold that experience, she no longer had to depend. The value became part of her. She had been liberated and was now complete. Inasmuch as she could realize such a Numinous experience, she was and will

be able to continue her part, her own way—her individuation. The acorn can become an oak, and not a donkey. Nature will take her course. A man or woman becomes that which he or she is from the beginning. I have seen quite a number of such cases as I have just cited to you.

Evans: How do the dreams and fantasies of the patient enter into the process?

Jung: I wrote a book about such dreams, you know, an introduction to the psychology of the unconscious. At that time my empirical material had been formed chiefly by observation of lunatics, cases of schizophrenia, and I had observed that there are, chiefly in the beginning of a disease, invasions of fantasies into conscious life, fantasies of an entirely unexpected sort which are most bewildering to the patient. He gets quite confused by these ideas, and he gets into a sort of panic since he never before has thought such things. They are quite strange to him and equally strange to his physician. Yet, the analyst is equally dumbfounded by the peculiar character of those fantasies. Therefore, one says, "That man is crazy. He is crazy to think such things; nobody thinks such things," and the patient agrees with him, which throws the patient into even more of a panic. So as an analyst I thought it to be really the task for psychiatry to elucidate that thing that broke into consciousness, the voices and the delusions. In those days, and mind you, I'm referring to over 40 or 50 years ago, I had no hope to be able to treat these cases or to be able to help them, but I had a very great scientific curiosity which made me want to know what these things really were. You see, I felt that these things had a system and that they were not merely chaotic, decayed material, because there was too much sense in those fantasies.

This led me to begin studying cases of psychogenic diseases such as hysteria, somnambulism, and others where the content that flowed from the unconscious was in readable condition and capable of being understood. Then I saw that, in contradistinction to the schizophrenics, the mental contents were elaborate, dramatic, suggestive and insinuating, enabling one to make out a second personality. Now this is not the case in schizophrenia. There the fantasies, on the contrary, are unsystematic and chaotic, so that you cannot make out a second personality. The cases are of too complicated a nature. I needed a simpler type, or a more comprehensible type, to study.

An old professor of psychology and philosophy at the University of Geneva published a case concerning an American girl, wherein he described her half poetic and half romantic fantasies. He published that material without commenting on it, giving it as an example of creative imagination. Now, when I read those fantasies, I saw this as exactly the kind of material I needed. I was always a bit afraid to tell of my personal experiences with patients because I felt that people might say that too much suggestion was involved, but since I had no hand in this case, I could not be accused of having influenced the patient. That is the reason I analyzed those particular fantasies. That case became the object of a whole book called *The Psychology of the Unconscious*. I have revised it after forty years, and it is now called *Symbolisms of Transformation* (16).

In *The Psychology of the Unconscious* (16), I tried to show that there is a sort of unconscious that clearly produces things which are historical and not personal. At that time, I simply called it "the unconscious," not distinguishing between the two aspects involved. Using the fantasies of the American girl, I tried for the first time to produce a picture of the functioning of the unconscious, a functioning which pointed to certain conclusions as to the nature of the unconscious.

Writing that book cost me my friendship with Freud, because he couldn't accept it. To Freud, the unconscious was a product of consciousness, and the unconscious simply contained the remnants of consciousness; I mean that he saw the unconscious as a sort of store-room where all the discarded things of consciousness were heaped up and left. To me, however, the unconscious was a matrix, a sort of basis of consciousness, possessing a creative nature and capable of autonomous acts, autonomous intrusions into the consciousness. In other words, I took the existence of the unconscious for a real fact, an autonomous factor that was capable of independent action.

To me that was a psychological problem of the very first order, and it made me think furiously, because the whole of philosophy, even up to the present day, has not recognized the fact that we have a counter-factor in our unconscious. It has not become recognized that in our psyche there are two factors, two independent factors, with consciousness representing one factor and, equally important, the unconscious representing the other factor. And the unconscious can interfere with consciousness any time it pleases. Now I say to myself, "This is very uncomfortable. I think I am the only master in my house, but in reality I must admit that there is another master, somebody in my house that can play tricks on me." I have to deal with the unfortunate victims of that interference every day in my patients.

