

Appassionato for the Imagination

Russell A. Lockhart

Introduction

It was not a voice dream, nor was there a visual image. It was one of those “knowing” dreams, where you wake up with a sense of *revelation*, in this case, that what I was to write was to be an “appassionato for the imagination.”

The previous day, Murray Stein had asked me if I would be interested in contributing an essay to a book that would be titled, *Jung's Red Book for Our Time*— a project focusing on Jung's *Red Book* as a guiding resource for individuals trying to navigate the tortuous currents of the contemporary world.

I had not yet agreed to do this, but when I woke from this dream, I felt it necessary to say “yes,” feeling excited as well as daunted by the task the dream implied.

I experience dreams as the intentionality of something *Other*.¹ I prefer to say, “something Other” rather than “the unconscious,” as this latter term is tied to the limitations of the ego. I also call this the *presentational* psyche, because the dream presents itself, fully formed, *to* the ego of waking consciousness. I refer as well to the *invitational* psyche because dreams have a quality of “inviting” the participation of the conscious ego. I think of these qualities of *other*, of *presentation*, of *invitation*, as characterizing the *gravitational pull of the imagination*.²

I have dreamed “titles” before, and I have followed through and worked on projects that—until such dreams—I had no conscious knowledge of or intention of doing. I experience these dreams as “tasks,” tasks dreamed up by the Other, and presented to me, gift-like. *Appassionato for the Imagination* is a title that I would not have come up with

from my conscious standpoint or intentions. Giving the dream credence and credibility, and privileging it in this way, is a measure of the impact that Jung's psychology—as exemplified by his experiences recorded in *The Red Book*—has had on *me* both personally and as an analyst for more than forty years.³

As I wrote the dream, I was aware of Beethoven's *Appassionata*, even hearing some passages from that ground-breaking work. Beethoven was losing his hearing, but wrote what he heard in his imagination, wrote in such a way that no one could play it and no piano could endure it. As commentators note, Beethoven plumbed the depths of imagination more so than any other musician in spite of his deafness and the degree of his debilitating and dreadful physical illnesses.⁴ This is why so much of his music was and is *unique*.⁵

As a teenager, my piano skills had reached recital level. Beethoven's *Moonlight Sonata* and his *Pathétique* were in my repertoire, but the *Appassionata* was beyond me—a personal failure. As I was mulling on this, two images came together: the unhearing Beethoven plunging into imaginal depths, and Jung plunging into imaginal depths fearing the loss of his mind. Both men, unbowed by their fears and afflictions, plunged ahead, bringing forth enormous personal and cultural riches.

The dream felt as if bringing Beethoven and Jung together was part of the intentionality of the Other. To what end? It was not, I sensed, to do a scholarly piece on the parallels between the two men—though there are many and that would be a worthy task. The more I pondered, and let imagination too, have its say, it became clear that what was central to the two men's lives is what I must explore: *art* and *imagination*. Doing so

would constitute my answer to how Jung's *Red Book* would guide seekers in whatever "post-futures" await.

"That's not art!" ... "That is art!"

March 4, 1913. Fresh from his defeat in the 1912 presidential election, former President Theodore ("Teddy") Roosevelt, strode into the International Exhibition of Modern Art, now referred to as the "Armory Show," and waved his arms wildly as he stomped through the galleries pointing at paintings and sculptures and shouting, "That's not art!"⁶

Unlike some presidents, Roosevelt was no cultural buffoon. Historians have noted that he had the finest mind since Jefferson. This Nobel Peace Prize-winning president wrote, read and spoke five languages. He read two books a day on wide-ranging topics. He wrote constantly. And he wrote a scathing review of the Armory Show. A self-proclaimed "bull moose," he never minced words. He considered these modern art examples—particularly those of the Europeans—to be expressive of a lunatic fringe, as being pathological, as having no artistic merit, and not to be taken seriously. Roosevelt's views were expressing those of the clear majority of the more than a quarter-million visitors to the Armory Show. The exhibit aroused passions like no other before or since, and when it moved on to the Art Institute of Chicago, it met with riots.

While it is not possible to pinpoint the birth of modernism, it is, I believe, possible to pinpoint the public awareness of modernism as *threat*—to this exhibit. Roosevelt saw and felt and articulated the threat. In his view, the purpose of art was to serve the progressive development of a nation. No president did more for the arts in assuring that this would be the case in America. He believed that economic and military power were not sufficient

for the triumph of the American spirit, that *cultural* power was essential. He meant upholding representational, figurative, and decorative arts as being the preeminent and necessary mode for achieving this triumph.⁷ What he witnessed was the possible derailment of the cultural engine necessary for achieving America's manifest destiny, no matter how that was to be defined.⁸

What did Roosevelt see? Nothing expressing the hopes and desires of a nation, or of other nations' emulating the success of America. Instead, he saw the expression of individual and diseased minds, minds that had become dissociated from the "facts of the world," had lost all connection with the "reality" of representation, and glorified the pathology of extremist and dangerous individuals. He would agree with Leila Mechlin, then editor of *Art and Progress* at the time, who went so far as to ask: "Why do we so blithely tolerate these crimes in art?"⁹

Passions ran high as the negative press drew larger and larger crowds. Into this cacophony stepped another luminary: *C. G. Jung*.¹⁰ Jung made it a habit to visit art galleries, exhibitions, and museums, both in his native Switzerland and in his foreign travels. Attending the Armory Show would not have been unusual for him. Jung was not just a viewer of art. He had painted representational landscapes in oils and watercolors from the time of his youth, well into his adult years, and before his visit to the Armory Show. He made a point of exploring art traditions in most every culture.

