

Christina von Braun

"Who invented the unconscious? Protestant and Jewish Conceptions in Post-Religious Europe of the 19th Century"

Dartmouth 24.10. 23

Abstract:

The concept (and term) of "unconscious" arose about a hundred years before Freud introduced the psychoanalytic concept of the unconscious. It was a term that surfaced in the late 18th century among writers and philosophers, some of whom were also medical doctors. Examining who used the term "unconscious" and who spoke about the unconscious (in a discussion that took place mainly in German) reveals that nearly all were Protestants, even theologians. "Unconscious" was a term that arose and practically replaced the term "God"; it occupied the premises that had been occupied by the "transcendent" until secularization - and since Protestantism was closer to secularization than Catholicism, the topic was picked up by them.

Why, then, did Freud and a group of Jews in Vienna become interested in the unconscious about a hundred years later? The talk will sketch the background to this development and the differences between a "Protestant" unconscious in the 19th century and a "Jewish" unconscious as it arose around 1900.

Who invented the Unconscious?

Protestant and Jewish Conceptions in Post-Religious Europe of the 19th Century.

Christina von Braun

I would like to mention that this is work in progress - a section from a new book dealing with the unconscious as territory for political and cultural conflicts.

The concept of the unconscious first appeared in the late 18th century. For the Enlightenment, it represented its alter ego, the repressed of knowledge and rationality. Until the modern era, the unconscious hadn't been an issue. In his excellent book of 1970 *The Discovery of the Unconscious*, the Swiss psychiatrist, psychoanalyst and medical historian Henri Frédéric Ellenberger saw it in phenomena that belonged to the category of unknown secret forces: the oracle of Delphi, magnetism, divining rods and all kinds of superstition. I will refer to the period after 1800, when the unconscious received its name.

When the Enlightenment set out to shatter the Christian doctrinal edifices, a term had to be found for things that didn't fit the new belief in rationality. Philosophers and poets were the first to set to the task, among them the poet Karl Philipp Moritz, who invented the terms "unconscious" and "id" more than a century before Freud. He defined them as "what goes on both in our body and in the depths of our soul and of which we only have vague concepts." Moritz had found a concept that is at the center of many cultural and political debates to this day.

Actually, the rationality of the "Lumières" or Enlightenment and the irrational unconscious have more in common than their juxtaposition suggests. For example, the difficulty of self-definition. Kant defined the Enlightenment as "man's emergence from his self-induced immaturity". The definition is questionable: For one, the concept of "self-induced immaturity" implies that it was just a question of *will* that kept man from becoming mature. Secondly, the definition is unhistorical: it ignores the historical context for the emergence of Enlightenment, including Kant's own new insights. But above all, it disregards that the Enlightenment necessarily carried its counterpart, the incalculable unconscious, in its baggage. Goethe clearly saw this. In *Faust II* he mocks the Humboldt brothers, who were the heroes of the German Enlightenment while at the same time practicing occultism and talking to the dead in their old château of Tegel! What's more: both Enlightenment and the unconscious (as it was to be defined) had their origins in Christian culture. One thing distinguished them, though: While the Enlightenment first emerged in Catholic Europe - especially in France and Great Britain -, the unconscious turned up in the Protestant area.

The decline of the church's domination over thought and feeling was experienced throughout Europe as a great liberation. Because France was in the hands of the Catholic Church, closely linked to the monarchy, the Enlightenment came at an earlier stage and was more radical than in Germany. As early as 1748, the physician Julien Offray de la Mettrie (1709-1751) outlined an unabashedly atheistic and mechanistic view of the world and man in his pamphlet *L'homme-machine*. He and many subsequent pioneers of the French Enlightenment simply broke with the Church and the Ancien Régime, and this attitude was soon to influence science and medicine. In contrast, the birth of Protestantism in the 16th century had already acted as a kind of pre-Enlightenment. Here, it sufficed to invent the unconscious to create a smooth transition from God to the ego of man. In Germany, the vacuum left by the belief in God was gradually filled with an interest in the psyche which allowed for the unspeakable and uncontrollable traditionally attributed to a "higher power".

