

Christina von Braun

The Unconscious as Bridge and Barrier to Living with the Other

(Conference: Paideia, 25 Years, 250 Years of Judaism in Sweden, May 2025)

You may wonder why I am bringing the unconscious into play with this topic. There are several reasons. First of all, the unconscious is very present in every question concerning our contact to others. Secondly, the unconscious has become the focus of many current political conflicts: in terms of domestic politics, parties often compete for the emotions of the electorate; in terms of foreign policy, digital influencing, social media and fake news have become important weapons. The resulting polarization of society is anti-intellectual and one of the reasons for the current rise in anti-Semitism in many countries. This was already true at the time of the Dreyfus Affair in France in the late 19th century, when the people who fought, together with Emile Zola, against the falsified conviction of Captain Dreyfus were defamed as “les intellectuels”. It was true in Nazi Germany, where “Jew” and “intellectual” became interchangeable terms; and it is also true today for the attacks being launched by some governments against academics and university students.

The term “unconscious” did not make its appearance with the beginning of psychoanalysis around 1900. The term emerged a hundred years before Freud, with thinkers, writers, poets and philosophers who wanted to avoid the word God but wished to maintain some kind of an omnipotent power. All of them came from a Protestant background, where - thanks to the Reformation - the process of secularization had begun earlier than in the Catholic world. The fact that Catholics were somewhat belated in this respect explains the radicalism and violence with which secularization finally took place in their culture. The philosophers of the “Lumières” strictly rejected any reference to the divine, while the French Revolution finally disempowered not only the nobility but also the Church.

With their invention of the unconscious, the Protestants had created their own kind of enlightenment. Under their influence, the transcendent “soul” became the terrestrial “psyche”. The concept of the unconscious offered a smooth transition from God to the human ego. The former characteristics of the divine – omnipotent, omniscient, creator of the world and master of the human being – were still there but now transferred simply to this field that happened to be within the human being. This became especially clear in the case of Friedrich Schleiermacher, who led a parish in Berlin and published widely read books. Religion, he said, is “contemplation and feeling” and has its own “province in the mind”.¹ His contemporary, the philosopher Schelling, spoke of the “absolute” or the “eternal unconscious”² - a concept that a scholar has described as a “governor of the not yet dead, but already dying God, to guarantee the endangered immortality of the soul”.³ Other writers looked upon the unconscious as a purely psychological concept, they declared it to be a *terra incognita*, an area awaiting exploration and cartography. Thus, in 1804 the writer Jean Paul proclaimed: “But we make far too small and narrow a measurement of the wealth of the ego if we leave out the immense realm of the unconscious, this true inner Africa.”⁴ The basically colonial idea that otherness had to be explored and then occupied already took shape and was to become stronger as time went on.

The ideas about the unconscious had started with philosophers and writers but soon spread to medicine and the natural sciences. In 1846, the physician and natural philosopher Carl Gustav Carus published a work on the psyche.⁵ The very first sentence, written in italics to emphasize it, sets the agenda: *"The key to understanding the nature of the conscious soul lies in the region of the unconscious"*. Carus calls for a "science of the soul" because "by far the largest part of our soul life rests in the unconscious".⁶ He thought of the conscious quite openly in terms of racial theory: For him, there were the "day peoples", which included the Europeans, the Arabs, Semites, Persians, who, according to him, were endowed with a higher consciousness, in contrast to the "night peoples" of Africa.⁷ East Asians and Indians were "peoples of dawn and dusk". Only the "day peoples" were considered as carriers of culture. Carus' hierarchical division of the world into higher and lower cultures was adopted by authors such as Arthur de Gobineau, whose writings were formative for the racial theories of the 19th century.⁸ Ultimately, they can also be found in Freud's comparison of the unconscious with the "indigenous population of the psyche".⁹ Descriptions like these are a sign that the question of otherness was deeply embedded in the discussion about the unconscious

By the middle of the 19th century, the unconscious had become a topic for bestsellers. For example, Eduard von Hartmann's *Philosophy of the Unconscious* was published in 1869 and then re-edited nine times within a few years. In the second volume, *Metaphysics of the Unconscious*, Hartmann elevated the unconscious to a new omnipotence. *"The unconscious does not waver or doubt, it does not need time for reflection but grasps the result instantly."*¹⁰ This already strong statement is followed by a sentence that sounds as if the Protestants had erected their own Holy See for the unconscious: "The unconscious does not err."¹¹ (The Catholic Church had proclaimed the dogma of papal infallibility a few years earlier).