Jung's aesthetics ran along traditional and representational lines, much like Roosevelt's. But in his youth, the works of the Swiss artist Arnold Böcklin attracted Jung—Freud, too, as well as Hitler, who acquired eleven of Böcklin's paintings. Böcklin's paintings tend to be dreamy and darkly Romantic in spirit. His series, entitled *The Isle of*

the Dead, was of special interest to Jung. In 1900 in Munich, Jung saw the work of Franz von Stuck who was inspired by Böcklin. Stuck's symbolist and highly erotic paintings and sculptures were at the center of the Munich Secession. Jung was impressed with Stuck's work.¹¹ Like many northern Europeans, Jung was already influenced by non-traditional and "strange," though still representational, images well before he encountered modern art in New York in 1913.¹²

Jung's negativity concerning modern art is well known and documented, perhaps no more strongly expressed than in his 1947 letter to Esther Harding. She had sent him a book of T. S. Eliot's poetry. Jung wrote to her: "I don't know T. S. Eliot. If you think his book is worthwhile, then I don't mind even poetry. I am only prejudiced against all forms of modern art. It is mostly morbid and evil...."¹³

He expressed his vitriol against modern art in his essays on Joyce and Picasso, published in 1932, and in various seminars and letters before and since that time.¹⁴

What *triggered* this deep-seated, long-standing complex?

I believe Jung's rejection of modern art stems from his experiences at the Armory Show. There is nothing to document this, but I think the possibility is worth drawing out. From 1900 to 1909, during his tenure at Burghölzli Psychiatric Hospital, Jung was exposed to the expressive work in drawing, painting, and sculpture of patients in various stages of mental illness, disease, and decay. Fragmentation, dissolution of boundaries, loss of representation, incoherence, loss of perspective, and extreme distortion were some of the outstanding characteristics of "patient art."

Jung looked at "patient art" with a scientific eye, aimed at psychiatric understanding of the patient's mental disorder. In this sense, what he saw at the exhibit would have been

“familiar.” All the *characteristics* of schizophrenic expression were here on display. He could take it in as a doctor and as a scientist.

But *something* got under Jung’s skin. I think it was the fact that what he was seeing was the work of *artists*, not patients—at a major, world-class exhibition, put on and arranged *by* artists. I can well imagine that Jung experienced something of the fear akin to what Roosevelt experienced—not as a concern for America’s manifest destiny, nor as a concern for the fate of European culture, but more that modern art *itself* was pathological and modern artists were analogous to schizophrenics, if not outright schizophrenic.¹⁵ This attitude became a fixation that did not change until shortly before Jung died. As I’ll illustrate, this change was enantiomorphic and led to what I consider Jung’s most important ideas relating to the future and, more precisely, in what sense his *Red Book* can be considered a guide. But back then, in 1913, aware of projection, as well as Freud’s recent allusion to Jung’s instability, there are reasons to suspect that Jung was troubled by his emotional volatility and that it heralded a breakdown.

In January 1913, three months before Jung went to New York, Freud suggested they break off their personal relationship, and Jung had acceded to this. Jung had written to Freud just before, claiming that “I am not in the least neurotic—touch wood! I have submitted...to analysis and am much the better for it.”¹⁶ This exchange of letters also reveals the degree of *emotional* swirl the two men were in with each other. Jung was still suffering Freud’s rejection of *Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido*, published in 1912, and later translated as *Symbols of Transformation*. Recall that the subtitle of this work was “An Analysis of the Prelude to a Case of Schizophrenia.” Jung most certainly would have been in a heightened emotional state over the collapse of their relationship when he was

face to face with the images of modern art for the first time, not as *patient* material, but as the expression of *artists*.

When he returned to Europe, he began to express serious concern about his mental stability, and this increased through the end of 1913 and beyond. He resigned positions, temporarily broke off the connection with his confidant Toni Wolff, began to play daily at lakeside building little structures, and broke off serious reading.¹⁷ Late in the year, Jung began to experience spontaneous and autonomous visions and voices and felt that he might be “doing a schizophrenia.”¹⁸ Jung wrote everything out in detail, but had difficulty understanding and interpreting what he was experiencing.¹⁹ In some frustration, he began to paint. In October 1913, he had a vision of the flooding of Europe, and this repeated a second time. Taking these images personally, he felt threatened with breakdown. He wrote that he thought his mind had gone crazy. Likely, in November, he asked an inner female figure what it was that he was doing. She unambiguously said: “It is art.” In a second conversation, she once again told Jung: “That is art.” He was riled and announced, like Roosevelt: “No, it is not art!” Jung says, “she came through with a long statement” following this second declaration.²⁰ This statement is unreported.

On December 12, 1913, he had the vision that initiated his full “descent” into the imaginal world that would become the raw material for *The Red Book*.²¹ Jung says he recognized the inner woman as “a patient, a talented psychopath who had a strong transference to me.”²² According to Shamdasani, the woman in question was Maria Moltzer.²³ Jung says, “she had become a living figure in my mind.”²⁴ What Jung leaves unsaid is that Maria Moltzer moved to Zurich in 1910 to be trained by Jung as a psychiatrist. She became a nurse at Burghölzli and was Jung’s assistant there working on child analysis. There are

indications that Jung had an affair with her, and he had been in analysis with her.²⁵ She became an analyst, became Jung's assistant and a most important and influential colleague.²⁶ She played major roles in the Jungian community. She was a talented artist. She developed what she called her "Bible" and kept writings and images of her psychic experiences in it and encouraged her patients to do so as well.²⁷ She was a primary influence on analyst Franz Riklin in turning him away from being an analyst and pushing him to become an abstract painter.²⁸ Jung was aware of this in 1913 when Riklin became a student of impressionist painter Augusto Giacometti. Later, Jung said he wanted to avoid Riklin's fate at all costs.²⁹

After seeing the Armory Show, and observing Riklin's decline, Jung saw art as a pathway to ruin and why he must avoid Riklin's fate. And he must deny any push from Maria Moltzer—inner and outer—in this direction. So, he must deny that what he was doing was art.