Almost all German theorists who dealt with the unconscious came from Protestant families or had grown up in parsonages; some were apostate others continued to practice theology. The Protestant parsonage was famous as a center of education and science, but apparently it was also suitable as a space of transition from a religious to a secular image of the "soul." Luther required believers to have a direct relationship with God, to renounce the ecclesiastical mediator role. He translated the Holy Scriptures into German so that believers would no longer have to rely on the interpretation of the clergy. Literacy rates grew more rapidly in Protestant areas than in Catholic ones - a literacy, by the way, that included women. The first girls' schools in Europe were established in Protestant areas. With the God of Protestantism taken "inward," conscience (not consciousness!) emerged. And with it a bit of Freud's concept of the superego. Its repressed, split-off, forgotten parts became the elements of the unconscious.

The religious origin of the unconscious is still apparent in early protagonists such as the philosopher Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1775-1854). In his transcendental idealism of 1800, he speaks of the "absolute" or the "eternal unconscious." It is, as Ludger Lütkehaus puts it, a metaphysical unconscious that is called "to substitute the not yet dead but already dying God, and to assure the endangered immortality of the soul." Later philosophers and writers

reduced the soul to a terrestrial figure. At the same time, they declared the unconscious a *terra incognita*, a territory waiting to be explored. One of the first wake-up calls to this kind of ego-mapping was formulated by the writer Jean Paul. In his *Vorschule der Ästhetik* of 1804, he writes: "We make far too small and narrow measurements of the great empire of the ego if we leave out the immense realm of the unconscious, this true inner Africa." *He also compares this "realm" to the moon, which shows only one of its sides to the earth, while the other turns away from the observer.* Germany had no colonies at this time, beginning of the 19th century, while Spain, Great Britain, France, and the Netherlands owned wide spaces from the 17th century: they allowed for (real and fantasized) ego expansions. Lacking outer spaces, Germany drew the attention to its "inner colonies". On the other hand, Jean Paul's image of an "inner Africa" already sounds like a premonition of Freud's remark about the "dark continent" of female sexuality.

By far the largest group of German theorists saw an inherent power at work in the unconscious. For Goethe, it was the prerequisite for artistic creation. "I believe," he wrote to Schiller, "that everything a genius does, as a genius, happens unconsciously." The theologian and philosopher Immanuel Hermann Fichte (1796-1879) pursued a similar idea in his *Psychology*, published in 1864. He wrote that "the dark region of the mind," that is, the unconscious, "is also the source of its consciousness." "Consciousness as such is not productive, does not bring forth anything new, but only accompanies with its light certain real states and changes in the soul, while at the same time certain others, equally real in it, remain in darkness." Similarly, the philosopher and psychologist Wilhelm Maximilian Wundt (1832-1920), founder of the academic discipline of psychology and cocreator of the psychology of peoples, relied on the powers of the unconscious: "Our soul is so happily laid out that it prepares us for the most important foundations of knowledge, while we don't have the faintest idea of the effort with which this is done. Like an alien being, this unconscious soul stands there, creating and preparing for us, until it finally throws the mature fruits into our lap."

For some theorists, the creative unconscious became a power dominating all of psyche and the intellect. This was the case with the physician and ethnologist Philipp Wilhelm Adolf Bastian (1826-1905), founder of the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde. He begins his 1868 *Contributions to Comparative Psychology* with the statement "that it is not we who think, but rather an id that thinks in us." For him, not only artistic creation but mental activity in general is subject to the dictates of the unconscious.

Slowly, the ideas of German philosophers and writers spread to medicine and the natural sciences. The physician, painter and natural philosopher Carl Gustav Carus (1789-1869), who in addition to numerous medical writings (on anatomy and gynecology, for example) also published works on natural philosophy and dealt with parapsychological phenomena such as magnetism, published a work on the psyche in 1846 in which he addressed the unconscious. The very first sentence set in italics is programmatic: "The key to knowledge of the essence of the conscious soul lies in the region of the unconscious." Carus called for a "science of the soul" because the "by far largest part of the realm of our soul life is based in the unconscious." Long before Freud, he proclaimed an interaction between the unconscious and consciousness: "By the very fact that the greatest part of the thoughts of our consciousness is submerged in

the unconscious and can enter consciousness only intermittently, one by one, the unconscious life of the soul is characterized as the foundation of the conscious." He also describes a repression mechanism: a "a formerly conscious thing thus becomes an unconscious thing."