I remember, for instance, one case which involved a young man, quite a rational young man. He had a lot of personal problems, but finally these enlarged and expanded until he was involved in very disagreeable relations with the whole of his surroundings. He was a member of society, but he was engaged in the poorest of relations with the other people of the society. It was really quite shocking. He began having and reporting collective dreams to me. Suddenly, he dreamed of things he had never thought of in his life before, mythological motifs, and he thought he was crazy, because he could not understand it at all. It was just as if the whole world were suddenly transformed. You see this same process in a case of schizophrenia, but this was not a case of schizophrenia. In this case the collective dreams were expressing the mythological patterns or motifs which were in his unconscious.

There are many examples of this in the collective dreams I have published. To make it clear, I shall tell a long story. Then you will see how the collective dream applies in cases such as the one cited above. I have already mentioned the case of that intuitive girl who suddenly came out with the statement that she had a black snake in her belly. Well now, that is an example of a collective symbol. That is not an individual fantasy; it is a collective fantasy. That fantasy is well known in India. Now right at first, I even thought she might be crazy, for she had no more connection with India by all external considerations that I did. But, of course, we are all similar in at least one respect—we are all human. This girl was just highly intuitive and oriented toward a "wholistic" manner of thinking, or thinking always within a context of totality or wholeness, a mode of thinking which is known in and characteristic of India. It is the basis of a whole philosophical system, that of Tantra, and this system has as its symbol Kucarini [*ed.: a mistranscription for Kundalini*], Kucarini the serpent. This is something known only to some few specialists; it generally is not known that we have a serpent in the abdomen. Well, that is a collective dream or collective fantasy.

Evans: As the individual goes through life day to day, is it possible that things that trouble him and cause tension lead to repression?

Jung: He doesn't repress consciously always. These things disappear, and Freud explains that by active repression. But you can prove that these things never have been conscious before.

They simply don't appear, and you don't know why they don't appear. Of course, when they do come up later, one can give the explanation that they have not appeared before because they were in disagreement or were incompatible with the patient's conscious views and attitudes. *But* that is afterwards that you can say this; you were not able to predict it.

So you see, these things that have an emotional tone are partially autonomous. They can appear or not appear. They can disappear at wish, not of the subject, but of their own; and, also, you can repress them. It is just so the same as with projections. For instance, people say, "One makes projections." That's nonsense. One doesn't make them; one finds them. They are already there; they are already in the unconscious. And so, these disappearances, or the so-called repressions, are just like projections. Without you having anything to do with it, they are already part of the unconscious. There are cases, sure, where consciousness enters in, but I should say that the majority of cases are unconscious. That was my first point of difference with Freud. I saw in the association experiment that certain complexes are quite certainly not repressed. They simply won't appear. This is because, you see, the unconscious is real; it is an entity; it works by itself; it is autonomous.

Evans: So in a sense, looking at the so-called defense mechanisms, projection, rationalization, etc., you would differ from the orthodox psychoanalytic view in that you would not say that they are developed as a means of defending the Ego. Rather, you would say that they are already there as manifestations of patterns that are already present in the unconscious.

Jung: Yes. Take, for instance, the example of that serpent. That never had been repressed, or else it would have been conscious to her. On the contrary, it was unconscious to her and only appeared in her fantasies.

It appeared spontaneously. She didn't know how she came to it. She said, "Well, I just saw it."

Evans: Now some of the orthodox psychoanalysts might have said, "This is a phallic symbol."

Jung: But you can say anything, you know. One can say that a church spire is a phallic symbol, but what is it when you dream of a penis? You know what a man has said, one of the orthodox men, one of the old guard? His explanation of that question was that in this case the censor had not functioned. You call that a scientific explanation?

9. Jung on Contemporary Psychological Problems

Evans: You are familiar, of course, with the work of Dr. J. B. Rhine at Duke University. Some of his work in extrasensory perception and clairvoyance, or mental telepathy, sounds much like the research into intuitive function, a phase of your work which we discussed earlier. For example, would you say that a person who has clairvoyance would be an intuitive type in your frame of reference?