This series included many more theorists, ending with Nietzsche, who was on one side the son of a Protestant pastor, but on the other hand the first in this line of Protestant philosophers to explicitly declare the death of God. For Nietzsche there was the omnipotence of the unconscious and nothing else: "'I think' does not apply. A thought comes when 'it' wants to, not when 'I' want it to do so."¹² At the same time, he formulated both the program of psychoanalysis and the obstacles to its implementation, decades before Freud was on the stage. "All expansion of our knowledge arises from making the unconscious conscious. The only question is what sign language we have for this."¹³

Given this long proto-Christian history of the unconscious, how come that it was almost exclusively Jews who invented psychoanalysis, this discipline that revolves around the unconscious? The answer is complicated. These Jews did not define themselves as religious. They were shaped by the process of secularization that many Christians had also undergone. And just as those had become cultural Christians, they were now cultural Jews: they no longer attended synagogue (or at most on the high holidays and out of obligation to tradition), and they no longer observed religious rules. Nevertheless, they were committed to Judaism. Its ways of thinking had become part of their psychological structure or, if you like, their unconsciousness.

What was the Jewishness these intellectuals stood for? As you know, from the late 18th century onwards, two ways of thinking Judaism had developed: on the one hand the Haskalah, the Jewish Enlightenment, and on the other Orthodoxy, which only made sense when it

became conceivable for some Jews to think and live a Judaism outside the synagogue - a "cultural" Judaism. The split had resulted from the process of Christian secularization, which had left the religious grounds, but established many of its old ways of thinking on a secular level as the example of the Protestant history of the unconscious shows.

By rejecting the turn towards the Enlightenment and secular modernity, Jewish orthodoxy renounced an important characteristic of traditional Judaism: flexible exegesis. It was one of the reasons for the longevity of Judaism: on the one hand, an unchangeable sacred text, the 36 Holy Scriptures, in which no letter could be altered; on the other hand, changing even contradictory interpretations, which ensured the constant renewal and adaptation of teaching to the current historical situation and the surrounding societies in which Jewish communities lived as minorities. It was an interaction between scripture and orality. For Orthodoxy, only the text, considered to be unambiguous, was valid. Enlightened Judaism, by contrast, adhered to the principle of flexibility, while shifting it to the political and cultural world, where it was called doubt, reflection, skepticism.

Christian religion had condemned doubt as one of the deepest sins while insisting on the unambiguousness of scripture. The Church allowed for new texts to appear but given no room to oral exegesis. Yet, with secularization, things fermented here too – a change that came about because the dominance of writing had led to a dead end. In the beginning, the belief in the supremacy of the written word had implied devaluation, even suppression of orality. By the time the value of spoken language was rediscovered around 1800, it had become a controlled form of orality, reorganized according to the logic and laws of writing. Writing theorists call this "secondary orality". In fact, the difference between writing and orality had been eliminated, everyone spoke as they wrote and vice versa – but this form of patronized language increasingly came into conflict with any form of creativity and cultural renewal.

Freud and other enlightened Jews used secondary orality; they were obliged to if they wanted to play a role in European culture and science. Educated Jews like him had gone through a humanistic education; they knew the texts of Greek antiquity inside out; Freud's teachings are almost all named after figures from Greek mythology. Thus, by embracing enlightenment and science, Jews suddenly found themselves in a tradition that tolerated orality only insofar as it was subordinate to the laws of scripture. They had imbibed a way of speaking and thinking that did not correspond to Jewish traditions.