Being a physician, Carus thought in biologicistic terms which he applied to ideas on race. In his writing *On the Unequal Capability of the Different Tribes of Men for Higher Mental Development*, which appeared three years after his work on the Psyche, he catalogued psycho-racial differences between different peoples. The "day peoples", to which he counts the Europeans, the Arabs, Semites, Persians, are endowed with a higher consciousness, in contrast to the "night peoples" of Africa. East Asians and Indians are in-between: "peoples of the dawn and dusk". Only the day peoples are capable to produce culture. The culture, emanating from the "twilight peoples" is only a „shadow caused by the light of the day peoples“. 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.

In Carus we also find the gender hierarchies typical for the 19th century: he describes consciousness as being more developed in the male, while the female is characterized by an "unconsciousness reigned by the divining rod of feeling". Such gender images overlapped with racial images. With the growth of social conflicts around 1850, they were extended to class categories: Carus calls the unconscious the "intrapyschic proletariat". With that, the unconscious could be transferred to the political realm. This is exactly what happened in the late 19th century when Gustave Le Bon developed his theories on the psychology of the masses.

By the mid-19th century, interest in the unconscious had grown to become a public topic. Eduard von Hartmann's (1843-1906) 1869 book *Philosophy of the Unconscious* was a bestseller, reprinted nine times within a few years. In a second volume, *Metaphysics of the Unconscious*, Hartmann elevated the unconscious to a new form of religious omnipotence. "The unconscious does not vacillate or doubt, it needs no time of deliberation, but grasps momentarily the result while at the same time reflecting the whole logical process. It produces the result immediately, not one thought after the other, but in one single piece, which as though it did not think it at all." And then follows a sentence that sounds as if the Protestants had erected a Holy See for the unconscious: "The unconscious does not err." (The Catholic Church had proclaimed the dogma of papal infallibility a few years earlier.)

The most important German theorist on the inherent power of the unconscious was Artur Schopenhauer (1788-1860). The publication of his work *The World as Will and Representation* dragged on for decades (1819-1844). Schopenhauer does not call it the unconscious, but speaks of the "will," which for him is a kind of life instinct. For Schopenhauer, man and his intellect are subject to a "sultan" who issues his "approved " or "not approved". The passage is wittily worded, but too long to quote here. Schopenhauer came from a secularized Protestant merchant family: he speaks of the "so-called soul" to which he attaches only a secondary importance. The "will" however is overpowering and includes many of elements the other theorists assigned to the unconscious.

Schopenhauer was also one of those, who used categories that anticipated Freud's psychoanalysis. He spoke of "associations" and described them as "one thought bringing about another". When he compares the human psyche to a plant, this sounds more biological than in Freud, but recalls the latter's tripartite division of ego, id, and superego: "The root presents the will, the crown the intellect, and the point of meeting, the rhizome, would be The Ego, which, belongs to both." But, unlike Freud, the intellect is clearly subordinate to the will in Schopenhauer's order. "What is called 'being master over oneself': apparently means that the master is the will, and the intellect the servant." From such statements to Freud's unconscious as "master in the house" is not a long way. Schopenhauer and Freud also meet on another point: both placed sexuality at the center of their theories. However, Freud met considerably more criticism for this than Schopenhauer. A possible reason could be that Schopenhauer saw in the sexual drive the "core of the will to life" and an activity on behalf of „a higher goal, the species", while Freud emphasized the autonomy of sexuality. That apparently met with resistance.

There was also a crucial difference to Freud: While Schopenhauer, like Goethe, Fichte, or Schelling, saw in the unconscious the source of intellectual creativity and the motor of consciousness, Freud said: "Where id was, there shall ego be." Thus, Freud in contrast to his protestant predecessors conceived of consciousness as the necessary tamer of the unpredictable forces of the unconscious. This difference, I think, were due to the political developments that began to emerge around 1900. I will come back to this in a moment.