Jung: That's quite probable. Or it can be a sensation type, say an extrovert sensation type who is very much influenced by the unconscious. He has introverted intuition in his unconscious.

Evans: Dr. Jung, you speak of rational and irrational functions, thinking and feeling being rational, and sensation and intuition being irrational. Would you care to elaborate on this notion?

Jung: As you say, there are two groups, the rational group and the irrational group. The rational group consists of the two functions, thinking and feeling. The ideal of thinking is a rational result, and the ideal of feeling is also a rational result. They hold rational values. That is differentiated thinking.

The irrational group is comprised of sensation and intuition. Sensation functions in such a way that it may not prejudice facts; it shall not prejudice facts. To the sensation type, the ideal perception is that you have an accurate perception of things as they are without additions or corrections. On the other side, intuition does not look at things as they are. That is anathema to the intuition. It looks ever so shortly at things as they are, and makes off into an unconscious process at the end in which he will see something nobody else will see.

Evans: So in terms of the person who is clairvoyant—

Jung: Those people who yield the best results are always those people who are introverted, where introverted intuition comes in. But that is a side aspect of it; it is not interesting. The other question is far more interesting, namely, the terms they use. Rhine himself uses them—recognition, telepathy, etc. They mean nothing at all. They are words, but he thinks he has said something when he says "telepathy."

Evans: The word itself is not a description of the process.

Jung: It means nothing, nothing at all.

Evans: Now, of course, a lot of the things that you are describing, some scientists would insist are due to chance, chance occurrences and chance factors. In his own work, Rhine used statistical probability analysis methods. He reports these occurrences more often than would be expected by chance.

Jung: Well you see, he proves that it is more than chance; it is statistically plausible. That is the important point which hasn't been contradicted.

There was some experimental proof offered in England, which resulted in the accusation: "Oh, Rhine, that's nothing but guesswork." And that is exactly true; that is guessing, what you call guessing. However, a hunch is guessing, but a definite guess, you know. All this really means nothing.

You see, the point is that it is more than merely probable; it is beyond chance. That's the major point. But as you know, people hate such problems they can't deal with concretely, and they can't deal with this one concretely. In fact, even Rhine does not understand how often extrasensory phenomena really occur, because it is a revelation which in these sacred rooms is anathema, a revelation of time and space through the psyche. That's the fact; that is what Rhine has made evident, but for scientists to say, "I'll swallow that," now that is difficult.

Evans: We might go a little further into some of your recent works in this area which many consider quite profound, but are not too well known to many of our students.

Jung: Of course not. Nobody in the general public actually reads these things. Of course, my books are at least sold.

Evans: To be more specific, I'm referring to the concept, synchronicity, which you have discussed, and which has some relevance at this point in our discussion. Would you care to comment on synchronicity?

Jung: That is awfully complicated. One wouldn't know where to begin. Of course, this kind of thinking started long ago, and when Rhine brought out his results, I thought, "Now we have at least a more or less dependable basis to argue on." But the argument has not been understood at all, because it is really very difficult.

When you observe the unconscious, you will come across plenty of cases which show a very peculiar kind of parallel events. For example, I have a certain thought of a certain definite subject which is occupying my attention and my interest; and at the same time, something else happens, quite independently, that portrays just that thought. This is utter nonsense, you know, looked at from a causal point of view. However, that there is something else to it which is not nonsense is made evident by the results of Rhine's experiments. There is a probability; it is something more than chance that such a case occurs.

I never made statistical experiments except one in the way of Rhine. I made one for another purpose. But I have come across quite a number of cases where it was most astounding to find that two causal chains happened at the same time, but independent of each other, so that you could say they had nothing to do with each other. It's really quite clear. For instance, I speak of a red car and at that moment a red car comes here. Now I haven't seen the red car, because it wasn't possible; it was hidden behind the building until just this moment when it suddenly appeared. Now many would say that this is an example of mere chance, but the Rhine experiment proves that these cases are not mere chance.