It is in this highly difficult situation, Jews – above all Freud – were increasingly attracted by a third language. A language that was located between the two poles of orality and writing: the language of the unconscious, which made the body its mouthpiece. Freud read the symptoms of hysterics as body language. By allowing the body to "speak", the hysterics, who guided Freud's discoveries of the unconscious, had become the embodiment of a "hidden" language that resisted the "tutelage" of writing.¹⁴

It was this unconscious which interested the Jewish intellectuals, and it was of course quite different from that of the Protestant thinkers and theorists who had emerged from the Christian traditions. At the same time, this unconscious showed a way out of the impasse into which the tutelage of spoken language by Scripture had led the intellectual and creative life of Jews and non-Jews alike. Freud often used images from the history of writing when discussing

the functioning of the unconscious: he spoke of the rebus, of hieroglyphics and described dreams as “sacred texts”.¹⁵ At the same time, he described psychoanalysis as an “exegetical method” that requires the signs of scripture to be “productively received”¹⁶ – not unlike Jewish traditions that interpreted the Holy Scriptures by oral exchange. The discovery of this third language and the associated commitment to ambiguity was the great innovation that psychoanalysis had in store. And it implied a new approach to the question of the unconscious.

Just as there have always been historical periods in religious history in which Jewish and Christian theology entered into a constructive dialogue with each other, it would have been possible to build a bridge between the Protestant and Jewish concepts of the unconscious - the present shows that there is room for the coexistence of different ideas about the human psyche. But in the first half of the 20th century, things looked different. This showed clearly when it came to the clash between Carl Gustav Jung and Sigmund Freud. Freud had initially chosen Jung as his successor. With the pastor's son, he hoped to counter the image of psychoanalysis as a “Jewish domain”. The hope proved to be a mistake. Jung was to mutate into one of the worst enemies of Freudian psychoanalysis - among other things by claiming that there was a Jewish and a Germanic unconscious. Conflicts that seemed more or less overcome with secularization were back again, but the new battlefield was not religion, but the psyche.

Jung's image of the unconscious had little to do with ambiguity and flexible exegesis. In his eyes, the unconscious consisted of two “layers”: on the one hand, the “personal unconscious”, which depended on the individual biography and “could just as well be conscious”.¹⁷ The other unconscious was collective. It was related to what Jung described as “archetypes”, considered as “the foundations of the conscious soul hidden in the depths.” Jung proclaimed them to be an “effect of the earth.”¹⁸ As Jews lived in dispersion and had no “earth” of their own, they could have no part in this collective soul rooted in the ground.

The example of Jung clearly shows along which line the new split followed: on the one hand, an unconscious with a high tolerance for ambiguity, and on the other, an unconscious that strives for unambiguousness. On the one hand, an unconscious that demands a flexible reading; on the other, an unconscious that claims an immutability of the human psyche. On the one hand, an unconscious that leads to self-reflection through doubt; on the other, an unconscious that is subject to the fate of the collective psyche. Freud and his colleagues never classified the unconscious in “Jewish” or “Christian”, but Jung's ideas were based on this cleavage.

With his ideas of a “racially” inherited “collective unconscious”, Jung was even more radical than many racist theorists of his time. He regarded the “Jewish unconscious” as a product of the “Jewish body” and demanded that the “actually existing and obvious differences between Germanic and Jewish psychology” should no longer be blurred. With psychoanalysis as a “Jewish creation”, the Jewish mind had, so his insinuation, created an instrument for the destruction of other cultures.¹⁹

Freud's books were burned on May 10, 1933. On September 15, 1933, the German Institute for Psychological Research and Psychotherapy was founded. It was located in the same offices that had previously housed the world's largest and most prestigious psychoanalytical institute,

named after Karl Abraham. C. G. Jung was appointed editor of the *Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie*. In an editorial from early 1934 on the state of psychotherapy, he stated: "The Aryan unconscious has a higher potential than the Jewish unconscious." He called it "a serious mistake of medical psychology to date that it transferred Jewish categories" to "Christian Germanic tribes and Slavs".²⁰ Statements like these clearly show that where a boundary had previously been drawn between Jewish and Christian religion, a boundary was now drawn between a Jewish and an Aryan psyche. Around one hundred and fifty years after its first mention, the unconscious had become the terrain of a secular cultural war against the Jews – a struggle that was also directed against the "intellectuals" and everything that had to do with reflection and doubt. Not much different from the current culture war against "wokeness" in the USA and some other countries.