Finally, Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) was also significant for the pre-Freudian history of the unconscious. He, too, came from a Protestant parsonage. No other German philosopher before him insisted as explicitly as he did that God was dead. In this respect, he forms the final point in this Protestant chain. Nietzsche found himself intellectually between Schopenhauer and Freud. On the one hand, he stood for the inherent power of the unconscious: "'I think' does not apply. For "a thought comes when "it" wants to, and not when "I" want it." On the other hand, in a fragment from the winter of 1870/71 (i.e., twenty-five years before *Studies on Hysteria*, the founding text of psychoanalysis, was published), he formulated both the program of psychoanalysis and obstacles to its implementation. "All expansion of our cognition arises from making the unconscious conscious. Now the question is what sign language do we have for this." Nietzsche also deserves credit for repeatedly emphasizing the fluid transitions between consciousness and the unconscious. For him, the unconscious was "the phase of the modesty of consciousness." Like for Freud, his terrain of exploration were his own psychic experiences. "I do not know at all what I am doing! I don't know at all what I should do. - You are right, but do not doubt it: you *are* done! at every moment! Mankind has at all times confused the active and the passive; its eternal grammatical blunder." Nietzsche also formulated the process of repression that later became central to the psychoanalytic theory. In *Beyond Good and Evil*, he presents us with a trenchant image: "That's what I did, says my memory. I can't possibly have done that, says my pride and remains adamant. Finally - memory yields."

Given the long Christian prehistory of the unconscious, how did it come about that almost exclusively Jews invented psychoanalysis, teachings of which revolve around the unconscious? I will try to sketch one possible answer to this (I'm not saying there aren't any others.) The

Jews involved in the creation of psychoanalysis did not define themselves as religious. They were shaped by the process of enlightenment that also formed many Christians. And just as these had become cultural Christians, these Jews too had become cultural Jews: they no longer attended synagogue (or only on the high holidays and by obligation to tradition), and they no longer adhered to the religious rulebook. Nevertheless, they professed Judaism. Its ways of thinking had become a part of their psychic structure through tradition – it had occupied their unconscious if you like.

The historian Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi calls Sigmund Freud a "psychological Jew," which is another variant of the cultural definition. He characterizes the qualities of this Jew in terms of "intellectuality and spiritual independence, the highest ethical and moral standards, a sense of social justice, and imperturbability in the face of persecution." The Jewish intellectuality and spiritual independence he refers to were due, on the one hand, to the centuries-long role of the outsider, and, on the other hand, to the traditions of oral exegesis with its contradictory interpretations. In the secular sphere, this became "Jewish intellectuality." The emergence of new patterns of thought and novel forms of art, which spread in Germany as elsewhere under the influence of cultural Jews, owed much to this heritage, and it also applied to the Jews who were attracted by Freud's approach to the question of the unconscious and joined his "school of thought".

What characterized the "Jewishness" of these secular intellectuals? From the late 18th century on, as you know, two ways of thinking Judaism had developed: on one extreme, the Haskalah, Jewish Enlightenment, and on the other, Orthodoxy. It made sense only once it had become conceivable for some Jews to think and live a Judaism outside the synagogue - a "cultural" Judaism. This split was a result of the Christian secularization process, which (in Germany, primarily through Protestantism) had led to a shift of Christian thought to confessionally neutral areas such as culture and science. At the same time, though, anti-Judaism had moved from a religious to a nationalistic and later racist level – in answer to which a Jewish movement arose at the beginning of the 19th century, which resulted in the "Science of Judaism." It implied commitment to both Judaism and the Enlightenment.

By rejecting the turn to Enlightenment and secular modernity, Jewish Orthodoxy renounced an important feature 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 Books, in which no letter was to be changed; on the other hand, changing interpretations. The interaction between written word and exegesis ensured the constant renewal and adaptation of doctrine to the current historical situation and the surrounding societies in which Jewish communities lived as minorities. With the emergence of Orthodoxy, this tradition came to an end. For the Orthodox of the time, the text promised unambiguity and was thus of higher value than oral exegesis. For enlightened Judaism, on the other hand, flexibility shifted to the secular, political and cultural, realm.