Anyone who encounters Jung's *Red Book* experiences it *as* art, no matter what else it may be. If what Jung was doing was *not* art, as he held for most of his life, what, then, *was* he doing? Or was it art after all? And if so, in what sense? And does it make any difference in discerning the nature of *The Red Book* as a guide in the coming time?

What Did Jung Do?

The Munich Secession of young artists in 1892 is considered the first major break with the tradition of outer world representational and figurative art that had always dominated the culture of art. These artists rebelled against not only cherished traditions, but also

against the authority of the industrial, mechanistic, and economic forces that held art prisoner. They reveled in art forms of more primitive cultures, of art from the east, art from the medieval period, and art from folk and mythic traditions. Munich was the center of these “experiments” in breaking down the hegemony of “the academy,” and focusing the origin of art on *the inner world as resource*. It was this scene in 1900 that Jung took in just before taking up his work with patients at Burghölzli at the age of 25.

Developments in the European art world during the first decade of the new century were fast and furious and led to many new “movements” and rapid “secessions.” One of the most influential figures to emerge during this period was Stuck's student, Wassily Kandinsky. It was not only because of his art—he is recognized as the “father” of abstract painting—but because of his writing on his conception of the “new” art.³⁰ He wrote: “I value only those artists who really are artists, that is, who consciously or unconsciously, in an entirely original form, embody the expression of their inner life, who work only for this end and cannot work otherwise.”³¹ The group that formed around Kandinsky’s aim was called “The Blue Rider,” after a 1903 painting by Kandinsky. By “inner life,” Kandinsky meant the artist’s *spiritual* life. In 1911, the year of his first abstract painting, he published, *Concerning the Spiritual in Art*. This influential and seminal work became the manifesto of modern art, and it remains today the foundational text. He worked to separate art from its dependence on the “real” world, to focus art on a “new” world, the *inner* world. Kandinsky called this the artist’s “inner need” to work from the promptings of the human soul. By 1912, *Concerning the Spiritual in Art* was widely known in Europe and the United States.

Kandinsky wrote that genuine art expressing the human soul was “prophetic.” Indeed, his soul was expressing apocalyptic images before the First World War that pointed to the coming catastrophe. Beginning in 1911, he worked these “inner necessities” into a series of paintings called “Compositions.” The allusion to music was deliberate, as Kandinsky yearned to create art that was as “abstract” as music was, that is, free of any dependence on representing the external world, free as it were to more fully express the realities of the inner world, reaching into the depths of the human soul.

Shamdasani, in his detailed introduction to *The Red Book*, describes how apocalyptic imagery was widespread and “in the air” at the turn of the century. He refers to Kandinsky’s 1912 description of the “coming universal catastrophe.” Jung does not refer to Kandinsky in any of his writings, letters, seminars, or in *The Red Book*.

While Kandinsky related to his apocalyptic images by painting them and creating a new art form (abstract art), Jung related to his apocalyptic visions as pointing toward possible madness and breakdown. Still, for both men, the outbreak of World War I, in August 1914, served to confirm the “validity” of these dark experiences, but in quite different ways. For Kandinsky, this confirmation of his inner apocalyptic experiences led to the deepening of his *already* developed theory of the prophetic nature of modern art arising from the artist’s inner need, his soul. For Jung, the confirmation of his apocalyptic experiences led to the realization that he was *not* mad, and he was not going mad, but that his experiences were giving birth to the development of a whole new psychology of the human soul and spirit, a psychology quite distinct from Freud’s psychoanalysis.³²

Jung may have seen Kandinsky’s painting at the Armory Show (“Improvisation No. 27: Garden of Love II.”). He may even have taken it as evidence of the madness that he

saw while he took in the paintings and sculptures. What Jung saw, set him against modern art for a long time and caused him to reject *as* art what he would do in relation to his inner experiences. It is clear, from the examples of Kandinsky and Klint (among *many* others), that artists having inner experiences similar to Jung's did *not* think of these experiences as portending madness. Instead, as artists, they related to these experiences through *expression*, giving birth to new art forms, essential contributions to the making of modern art.

What can be said, I believe, is that the experience of the deep psyche can be the basis for many forms of expression, discovery, development and creativity. The modernist impulse was illustrating this in *all* aspects of human culture, art, literature, and music as well as the sciences.

From the perspective of Jung's breaking away from the *dogma* of Freud, from his privileging inner experience over outer experience as a root "source," from his developing "new" means, modes and methods of discovery, Jung was every bit a "modern" despite his self-proclaimed rejection of modern art.

When Jung "fell" into the unconscious with his consciousness intact, though shaken to the core, he took what he experienced as *real*, as real as the outer world we call reality. This is the singular key to exploring one's psyche in the way that Jung records in *The Red Book*. It is the essence of what artists and writers and many others discovered in the same period. Jung experienced the *autonomy* of the figures he met, the geographies he explored, the time scales in which he found himself immersed. He quickly gave up any "agenda" from the outer world and learned that *he* was to be subject to the agenda of the inner world, the agenda of the Other. He realized early on that it was the immersive

experience *itself* that was necessary, the crucial step that could not be avoided. Still, the scientist and psychologist in him believed that it all needed understanding, explanation, interpretation, and its potentials drawn out. He realized as well that such work was a *separate* thing, but *not* the primary thing.

