

On defining words, some scenarios and vectors in the ‘autobiography’ of C. G. Jung¹

Christian Gaillard, *Paris*
(Translated by Ann Kutek)

Abstract: Having first considered recent research into the circumstances surrounding the production and publication of the ‘autobiography’ of Jung, the author concludes that in spite of its being the work of several authors, it nevertheless constitutes a whole. Taken from whichever angle, they all point to Jung’s particular inquiry into the unconscious, as it emerges through Jung’s own words. The author goes on to suggest both a lateral and a structural reading of *MDR (Memories, Dreams, Reflections)* which in turn reveals, on the basis of the several dreams reported, the central ‘fantasy’ which inspired Jung’s research and his *oeuvre*. Finally, he discusses the idea of the collective or impersonal unconscious and highlights the emphasis Jung places on processes which unfold according to rhythms which are associated with distinct scales, depending on whether they are those of the individual, the clan or the culture.

Key words: Jung’s ‘autobiography’, collective unconscious, language.

The editing of the text

How is one to approach a text, whose wide distribution and translation into countless languages has made it not only a best seller on a global scale, but one that has become a work of reference, consulted virtually daily, a favourite of many Jungian analysts as it is for many others, without first examining closely some aspects of its very nature and therefore taking some elementary precautions before placing any reliance upon it?

In this connection what is notable in the first instance is the fact that the French publishers of the book – Gallimard, in their ‘Témoins’ series – published

¹ This article is a largely faithful transcript of an address given at a Day Conference of the International Association for the History of Psychoanalysis, on the theme of ‘The Failed Encounter between Freud and Jung – a Reading of Two Autobiographies’, held in Paris on 2 February 2002. The paper was especially intended for an audience of Freudian psychoanalysts. It was published in the original French in the journal, *Topique-Revue Freudienne*, 79, 2002.

it under the title of *Carl G Jung – Ma Vie* [My Life], with in smaller print above the title, *Souvenirs, rêves et pensées, recueillis par Aniela Jaffé, traduits par Roland Cahen et Yves Le Lay* [Memories, dreams, and reflections compiled by Aniela Jaffé, translated by Roland Cahen & Yves Le Lay], while the original German language edition states, *Erinnerungen, Träume, Gedanken von C.G. Jung. Aufgezeichnet und herausgegeben von Aniela Jaffé: Memories, dreams and reflections of C G Jung. As noted (or recorded or written down) and published by Aniela Jaffé*].

The first issue to be addressed, therefore, concerns the actual authorship of the work. Who is responsible for it? Is it his publishers with their own aims and expectations? Or is it Mrs Jaffé, who we know was Jung's secretary at the time of its production? Or is it Carl Gustav Jung himself? Or, more to the point, what role does each of the protagonists play in the editing of the text?

An examination of the circumstances surrounding the creation and composition of this volume would surely provide an answer to such questions. I shall recall them briefly here: We are in 1957–58 – only a few years before Jung's death in 1961. Besides, we should also remember, that 1957–58 is almost 20 years after the death of Freud in 1939 and that, in the intervening years, much has happened in the psychoanalytic movement and, more pertinently, in the Jungian movement itself. Let us recall, also, that the difference in age between Freud and Jung was 19 years. While this may be sufficient to make of the one an elder and the other a disciple such that, in the case of Freud, he is expected and able through his authority to establish himself, and becomes an acknowledged master and father, the more so as he is the begetter of psychoanalysis; the age difference between them is not of itself sufficient to make of the other, Jung, simultaneously and definitively a son and heir, despite his patronymic, *Jung*, which in German signifies 'young' or 'the youth'. This certainly does contribute to the complexity of how they each relate to sonship and inheritance, and theirs was a notoriously complex relationship, especially if we consider, among several other relevant factors, the experience of starting out as a neurologist, then as a therapist and analyst to hysterics in Vienna – a rather chronically anti-Semitic Vienna. It could not necessarily have given rise to the same stance towards the unconscious as might the experience of being steeped in the heavy, hospital-based psychopathology, and, as the son of a Swiss pastor, of having to struggle between Basel and Zürich with the spurious but no less obsessive vestiges of a traditional Christianity which, at the time, still haunted both places.

So, in 1957, Jung is 82 years old. He is by now an old man, retired from the world in his Küsnacht home on the edge of Lake Zürich, but is still sought out by analysts the world over, who keep going back to him. At the same time study groups and training institutes are being set up just about everywhere in Europe and the USA, the first of these having been founded in Zürich some ten years earlier in 1948, even though Jung himself had his reservations about it and was never its director.

By then, sought after by publishers, who for some time have been urging him to write an autobiography, Jung is initially firmly opposed to the idea. That is, right up to the moment – I am summarizing – when his secretary at the time, Aniela Jaffé, persuades him, with much effort on her part, to devote a few hours each day to her, during which he would reply to her inquiries mostly verbally, while she takes notes, then transcribes his thoughts. At the time she was also responsible for composing his replies to his many correspondents. In the case of both activities, in respect of the pages of the book and in the matter of editing his letters, Jung quite often returns to the transcripts of his thoughts, corrects and amends them and completes Aniela Jaffé's suggested editing.

It appears therefore that the very circumstances of its composition point to a book *in two voices*. Written by four hands. Such is the state of play nowadays, and it is really fascinating to compare in the minutest detail the published text with the first transcriptions, then the successive manuscripts or 'typescripts' which preceded the published version we ordinarily have today. We owe this work primarily to the British researcher, Sonu Shamdasani². Further research will soon be providing us with more information when another biography is published in autumn 2003.

Shamdasani's research has a number of merits, which are to reveal passages, or even entire chapters, that have been 'omitted' from the actual published version, without the possibility as yet to ascertain whether in each case, these 'amendments' or 'omissions' are in Jung's own hand, whether they were made by his secretary and collaborator or whether they are the result of interventions and pressure from those who might be anxious about the image they and we have of the great man.³

Moreover, if we consider the composition of the work itself in the light of recent research, we may conclude, provisionally at least, that the 'Prologue', and the first three chapters entitled, 'First Years', 'School Years' and 'Student Years' respectively, along with the twelfth, called, 'Late Thoughts' and the thirteenth entitled, 'Retrospect', are largely and most authentically in Jung's own hand, while the remaining chapters are much more extensively edited by Mrs Jaffé, who has used various other documents to construct them.

It follows thus that, in some parts of *MDR* at least, we are dealing with a 'biography', as much as an 'autobiography'; and we could justifiably ask ourselves whether this 'biography' is to some extent, as often happens in similar circumstances, a 'hagiography'.