This new demarcation explains that - contrary to what the National Socialist defamation of psychoanalysis as a "Jewish science" might suggest - psychoanalysis was not abolished after 1933, but on the contrary massively promoted. Needless to say, it was a different kind of psychoanalysis. It was a psychoanalysis without Jews. In the 1930s, 190 Jewish analysts fled Germany, soon those of Austria were to follow. Most of them emigrated to the USA, which was to become the center of psychoanalysis within a few decades. Parallel to this "cleansing" of psychoanalysis, which can also be understood as a "purification" of the German unconscious from its Jewish components, the National Socialist occupation of the soul began.

The management of the Berlin institute was entrusted to the neurologist and lawyer Matthias H. Göring, a cousin of Hermann Göring. In December, he reported in the *Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie* that the new professional association invited those doctors to join "who are willing to train and practice the art of healing in the spirit of the National Socialist world view. The Society requires of all its members who are active as writers and speakers that they have worked through Adolf Hitler's fundamental book *Mein Kampf* with all scientific seriousness and recognize it as their foundation. It wants to cooperate in the work of the People's leader to educate the German people to a heroic, self-sacrificing attitude."²¹ Göring announced the rise of a new "German psychoanalysis", the aim of which was to establish itself as a "fighting organization for the Führer's biological idea" and to raise "psychotherapeutic storm leaders" ("psychotherapeutische Sturmführer").²² For him, the task of German psychotherapy was "not only to cure the sick, but also to make the healthy fit for use", because "the unity of mind and will of a nation must be valued higher than the freedom of mind and will of the individual".²³

With the beginning of the war, the institute became an important instrument of warfare. It collaborated with several Reich offices relevant to ideology and martial training: education, health, labor, criminal police, public education and the Reich Ministry for mass information and propaganda. In 1943 and 1944, when the war took on its "total dimensions", additional funds were approved: for psychological warfare, the training of military psychologists, the treatment of war neurotics. At the same time, the state commissioned psychological studies on the Soviet Union, the USA, England, France and Czechoslovakia. They were intended to help identify the enemy's "weak points" as well as weaknesses at home; psychological warfare and "collective soul guidance" merged.²⁴ Within a few years, the healing and cognitive method of psychoanalysis, which had begun as a means of reflection on the self and the other became the mediator of a new faith. The tools had changed slightly; the territory remained the same:

the psyche. But the goal of the “treatment” was completely different: the unconscious became the target of a domination of the other.

At this point, I invite you to take a closer look at the difference between trust and faith. Both are inherent parts of the human condition - and at the same time opposites. Trust is the basis of any kind of community building and coexistence. The American social psychologist Timothy Levine, who has conducted extensive empirical research on the issue of trust, writes that the tendency to trust others is “an adaptive consequence of human evolution; it enables efficient communication and social coordination” and allows “humans to function socially”. While trust can be betrayed or let down, in the majority of cases it forms a firm and often unconscious bridge between people. Most deceptions, according to Levine, “are committed by a few prolific liars, so most of the time we are right to trust in others, even if this trust makes us susceptible to occasional deception.” This however, he writes, poses less of a threat to the survival of the species than the loss of trust.²⁵