What he went through, what he recorded in dialogues, reflections, writings and images in *The Red Book*, is, I believe, the single best psychological example of what the great poet Wallace Stevens understood: “Not ideas about the thing, but the thing itself.”³³ *This is Jung’s great gift to the world.*

But how does one take the inner world as real, as Jung and others have done, without its being or becoming madness? There is no simple or single answer to this. When Harvard mathematics Professor George Mackey asked the patient, “How could you, how could you, a mathematician, a man devoted to reason and logical proof...how could you believe that extraterrestrials were sending you messages? How could you believe you are being recruited by aliens from outer space to save the world?” John Nash, one of the greatest mathematical minds of the twentieth century, responsible for fundamental changes in many fields, replied, “Because the ideas I had about supernatural beings came to me the same way that my mathematical ideas did. So, I took them seriously.”³⁴

The Nobel Prize-winning Nash is proclaiming that his schizophrenic hallucinations and delusions come from the same place as his mathematical ideas. He describes his ideas as coming to him as if fully-seeded, and that it was his labor to extract the growth potentials that would then become his fully-flowered contributions. This is what Jung did. He took his inner voices and visions seriously. But Nash ended up in the psychiatric ward, and Jung did not. There are few people who can, like Jung and on their own, work their

way out of a breakdown when madness threatens. And in today's world, any breakthrough of the autonomous psyche meets with immediate "treatment" in the form of medication to stop it. John Nash, following his recovery (after stopping psychotropic medications), felt that medication was highly over-rated and interfered with his recovery. But in today's world, it is unethical and unprofessional to treat such experiences any other way, according to consensus opinion, a basis that John Nash found intolerable in relation to reality as well as the mind.³⁵

How then, and in what way, can the *Red Book*, be a guide?

Jung's Imaginal Bounty

Looking back on his experiences recounted in *The Red Book*, Jung concluded that, "All my works, all my creative activity, has come from those initial fantasies and dreams which began in 1912...Everything I accomplished in later life was already contained in them, although at first only in the form of emotions and images."³⁶

It will take many years for scholars to trace the lines of development from *The Red Book* experiences to the completed major works. As Hillman and Shamdasani argue in *The Lament of the Dead*, most everything of consequence for a true understanding of Jung's work will need to be worked through again. This work is well underway, but no matter how rich the bounty of Jung's major works, I do not think this is the way to appreciate *The Red Book* as a guide for the coming time. We need to realize that what Jung was saying and doing—that the source of his great ideas, and his creativity in relation to them—was generated within his imaginal experiences of the Other. *That* was what provided the material for his greatest works, *that* was the source and origin of his ideas.

If the experiences of the Other hold the seeds of future development, as Jung says, then the crucial thing would be for *each* person to enter the *imaginal* ground and develop a relationship with the Other. What these experiences will be, what will be required to host them and to engage what the Other presents, cannot be predicted because it will be *unique* to each person. *The Red Book* tells the incredible story of what happened when Jung undertook *his* “experiment.” Its *contents*, as well as the fruit of those experiences, must not become an object of imitation. One must seek one’s own.

Jung says: “My science was the only way I had of extricating myself from that chaos. Otherwise, the material would have trapped me in its thicket, strangled me like the jungle creepers.”³⁷ Few would have such science as Jung had to deal with experiences of the Other. But my reading of *The Red Book* leads me to discount Jung’s notion that it was his *science* that enabled him to deal with the experiences. Rather, I believe it was Jung’s readiness and persistent entering the imaginal space where the Other presented itself, inviting Jung to participate in the *reality* of the Other, to host, day after day, what manifested. Jung’s eros *acts* of engagement in dialogue and expressive works of imagery I call the “Eros of Alterity,” the literal *doing* it. That to me is the critical factor. When consciousness takes this form in relation to the Other, the Other will bring forth what cannot be predicted, but will invariably, like dreams, bring forth the seeds of the future.

The Red Book, more than any other psychological document, lays bare the *story* quality of encounters with the Other, whether in dreams, visions, fantasies or Active Imaginations, including the expression of images (which are stories stopped in time). The importance of this is ignored, as most everyone wants to turn these experiences into “other” stories, stories called explanations, interpretations, understandings. These are

stories too, though clothing them in scientific garb disguises their nature. When this happens, we drop out of engaging psyche's unique stories. This can only be done through continuing the story on, by becoming participants (characters) in the stories, by following what is *next*. This ongoingness and the immersion in stories are clear in *The Red Book*, and are a major aspect of the “power” and “dramatic draw” of *The Red Book*. This is the art not only of *The Red Book* itself, but the art that Jung engaged in with the living presence of the Other. As Robert Olen Butler says, “Art does not come from ideas. Art does not come from the mind. Art comes from the place where you dream.”³⁸

Jung's Enantiodromia and the Coming Guest

In 1982, I suggested that one of the major keys to understanding the meaning and purpose of Jung's work lies in his September 2, 1960, letter to Sir Herbert Read.³⁹ Now that *The Red Book* is available, I suggest that this letter is also an essential key to understanding the implications of *The Red Book*, as well as to how it may serve as a guide to navigating the future.

The occasion of Jung's writing to Read was Jung's appreciation for Read's essay, “The Art of Art Criticism” published along with other's tributes celebrating Jung's 85th birthday.⁴⁰ The letter is long and complex—complex because Jung seemed to write in different voices in the letter. The first four paragraphs are a reprise of Jung's familiar scold against modern art with an emphasis on Joyce and Picasso. In the fifth paragraph, Jung becomes more reflective, ending the paragraph with a crucial question.

The great problem of our time is that we don't understand what is happening to the world. We are confronted with the darkness of the soul, the unconscious. It sends up its dark and unrecognizable urges. It hollows out and hacks up the shapes of our culture and its

historical dominants. We have no dominants anymore, they are in the future. Our values are shifting, everything loses its certainty, even *sanctissima causalitas* has descended from the throne of the axioma and has become a mere field of probability. Who is the awe-inspiring guest who knocks at our door so portentously?⁴¹

Jung returns to his antagonism against modern art by saying that the “creative artist will not trust it,” that is, what the awe-inspiring guest presents. I do not think this is true but is an example of Jung’s complex continuing to speak. The rest of the paragraph continues in this vein. The next paragraph brings Jung to express what I consider to be the central key to Jung’s published work including *The Red Book*:

We have simply got to listen to what the psyche spontaneously says to us. What the dream, which is not manufactured by us, says is *just so*....It is the great dream which has always spoken through the artist as a mouthpiece. All his love and passion (his "values") flow towards the coming guest to proclaim his arrival.⁴²

Here we have an extraordinary conception of the artist as a mouthpiece of the great dream, as welcoming the “coming guest.” It is clear that Jung here uses the “coming guest” as a metaphor for the essential nature of what visited him all those years ago beginning in 1912. And here, Jung says it is the *artist* who welcomes the coming guest. To me, this points to the unfolding enantiodromia of Jung’s complex against modern art. It is implicit that Jung declares himself an artist and his art as welcoming the arrival of the coming guest.