Here we have a number of factors which could easily baffle the reader, yet it is appropriate to take them into account for Jung himself not only showed considerable reticence towards the project, but clearly and expressly forbade

² S. Shamdasani, 'Memories, Dreams, Omissions', Spring, no. 57, 1995.

³ I shall return to these 'amendments' and 'omissions' in the actual book, when I consider later not only what I personally find in it, but also what I do not find there.

that this work should form part of the *Gesammelte Werke* (Collected Works).⁴

He has even referred to it as ‘Mrs Jaffé’s book’, which is perhaps not very elegant on his part, but has the merit of giving unto Caesar what is Caesar’s – if not to God what is God’s.

Indeed, we need to take one step further. Jung, as I have recalled, was 82 years old when he worked on this book. He is at this point an old man reminiscing. In the context of his great age, he allows himself to welcome and relive his oldest childhood memories, his adolescent questioning and debates and those of his student days. He recalls his early work, relates his meeting with Freud and his gradual break from him. He speaks of inner stirrings and of clinical discoveries which were the essence of his theoretical work, thereby attempting to tell of the genesis and of what is the crux of his research. Thus he comes to meditate, to speak up, even if it is in two voices, as we have seen, about death, about his death and on life after death, and thence about the place we might have reached in our collective history.

But just as we consider the moment when he is speaking, looking back at his life and work, how can we avoid the question of retrospective construction or reconstruction in this book, and of the creation of an explanatory myth cobbled together in the aftermath?

It is important, therefore, to read this book against the background of current research into autobiographical writing with all its hazards and traps. This theme has been taken up most recently by Christine Maillard in her work at the University of Strasbourg and her exchanges with German specialists and those researchers who are focusing on this question in Germany.⁵

It is important also, of course, to examine each of the facts recorded in the book against the details established by the biographers of Jung, if only to verify and fill in the gaps and thereby afford a different perspective on the facts as he relates them.

Above all, it is important to consider the scenes which punctuate the book, not so much taking the narrative at its word, at least when referring to those chapters which are more Aniela Jaffé’s confection than those of Jung himself, but in terms of their *structural organization*. This may seem like obscuring their relevance, but it could also lead to a transversal or axial reading of the book by putting into perspective the chronology of the scenes in the work and thus into the chronology of Jung’s own life, as I shall try to show later.

⁴ *Gesammelte Werke*, 20 volumes, including a bibliography and an index, published originally by Rascher Verlag in Zürich and Stuttgart and by Walter Verlag in Olten. The English version, the *Collected Works* is presented in the same way and is published by Routledge & Kegan Paul in London and Princeton.

⁵ C. Maillard, ‘Le Livre de Madame Jaffé, Ma Vie de C. G. Jung: remémoration, légitimation, monumentalisation’, *Cahiers Jungiens de Psychanalyse*, no. 104, Summer 2002.

Finally, as regards the reflections outlined or developed in *MDR*, particularly the more theoretical ones, they are bound to be read in the light of Jung's other writings, which alone can be corroborative in this context.

With these few pointers and rules in mind, I come to the second phase of my argument and to the simple question: how do I myself read this book, and what use do I make of it personally?

A quilted reading

First, I would like to say that my reading of this book is a constant surprise to me. I am amazed practically every time I go back to it, a book I supposedly know well. This constant and insistent surprise resists both my reading and my reflection upon what it is I discover and rediscover in it.

Now given the surprise, the renewed amazement, and the recurrent insistence of the material, is this not the very stuff which would confirm that we are actually dealing here with an authentic work? With a work which is not simply a record but reveals what it consists of precisely by the fact that it stubbornly resists, as it were, any attempt to reduce it, to nullify its impact, or to 'digest' it?

I therefore consider this book to be genuine source, whatever may have been the very particular circumstances of its production or its development; these were undoubtedly complex, having been worked on by four hands, as we have seen.

All this necessarily gives rise to a fairly troubling question: what was the role of Mrs Jaffé in the whole business? What is the role of this lady and what is her place in this work? And, more generally, what has been the role of the women who surrounded Jung, Jung's women? The *Jungfrauen* as they were openly referred to ambivalently in his time – because even then, it was difficult not to notice when reference was made in German to the *Jungfrauen*, being at the one and same time about 'virgins', and literally, about 'Jung's women'...

Here is a question which could appear in poor taste, arising, as it does, in the midst of an argument which up to now has been rigorously methodical and carefully academic, due to the unsavoury and possibly scandalous note it introduces. Except that to be surprised by Mrs Jaffé's role in this 'autobiography' of Jung, and perhaps in Jung's thoughts or in Jung's approach, could be a way of highlighting what sexuality meant to him – and to us. It is also a way of enquiring about what women and the feminine meant to him – and to us, but that is yet another matter. Let us leave this question aside for the moment. Let us venture further and look at another question, as is so often the case with an enduring work: Are not the inevitable surprise and amazement we find here an integral aspect of the position we are made to adopt as practising analysts, and therefore, are they not, I would suggest here, directly an outcome of the unconscious?

The surprise and amazement under discussion here, along with the resulting urges, notably the urge to think, are awoken by the minutiae, that is the detail, as much as by the whole. This is surely what is happening here, and that from the beginning of the book, from the very first lines. We shall see that this is quite telling.

In fact, everyone will have read the first German sentence of the Prologue, *‘Mein Leben ist die Geschichte einer Selbstverwirklichung des Unbewussten’*, translated into English as ‘My life is a story of the self-realisation of the unconscious’. Here, I imagine the reader comes to a full stop. Especially if he is a Freudian analyst. ‘What?’ he says to himself. ‘Why this concretization of the unconscious? Concretizing it to such an extent that in the French translation the unconscious itself becomes a subject in the sentence: “*Ma vie est l’histoire d’un inconscient qui a accompli sa réalisation*”’.

I speak of ‘concretization’, one could as easily call it ‘hypostasis’ – a term Jung readily uses . . . when he criticizes religions. Here we see Jung, betrayed by his own words, putting the unconscious and its reality on a plane and in a position strangely akin to those religions that are regarded as theistic. This is quite startling except that there are peculiar difficulties with the translation here. Firstly, what I read in German is not ‘My life is a story of the self-realisation of the unconscious’, as the English translator proposes, nor is it, ‘My life is the story of an unconscious which has achieved self-realisation’, as the French translator has it, but, literally, ‘My life is the story of a self-realisation of the unconscious’.