Now it would be superstitious and false to say, "This car has appeared because here were some remarks made about a red car; it is a miracle that a red car has appeared." It is not a miracle; it is just chance—but these chances happen more often than chance allows. That shows that there is something behind it.

Rhine has a whole institute, many co-workers, and has the means. We have no means here to make such experiments; otherwise, I probably would have done them. Here it is just physically impossible, so I have to content myself with the observation of facts!!

Evans: An interesting area which is being discussed a lot in the United States today, and I'm sure is of interest to you as well, is that of psychosomatic medicine, an area dealing with the way in which emotional components of personality can affect bodily functions.

Jung: As an example of this, I see a lot of astounding cures of tuberculosis—chronic tuberculosis—effected by analysts; people learn to breathe again. The understanding of what their complexes were—that has helped them.

Evans: When did you first become interested in the psychic factors of tuberculosis? Many years ago?

Jung: I was an analyst to begin with; I was always interested naturally. Maybe also because I understood so little of it, or more importantly, I noticed that I understood so little.

Evans: To expand on my earlier question, we are right now becoming more and more interested in the United States in how emotional, unconscious personality factors can actually have an effect on the body. Of course, the classic example in the literature is the peptic ulcer. It is believed that this is a case where emotional factors have actually created pathology.

These ideas have been extended into many other areas. It is felt, for example, that where there already is pathology, these emotional factors can intensify it. Or sometimes there may be actual symptoms or fears concerning pathology when no true pathology exists, such as in cases of hysteria or hypochondriasis. For example, many physicians in America say that 60 to 70 percent of their patients do not have anything really physically wrong with them, but they instead have disorders of psychosomatic origin.

Jung: Yes, that is well known—since more than fifty years. The question is how to cure them.

Evans: Speaking of such psychosomatic disturbances, as, for instance, your experiences and studies into tuberculosis, do you have any ideas as to why the patient selects this type of symptom?

Jung: He doesn't select; they happen to him. You could ask just as well when you are eaten by a crocodile, "How did you happen to select that crocodile?" Nonsense, he has selected you.

Evans: Of course, "selected" in this sense refers to an unconscious process.

Jung: No, not even unconsciously. That is an extraordinary exaggeration of the importance of the subject, to say he was choosing such things. They get him.

Evans: Perhaps one of the most radical suggestions in the area of psychosomatic medicine has been the suggestion that some forms of cancer may have psychosomatic components as causal factors. Would this surprise you?

Jung: Not at all. We know these since long ago, you know. Fifty years ago we already had these cases; ulcer of the stomach, tuberculosis, chronic arthritis, skin diseases. All are psychogenic under certain conditions.

Evans: And even cancer?

Jung: Well you see, I couldn't swear, but I have seen cases where I thought or wondered whether or not there was a psychogenic reason for that particular ailment; it came too conveniently. Many things can be found out about cancer, I'm sure.

You see, with us it has been always a question of how to treat these things, because any disease possible has a psychological accompaniment. It just all depends upon —perhaps life depends upon it—whether you treat such a patient psychologically in the proper way or not. That can help tremendously, even if you cannot prove in the least that the disease in itself is psychogenic.

You can have an infectious disease in a certain moment, that is, a physical ailment or predicament, because you are particularly accessible to an infection—maybe sometimes because of a psychological attitude. Angina is such a typical psychological disease; yet it is not psychological in its physical consequences. It's just an infection. So you ask, "Then why does psychology have anything to do with it?" Because it was the psychological moment maybe that allowed the infection to grow. When the disease has been established and there is a high fever and an abscess, you cannot cure it by psychology. Yet it is quite possible that you can avoid it by a proper psychological attitude.

Evans: So all this interest in psychosomatic medicine is pretty old stuff to you.

Jung: It's all known here long ago.

Evans: And you are not at all surprised at the new developments . . .