The next paragraph shows perhaps the last vestige of Jung’s railing against the negative aspects of modern art as showing “the intensity of our prejudice against the future.” This mischaracterizes the very nature of modern art—particularly its prophetic aspects described by Kandinsky and others.⁴³

The following paragraph articulates Jung's "new" voice about what is at issue:

What is the great Dream? It consists of the many small dreams and the many acts of humility and submission to their hints. It is the future and the picture of the new world, which we do not understand yet. We cannot know better than the unconscious and its intimations. There is a fair chance of finding what we seek in vain in our conscious world. Where else could it be?⁴⁴

To me, this is Jung's best description not only of the major purpose of his work but also of the nature of what he was doing in those early years that became the origin of his later and most profound work. This also indicates what *each* person can do to welcome the coming guest. It is an *individual* task. This individual task of welcoming the coming guest is the key to how *The Red Book* can be considered a guide in the coming time. It shows how Jung welcomed the coming guest and serves as a reminder to all of what is possible. Each person, in welcoming the coming guest, will have a different and unique experience. This is as it needs to be and as it should be. Jung's crucial point is made unmistakable by Harold Rosenberg:

Art consists of one-person creeds, one-psyche cultures. Its direction is toward a society in which the experiences of each will be the ground of a unique, inimitable form—in short, a society in which everyone will be an artist. Art in our time can have no other social aim—an aim dreamed of by modern poets, from Lautréamont to Whitman, Joyce, and the Surrealists, and which is embodied in the essence of the continuing revolt against domination by tradition.⁴⁵

Yes, the artist in *each* of us.

A few months before Jung died, he received a gift from a young artist as an expression of gratitude for Jung's work. It was an *abstract* painting. Jung wrote back to the artist and said, "...the religious view of the world, thrown out at the front door, creeps in again by

the back, albeit in strangely altered form—so altered that nobody has yet noticed it. Thus does modern art celebrate the great carnival of God.”⁴⁶ Jung’s inner battle with modern art was done, its enantiodromia complete.

Do what you can, *now*, to welcome the coming guest.

Endnotes

¹ Psychiatrists at one time were called “alienists” because they worked with psychic experiences “alien” to normal consciousness. The more modern, and postmodern term, “other,” has had a long and varied history in psychoanalysis, as well as the arts, literature, and criticism. I use the term here not so much in the technical sense of Lacan or Bion, or others, but in the simplest sense of *not constructed or constituted by ego consciousness*. I capitalize it to emphasize the *feeling* sense of “presence” and its myriad “personifications.” This use of Other also lessens the proprietary claims of the ego.

² These ways of seeing the dream (as well as other manifestations of experience originating outside of consciousness) are described more fully in my book, *Psyche Speaks* (1987; reissued 2015). The gravity I refer to, pulls the ego to engage the offerings of the Other *imaginally*. This contrasts to the ego pulling these offerings into interpretation, explanation, understanding, and other more familiar, favored, and proprietary narratives. For most, the former is weak and the latter is all consuming.

³ It was my privilege to experience some of the text and images of *The Red Book* during my early analysis with James and Hilde Kirsch in the 1960s. So, the impact of the material has been working on me for a long time. As Shamdasani notes in his *Introduction to The Red Book*: “Jung let the following individuals read and/or look at *Liber Novus*: Richard Hull, Tina Keller, James Kirsch, Ximena Roelli de Angulo (as a child), and Kurt Wolff.” He further comments that, “It appears that he allowed those people to read *Liber Novus* whom he fully trusted and whom he felt had a full grasp of his ideas. Quite a number of his students did not fit into this category” (C. G. Jung, *The Red Book: Liber Novus*. Edited by Sonu Shamdasani. Translated by Mark Kyburz, John Peck and Sonu Shamdasani (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2009), 215). I appreciated the trust the Kirsches expressed in me in letting me have access. After seeing the full published text and seeing all the images, it surely was a small part, but it made all the difference nonetheless.

⁴ In *Beethoven’s Hair*, Russell Martin tells the dramatic story of Beethoven’s “use” of his illnesses as a way of stimulating the depths of his imagination. See Russell Martin, *Beethoven’s Hair* (New York: Random House, 2002).

⁵ The most important and enlightening work on Beethoven’s uniqueness and his spiritual development is found in J. W. N. Sullivan’s *Beethoven: His Spiritual Development* (New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1954).

⁶ For an excellent review of the scene and a valuable perspective on the importance of the Armory show, see Rosenberg's 1963 review on the 50th anniversary in Harold Rosenberg, "The Armory Show: Revolution Reenacted." *New Yorker* (1963) April 6: 99-115.

⁷ The kind of art Roosevelt championed can best be seen in John Gast's "American Progress" (1872). A good reference with commentary and image is available from the Archive for Research in Archetypal Symbolism at https://aras.org/sites/default/files/docs/00043AmericanProgress_0.pdf

⁸ The term "manifest destiny" has undergone many changes in meaning since its first appearance in 1845. Underlying all is the root idea that America is "special," not only among nations but in the "eyes of God." This view is now in another upswing that affects everything. The best review of the oscillations and strength of "manifest destiny" is Ronald Schenk's *American Soul: A Cultural Narrative* (New Orleans: Spring Journal, 2012). For a review of this important book, see Russell Lockhart, "Review of *American Soul: A Cultural Narrative* by Ronald Schenk," *Psychological Perspectives* (2014) 57(4): 454-459.