This should be reassuring: an apparently close reading of this text would suggest it was nothing other than about realisation, one of several, that of a life, the life which will form the subject matter of this ‘autobiography’.

Yet, this reassurance can only be short-lived, since, as will be observed, all that has happened is a displacement of the difficulty. The displacement is self-incriminating. If the theme is actually about ‘the story of an unconscious’, as the French translator says, I feel at ease, I find myself on familiar ground. The theme could be about my unconscious, or yours, or, in this ‘autobiography’, about that of Carl Gustav Jung, son of Paul Achilles Jung and of Emma Jung, née Rauschenbach.

However, if I were to examine the original German text more carefully, and if I were to read, to spell out, as the English spells it out as well, that the subject matter of this book is ‘the self-realisation of the unconscious’, then, normally, I would be startled and would say to myself: Look at him, that Carl Gustav Jung, pushing forward his pet theory of the unconscious, which he takes to be far from a personal issue or the outcome of a particular history – he does not just stop there, and we were warned of this – he actually goes much further and describes it as a ‘collective’ reality; who could possibly follow him down that path?

Indeed, we can accept a certain amount of transgenerational thinking. Everybody talks about it these days and some are working on it. We know

that structuralism, originally in linguistics, later in anthropology, notably in relation to kinship systems, has uncovered, and even led to the analysis of certain types of organization which are largely unconscious and impersonal. Each of us as clinician will have experienced heavy pathologies, delirious ones, out of all proportion to the subject – and who in fact is *subjected* to them – and is reduced to being their plaything. This is of small account, since the unconscious described as 'collective', be it an intuition, a notion, a concept, or a theory, is hardly acceptable in psychoanalysis...at least nominally these days. One generally stops there and definitively comes back to Freud.

However there remains a second difficulty in the same sentence, which gives us another chance to move on. We were speaking of 'realisation', and doubtless there will be some who will have noticed that the German expression Jung uses for it is *Verwirklichung*, which is not as one might have expected, the German term *Erfüllung* – as an ordinarily trained Freudian analyst would have it, considering that, since the time of Freud, when one says 'realisation', or 'fulfilment', and more particularly 'wish fulfilment', one thinks of *Wunscherfüllung*, that is the achievement of, or, more literally, the fulfilment of a desire.⁶ Jung does not use the term *Wunscherfüllung*. He speaks differently. There is nothing accidental in this detail, and of course, it brings about all kinds of effects in the patterns of thought and in the clinical practice of psychoanalysis as well. Jung is not a Freudian – we thought as much anyway – so it does not amount to a revelation, nor even a scoop! But there is scope to look at what this means as accurately as possible.

The expression *Verwirklichung* he uses reveals instantly, quite plainly, what is meant by it and, I would venture, even allows one to perceive it; at least if it is possible to perceive words or the life of words at all. If one allows them to speak, to play, rather than be played with.

Verwirklichung, the German substantive noun, which is usually translated into French as '*réalisation*', and in English as 'realisation', is through its German root and flexional ending a very active noun, considerably more sensitively active than the French or English words '*réalisation*' and 'realisation'.

The same goes for its close relative, the word *Wirklichkeit*, which Jung uses when he wants to speak of 'reality'. Jung practically never uses the German term *Realität*, whereas Freud does; for example, when speaking of 'reality testing', Freud will say, *Realitätsprüfung*.

Two very Jungian expressions, *Verwirklichung* and *Wirklichkeit*, come from the German verb *wirken*, which Jung is fond of using throughout his writings. This German verb means to 'act', to 'operate', to 'act upon', to 'produce an effect', so that it would be almost more precise to talk in English about 'efficiency', or even, of 'effectiveness' in preference to 'reality' when Jung speaks of *Wirklichkeit*. This is because the 'realisation' to which Jung refers

⁶ Or a vow or a wish. Cf. A. Bourguignon et al., *Traduire Freud*, Paris, PUF 1989, p. 143–144.

here, as in so many of his other writings when he says *Verwirklichung*, and the 'reality' he speaks of when using *Wirklichkeit* point to a perception or more accurately to a living experience. Of what? Well, of the very thing that preoccupies all of us, haunts us, works us up, agitates us, animates us, gives us structure, redirects us: the unconscious.

At last, we have reached the heart of the argument. For we may as well state it now and emphasize it repeatedly as it is, to my mind, what distinguishes, differentiates, and at times, divides and creates antagonism among the various traditions which make up the psychoanalytic movement. It is therefore of far lesser import to have our usual debates about this or that way of working, what is more or less similar or more or less necessary – about the use of the couch, when and with whom, or about the length and rhythm of sessions, for instance.⁷

These are obviously important questions in themselves and they are often decisive in psychoanalytic clinical practice; but the core and the best of our debates, what makes them so interesting beyond the mere encounter, or even the failed encounter between Freud and Jung, and beyond the rivalries of people who were in opposition throughout the various phases of the psychoanalytic movement, and above all beyond the affectations and rivalries of the institutions which were set up to defend their bit of turf, indicates *what is essential for us all*: the different conceptions of and practices in relation to the unconscious we hold, according to which psychoanalytical tradition we belong.

Yes, it is in fact a debate about the unconscious. We are debating with and within the unconscious, every one of us. It is the unconscious which, in effect, is making us address this issue.

For Jung, and the words he uses to express it make it fairly clear to see, the unconscious is a living object, an unidentified living object, albeit one that can be recognized – in every sense of the word. It is possible to learn to recognize it on condition we experience it ourselves – albeit as a live experience.

This live experience of the unconscious, stated in this way, is the whole purpose of this book, this 'autobiography'. For it is the purpose – or more particularly, the challenge – of the life and work of Jung. It is the challenge of his history. It forms the heart of the entire organization of his life and work, whence everything else follows.

It must be understood that this is the source of his experimental work, in the laboratory, of his 'association tests' which first brought him fame, of his concept of the 'complexes', which springs from his work on associations, and which are in sum nothing other than the nuclei, the links of highly charged emotional representations, endowed with powerful autonomy, that is to say with their own substance, their own life, which makes them respond almost

⁷ Cf. my chapter entitled 'La psychanalyse jungienne', in *Psychanalyses, Psychothérapies. Les nouvelles approches*, Paris, Seuil, 2002.

motu proprio, one is tempted to say, according to their own logic, or rather, in line with their own dynamism.

