



The Ins and Outs of Living with Jung

by Van Waddy

Robert and Janis Henderson's *Living With Jung, Volume 1*, is a smorgasbord of memories, stories, and personal reflections about Jung by people who actually worked with Jung or knew him personally, as well as younger analysts who worked with people who knew and worked with Jung. Called "enterviews," each of the twelve chosen analysts fell between the ages of 58 to 96 at the time of their interview, have soul-grown wisdom of their own, and have written enough books themselves to fill a library. They each share their favorite story about Jung and explore their views on typology, spirituality, death, the afterlife, shadow, and the Self.

The Hendersons began with Adolf Guggenbuhl-Craig, age 70, in 1992, former Chair of the Institute in Zurich. Questions about shadow, sexuality and death were raised. "To live with

the shadow does not mean to be nasty, to steal, cheat, lie, or betray your friends. The shadow is *so* strong we always live it anyway. What we can do is become more conscious of how it insinuates itself into our lives, and thus avoid falling inadvertently into its 'hands'."

Jane and Jo Wheelwright, instrumental in establishing the Jung Institute in San Francisco in the 1940s, were 89 at their interview. They speak of their own analysis with Jung and Toni Wolff when they were in their twenties and claim that Jung's work on typology saved their marriage, opposites as they were. Their relationship forced them to recognize and deal with their inferior functions. No longer living, they spoke of death as "a returning to the cyclical creativity of nature."

Toni Frey-Wehrlin underwent analysis with C. A. Meier, with whom he later established the first and only inpatient Jungian psychiatric clinic in Switzerland, until they clashed in what Wehrlin describes as a father-son-shadow battle. He draws a picture of Jung as one not interested in mundane day-to-day matters, leaving parenting, financial support, and all household matters to Emma, who did everything so Jung was free to be Jung. Wehrlin, at 70, speaks of aging positively. "At 40, you think differently about God and the beyond than you do at 70. At 70, it becomes more interesting." "Analysis is important, but getting older allows for more shadow integration." Shadow holds less energy at that time and causes less damage.

Joseph Henderson, interviewed at 96 and still seeing patients at that age, wrote one of the five chapters in *Man and His Symbols* with Jung. He was one of Jung's patients when Jung was in his early 50s and reports that Jung, an extremely tall man, would "stride back and forth" during analysis, "talking and gesticulating, except that every now and then he would sit down and become very personal and very direct, and that was all inspiring and sometimes difficult." Jung's children, he says, had a "difficult time," as Jung made no time for his two daughters, and his son Franz later complained that his father gave him "no direction." When asked, What do you think happens at death?, Henderson responded, "I won't know until I get there." He speaks of old age as "filled with a sense of *being*. Life does not surprise me as it used to. I think life is just the way it is, and I am the way I am, and I don't need to keep telling myself that if I worked harder, I'd be more spiritually enlightened."

Thomas Kirsch, an analyst in Palo Alto, is the only child of Hilde and James Kirsch, co-founders of the Los Angeles Jung Institute and first generation Jungians. "Since both of my parents had analyzed with Jung, he was part of our household and a phantom that was behind everything that went on in my childhood." When asked why his parents and first generation Jungians had the need to idealize Jung, Kirsch points to World War II and said people in analysis with Jung at that time were abruptly cut off from Jung with no contact for six years; secondly, Jung's position in the world was marginalized by Freud's notoriety, causing Jung's admirers to defend Jung royally, in order to preserve their own identity. He explored at length the question whether or not Jung was anti-Semitic, citing Deirdre Bair's book that disclosed that Jung was Agent 488 in the OSS (Office of Strategic Services) and sent reports to Eisenhower. "As Jo Wheelwright has said, Jung was not pro-Semitic. He may not have been anti-Semitic, but he was not

Van Waddy is a licensed psychotherapist in Atlanta. (See www.vanwaddy.com)

pro-Semitic either.” Jo’s dad told him Jung was not interested in Judaism because he couldn’t find the numinous in it—until he discovered the Kabbalah literature. Then Jung became more positive toward Judaism.

John Beebe, who we Atlanta Jungians feel lucky to know personally, speaks of the defenses of the Self (“The Self violently resists developments that are encouraged along lines that are not natural to the person in question”) and of defenses *against* the Self (negative attitudes towards dreams and the unconscious; parents demanding their child to be another way than the child’s natural self). He spoke at length about his typology model.