⁹ Leila Mechlin, "Lawless Art," *Art and Progress* 4, 1913: 840-841.

¹⁰ There is no absolute documentation that Jung attended the Armory Show. Shamdasani has examined what evidence there is and concluded that "he likely attended the Armory Show," (Jung, C. G. *The Red Book: Liber Novus*. Edited by Sonu Shamdasani. Translated by Mark Kyburz, John Peck and Sonu Shamdasani. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2009, 203) adding that Jung discusses the art of Duchamp and Picasso together in the 1925 seminar. Jung would have seen the art of Duchamp and Picasso together at the Armory and this *direct* experience is the likely source because of so little in the way of reference material on modern art in Jung's library.

¹¹ Jung commented on Stuck's painting in *Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido*, published in 1912. Listing the many variations of dream content that is sexual in nature, he refers to the "variations of Franz Stuck, whose snake-pictures bear significant titles like 'Vice,' 'Sin,' or 'Lust.' The mixture of anxiety and lust is perfectly expressed in the sultry atmosphere of these pictures...." (Jung, C. G. *Symbols of Transformation*. Collected Works, Vol 5. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956, 8-9). Stuck's most famous painting, entitled "Sin," is shown in plate 10 of the book.

¹² From the standpoint of art, Jung's daytime personality was at home with the general representational and figurative contents of art. But from early on, it is arguable that his nighttime personality was drawn to something "darker," something "behind" and "underneath," at the very least, something "different." Thus, his attraction to the work of Böcklin and Stuck as well as his attraction to the occult. The same sense of difference applies to Hitler, whose daylight personality was attracted most of all to Vermeer, but whose nighttime personality was drawn to Böcklin and Stuck. Stuck was Hitler's favorite artist even in childhood. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Franz_Stuck).

¹³ July 8, 1947. See C. G. Jung, *Letters*. Edited by Gerhard Adler and Aniela Jaffé. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. Vol. I (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 469.

¹⁴ Late in life his assessment profoundly changed under the influence of Sir Herbert Read. I explore the significance of this further on.

¹⁵ Jung initially called Joyce and Picasso's art "schizophrenic," (Cohen, David. "Herbert Read and Psychoanalysis." In *Art Criticism since 1900*. Ed. Malcolm Gee. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993, 174) but in revised versions used the expression "analogous to."

¹⁶ Jung was making the point that analysis by someone else was more crucial than having only a self-analysis, as was the case with Freud. Freud scoffed at the notion that his own self-analysis would be inferior to Jung's being in analysis with Maria Moltzer (see endnote 23 for detail).

¹⁷ See Deirdre Bair, *Jung: A Biography*. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 2003), especially her detailed account of this period in Chapter 7, "My Self/Myself."

¹⁸ This characterization of the late 1913 period is from an interview with Jung by Mircea Eliade at the 1952 Eranos Conference. The interview, entitled "Recontre avec Jung," was published in *Combat: de la Résistance à la Révolution*, in Paris, October 9, 1952. An abridged version of this interview is available in *C. G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*. Edited by William McGuire and R. F. C. Hull (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977). In this interview, Jung recalls his troubled state in 1914, and remembers his lecture on schizophrenia to be delivered in Scotland, and says, "I'll be speaking of myself! I'll go mad after reading out this paper." (p. 233). After this lecture Jung learned that war had broken out, and he realized his dreams and visions were referring to the state of the world and not his mind. Jung says that deepening and validating and working out this relation between the collective unconscious and manifest reality occupied him from then on.

¹⁹ The difficulty with interpretation and understanding was essential in leading Jung to the decisive step of developing an entirely *different* basis of dealing with the interior flow of dreams, visions, voices, and other such manifestations. Jung's capacity to hold the tension and stay with the doubts and uncertainties of "not knowing" is an extraordinary example of Keats's "negative capability." For one of the best treatments of this essential idea, see Andrés Rodríguez, *Book of the Heart: The Poetics, Letters, and Life of John Keats* (Hudson: Lindisfarne Press, 1993), especially the chapter entitled, "The Penetratum of Mystery."

²⁰ See C. G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (New York: Random House, 1963), 186.

²¹ For the vision and the painting, see "Descent into Hell in the Future" in C. G. Jung, *The Red Book*, Chapter 5.

²² See C. G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, 185. Why Jung calls her a psychopath is not documented.

²³ For Shamdasani's identification of Maria Moltzer as the voice, see his *Introduction to The Red Book*, 199, and his 1995 article, "Memories, Dreams, Omissions," *Jung in Context: A Reader*, (ed.) Paul Bishop. London: Routledge 129. He says Jung knew her from 1912-1918. But Jung knew her as well at Burghölzli. Moltzer, a Dutch woman from a wealthy brewing family, became a nurse in order to combat the destructive effects of alcohol. In 1910, Jung wrote to Freud telling him that "between the two ladies there is naturally a loving jealousy over me" (Sigmund Freud, C. G. Jung, *The Freud/Jung Letters*, (ed.) William McGuire and Tr. by Ralph Manheim and R. F. C. Hull (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), 351-52). Jung was referring to Maria Moltzer and Fraulein Boeddinghaus (see p. 351, fn 2, and p. 352, fn 3). A few

months earlier, Jung wrote to Freud: “The prerequisite for a good marriage, it seems to me, is the license to be unfaithful” (ibid., 289).

²⁴ It was from this experience with her, that Jung developed the concept of anima, and the idea that it was through the anima that a man experiences his soul. Moltzer also originated the idea of the intuitive function, which Jung acknowledged (see C. G. Jung, *Psychological Types*. Collected Works, Vol 6 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971), par. 773, note 68).