Here the notion of 'dynamism' comes to the fore in our argument. This is both rather appropriate and important, since it is right that we should have reached this point in a discussion about the unconscious, moreover, in the context of power relations. But we should take care to note that we are dealing with a dynamism, with power relations, which are not exactly those of 'repression' nor of the 'resurgence of repressed contents', so characteristic of Freudian discourse.

The evidence for this is in the fact that the family of terms in whose root lies the German verb *wirken*, which, as we have seen, can be translated as 'to act', to 'operate', to 'produce an effect' – and, in turn, emerging from this family, are the terms *Verwirklichung* and *Wirklichkeit*. It so happens that there is an associated second family of words which are prevalent in Jung's language: they are *Gegenwirkung* and *Mitwirkung*, which translate respectively as 'counter-effect' and 'joint-effect'.

All this vocabulary of power relations, of psychic dynamism, arises and asserts itself in Jung's writings from 1916 onwards, that means significantly after his break with Freud and at the point when he articulates the fundamentals of his thought, which from then on constantly leads our attention by its shifting terminology towards *tension*, *conflict*, *contradiction*, or, in a less incisive and a differently dynamic way, towards the impact of *compensation* and *complementarity*. These concepts are decisive in the analytical psychology developed by Jung.⁸ Here, as a result of what I have been saying about autonomous 'complexes' and power relations in terms of contradiction or relative coordination or conjunction which occur in our psychic functioning when we are dealing with the unconscious, it would be obviously necessary to dwell on the Jungian concept and practice of *imagos*, as inner figures of the main protagonists of our personal history, but also as fairly generic evolutionary figures and presences. From there, one would surely have to proceed to a discussion of the Jungian concept and practice of *archetypes*, which cause such confusion in our usual teaching situation, especially in the universities, so that one loses sight of their reality – which for Jung, was obviously structural. In other words, their function is as unconscious and largely impersonal organizing principles, of our most ordinary representations and behaviour.

We could be tempted, therefore, to pursue this line by discussing at length and in as much detail as necessary, the conceptual intricacies of Jung's project, except, this is not what Jung does in this book, this 'autobiography'.

It will have been noted from the start of this book that rather than beginning by presenting and discussing the principal concepts underlying his approach – like Freud did when he wrote his autobiography in 1925 – Jung,

⁸ Cf. C. Gaillard *Jung*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 2001, 3rd edn.

on the contrary, and emphatically, begins by telling us of his childhood. And this, in spite of hearing it said in supposedly well informed circles, that Jung and those analysts who follow in his wake do not explore childhood material in analysis.

Moreover, another surprising aspect in this context is that the chapter devoted to childhood has nothing to do with psychobiography. Should we recall the purpose of a psychobiography? This is a particular orientation in research, notably in the psychoanalysis of art, from at least 1910, which seeks to explain all the elements of an artwork through the chance experiences of its creator's childhood, if possible, from his time in the cradle.⁹

Yet there is nothing that Jung seeks to explain, he offers no reasons, no aetiology in the childhood chapter of this book, although it would probably have set the mind at rest. There is, in fact, a whole labour of reminiscence, or more precisely of reliving; a reliving of place, of time, the founding moments, as we shall see, of crucial and decisive childhood scenes which Jung in his older days recovers, circumstantially, etched in the memory of his body. These moments are still evidently vivid, still as present and urgent when he composed this book as they had been when they haunted, directed and oriented him, often without his being aware, throughout his life, and particularly when he passed from one phase to another in his work, as is evidenced now by the sequence of the chapters in this book.

Here there are no actual memories, or fantasies from the cradle, as one might find in Freud's *Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of his Childhood*. Instead, there is a captivating story of a high chair, a child's view from a high chair:

I am sitting [note the use of the present tense] in our dining room, we read, on the west side of the house, perched in a high chair and spooning up warm milk with bits of broken bread in it. The milk has a pleasant taste and a characteristic smell. This was the first time I became aware of the smell of milk. It was the moment when, so to speak, I became conscious of smelling.¹⁰

What is the register, the rule, indeed the *prima materia* of this 'childhood memory', if not sensation? This 'memory' is so sensual, so obviously bodily, that the writing vibrates with it, it is organically vibrant, and what we are witnessing is truly a reliving of a recovered experience, even though it is to do with the past, a supposedly outlived past; and out of this recovered past is born a *subject* becoming conscious of smelling, and then of being. The young Carl Gustav became conscious of who he was, he became the subject of his life.

⁹ These terms are also reflected in the work that I do, being involved in the psychoanalysis of art. Cf. notably C. Gaillard, *Le Musée Imaginaire de Carl Gustav Jung*, Paris, Stock, 1998; *Les Evidences du Corps et de la Vie Symbolique*, Paris, ENSBA, 1998; *Donne in mutazione*, Bergamo, Moretti e Vitali, 2000.

¹⁰ C. G. Jung (1963). *Memories Dreams, Reflections*. London: Flamingo Edition, 1983, p. 21.

I propose to call Jung's approach an 'emergentist' one, such as is clearly revealed here. Indeed this approach is *doubly emergentist*. It has to do with the stunning emergence of a subject, simultaneously with the emergence of what the ego has to face, initially in its almost undifferentiated form, when hardly recognizable, but able to be incarnated and shaped, to be represented, and to become enlivened and even to give voice, as staged in dreams, for example, or to be exercised either spontaneously or deliberately in the 'active imagination', as witnessed in one of the most captivating chapters of the book, Chapter VI. Here Jung, now over 37 years old, following his break with Freud, can be seen looking at and conversing with a certain Salomé or a certain Elijah, so present to him, in such a concretely emergent way, that he was wont to talk about them, and to translate them pictorially, secretly of course, in his notebooks, which he bound himself and which, alas, remain unpublished.¹¹

This handiwork, in manuscript, painted, or etched with a needle, is a labour of finding a form, of *imaging* – as it is called in German, in Jung's German, which is also that of Prinzhorn for instance, *Gestaltung*, Jung will go back to it repeatedly, and persistently, many times in the course of his life and his work, at the most critical moments of his life, and most notably in the house which was to become known as his 'Tower' at Bollingen, whose gradual transformations can be followed in Chapter VIII of the book.¹²

This mode of elaborating, of imaging, of *Gestaltung*, is obviously traceable to the *figuration*, the *dramatization* and the *symbolization* which Freud considers in his *Traumdeutung* [Interpretation of Dreams]. In this connection, Freud speaks of *Rücksicht auf Darstellbarkeit* when he talks about the 'work of dreams', which in French we translate rather clumsily as the '*prise en considération de la figurabilité*' (taking into account the figurability) – but which we would do well, in my view, to include in our thinking, nourished as it is by recent developments in linguistics – and prompts me to refer to 'the capacity of the unconscious to express itself'.¹³

Jung takes this particular capacity of the unconscious totally seriously, which in any event, is quite autonomous, and which we could also describe as autochthonous. And he makes it work. In fact he makes it the centrepiece of his work.