Yet, this shift was not without risk. For one, it meant adaptation to Christian society: With Enlightenment, Christians had freed themselves from the paternalism of the church, but that didn't mean society was not in the wake of Christianity. For Christians secularization meant turning away from transcendental thought, but it didn't keep Christian contents from shifting to a secular level. Jews who wanted to participate in the novelties of Enlightenment - and

there were good reasons for this, since for the first the time acquiring full citizenship and gaining a foothold in academic institutions became a possible perspective – thus found themselves in the middle of a Christian heritage.

The other problem related to the relationship between orality and writing. The Semitic consonantal alphabet had contributed to the preservation of orality in Jewish traditions. You can only read a Hebrew text if you know the spoken language. This need for orality had created a strong hold for oral teaching and exchange, and that in turn had allowed for the constant renewal of interpretations. In contrast, the vocalized Greek alphabet, which captured all the language, led to the suppression of oral culture; the written text became the sole authority. One of the arenas of this power shift was the Greek theater, whose dramas tell us to this day about the process of transformation of Greek culture through writing: according to Walter Ong, the theater gave rise to "the first Western verbal art form that was completely controlled by writing,". As it turns out, the language Freud and other enlightened Jews used was in the tradition of this orality controlled by writing.

Is this to say that Freud offered us a new version of Hellenism? The answer is more complicated. In Christian culture, the supremacy of written language had led first to the devaluation, then to the suppression of orality, and finally to the alignment of spoken language according to the logic and laws of writing. This controlled orality had increasingly come into conflict with any form of creativity. From the Romantic period onward, writers lamented the loss of orality. For the first time in Christian culture, written language was condemned. "Books are dead coals; the spirit of oration, like a sirocco, kindles the dead ashes," wrote the writer Gustav Anton von Seckendorff. Goethe called writing an "abuse of language" and a "sad surrogate of speech."

In assimilated Judaism too, European languages had displaced the traditional oral languages such as Yiddish and Ladino, and here again you find attempts to return to the immediacy of the spoken language. Buber and Rosenzweig propagated a turn to Yiddish, and Rosenzweig translated into German the chants of the famous 12th-century Sephardic poet Jehuda ben Samuel ha-Levi (1075-1141). In his commentary he wrote: "The poems are, of course, not intended to be read, but, as in all times when poetry, or part of poetry, was a matter of the people, to be performed and heard. [...] When poetry is written for a certain circle of people and is received by them, by their throats, of course, not only in the spirit, then 'the time' has arrived." Rosenzweig emphasized that it was rhythm, rhyme, meter, alliteration, repetition that gave these verses their power, thus describing the characteristics of oral memorial culture.

For the enlightened Jews of this generation, a return to the old orality of Judaism was as impossible as a return to religion. Educated Jews like Freud had gone through a humanistic education; they were often closer to these traditions than to that of the Hebrew alphabet. They knew the texts of ancient Greece inside out; Freud's teachings are almost all named after figures in Greek mythology. By professing enlightenment and scientific thought, Jews suddenly found themselves in a tradition that either despised orality or tolerated it only if it submitted to the laws of Scripture.

In this seemingly hopeless situation, Jews - above all Freud – discovered a third language. A language that was located between the two poles of orality and writing: the language of the unconscious. It took possession of the body and made it its mouthpiece. Freud read the symptoms of hysterics as language become the body. By making the body "speak," hysteria that had guided Freud's discoveries became the embodiment of a "hidden" language that resisted "guardianship" by writing. On the one hand, this malady was pure corporeality; on the other hand, it used a sign system that could be deciphered with the help of speech – despite this speech being occupied by writing. Just as a text written in the consonants of the Semitic alphabet is legible only to those who also master the spoken language, so too the symptoms of hysteria demanded an interpretation that encompassed both speaking and writing.