²⁵ Freud wrote in a December 26, 1912 letter to Ernest Jones that Jung “is behaving like the florid fellow that he is. The master that analyzed him could only have been Fräulein Moltzer, and he is so foolish as to be proud of this work of a woman with whom he is having an affair.” See Sonu Shamdasani, *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology: The Dream of A Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 52). Jolande Jacobi, in her interview with Gene Nameche (interviewer for the Jung Oral Archives), said this about the affair: “I heard from others, about the time before he [Jung] met Toni Wolff, that he had a love affair there in the Burghölzli with a girl—what was her name? Moltzer.” For more complete discussion, see Sonu Shamdasani, *Cult Fictions: C. G. Jung and the Founding of Analytical Psychology* (London: Routledge, 1998), 57.

²⁶ Moltzer was considered one of the “feminine element...from Zurich (Freud, Sigmund and Jung, C. G. *The Freud/Jung Letters*. Ed. William McGuire and Tr. by Ralph Manheim and R. F. C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974, 440). She can be seen with the others in the photograph of those attending the 1911 Weimar Congress (Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung, *The Freud/Jung Letters*, insert between 444-445.)

²⁷ C. G. Jung, *The Red Book*, 204, ftn. 111. Shamdasani cites from the Fannie Bowditch Katz diaries, which have detailed records of her analysis with Moltzer as well as observations on many aspects of the analytical scene.

²⁸ Riklin worked with Jung on the word association experiments at Burghölzli and married Jung’s cousin, Sophie Fiechter (See Deirdre Bair, *Jung: A Biography*, 222). Shamdasani notes that Moltzer had argued that the unconscious was art and had convinced Riklin that he was a misunderstood artist and led him away from being an analyst (see Shamdasani, “Introduction,” *The Red Book*, 199). Mary Foote was one of the American modernists who exhibited at the Armory show. Years later, Jung was impressed by her paintings of American Indians and how she captured their inner spirit. He took on the “drab little painter” (Bair, Deirdre. *Jung: A Biography*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 2003, 361) for analysis in 1927, and soon she became the transcriber of Jung’s seminars. For a generous appreciation of Mary Foote, see Deirdre Bair, *Jung: A Biography*, 360-363.

²⁹ In a section omitted in the English edition of Jung’s *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, Jung speaks of the woman whose voice had told him his own work was art, and how this *same* woman “exercised a disastrous influence in men. She succeeded in talking a colleague of mine into believing that he was a misunderstood artist. He believed it and was shattered” (Sonu Shamdasani, *Cult Fictions: C. G. Jung and the Founding of Analytical Psychology*, 16). The colleague is most certainly Riklin, and the woman in question, Moltzer. It is this feature of hers that I believe forms Jung’s basis for calling her a psychopath, in the sense of over determining the life of another. Jung referred to Sabina Spielrein as a hysteric, never as a psychopath. This is a further

evidence that the anima voice was not Spielrein, as commonly assumed, but Maria Moltzer.

³⁰ If Kandinsky was the “father” of abstract painting, then it was Hilma af Klint who was the “mother” and who antedated Kandinsky by five years. Klint heard voices that announced, “You are to proclaim a new philosophy of life and you yourself are to be a part of the new kingdom. Your labours will bear fruit.”

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hilma_af_Klint) This sort of inner prompting led to her first series of abstract paintings in 1906, entitled, “Primordial Chaos.” She kept careful notes of her experiences which came to fill more than 150 notebooks and yielded more than 1200 paintings. She trained at the Swedish Academy of Fine Arts, but her real teachers were the figures she experienced in her inner world which she described as painting “through” her.

³¹ See Richard Stratton, “Preface to the Dover Edition” in Wassily Kandinsky, *Concerning the Spiritual in Art* (New York: Dover Publications, 1977), vii.

³² While most characterizations of the differences between Freud’s psychoanalysis and Jung’s analytical psychology focus on their theories and concepts, what needs more attention is the crucial difference between how experiences of the deep psyche are *related to*. This is made clear with the publication of *The Red Book*.

³³ Wallace Stevens, *The Collected Poems of Wallace Stevens* (New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1954), 534.

³⁴ Sylvia Nasar, *A Beautiful Mind* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1998), 11.

³⁵ Children come with a rich inner life, much of which becomes imaginal. This tends to be ever more neglected and suppressed as the child grows and the hegemony of the outer life nearly extinguishes the inner world. Central to a child’s early life is *story*. This is also the case when the inner life erupts into overwhelming experiences such as occur in psychosis. For a “story” approach to psychosis and other major manifestations of the disturbed mind, see George Mecouch, *While Psychiatry Slept* (Santa Fe: Belly Song Press, 2017).

³⁶ C. G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, 192.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ Robert Olen Butler, *From Where You Dream: The Process of Writing Fiction* (New York: Grove Press, 2005), 13.

³⁹ Jung’s letter to Reed (C. G. Jung, *Letters*. Edited by Gerhard Adler and Aniela Jaffé Translated by R. F. C. Hull. Vol. II (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 586-92) is one of only two illustrated letters in the two volumes of Jung’s letters. It is not clear why Jung’s letter to Karl Abraham in 1908 was chosen (C. G. Jung, *Letters*. Edited by Gerhard Adler and Aniela Jaffé Translated by R. F. C. Hull. Vol. I, insert between 4-5). But the Reed letter is of major historical importance and I believe the editors (Adler and Jaffé) recognized this. There is also a photograph of Reed’s visit to Kusnacht in 1949 (Plate III). At Eranos, in 1952, Reed gave a lecture entitled, “The Dynamics of Art,” in which he defended modern art and took Jung to task for his mistaken views on modern art. Jung walked out of the lecture, and this nearly ended their friendship. The rift healed. Reed, knighted in 1953, became the chief editor of Jung’s *Collected Works* along with Gerhard Adler, Michael Fordham, and William McGuire, with R. F. C. Hull as translator. It is intriguing, to say the least, that someone who was not an analyst was in this position. Sir Herbert Read was a poet, novelist,

literary critic and art historian and an avid proponent of symbolist and modernist art movements and their importance in education.