In fact, it is the source from which we can draw an understanding of some strange concepts – strangely alive, enlivened and often gendered concepts – such as those of the *shadow*, of the *anima*, of the *animus* and even of the *self*,

¹¹ They are called the *Black Notebook* and the *Red Notebook*, and are to be published soon. At the moment only some pages of them are known.

¹² I have had the privilege of seeing some of these paintings *in situ*, and of publishing a few, in still unedited form in my *Musée Imaginaire de Carl Gustav Jung*, Op. cit.

¹³ C. Gaillard, 'Psychanalyse ou psychanalyses?', in *Pour Une Psychothérapie Plurielle*, A. Delourme ed., Paris, Retz, 2001.

all conceived as means of recognition in the constantly elusive relationships with the unconscious.

We can see these concepts filtering through, emerging, sometimes surreptitiously it is true, like a watermark in *MDR*, running its course from one chapter to the next. The point is that the very work of imaging, of *Gestaltung*, whether it is done with a paintbrush or an etching needle, also gives food for thought.

Obviously, it cannot simply be an accident that Chapter VII, the chapter in the book called 'The Work', immediately follows the one which deals with the years of greatest turmoil and with the groping explorations, between 1912/1913 and 1916/1918 after his break with Freud, years when Jung developed a steadfast attachment to working out in clay, in stone or in wood those things that were occupying or preying on his mind, but which either still escaped him, or on the contrary, threatened him too closely and severely with spilling over. Thinking work, the fashioning of concepts and putting them to work to test a theory, benefited from what the hand itself had learnt from the deepest unconscious demanding to be known.¹⁴

Let us come back, briefly, to his return in this book, to the child he had been. We have addressed this theme by relying on the Freudian teaching about figuration, dramatization and even scenes. In fact, to read this book, it is necessary to take one further step and consider *scenarios*.

Anyone who has read the book surely cannot have failed to linger on the dream of the 'Underground Phallus', to which Jung refers, when he was three or four years old. Yet, who will have noticed the analogy, or more accurately, the formal and especially, the *structural homology* of this dream with the one that precedes his writing of 'Answer to Job', in 1951, and which occurs some 70 years later?¹⁵

The so-called dream of the 'Underground Phallus', it will be remembered, places the very young child in front of a huge and monstrous organic object of about four or five metres in height and about fifty to sixty centimetres wide which quickly threatens to devour him.

The dream which precedes the writing of 'Answer to Job', first of all sets an architectural scene, a greatly impressive one, and almost ideal in its balance of composition, like the Council Hall of Sultan Akbar at Fatrhepur Sikri in India, which Jung had visited. Then this dream opens onto a backroom scene, a background, onto a quite different tale, troubling in a very different way, which, in fact, is quite shocking and scandalous, the one about the military general, Uriah, whom the very handsome, very enlightened, very wise, very

¹⁴ From his first truly Jungian writings (following, of course, *Symbols of Transformation*, published in 1911-1912) which date from 1916, and where the outline and fundamentals of his thought are visible, Jung clearly balances the exercise of 'comprehending' (he says *Verstehen*) with the work of finding a form, with *Gestaltung*.

¹⁵ Respectively, pp. 26-27 and 244-247 [Op. cit.]

ideal King David had sent to his death in battle in order to have his pleasure with the wife of the hapless soldier, the very desirable Bathsheba – an unsavoury story, which casts a strong pall of darkness on the scene. It will be recalled also, that in this dream, when together with his father, the pastor Paul Achilles Jung, who kneels down and bows to touch the ground with his forehead, Jung himself certainly does kneel down, but only allows himself to almost touch the ground, thus keeping a gap, a margin, the margin of a glimpse of thought and of freedom for himself which he must not and can neither, nor wishes to, forbid himself.

Why shine a torch on these two scenes, which in the 'autobiography' are separated by some 220 pages? Because the book involves us in a reading, which not only depicts the thread of the chapters, but also criss-crosses and exposes the corner-stones and watermarks of Jung's life as well as those of his work.

From one scene to the next, from the so-called dream of the 'Underground Phallus' to the tall column where sits the sultan-king, this is still the same scenario, evolving to be sure, from one scene to the next, but structurally similar. The scenario of a countenance that one is concretely and inwardly invited to experience through the layout of places – the subterranean arch in the 'Phallus' dream, the mobilization of the impressions left by the visit to the temple of Fathepur Sikri in the Uriah dream.

But this scenario also speaks of a decentring, then of a confrontation – for in his work, Jung is fond of the German term *Auseinandersetzung* – with something bigger and stronger than oneself. Disproportion is obviously an outstanding and substantive characteristic in both scenes, such that he is carried along by longing, dreaming of protection and equanimity, perfect completeness even, which the place all but promises. However he is actually met by manifest incompleteness and even more patently by a close, internal and intimate menace and by some perhaps radical and strangely moving contradiction.

Moreover, in the one scene as in the other, it is necessary to think. The more so, as in both cases, the father finds himself in a bad light, either absent or crushed. While in the so-called Phallus dream, the mother's words remain uncertain, dubious.¹⁶

Thus, there is nowhere to go here with the *déjà vu*, the already stated, the already known. All labelling is thus placed in abeyance. Yet, it is necessary to think, and to find the words to express it. Jung sets about the task step by step, creating his own vocabulary, and an approach which is as closely adjusted as possible to his own experience and breakthroughs.

Thus the Fathepur Sikri and Uriah dream, about a willing and perhaps even a colluding victim, who is otherwise conscious, in a way that the king

¹⁶ Cf my Jung, Op, cit, pp. 14–16. Using the same structural reading, one can re-read the dream which comes at the end of his trip to Tunisia in 1925 and therefore falls in between that of his three/four year old self and the 1950 one.

himself is not, contains in its own enigmatic and exacting way the passionate and argued thought that Jung later develops about the fate of Job. We can share this thought with him, as well as the circumstances surrounding his dignity, his power and his relative ability to rise above it, which so weighs upon him.¹⁷

This reflection runs throughout this 'autobiography'. It is a reflection upon ethics. It is a reflection where we see Jung feeding on constant visiting and enquiring into religions, myths, rites and the arts which have marked our civilization, and which do not cease to stimulate his own thinking. With the result that his thinking, placed in this context, it should be emphasized, teaches a kind of humility. For in these circumstances, it knows itself to be provisional; and then always obstinately and necessarily refractory to all kinds of orthodoxies. It can only help us to find a new take, or another take on what escapes us, or exceeds our understanding, which has remained unthought and unrealized till now.¹⁸

While we are on the subject, at least a few words are called for regarding what is missing in the book. Firstly, and this is strange, there is nothing in it about the 1930s. I mean about Jung in the face of mounting Nazism in Germany, about the criminal campaigns against the Jews and about its spilling out onto Europe.