Jung: No. For instance, there is the toxic aspect of schizophrenia. I published it fifty years ago—just fifty years ago—and now everyone discovers it. You are far ahead in America with technological things, but in psychological matters and such things, you are fifty years back. You simply don't understand it; that's a fact. I don't want to figure in a general corrective statement; you simply are not yet aware of what there is. There are plenty more things than people have any idea of. I told you that case of the theologian who didn't even know what the unconscious was; he thought it was an apparition. Everyone who says that I am a mystic is just an idiot. He just doesn't understand the first word of psychology.

Evans: There is certainly nothing mystical about the statements you have just been making. Now to pursue this further, another development that falls right in line with this whole discussion of psychosomatic medicine has been the use of drugs to deal with psychological problems. Of course, historically drugs have been used a great deal by people to try to forget their troubles, to relieve pain, etc. However, a particular development has been the so-called non-addictive tranquilizing drugs. These, of course, became prominent in France with the drug, chlorpromazine. Then followed such drugs as reserpine-serpentina, and a great variety of milder tranquilizers, known by such trade names as Miltown and Equinal. They are now being administered very freely to patients by general practitioners and internists. In other words, not only are the stronger tranquilizers being administered to mentally ill patients such as schizophrenics, but to a great extent today these drugs are being dispensed almost as freely as aspirins to reduce everyday tensions.

Jung: This practice is very dangerous.

Evans: Why do you think this is dangerous? These drugs are supposed to be nonaddictive.

Jung: It's just like the compulsion that is caused by morphine or heroin. It becomes a habit. You don't know what you do, you see, when you use such drugs. It is like the abuse of narcotics.

Evans: But the argument is that these are not habit-forming; they are not physiologically addictive.

Jung: Oh, yes, that's what one says.

Evans: But you feel that psychologically there is still addiction?

Jung: Yes. For instance, there are many drugs that don't produce habits, the kind of habits that morphine does; yet it becomes a different kind of habit, a psychical habit, and that is just as bad as anything else.

Evans: Have you actually seen any patients or had any contact with individuals who have been taking these particular drugs, these tranquilizers?

Jung: I can't say. You see, with us there are very few. In America there are all the little powders and the tablets. Happily enough, we are not yet so far. You see, American life is in a subtle way so one-sided and so uprooted that you must have something with which to compensate the real nature of man. You have to pacify your unconscious all along the line because it is in absolute uproar; so at the slightest provocation you have a big moral rebellion in America. Look at the rebellion of modern youth in America, the sexual rebellion, and all that. These rebellions occur because the real, natural man is just in open rebellion against the utterly inhuman form of American life. Americans are absolutely divorced from nature in a way, and that accounts for that drug abuse.

Evans: But what about the treatment of individuals who are seriously mentally ill? We have the problem of hospitalized, psychotic patients. For instance, certain schizophrenics are so withdrawn that they are virtually impossible to interact with in psychotherapy; so in many hospitals in the United States, drugs such as chlorpromazine have been used in order to render many such patients more amenable to psychotherapy. I don't think most of our practitioners believe the drugs cure the patients in themselves, but they at least make the patient more amenable to therapy.

Jung: Yes, the only question is whether that amenability is a real thing or drug-induced. I am sure that any kind of suggestive treatment will have effect, because these people simply become suggestible. You see, any drug or shock in the mind will lower stamina, making these people accessible to suggestion. Then, of course, they can be led, can be made into something, but it is not a very happy result.

Evans: To change the topic for a moment, Professor Jung, I know our students would be interested in your opinion concerning the kind of training and background a psychologist, a person who wants to study the individual, should have. For example, there is one view that says maybe he should be trained primarily as a rigorous scientist, a master of such tools as statistics and experimental design. Others feel, however, that a study of the humanities is also important for the student who wants to study the individual.

Jung: Well of course, when you study human psychology, you can't help noticing that man's psychology doesn't only consist of the ramifications of instinct in his behavior. There are other determinants, many others, and the study of man from his biological aspect only is by far insufficient. To understand human psychology, it is absolutely necessary that you study man

also in his social and general environments. You have to consider, for instance, the fact that there are different kinds of societies, different kinds of nations, different traditions; and in the interest of that purpose, it is absolutely necessary that one treat the problem of the human psyche from many standpoints. Each is naturally a considerable task.

