



---

P56 57

JH: And when he asks those questions, also in the American West, he's always amazed that they don't have any idea what these things mean, because they're not interested in them!

SS: And yet he admires it because they have something that he sees the West has lost, which is this imminent dwelling within the cosmos. He longs for this, but he himself is the most furthest removed from it, precisely because of his quest for meaning and understanding.

JH: Does he come to terms with the figure in himself that requests meaning? Does he come to terms, because that would-be the task, the way I understand archetypal psychology, that you must always understand who is asking the question. The task is not to get the answer, the answer is who is Dominating my mind, so that that's my basic question, who is determining my point of view. It's like a deconstructive "I." You don't just want to get an answer. The real answer is "Why is that my question?" Does he ask that question? Does he ask, Why is meaning so bloody important? Why must I understand?

SS: I think you have tensions in Jung. On the one hand there's the figure that builds the tower in Bollingen, that makes the stone he puts these cryptic citations on, that paints his murals in the tower in the room he calls the chapel and is happy to dwell within his own cosmology, remote from others, simply to dwell with his own figures. And yet on the other hand, around the same time, say the 1950s, there is Jung the figure who's bemoaning the fact that there's no one in the West who can understand him, who's making an effort to reach the populous. He is not content with finding a solution for himself but wants to provide a means of understanding that would be of therapeutic benefit for others.

### P57 THIRD CONVERSATION

**Not corrected**

SS: Jung spent sixteen years of work largely transcribing the typed manuscript into the calligraphic volume and adding the paintings. This was something done for others as well as for himself.

JH: So it was clearly not self-indulgent, in the sense that he was imagining artwork has that basic problem in it, that in some ways both Joyce and Picasso, who exhibited their work and published their work, nonetheless indulged in that aspect of their art, exaggerated enormously in some artists and less so in others. And because Jung was concerned with the meaning of it, it could not become just "doing it."

SS: "Doing it" is insufficient. He's conflicted about the effects that making his work public at certain junctures will have. He's conflicted precisely because of the issue of sacrificing where he's got to in terms of public standing, his persona. Will he himself beset as an artist? Will anyone then take his psychology seriously as a universal science? Yet at the same time he's not leaving it, and I think that he becomes, I suppose, ultimately resolved for the work being made posthumously available.

JH: It had to be published to fulfill his notion that otherwise it's self-indulgent, it's only /zi private tower.

SS: He states repeatedly that, central to his involvement and engagement with the material, he felt something in it concerned

---

P 66 67

through the books. It was something that he could convey. So there's a sense that for those who had a personal encounter with him, they knew what he was on about, and they then knew how to read the published works, could distinguish the esoteric clues and see what was just the exoteric cover. It was at this one point where Cary Baynes talks about his books being written out of the head and not out of the heart, in the fire with which he spoke, for instance, at the Polzeath seminars. Tina Keller, who worked with Jung during this period, said she found herself disappointed to read his later works.

JH: Greatly disappointed to read his later works. But he taught her active imagination.



Extracts text scanned (not all corrected) - with permission from Sonu Shamdasani  
Confidential and for private use only – do not quote without permission from Sonu Shamdasani

SS: But that fire wasn't there. So I think this was something he was aware of. The question was, how great was the cost. He's now in a position to begin to be able to look at the enterprise of translating his own experience and first articulation of them into a conceptual frame acceptable to a medico-scientific public.

JH: That's it. That was the idea of the return he had. Personality number two had to somehow be expressed through personality number one.

SS: The tragedy was that his work was never really accepted by the medico-scientific public, so was that effort worth it?

JH: Yes, was that effort worth it? I think at this point, because now we're in another time of history, and another time, what needs to be returned is not just what he experienced with these particular dialogues and the work of the Red Book but the weight of human history, which is the crucial thing, the dead. The dead have to come back. Do the dead, or the voices of the dead, come

back through that conceptual structure? I don't think they do. I don't think they come back through the amalgamation of the individuation process with developmental psychology, as it is expressed in so many of our colleagues' work. This amalgamation of personal history from childhood, parental family, combined with individuation as a journey through the opposites and so on. This language doesn't bear the weight of human history. It's my life, it's not human history. And it's the weight of human history, the voices of the dead, opening the mouth of the dead and hearing what they have to say, not just the deep repressed or the forgotten, it's the actual living presence of history in the soul, the past in the soul. We don't have a language for that in psychology. I think there is a language for that, I think Jung moved in that direction through anthropology and archaeology-which was his earliest interest, archaeology, that is, actually digging up the remnants of the past. But we do have a language that would begin to express it. We have it in the Greek plays, we have it in literature, we have it in works of art, we have it in the Commedia of human life. If that is studied rather than psychology studied, if philosophy is studied, the writings of the fathers of the church, the very things that Jung used, Neoplatonic philosophy, the things that Jung used in the language that he discussed with his figures, this would bring back, I think, some of this weight of history, and we'd have a different kind of imagination about what goes on in the psyche than the language that he used for his return.