This 'omission' in the 'autobiography', is it the doing of Mrs Jaffé, or is it due to Jung's own difficulty to reconsider this period in his history? Current research on this matter does not tell us.

Yet this is a question we must confront. It matters to us because we have not finished enquiring into what happened then in Germany and elsewhere. Because similar events could recur at any time, or are recurring even today, and therefore, at the very least, our vigilance is demanded.

Besides, this question of Jung in the face of Nazism matters to us because a polemic, at times a deaf and insidious one, at other times an explosive but mostly a repetitive one, does not stop raging against him. This is particularly true in relation to his writings during those years, and in relation to his institutional activities, to the point that one hears here and there that his 'analytical psychology', his very thinking and practice in relation to the unconscious, would turn him, and us, into partisans of such a régime, and even into anti-Semitism.

Now, one or two very simple matters need to be recalled in this connection. First of all, since this is to do with research and with history, it is necessary that we closely study the facts, all the facts as they are and in context.

The different societies of Jungian analysts, in Germany, in the Anglo-Saxon countries, and notably in France, have addressed the issue mainly by developing a collection of works and reflections on this issue. In France the bulk of this

¹⁷ C. G. Jung (1952). 'Answer to Job'. CW 11.

¹⁸ Cf. C. Gaillard (2001). 'Amplification et pensée après Jung', *Topique*, Revue freudienne, no. 76, 2001.

work has been assembled and presented in the issues numbered 82 and 96 of our *Cahiers Jungiens de Psychanalyse*.

Obviously, all the data, writings, facts and gestures are relevant here, however isolated and strange they may appear. Now there is one fact which has been discovered, or at least seriously documented only recently.¹⁹

We are in 1934. The previous year, in 1933, the Nazi régime has just promulgated its first professional interdicts against Jews (the *Berufsverbot*). These measures apply to all professional organizations, to lawyers, judges, professors – obviously to analysts and therapists also.

Dr Kretschmer, who was at that time president of the General Medical Society for Psychotherapy, therefore tenders his resignation from the Society, and Jung, the vice-president, in his capacity as a Swiss and at the request of his German colleagues, after much internal debate, accepts the presidency. Almost at once, however, he takes a series of precise institutional measures. He moves the headquarters of the Society from Berlin to Zürich and he works on the transformation of the Society, originally made up largely of German members, but also of Scandinavians, Swiss and Dutch, into a federation of autonomous national societies.

This institutional transformation includes two key rules. No national society, whatever its size, could make sure of a majority of votes in the International Society – this measure was obviously aimed at the large and powerful German Society. Furthermore, each therapist or analyst could belong directly and personally to the International Society – which was meant to counteract the 'Aryan paragraphs' put in place by the Nazi régime to ensure the alignment, the *Gleichschaltung*, of all professional groups in Germany.²⁰ But all these dispositions had to be voted in at the first Congress of this new International Society, which was to have been held at Bad Nauheim, in Germany, in May 1934, obviously with a strong participation of the German delegates.

In March 1934 Jung needs assistance with his project. He decides to contact a well-known Zürich lawyer, Me Rosenbaum. The latter replies to him immediately, in essence stating: 'Herr Professor Doktor, you are crazy. They are far too powerful...'

However, Jung argues so effectively that the lawyer eventually agrees to work with him, and Jung goes to the Congress at Bad Nauheim where he arranges for his measures to be voted on. During a subsequent interview with Max Frisch, Me Rosenbaum tells of how Jung returned from Bad Nauheim and said to him: 'They're crazy. Really, they are crazy. If only they knew...' In fact, if they had known that a Jew had drawn up the statutes conceived

¹⁹ Personal communication from Mr. Ulrich Hoerni, on behalf of the *Erbengemeinschaft C.G. Jung*, in anticipation of Deirdre Bair's biography, soon to be published by Little Brown in the USA.

²⁰ Cf. *Cahiers Jungiens de Psychanalyse*, no. 82, entitled 'Jung et l'histoire, Les années trente', and the entire bibliography cited in that issue.

precisely to counteract, as much as possible, the anti-Jewish measures of the Nazi régime . . .

Of course this is only one fact to put on file. A fact which does not alter the question of whether it would have been decidedly better if Jung had, from the outset, severed all contact with Germany, and should have used his authority clearly and publicly to denounce the Nazi régime and its actions, particularly against the Jews. Another fact which also continues to amaze us when reading the criticisms which he allowed himself to make here and there, during those years against the defects of democracy, or the more dubious and indefensible phrases, which he used about Jews in this context, in his stubborn clinging to his wish to establish a differential psychology of different peoples which he long thought possible.²¹ These are, to my mind, and I have both said and written about it, particular ethical issues. Even if one already knows it, it still needs to be recalled that he did also issue many warnings and cautions, declaring, for example, in front of the Kulturbund in Vienna in 1932:

At any moment several millions of human beings may be smitten with a new madness, and then we shall have another world war or devastating revolution. Instead of being at the mercy of wild beasts, earthquakes, landslides and inundations, modern man is battered by the elemental forces of his own psyche.²²

Then in 1933, at conferences held in the centre of Germany, in Cologne, in Essen or in Berlin, he declared: 'The political and social movement gains nothing by this when it has swarms of hypnotized camp followers'.²³ Finally, consideration needs to be given here to his essay, 'Wotan' (1936), which he devoted to the interpretation of Nazism.²⁴ It is an interpretation bereft of any complacency, and impressive in its breadth of vision; the breadth of view he brings to the rise of Nazism and which is also often the gaze he directs at our history, I have proposed to call 'farsighted' – farsightedness being that quality which enables one to take the long view, sometimes a very long view, up hill and down dale, and which sometimes can turn the seer into a visionary but which does not always ensure he is careful about what is happening under his own nose, in fact, where he places his feet . . .