Patricia Berry, who will speak to our Jung group this coming November, was the youngest ever to enroll in the Jung Institute in Zurich -- right out of college. She said she expected to find serious academic studies of Jung’s work there, but “found instead worshipful people telling stories.” She loved Von Franz best: “She would sit up there on the lecture platform with her legs splayed, her dirty fingernails, and hold forth with such passion and sparkle—it was truly exciting. She was the psyche.” I resonated with Pat’s sharings about spirituality, her own learning to *center*, to “step outside the spin,” how she has learned to “let go and drop until I land.”

James Hall, founding member of Inner-Regional Society of Jungian Analysts, was disabled by a brainstem stroke in 1992 that left him with locked in syndrome, quadriplegic and mute. Using a splint attached to his index finger, he continues to write essays and books. When asked about his stroke and how he understood Jung’s notion that God had an unconscious (*Answer to Job*), Hall responded, “Rather than say, ‘God has an unconscious,’ I prefer to say, ‘God exists in a dissociated state.’ Job believes there is a tendency in God toward order and justice, even if God is currently dissociated from it.” On afterlife: “I think we do survive death, the archetypal Self in each of us survives death. And since the ego, the ‘I’, is a specialized organ of the Self, one could say that it, too, ‘survives’.”

The author asks each analyst he interviews their understanding of Jung’s often-quoted “I do not believe in God. I know.” Joe Henderson clarifies that Jung’s remark was a defensive reaction to John Freedman’s “suspicious” approach with Jung in a film interview with Freedman. Freedman asked Jung if he had faith. “Jung said no, he didn’t need faith because his own experience of religion (or God) was not based on faith, it was immediate.” Some analysts responded to that question by saying *they* didn’t “know God.” Wehrlin said Jung meant the psyche has, by its nature, an image of God, the Self. Jo Wheelwright, who called God Albert, said Jung “knew by his own experience, not through religion.” Another, Russell Lockhart, who explored dreams as guests who bring choices which are meant to lead to action, spoke of Jung in the Gnostic sense: “It is my experience. Where the experience of the ‘other’ is so powerful and numinous, *there*, belief simply does not come into it.”

Each analyst was asked about the shadow, their personal shadow, and how they thought Jung dealt with his own shadow. “Not very well,” responded Pat Berry, “because Jung did not have an equal to help him. That is the danger of the big person-



Joseph Henderson—100th Birthday Celebration

ality.” Jo Wheelwright is quoted as saying he came to Jung’s house for analysis one day in 1938 and witnessed Jung throwing Jolande Jacobi down the stairs. Jung invited projections, the analysts agree, and Jung could/would exploit the transference people had with him to his own advantage. “He had a very arrogant side,” said Wehrlin. “Someone would ask a question and he would say, ‘Of course! Why do you ask such a thing!’” Murray Stein offered: “Jung was a lot like Goethe, a creative phenomenon of the mind and spirit on one hand and a somewhat banal bourgeois middle-class European man of his times on the other.”

Murray Stein, now living in Switzerland as Training Analyst in Zurich, also an ordained minister, was drawn to Jungian psychotherapy by what he had been seeking all his life—“a way to deepen and extend the spiritual life of the individual.” Stein explores the need for individuals within a marriage to work diligently on their own personal individuation process, something he calls integrity and, without which, marriage would lack genuine intimacy and depth.

Gilda Frantz, at 78, explored her work on loneliness, how a person’s alienation or alignment with the Self determines the extent of pain or meaning available in the experience of loneliness. She calls for each of us to be vigilant in making sure we are connected to soul and not being led by the outer world, the “voices” speaking to and at us every day. “It takes work and time to get to know whether the inner voice is actually internalized collective thinking or the promptings of the soul.”

All in all, Robert and Janis Henderson’s *Living With Jung, Volume 1* is a powerhouse of information, reflection, invitation and celebration. Their intention was to show Jung to be “a very ordinary man, who lived his life to the best of his ability, having as much difficulty with his shadow as he did with his genius.” This gives great comfort and encouragement to the rest of us.

I look forward to getting my hands on *Volume 2*.