SS: Well, before coming to the issue of history I want to say little bit more about his conceptualism. There's a sense I get that he saw it as offering a safety rail for those who would be unable to encounter themselves without it. It had an apotropaic function, but one that nevertheless was of therapeutic benefit and utility to some people.

---

P72 73

JH: And that's why he started the club in 1916.

SS: Precisely for the same reason.

JH: So that these people would have a world of some sort. Some kind of reality.

SS: Someone they could talk to.

JH: So the rail that he was advising was *faute de mieux*, because there wasn't the rituals of daily life for these people, which held him. He was served not by duty and work, it was daily life as ritual, showing up on time, doing what was to be done. This was a way of *keeping* him that these people didn't have. That's what you're suggesting?

SS: He states explicitly that his family was a joy to him and convinced him of his own reality. He could shut the door to his study.

JH: But you see the inheritance of this is that sixty years later or seventy, eighty years later there's a world that follows this guiderail and is afraid, and it has put the weight of human history, all that incredible material, back down into the depths of the psyche. And it spends its time with the guard rail.

SS: Well, I think it's even worse than that. They've mistaken the guard rail for the essence.

JH: Exactly.



Extracts text scanned (not all corrected) - with permission from Sonu Shamdasani  
Confidential and for private use only – do not quote without permission from Sonu Shamdasani

SS: So for instance if you take the collective unconscious as Jung's myth, as some have, then you think the conceptual system is the essence of his work, rather than his own personal cosmology. That is what I see as his myth, not the conceptual system. Everything gets turned topsy-turvy.

JH: That has taken place, and it's what I've been struggling with for fifty years. None of that feels like the palpable psyche to me. I'm aware of certain experiences I have that I would call anima possession, or I would feel infatuated and caught by the archetype of the anima, but I could just as well speak about Aphrodite, or about Venus, and I would be in a much closer relationship with that than if using the word "anima" as a complex or as an archetypal generality.

SS: I'm reminded of a story John Phillips once told me, how in the r950s at the Jung Institute he went to Jung one day and said, Professor Jung, I've something that's been troubling me that I have to confess. I simply don't agree and don't believe in your theory of the anima. And Jung looked at him and winked and said, "I won't tell anybody." As if to say your secret's safe with me! I don't mind! But the *curatorium* would!

JH: Now, what I'd like to do in the last little bit of my life is promote another way, or another language, for the weight of human history, that psychology would emerge from the weight of human history by dealing with the same kinds of problems: possession, obsession, phobia, the languages of psychiatry and diagnosis, in terms of the world's arts and literature. You read Dostoyevsky, you read Tolstoy, you read Tennessee Williams, you read whatever you want to read, you read the Greeks, you read literature, drama, theater, plays, and you see the human comedy, the human tragedy presented to you in specific characters with whom you can identify, with whom you can feel the same things going on in them that are going on in me.

---

P 82 83

JH: The images explain themselves.

SS: He's asking one character to explain what the other character has said. The images are instructing him. He's allowing that to take place, indeed that's something that is marked right throughout the work. The figures make shocking statements, he allows that to transform-

JH: He's being pulverized again and again by these figures. He doesn't like his own "I." The "I" in the dialogues he would like to dissociate himself from.

SS: The "I" is actually one of the most interesting figures, in terms of what befalls the "I" and what the "I" has to suffer and undergo and the transformations of the "I", but it's accomplished through allowing it to be subordinated to the other figures.

JH: It's very interesting. Back in the 1960s, I think, I gave a talk at Goldsmiths College, those art students in London, and I came up with this idea of the imaginal ego, the idea that we needed another ego, who was at home in the dream world, who spoke to the figures as one of them or something like that. This is exactly what the Red Book confirms. I didn't do anything further with that, it was a little paper printed in there somewhere or other, but the idea is exactly that. The ego itself is just one of these figures, the so-called "I," and it's very uncomfortable in the underworld.

SS: In working on this text it took me quite a while to realize this, so initially I had it in terms of Jung talking to a character, and then I understood it's not Jung.

JH: Exactly, it's not Jung. It's part of the drama.

SS: It's Jung's "I." Which is one character among others. In a sense it's all Jung.

JH: It's all Jung, but none of it's Jung.

SS: He is no more his "I" than he is his soul. And then the text opens up, radically.

JH: And if you think of this therapeutically, then the person opens up to realize that I, this "me" who I walk around with all the time, is actually a composite of a lot of people living in the same house. So who's talking now? Even as I sit here? Who's talking now? When you asked, it's very hard for me to put myself into the "me" sitting here, what I was thinking at another time, to explain something. It's very difficult, I can't do it easily. I much prefer not giving an account or a defence or an explanation or a promotion, or anything like that,



Extracts text scanned (not all corrected) - with permission from Sonu Shamdasani  
Confidential and for private use only – do not quote without permission from Sonu Shamdasani

as we have our dialogue. So it's almost as if we are part of an active imagination ourselves. Because the question of what it is about my work that connects with the Red Book puts me into a position of abstraction, and I'm uncomfortable. I can't say what I do, or what I did, it's very awkward. Yet I can do it. And now this book is so crucial because it opens the door or the mouths of the dead. Jung calls attention to the one deep, missing part of our culture, which is the realm of the dead. The realm not just of your personal ancestors but the realm of the dead, the weight of human history, and what is the real repressed, and that is like a great monster eating us from within and from below and sapping our strength as a culture. It's all that's forgotten, and not just forgotten in the past, but that we're living in a world which is alive with the dead, they're around us, they're with us, they are. The figures, the memories, the ghosts, it's all there, and as you get older your borders dissolve, and you realize I am among them,

---

P100 101

that his life is subtracted out of it, but the *realia*, the *personalia* of his life, isn't the fundament. It's the images that frame him.