If Jung is a man of sensation who must have thought a lot, and if his thought is mainly directed at the trends and structural conceptions of intuition, it is not certain that he made good use of the weights and measures that

²¹ Cf. in *Cahiers Jungiens de Psychanalyse*, no. 96, entitled 'Crise en histoire', Jung's article, 'Psychotherapy Today' of 1934 and in the same issue, my article called 'L'altérité au présent' (English version entitled 'Otherness in the present', *Harvest*, 46, 2, 2000).

²² Published in 1934 in *Wirklichkeit der Seele* (Rascher). English version: *The Development of Personality*, CW 17, para. 302.

²³ In C.G. Jung, *Speaking*, Princeton University Press, 1977, p. 63.

²⁴ English version, CW 10, p. 179. Translated into French in *Aspects du drame contemporain*, Genève, Georg, 1948.

are more closely associated with feeling. In any event, let us be clear, there is a radical incompatibility between Jung's project and national socialism, and all manner of totalitarianism. Quite simply, and quite fundamentally, because in his approach and project the purpose is individuation.²⁵

Moreover, there is another chapter that some claim to regret is missing from this volume. A chapter where Jung would introduce himself, or where he might have been introduced in the light of his clinician's daily work, as an analyst.

Yet is it certain that he does not present himself as an analyst? I hope I have shown that this observation is way off the mark. Everything about this book comes from a man grappling with the unconscious and from a clinician, including his most theoretical vocabulary. From a clinician who, in this book, describes his personal relationship with the unconscious, which for him was a whole story, often a solitary one, undoubtedly much too solitary, but who, on every page, shows himself aware of the dangers and the discoveries often unexpectedly experienced in the secrecy of his consulting room. He was the first in the history of the psychoanalytic movement to expressly request that every analyst should not only undergo a personal analysis, but also a training analysis. This was in 1912.²⁶ The International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA) did not ratify this as a rule until 1922.

Finally, let us return with a sentence or two, to the classic debate concerning the so-called collective unconscious. In a recent essay about referrals for incipient psychoses for analytic assessment, Nicolas Gougoulis introduces the idea of the 'appel impersonnel' (impersonal appeal).²⁷ This is something which is of direct importance to us. For at least two reasons. The first is that Jung played a decisive role in the renewal of psychiatry in his day, and it is possible that there is some merit in consulting it even now in this connection. The second reason is that on this basis, we can ask whether the 'impersonal appeal', which is pertinent in relation to incipient psychoses, is not to be found often enough in many other analytic assessments – and also in a good number of our own lives.

The questions that arise are, in effect, the following: Who is there? Who is speaking? And even: Is there anybody there? In other words, the issue is about the emergence of a subject, when someone decides to review, to recognize his relationship to himself and to others, in the course of his own history and, at one and the same time, is able to open himself to what arises in terms of sensations, emotions, feelings, associations of all kinds in the protected and protecting frame of the consulting room, and therefore, in the course of the transference in progress.

²⁵ In this connection, Cf. my article under this entry in the *Dictionnaire International de la Psychanalyse*, ed. A. de Mijolla, Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 2002.

²⁶ Cf Freud (1912). *Psychoanalytic Technique*. SE. 12: 'Case History of Schreber, Papers on Technique and Other works'.

²⁷ N. Gougoulis (2001), 'Les moments d'ouverture dans le traitement psychanalytique des psychoses débutantes', *Psychothérapies*, 21, 4.

Should we not say that, in effect, the unconscious is primarily and ordinarily anonymous? That it is impersonal so long as someone has still not found himself and engaged with it?

To recapitulate and conclude

This is indeed the direction Jung first pursued, from his earliest pioneering work with psychotics. Against this background must be understood his lengthy dipping, from 1934/1935 and almost to the end of his life, into the iconography and literature of the alchemists – who, as he demonstrated, naturally had little clue about what they were engaged in.

A strange pastime for an analyst! It mobilized Jung, the later Jung, as we can see in *MDR*, for nearly twenty-five years, while at the same time he was developing an impassioned reflection on the hazards and traps of our contemporary world, about the progress and faltering of Christianity, and about the analysis of the transference in psychoanalytic practice.

I have mentioned how the scenario that was formed out of the dream of the very young, three or four year old Carl Gustav Jung, was nourished by his clinical practice and by his engagement with the arts and literature, and reworked on the occasion of the dream about Fathepur Sikri, at the beginning of the fifties. This scenario, concerning the necessary demeanour to enable the confrontation with what presents itself in its fundamental otherness and its disproportion and about the assumption of a new attitude which was both ethical and thoughtfully creative, takes a different twist, another shape and energy after 1934–1935.

Jung's thought is then able to advance into the most obscure recesses of our culture, precisely because it has adopted imaging, and because it knows itself to be deliberately dramatizing. His thought, which he learned to his own cost, is never other than the best possible expression at any given moment of that which he could not fail to recognize nor experience differently; it is, in fact, a symbolic thought. A thought which, to reassess and relaunch itself at every stage of its course, including in his most theoretical elaborations, both runs into and debates with the metaphor which, for better or worse, contains the actual experience, upholds it and orients it in the direction of its act of becoming.

The ancient alchemists were busy around their furnaces, they did not recoil from the calls of the cave or the bath, their sorcerers' recipe books were peopled by devouring hybrid monsters; their eroticism, wilfully and definitely copulatory, accompanied their scientific and wise orations.²⁸ Jung finds in them the anxiety-provoking and animation familiar in the consulting room. He recognizes them himself and, with a reasoned jubilation, that of a lexicographer and iconologist, he shows and demonstrates what is going on and what

²⁸ It is quite interesting to see how this metaphor of the bath crops up in Jean Laplanche's *Banquet. Transcendance du Transfert*, Paris: PUF, 1987.

the quest might be, noting with each step the troubling analogy and the obvious gap between their 'experiments' and our experience.

Through this process, once again, his vocabulary is transformed and his project amplified in a way which allows him, quite differently from previous attempts, to capture according to different scales not only the life of each individual, but also those aspects of what we could call transgenerational lives, even including the great rhythms of our collective history, at the same time as their necessary confrontation with other cultures, besides ours, notably that of the Far East.

He had already described how the ego can be ill treated as soon as a relationship engages with the unconscious for the long term. Now, he does not hesitate to latinize with the alchemists and to speak of *divisio elementorum*, of *putrefactio*, of *calcinatio*, of *incineratio*: these word-images from another language give him a better grip than our ordinary concepts do on the trials we have to face when the most elemental, most undifferentiated, most dangerously archaic aspects of ourselves are at work.