Unlike trust, faith must be learned, trained, suggested or imposed. Faith is exclusive, there is only one truth, everything else falls under “lies”. Trust tolerates the other truth alongside its own. Faith must assert its own position resolutely, even ruthlessly. Trust is given; faith, on the other hand, is considered, decreed, even enforced. There are fanatics of faith, whereas the term “fanatics of trust” makes no sense. Faith does not have to be religious, it can refer to an ideology or an institution such as “the party”. Its representatives generally protect themselves by appealing to a higher authority: God, nation, providence, a political program. However, faith is a precarious matter, because it requires the willingness, indeed the will, to believe in something. Innate trust, on the other hand, “grows”, it is not intentional, whereas faith leaves little room for what happens “by itself”. Because it is closer to consciousness - it always has its origin in a text, a doctrine or a confession - faith is better suited to hierarchical structures and violence than trust. Autocrats never rely on trust, only on faith.

In 1944, the economic and social theorist Karl Polanyi published his book *The Great Transformation*, in which he described the process of industrialization as a shift from community to society. In the former, a collective set of rules - such as the principle of the circulating gift, as described by Marcel Mauss, or the Torah, with its diverse, even contradictory interpretations - determines the behaviour of the individual; in the latter, the self-determined individual, derived from the free market economy, dominates. With this disintegration of the community, people were left to themselves. Polanyi’s book ends with the question of whether fascism, which triumphed in many countries in the first half of the 20th century, did not exert such an attraction because it promised to restore the old communities of trust. This explains, according to him, the fact that fascism emerged simultaneously in different regions and under different political and economic conditions. “There was in fact no kind of tradition of a religious, cultural or national nature that immunized a country against fascism once the conditions for its emergence were in place.”²⁶ His conclusions impute that fascism pretended to restore the old communities of trust, but in fact installed communities of faith. The terrain on which this deceptive maneuver took place was the unconscious.

Today, we are in a comparable situation. A recent study stated: “For the first time since 2004, our Transformation Index (BTI) shows more autocratic than democratic states. Of 137 countries surveyed, only 67 are still democracies, while the number of autocracies has risen to 70.”²⁷

The reasons for the crises are new: climate change, the battle for water or energy resources, unpredictable financial speculations, algorithmic manipulations. They have contributed to turning trust into an increasingly rare commodity. But the reactions are similar as in the beginning of the 20th century: a growing belief in autocratic systems. In this situation, where the survival of liberal society is at stake, there is an ever rising need to defend it – not through weapons, but rather through the support of psychological and intellectual resilience, and this is where trust come in.

In my conclusion, I would like to show that the unconscious has not only been a terrain of manipulation but also offered a high potential for resistance - due to its high flexibility, which allows it to adapt to different historical and political contexts, a characteristic, not by chance, comparable to the Jewish tradition of flexible exegesis of the Holy Scriptures.

Ever since the early 20th century, the psyche has moved to the center of power struggles - and there is some evidence that this was one of the reasons for the emergence of psychoanalysis. With the reflection it demanded, psychoanalysis offered a certain resistance to the process of manipulation. In the totalitarian state, faith had widely, but not completely, destroyed trust. Yet, the pre-existence and spread of psychoanalytical insight before 1933 contributed to creating a resilient unconscious. Until the Nazi takeover, knowledge of psychoanalytic processes was much more widespread than the number of people who had undergone analysis or acquired psychoanalytic theories would suggest. Psychoanalysis had become the basis of an implicit knowledge of society - just as today the space that a society allots to reflections on the unconscious is an indicator of its capacity for democracy as well as its mobility and ability to survive. In the first decades of its existence psychoanalysis concentrated on the individual, but from the 1930s onwards it started to look at collective processes. Dreams became, as Barbara Hahn put it in her book *Endless Night*, “historical material”: “All major incisions and upheavals in the history of the last century were registered, documented and reflected upon in dreams. In dreams, as dreams, it was explored how these caesuras can be thought of.”²⁸ Some of the dreamers of this time knew while they were dreaming that their dreams were “controlled” and produced by the surrounding political situation. They grasped the influence of dictatorship on their unconscious. It is due to this that these dreams offer us clues as to how terror “functioned” and how totalitarian states were able to establish themselves in the collective and individual unconscious.