⁴⁰ C. G. Jung, *Letters*. Vol. II, 586, fn. 1.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 590. Adler cites Jung's earliest childhood dream (the phallus as man-eater dream) and a "parallel" figure ("the pilgrim of eternity") described by the Irish poet George Russell (known also as Æ) in his *The Candle of Vision*. Adler says this book had a profound effect on Jung, though Jung does not reference Æ in any of his writings or letters. Æ is important because he discovered active imagination in 1884 and worked his conversations with dream and imaginal experiences into his poetry and his paintings. For a detailed look at Æ's contributions, see Russell Lockhart, *Psyche Speaks: A Jungian Approach to Self and World* (Wilmette: Chiron Publications, 1987; reissued Everett: The Lockhart Press, 2015), especially the chapter entitled, "Æ's Augury."

⁴² C. G. Jung, *Letters*. Vol. II, 591.

⁴³ *Ibid.* Read replied to Jung's letter on October 19, 1960: "The whole process of fragmentation, as you rightly call it, is not, in my opinion, willfully destructive: the motive has always been (since the beginning of the century) to destroy the conscious image of perfection (the classical ideal of objectivity) in order to release new forces from the unconscious. This 'turning inwards'...is precisely a longing to be put in touch with the Dream, that is to say (as you say), the future. But in the attempt the artist has his 'dark and unrecognizable urges,' and they have overwhelmed him. He struggles like a man overwhelmed by a flood. He clutches at fragments, at driftwood and floating rubbish of all kinds. But he has to release the flood in order to get nearer to the Dream. My defense of modern art has always been based on this realization: that art must die in order to live, that a new source of life must be tapped under the crust of tradition" (C. G. Jung, *Letters*. Vol. II, 591, fn. 8). Read makes clear that modern art cannot be only based on the "spirit of the time," as Jung claimed, but in its various ways was expressing the "spirit of the depths."

³⁹ C. G. Jung, *Letters*. Vol. II, 591-592.

⁴⁰ Harold Rosenberg, "Metaphysical Feelings in Modern Art," *Critical Inquiry* 2 (1975) 217-232.

⁴¹ C. G. Jung, *Letters*. Vol. II, 604.

Bibliography

Bair, Deirdre. *Jung: A Biography*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 2003.

Butler, Robert Olen. *From Where You Dream: The Process of Writing Fiction*. New York: Grove Press, 2005.

Freud, Sigmund and Jung, C. G. *The Freud/Jung Letters*. Ed. William McGuire and Tr. by Ralph Manheim and R. F. C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Hillman, James and Shamdasani, Sonu. *Lament of the Dead: Psychology after Jung's Red Book*. W. W. Norton & Company, 2013.

Jung, C. G. *Symbols of Transformation*. Collected Works, Vol 5. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956.

Jung, C. G. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. New York: Random House, 1963.

Jung, C. G. *Psychological Types*. Collected Works, Vol 6. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.

Jung, C. G. *Letters*. Edited by Gerhard Adler and Aniela Jaffé' Translated by R. F. C. Hull. Vol. I. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.

Jung, C. G. *Letters*. Edited by Gerhard Adler and Aniela Jaffé' Translated by R. F. C. Hull. Vol. II. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.

Jung, C. G. *C. G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters*. Edited by William McGuire and R. F. C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.

Jung, C. G. *The Red Book: Liber Novus*. Edited by Sonu Shamdasani. Translated by Mark Kyburz, John Peck and Sonu Shamdasani. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2009.

Kandinsky, Wassily. *Concerning the Spiritual in Art*. New York: Dover Publications, 1977.

Lockhart, Russell. *Psyche Speaks: A Jungian Approach to Self and World*. C. G. Jung Lectures, Inaugural Series. C. G. Jung Foundation of New York, 1982.

Lockhart, Russell. *Psyche Speaks: A Jungian Approach to Self and World*. Wilmette: Chiron Publications, 1987 (Reissued Everett: The Lockhart Press, 2015).

Lockhart, Russell. Review of *American Soul: A Cultural Narrative* by Ronald Schenk. *Psychological Perspectives* (2014) 57(4): 454-459.

Martin, Russell. *Beethoven's Hair*. New York: Random House, 2002.

Mechilin, Leila. "Lawless Art." *Art and Progress* (1913) 4: 840-841.

Mecouch, G. *While Psychiatry Slept*. Santa Fe: Belly Song Press, 2017.

Nasar Sylvia. *A Beautiful Mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster. 1998.

Rodríguez, Andrés. *Book of the Heart: The Poetics, Letters, and Life of John Keats*. Hudson: Lindisfarne Press, 1993.

Roosevelt, Theodore. "A Layman's Views of an Art Exhibition." *Outlook* (1913) 103: 718-720.

Rosenberg, Harold. "The Armory Show: Revolution Reenacted." *New Yorker* (1963) April 6: 99-115.

Rosenberg, Harold. "Metaphysical Feelings in Modern Art." *Critical Inquiry* (1975) 2: 217-232.

Schenk, Ronald. *American Soul: A Cultural Narrative*. New Orleans: Spring Journal, 2012.

Shamdasani, Sonu. "Memories, Dreams, Omissions." *Spring Journal of Archetype and Culture* 57, 1995.

Shamdasani, Sonu. *Cult Fictions: C. G. Jung and the Founding of Analytical Psychology*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Shamdasani, Sonu. *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology: The Dream of A Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Stevens, Wallace. *The Collected Poems of Wallace Stevens*. New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1954.

Sullivan, J. W. N. *Beethoven: His Spiritual Development*. New York: Random House, 1960.