He had forged the concept of the shadow to speak of the presences returning from repressed contents, sometimes personified in the scenarios of dreams, although most often experienced as unknown affects or projected from here and there onto the environment. He goes on now to speak of the hard path, the difficult phase of the *nigredo* - in French we refer to it as, 'l'oeuvre au noir' [work in the dark]. His thinking about this becomes more sensuous than ever, to learn better to recognize and describe better the stages and phases of a work in progress which the clinician has to know well by its rhythm if he wants to accompany his patient accurately.

These rhythms occur from one chapter to the next of this 'autobiography', unexpectedly given the artifice, of the writing and composition of the book. Doubtless, this is because the substance of this work, which attempts to narrate a life as it was lived, imposed itself upon those who crafted it.

As noted, that the first sentence of the German Prologue already cited and discussed above, in speaking of 'realisation' does not use the term *Verwirklichung*, but *Selbstverwirklichung* - which is differently burdensome in French compared to the German or English. The French translator should indeed have translated this *Selbstverwirklichung*, as the English one did, by 'auto-réalisation' (in English, 'self-realisation'). The trouble is that French culture can hardly accept that the unconscious is so active that it might actually be able to realize itself.

However, Jung's thinking, already from his first researches into the 'complexes' and 'associations' undertaken with psychotics, asserts itself at every stage of his work frequently as a thought about processes and structures. These processes and structures are constantly held of as largely autonomous and autochthonous, that is, they belong to a time and to modalities of expression which we can never master. One has to get used to it, whether one is French, a post-modern American linguist, or an Aboriginal.

We started out with some curious problems of translation. And we have just happened upon another one at the end of this journey, which readily demonstrates, if such a demonstration were still needed, that Jung is not so easy to absorb, at least linguistically speaking. To be able to use him requires an effort of translation, as it were; but this effort, this work, can, in turn, also translate more fundamentally into the kind of decentring that is required when one wishes to have access to a different language and finally to a different reality.

Actually, this is no worse than it already must be for an analyst. What I mean is that the translation difficulties with which we have had to deal could be fundamentally those inherent in psychoanalysing – if it is true that one of the desirable attributes of an analyst is the spirit of inquiry into what he hears and how he hears what reaches him, when it is often quite enigmatic, at least at first, indeed invariably.

For, precisely the very thing we hear as analysts, which demands both to be translated and interpreted, does not easily lend itself to the process, to the extent that it concerns a process or work in progress which is fundamentally and above all, unconscious.

It remains for us, then, to learn how best to serve it in the particular circumstances of our own clinical practice.

TRANSLATIONS OF ABSTRACT

L'auteur rappelle tout d'abord les recherches récentes sur les conditions dans lesquelles l'"autobiographie" de Jung a été écrite et publiée. Il en conclut que ce livre est un ouvrage composite, à plusieurs voix, mais n'en constitue pas moins une oeuvre. Il s'engage ensuite dans une première série d'approches de ce livre qui met en évidence la problématique proprement jungienne de l'inconscient telle qu'elle apparaît à travers le vocabulaire même de Jung. Puis il propose une lecture transversale et structurale de l'ouvrage pour dégager de plusieurs rêves qui s'y trouvent rapportés le "scénario" autour duquel s'est développée la recherche de Jung d'une étape à l'autre de son élaboration. Enfin il discute la notion d'inconscient collectif ou impersonnel et conclut en soulignant l'attention portée par Jung à des processus qui obéissent à leurs propres rythmes et se réalisent à diverses échelles, celles d'un individu, d'une lignée ou d'une culture.

Nach der Betrachtung neuerer Forschung zur Umgebung der Erzeugung und Veröffentlichung der ‚Autobiografie‘ von Jung kommt der Autor zum Schluß, daß dieses Werk in der Tat ein ganzes bildes, obwohl es von mehreren Autoren stammt. Von jedwedem Winkel zeigen sie alle auf Jung's spezielle Erforschung des Unbewußten, wie sie aus Jungs Worten hervorgeht. Der Autor schlägt dann vor, ‚ETG‘ sowohl lateral als auch strukturell zu lesen, woraus sich dann auf der Basis einiger berichteter Träume die zentrale ‚Fantasie‘ ergibt, welche Jung's Forschungen und sein Werk inspirierte. Schließlich diskutiert der Autor die Hypothese des kollektiven oder unpersönlichen

Unbewußten und unterstreicht die Betonung, die Jung auf Prozesse legt, welche sich gemäß von Rhythmen entfalten, die mit wohlunterschiedenen Skalen assoziiert sind, jeweils abhängig davon, ob es sich um diejenigen des Individuums, des Clans oder der Kultur handelt.

Dopo aver considerato le ricerche recenti tenendo conto delle circostanze che portarono alla produzione e alla pubblicazione dell'autobiografia di Jung, l'autore conclude che nonostante essa sia il lavoro di vari autori, tuttavia costituisce un tutto intero. Da qualunque angolo si guardi, viene sempre indicato un particolare interesse di Jung nei confronti dell'inconscio, come emerge dalle parole stesse di Jung. L'autore prosegue suggerendo una lettura sia laterale che strutturale di 'MDR', che a turno rivela, sulla base dei vari sogni riportati, ora la 'fantasia' centrale che ispirò la ricerca di Jung, ora la sua opera. Infine viene discussa l'idea di un inconscio collettivo o impersonale e si sottolinea l'enfasi posta da Jung sui processi che si sviluppano secondo ritmi associati a scale distinte e che dipendono dall'essere quelle dell'individuo, del clan o della cultura.

Habiendo primero considerado la reciente investigación dentro de las circunstancias alrededor de la producción de la autobiografía de Jung, el autor llega a la conclusión de que a pesar de ser un trabajo realizado por varios autores, la misma, sin embargo, constituye un todo. Vista desde cualquier ángulo, todos señalan la muy particular búsqueda de Jung dentro del inconsciente tal como va surgiendo a través de las palabras del propio Jung. El autor continúa sugiriendo Tanto la lectura lateral como estructural de Recuerdos, Sueños y Pensamientos que a su vez revela, basándose en los diversos sueños reportados, la 'fantasía' central que inspiró la investigación y obra de Jung. Para finalizar, él expone la idea del inconsciente colectivo ó impersonal y destaca el énfasis que Jung puso en los procesos que se destapan en concordancia con los ritmos asociados a las diferentes escalas, dependiendo de sí estas son del individuo, el clan ó la cultura.