Thus, after my association experiments at which time I realized that there was obviously an unconscious, the question became, "Now what is this unconscious? Does it consist merely of remnants of conscious activities, or are there things that are practically forever unconscious? In other words, is the unconscious a factor in itself?" And I soon came to the conclusion that the unconscious must be a factor in itself. You see, I observe time and again, for instance, when delving into people's dreams or schizophrenic patients' delusions and fantasies, that therein is contained motives which they couldn't possibly have acquired in our surroundings. This, of course, depends upon the belief that the child is not born *tabula rasa*, but instead is a definite mixture or combination of genes; and although the genes seem to contain chiefly dynamic factors and predispositions to certain types of behavior, they have a tremendous importance also for the arrangement of the psyche, inasmuch as it appears, that is. Before you can see into the psyche, you cannot study it, but once it appears, you see that it has certain qualities and a certain character. Now the explanation for this must needs depend upon the elements born in the child, so factors determining human behavior are born within the child, and determine further development. Now that is one side of the picture.

The other side of the picture is that the individual lives in connection with others in certain definite surroundings that will influence the given combination of qualities. And that now is also a very complicated factor, because the environmental influences are not merely personal. There are any number of objective factors. The general social conditions, laws, convictions, ways of looking at things, of dealing with things; these things are not of an arbitrary character. They are historical. There are historical reasons why things are as they are. There are historical reasons for the qualities of the psyche and there is such a thing as the history of man's evolution in past eons, which as a combination show that real understanding of the psyche must consist in the elucidation of the history of the human race—history of the mind, for instance, as in the biological data. When I wrote my first book concerning the psychology of the unconscious, I already had formed a certain idea of the nature of the unconscious. To me it was then a living remnant of the original history of man, man living in his surroundings. It is a very complicated picture.

So you see, man is not complete when he lives in a world of statistical truth. He must live in a world where the "whole" of man, his entire history, is the concern; and that is not merely statistics. It is the expression of what man really is, and what he feels himself to be.

The scientist is always looking for an average. Our natural science makes everything an average, reduces everything to an average; yet the truth is that the carriers of life are individuals, not average numbers. When everything is statistical, all individual qualities are wiped out, and that, of course, is quite unbecoming. In fact, it is unhygienic, because if you wipe out the mythology of a man, his entire historical sequence, he becomes a statistical average, a number; that is, he becomes nothing. He is deprived of his specific value, of experiencing his own unique value.

You see, the trouble is that nobody understands these things apparently. It seems quite strange to me that one doesn't see what an education without the humanities is doing to man. He loses his connection with his family, his connection with his whole past—the whole stem, the tribe—that past in which man has always lived. We think that we are born today *tabula rasa* without a history, but man has always lived in the myth. To think that man

is born without a history within himself— that is a disease. It is absolutely abnormal, because man is not born every day. He is born into a specific historical setting with specific historical qualities, and therefore, he is only complete when he has a relation to these things. If you are growing up with no connection from the past, it is like being born without eyes and ears and trying to perceive the external world with accuracy. Natural science may say, "You need no connection with the past; you can wipe it out," but that is a mutilation of the human being. Now I saw from a practical experience that this kind of proceeding has a most extraordinary therapeutic effect. I can tell you such a case.

There was a Jewish girl. Her father was a banker. She had been educated more through worldly experience and formal education, and was decidedly lacking in any understanding of tradition. I examined her history further and found out that her grandfather had been an ascetic in Galicia. With this insight, I knew the whole story, and let me explain why. This particular girl suffered from phobia, a terrible phobia, and had been under psychoanalytic treatment already with no effect. She was really badly plagued by that phobia, in excited states and so on. I observed that this girl had blocked significant influences of her past. For instance, the fact that her grandfather was an ascetic, that he lived in the myth, was one influence she had blocked. Her father too had resisted this ascetic influence. So I simply told her, "You will stamp out your fears if you gain insight into what you have lost or are resisting. Your fear is the fear of the influences from the past." You know, the effect was that within a week she was cured from so many years of bad anxiety states, because this insight went through her like a lightning bolt. I was able to interpret the source of the problem so quickly because I knew that she was absolutely lost. She thought she was in the middle of things, functioning well, but actually she was in a sense lost or gone.