We owe one of the most important documents on the direct influence of the totalitarian state on the unconscious to the journalist and author Charlotte Beradt, who collected the dreams of people in the first years of the Nazi dictatorship. By the time she fled in 1939, she had collected around three hundred dreams, which she considered a testimony of this period. Beradt transcribed the dream reports using codes and sent them, disguised as letters, to addresses abroad, where she found them after her departure.²⁹ Beradt was not a psychoanalyst - and in her comments on the dream collection she avoided psychological interpretations. These dreams, she states, had “their roots directly in the soil of the political present surrounding the dreamers, from which they grow and proliferate.”³⁰

Beradt first reported on her collection of dreams about the Third Reich in the American magazine *Free World* in 1943.³¹ In her essay, she described how she woke up one night in a cold sweat from dreams in which she was “shot at, martyred, scalped”. This had happened

before but that night, she “suddenly thought that I was probably not the only one among thousands and thousands who were condemned to such dreams by the dictatorship. What happened in my dreams also happened in theirs.”³² She then began to “systematically collect reports of dreams under the dictatorship”.³³ Beradt called her dream documents “night books”. In contrast to diaries, they were the result of “involuntary psychic activity” - yet these documents meticulously record “the effect of external political events on the human interior” like a seismograph. They were “dreams dictated by the dictatorship”.³⁴ At the same time, the dreams exaggerated the facts, made a parody of the ideology. The dreams themselves were a form of resistance by revealing the precariousness of the Nazi faith.

To give you a few examples: a doctor dreamed that his apartment no longer had walls and that a voice bellowed from the loudspeaker: “According to the decree on the abolition of walls from the 17th of this month ...”. A civil servant dreamed “bureaucratic atrocity tales” in which he invented telephone monitoring offices, a “training department for the installation of eavesdroppers in the wall” and a “decree against bourgeois arrears among municipal officials”. One woman dreamed of a talking bedside lamp that “instead of spending light, brings to light what she has said in bed with loudspeaker power”.³⁵ In these early years of the regime, anxiety dreams were mainly triggered by “the myriad of authorities and offices, laws, prohibitions and punishments”.³⁶

Already in the early years of National Socialist rule, people's awareness of permanent surveillance was very present, even among children. One young girl dreamed that “the two little angels hanging above my bed no longer look up, but down and watch me closely”.³⁷ At the same time, the dreams revealed that the unconscious had installed instances of self-observation, that the intellect perceived how the ego came under pressure to conform. In Beradt's “night books”, the dreamers took precautions similar to those in real life. A math teacher dreamed that she fled to a bar (“I have never entered such a place in my life”), pulled “a thin piece of paper out of her pocket” and wrote down “a few equations in invisible ink, in mortal fear”. The very fact of knowing something - of knowing something verifiable - was fraught with fear. One man dreamed that “by precaution, I speak Russian in my dream (which I don't know at all) so that I don't understand myself and so that nobody understands me if I say something about the state, because that is forbidden and has to be reported”. Another told a “forbidden joke in a dream, but out of prudence falsely, so that it no longer makes sense”. Yet another dreamed only in rectangles, triangles and octagons, “because it is forbidden to dream”. Beradt's comment: “Here someone has decided to dream abstractly out of caution.”³⁸

Dreams could not endanger the regime. Yet, they were symptomatic of the changes in the individual unconscious during the dictatorship and an impetus for reflection. Some of the witnesses also understood their dreams as forewarnings, opening up the possibility of an “inner or outer emigration”, as the historian Rainer Koselleck writes in his epilogue.³⁹ Alone the fact that the dreamers remembered their nocturnal stories and wrote them down, shows an awareness of the political situation. A non-Jewish young woman, who feared being mistaken for a Jew because of her protruding nose, dreamed that she managed to present a certificate about her grandmother at the “Office for Proof of Aryanity” (which did not exist in reality). The official “takes the certificate, tears it to shreds and burns the shreds in an oven

built into the wall: 'Are you still pure Aryan now?' The dream reveals, in passing, that "race" was in fact a bureaucratic category. The regime never managed to give an exact definition of the terms "Aryan" and "Jewish".