JH: We are lived by them, as he says in other places.

SS: It's what he then realizes, that there are powers that move in his depths.

JH: That's the profoundly personal.

SS: You couldn't imagine a less Freudian book. It just completely bursts that framework.

JH: Which dominated the last hundred years. We've had a hundred years of psychotherapy based on introspection. And this is not introspective, this is an account, this is a *récit*, in Corbin's sense, a kind of visionary journey through a world of scenes, a world of places, a world of people, of figures. That's not achievable through introspection. B"

SS: Or it's introspection where the viewers themselves change in the act of viewing. It's not constant: he's allowing himself, his perspective, to be shifted, quite radically.

JH: In fact he's a participant.

SS: He's allowing himself to enter into the drama, the scene of the fantasies as one participant among others.

JH: He's a member of the *dramatis personae*. He's in the cast.

SS: One amongst others.

JH: Yes, one among others. Now isn't that a huge insight just to begin with? Isn't that a huge relief for the egocentric human being of our time, who goes to his therapy and tries to work out his problems, when *this* says you're one among others. There are a lot of people in your house. You don't live alone.

SS: And transformations happen to this "I." The "I" becomes a greening being, a chameleon, it undergoes fantastic transformations. It's not a fixed human being.

JH: with a particular point of view. And it has to suffer challenges to everything this "I" brings.

SS: The sharpest example of that is at the beginning of *Scrutinies*, where Jung has this confrontation with the "I," which suddenly shifts. My "I," I have to live with you. How am I going to continue with this other entity?

JH: Now, just there we can translate that event into the language he uses in what you might call his conceptual work as relativization of the ego. That's a term he uses, or it becomes that way in English anyway. And that phrase doesn't carry anything, it's an abstraction that doesn't give the right value to what it really feels like.

SS: Paradoxically, if you're talking about relativizing the ego, the ego still remains in the central position, although its position is being decentred, relativized, and so forth, whereas what is evocative about this *Scrutinies* section is the "I" is itself personified. He sits and talks to his "I," addresses his "I." So the question is who is doing the addressing? It's left open.

P 208 209

SS: Compare it to the paucity of his references to Shakespeare.

JH: of course I don't want to go back to literature as a better study. But there's not much Jesus Christ in Shakespeare!



SS: I want to return to this question of why you stayed in psychology. My sense is that when you use "the word" it's an aspirational term.

JH: Yes.

SS: You still have a dream of psychology, of what it could be.

JH: Yes I do. I've no idea what that is. Maybe there's this great romantic dream of the restoration of the gods, the return of the romantic vision of Shelley, of Heine in a way, of Nietzsche in a way, of a world in which everything is psychological because everything is metaphorical and mythical. There's no split off other fallen world, in other words, this is a redemptive fantasy. It probably moves me, despite my skepticism. I think it's, as you say, aspirational. In a way it's more than aspirational, it's a very enlivening fantasy. It's like D. H. Lawrence, seeing how alive the world can be, even is. At the same time, I'm much more pessimistic than most other people I know. This is nothing I believe but it feeds my own thought.

SS: Losing the sense of aspiration for psychology was what took me out of it. I lost the hope that I would somehow be able to solve things where no one else had. That began to strike me as absurd, so I then turned to rummage within the cemeteries of past psychologies.

JH: You don't need that kind of aspiration. You must have an aspiration, of some sort, within the history of discovery.

SS: In a way, reflecting on it as we're speaking, part of what took me to psychology is still present there, even though it's no longer called psychology.

JH: That's good. That's what *has* you, even though it's no longer officially psychology. But that's partly because psychology's gone to pieces. It's not because you left it. It left you, and the search is still, in a strange way, for what makes it work, what makes the psyche work.

SS: And I'm fascinated with it. I'm not interested in any other area of historical inquiry.

JH: That's interesting, that sentence. I don't think that would-be admitted by historians generally, that their interest is in the deeper subject of their historical search rather than just "doing" history.

SS: To me, it's a question of having sufficient distance to encounter the phenomena at a different level. So then, for instance, I wrote at length about the history of dreams, purely because of my fascination with dreams, but then writing it gave me a new perspective on my own life and on how dreams became seen as disclosive of subjectivity. How I'd come to frame myself, or understand my own dreams, in a certain way. How I'd been taken by the subject so that in a way the process of self-understanding is still there, but in a very indirect way, when it tries to understand the formation of contemporary dream cultures. How they arise, how they form, how they mutate.