Evans: What can we learn from this remarkable case, Dr. Jung?

Jung: Well, it illustrates that it makes no sense and that our existence is incomplete when we are just "average numbers." The more you make people into average numbers, the more you destroy our society. The "ideal state" and the "slave state" come into being. If you want to be an "average number," go to Russia. There it is wonderful; there you can be a number. But one pays very dearly; our whole life goes to flames, like in the case of the girl. I have plenty of cases of a similar kind.

10. Personal Insights, Reminiscences, and Experiences with Great Figures

Evans: As one reads your work, we seem to be aware that you know archeology, anthropology—

Jung: Well this is true inasmuch as a great deal of my work is concerned with these disciplines, but I have no mathematical gifts, you know, which handicaps me some. You cannot get real knowledge or understanding of nuclear physics without a good mastery of mathematics, higher mathematics. There I only have a certain relation with it on the epistemological questions, you know. Modern physics is truly entering the sphere of the invisible and intangible, as it were. It is in reality a field of probabilities, which is exactly the same as the unconscious. I often have discussed this with Professor Scherrer. Now he is a nuclear physicist, and to my amazement I found that they have terms which are used in psychology too. This is simply on account of the fact that we are both entering a sphere which is unknown. The physicist enters it from without and the psychologist from within. That's the

reason for the parleys between psychology and higher mathematics. For instance, we psychologists used the term "transcendental function." Now transcendental function is a mathematical concept, the function of rational and imaginary numbers. Now that is higher mathematics, with which I have nothing to do. But we come to the same terminology.

Evans: When you spoke with Dr. Einstein in your early discussion, he more or less tried out some of his ideas on you. Did you ever bring to him the possibility that relativity might apply to psychic functions? Did you ever discuss that?

Jung: Well you see, you know how it is when a man is so concentrated upon his own ideas as was Dr. Einstein; and when he is a mathematician on top of everything, then you are not welcome.

Evans: What year was it that you were friends with Einstein?

Jung: I wouldn't call myself a friend. I was simply the host. I tried to listen and to understand, so there was little chance to insert some of my own ideas.

Evans: Was this after he had already formulated his relativity theories, or just before?

Jung: That was when he was working on it, right in the beginning. It was very interesting.

Evans: In your dealings with Professor Toynbee, have you gotten rather interested in his ideas of history?

Jung: Ah, yes, particularly his ideas about the life cycles of civilizations, and the way that they are ruled by archetypal forms. Toynbee has seen what I mean by historical functions of archetypal developments. That is a mighty important determinant of human behavior, and can span centuries or thousands of years. It expresses itself in symbols, sometimes symbols that you would never think of at all. For instance, as you know, Russia, the Soviet Republic, had that symbol of the red star. Now it is a five-rayed red star. America has the five-rayed white star. They are enemies; they can't come together. In the Middle Ages for at least 2000 years the red and white were the couple; they were ultimately destined to marry each other. Now America is a sort of matriarchy, inasmuch as most of the money is in the hands of women, and Russia is the land of the little father; it's a patriarchy. So the two are mother and father. To use the terminology of the Middle Ages, they are the white woman, the "femina alba," and the red slave, the "servius rubeus." The two lovers have quarreled with each other.

Evans: Well, Dr. Jung, you've patiently and interestingly responded in a spontaneous fashion to questions ranging from your feelings about Freud's ideas to reactions to Toynbee. Perhaps we should not impose upon your extreme kindness any longer at this time. I do hope, however, that our students are stimulated by what you've said to go back to your great array of writings. After all, this is the real purpose for making these interviews available to students, to motivate them to read the original writings of the world's great contributors to our understanding of man's personality.

Jung: Yes. People have to read the books, by golly, in spite of the fact that they are thick. I'm sorry.

— *End* —