What is missing in this collection are the dreams of the Nazis, writes Bruno Bettelheim in the afterword to the English-language edition of Beradt's book.⁴⁰ Are they really missing? Is it not more correct to say that the perpetrators turned their dreams into reality? Which might explain their lack of dreams. Perhaps they were obsessed with the task of turning their fiction into facts. Or more precisely: perhaps they believed in everything but the unconscious. In any case, hardly any of them ended up on the couch after the war - where the survivors told and retold their nightmares, often only late in life.

The terror was not dreamable - and yet there were dreams in the concentration camps, and they had their role in increasing resilience and trust. A good example are the accounts of the French writer and camp survivor Jean Cayrol. In his 1950 essay *Lazare parmi nous*, the poet described the life-sustaining power of dreams for him and other prisoners in the concentration camps.⁴¹ "In this fiat nox, the dream became the almond kernel that nothing was allowed to break; untouched and intact, it concealed the secret that allowed some to survive and the miraculous explanation of their salvation. The dream helped them to contain the evil; everything was taken from the prisoner, but he kept what was essential. He kept the dream that became reality." However, Cayrol's dreams changed over time: while they were initially a protective shield, a retreat from the reality of the concentration camp, they took on an increasingly gloomy form as his physical strength diminished: comparable to "a wintry garden with black trees through which the icy wind blew; disaster awaited me; you could already read the future in these images". When the body reached a state that hardly allowed it to leave the cell, the ego withdrew into the "last coil of its unconscious" and dreamed up "the most precious miniatures of a landscape, for example a clearing at eight o'clock in the morning when the ground is still damp with dew".⁴²

Cayrol's experiences, like those of other concentration camp survivors, show that the unconscious, which had been manipulated by the National Socialists, also yielded the power for resistance; it helped prisoners to survive. In fact, they shared their dreams and gave each other support, creating a community of trust. The result was "the community of persistent dreamers who share their nightly impressions with each other early in the morning".⁴³ According to Barbara Hahn, Cayrol's essay is "carefully compiled and arranged", which makes it a piece of literature, but the "dreams that he passes on to posterity are documents of resistance. If the dreamers kept an inner retreat zone, then they could survive. Then they could return after the liberation of the camps."⁴⁴ The unconscious had helped to ensure that the ego did not give up.

Thus, under National Socialism, the unconscious also became a bastion of the will to freedom and life. A long way, if you think back to the beginnings: first a "dark continent" that had to be conquered, then an unpredictable "master of the house", finally a contested territory - and now the principle of hope. The dreams that Beradt and Cayrol report on are all manifestos of resistance. Sometimes, as with many of Beradt's dreamers, the unconscious was content to go underground. In other cases, it served to collect testimonies against the dictatorship; in still other cases, such as Cayrol's, it became a means of survival.

The totalitarian state aimed to subjugate the unconscious, however, the unconscious also proved to be a strong counter force. When we reflect on a topic like 'Living with difference', we should keep in mind that one and the same factor can in one case become a barrier between myself and the other self but could in another case form the bridge for the two to meet.

Allow me to finish with a short quote: When I told my husband (he's a psychoanalyst) the topic of this conference, he said: There's only one thing that's more difficult than living with the other – namely living without the other. I think he's got a point there.

(Notes are incomplete; the references can be found in: Christina von Braun/Tilo Held, Kampf ums Unbewusste. Eine Gesellschaft auf der Couch, Berlin (Aufbau) 2025)

¹ Schleiermacher, Über die Religion, S. 204, 211.

² Schelling, LH S. 54

³ Lütkehaus, Einleitung, S. 13.

⁴ LH, 77

⁵ (Psyche. Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Seele. 1846 ([Digitalisat und Volltext](#) im [Deutschen Textarchiv](#)), (2. verb. und verm. Aufl. 1860).

⁶ LH 127

⁷ LH (130)

⁸ Patrik von zur Mühlen: *Rassenideologien*. Dietz, Bonn 1977, 1979 [ISBN 3-8012-1102-9](#) S. 47f.

⁹ Freud, GW, Bd. 10, S. 194.

¹⁰ Hartmann, LH 193, Hervorhebungen im Original

¹¹ LH (?) 194

¹² *Nietzsche: Jenseits von Gut und Böse. Vorspiel einer Philosophie der Zukunft: 17. 220*

¹³ Nachgelassene Fragmente 5, 89, LH 224.

¹⁴ Vgl. Christina v. Braun, Nicht ich.... ‚Frauenkrankheiten‘ als Spiegelbild der Geschichte, in: Farideh Akashe-Böhme, Von der Auffälligkeit des Leibes, Frankfurt/M. 1995, S. 98-129.

¹⁵ Freud, Traumdeutung, in: ders., Gesammelte Werke, Bd. II/III, S. 518.

¹⁶ Quelle

¹⁷ Jung, Ebda. S. 19

¹⁸ (Jung 1927, S.45).

¹⁹ „Die Juden haben diese Eigentümlichkeit mit den Frauen gemeinsam; als die physisch Schwächeren müssen sie auf die Lücken in der Rüstung des Gegners zielen und wegen dieser [...] Technik sind die Juden selbst dort, wo die anderen am verwundbarsten sind, am besten gedeckt. Infolge ihrer mehr als doppelt so alten Kultur sind sie sich der menschlichen Schwächen und Schattenseiten in viel höherem Maße bewußt als wir und darum [...] viel weniger verwundbar.“ C.G. Jung, Zur gegenwärtigen Lage der Psychotherapie, in: Zentralblatt, H. 1-2, 1934, S. 8.

²⁰ C. G. Jung, Zur gegenwärtigen Lage der Psychotherapie, in: Zentralblatt, H. 1-2, 1934, S. 9.

²¹ M. H. Göring, Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie, Bd. 6., Dez. 1933, 3. Heft, S. 140 f., 143.

²² Ebd., S. 66.

²³ M. H. Göring, Kurzfassung des Eröffnungsreferats in: Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie, 1934, Heft 3, S. 130.

²⁴ Cocks (1997), S.305, 306.

²⁵ Levine, Duped, Kindle-Version, S. XI.

²⁶ Polanyi, The Great Transformation (1990), S. 314 f.

²⁷ Demokratie weltweit unter Druck: Zahl der autoritären Regierungen steigt weiter, Bertelsmann-Stiftung 23.02.2022 <https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/de/themen/aktuelle-meldungen/2022/februar/demokratie-weltweit-unter-druck>

²⁸ B. Hahn, Endlose Nacht (2016), S. 18 f.

²⁹ Beradt, Das Dritte Reich des Traums (1981), S. 12.

³⁰ Ebd., S. 14.

³¹ Beradt, Dreams under Dictatorship (1943).

³² Beradt, Träume unter der Diktatur, in: Beradt/Hahn (2016), S. 137–147, 137.

³³ Hahn, Endlose Nacht, S. 33.

³⁴ Beradt (1981), S. 10.

³⁵ Beradt (1981) S. 19, 32, 39.

³⁶ Beradt, Träume unter der Diktatur (2016), S. 138.

³⁷ Beradt (1981), S. 40.

³⁸ Beradt (1981), S. 26, 23, 41 f.

³⁹ Koselleck, in: Beradt (1981), S. 130.

⁴⁰ zit. nach Hahn, Nachwort in: Hahn/Beradt, S. 154.

⁴¹ Cayrol, Lazarus unter uns (1959).

⁴² Hahn/Cayrol, S. 151, 153, 154, 153.

⁴³ Hahn/Cayrol, S. 153.

⁴⁴ Hahn, Nacht, S. 154 f.