The unconscious that interested the Jewish intellectuals thus differed profoundly from that of the Protestant intellectuals. At the same time, it pointed to a way out of the impasse into which the full Greek alphabet, with its tutelage of spoken language by writing, had led intellectual and creative life of both Jews and Non-Jews. Psychoanalysis contested writing and secondary orality with its reference to a third language that was close to the body while being "readable" in a whole new sense. Freud very often used images of writing when treating the mode of operation of the unconscious: he spoke of rebus, of hieroglyphics, and referred to dreams as "sacred texts." In his words, psychoanalysis was an "exegetical method", calling for "a productive reception " of the written signs - just as oral interpretation does with the Holy Scriptures. On the other hand, Freud attested to the unconscious's power of resistance to the domination of rational thought, unaffected by contradictions or the necessities of chronology: "The processes of the system U_{bw} are timeless, i.e. they are not ordered in time, are not modified by the passing of time, have no relation to time at all." Also, Freud continues, "the logical laws of thought do not apply, especially not the theorem of contradiction. Contradictory impulses coexist without cancelling each other out or subtracting from each other." These explanations hark to oral traditions, that allow for, indeed demand, ambiguity. Such characteristics of the unconscious, Freud concluded, still await their "appreciation in philosophical thought." The discovery of this third language, the commitment to the ambiguity of the unconscious, was undoubtedly one of the great innovations of this approach to the unconscious, and it was also one of the reasons for the emergence of psychoanalysis.

Another reason for the advent of "Jewish ideas" about the unconscious was soon to become apparent: the rise of racist anti-Semitism which developed towards the end of the 19th century, in parallel to the birth of psychoanalysis. It became apparent in the conflict between Freud and C.G. Jung. 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 mistaken. Jung was to mutate into one of the worst enemies of Freudian psychoanalysis - by defaming its "Jewish" parts and by claiming a "Germanic unconscious."

Jung's image of the unconscious had little to do with ambiguity and flexible exegesis. In his eyes, the unconscious consisted of two parts or "layers": on the one hand, the "personal unconscious," which depended on the individual biography and "might as well be conscious." The other unconscious was collective. With Schelling we encountered the connection of the unconscious to the transcendent. With Jung, the idea of eternity connects with an eternally

renewing nature. (*Which by the way, may explain the Jung renaissance with some ecological movements*) Jung circumscribed the psychological aspects of this eternal renewal with the term "archetype" which he created in 1927. The archetypes are "the foundations of the conscious soul hidden in the depths. [...] they are systems consisting both of images and emotions, and they inherent to the brain structure, indeed they are its psychic aspect. [...] In these primordial images earth and its laws probably confront us most clearly." Since the Jews lived in dispersion and had no "earth" of their own, they could have no share in this collective soul rooted in the ground.

Jung states the "surprising conformity" of the psyche of individual peoples and races. It is due to a differentiation of the "collective psyche" and is hereditary, from which he deduces the incompatibility of the different races. The example of Jung, who, again, came from a Protestant family, clearly shows that the two traditions of the unconscious took on a new form with the emergence of psychoanalysis: on the one hand, an unconscious with a high tolerance for ambiguity (the unconscious is unpredictable, resists the rules of logic), on the other hand, an unconscious that strives for unambiguity. On one side an unknowable unconscious that demands flexibility, on the other an unconscious that argues with the immutability of the human psyche. On the one hand, an unconscious that leads to self-reflection via doubt; on the other, an unconscious that is subject to the fate of the collective psyche. Freud and other early campaigners for psychoanalysis never made a classification of the unconscious distinguishing between Jewish and Christian traditions. Jung did.

With his ideas of a "racially" inherited "collective unconscious" he went further than many racist theories of his time. He regarded the "Jewish unconscious" as a product of the "Jewish body" and declared "racial psychology" to be the new research program: Its aim was to put an end to the blurring of "differences between Germanic and Jewish psychology which actually exist and have been known to people for a long time". And he adds: With psychoanalysis as a "Jewish work of art", the Jewish mind had created an instrument for the destruction of other cultures. Psychologists supporting the National Socialists movement saw a remedy against these harmful influences in the psychoanalysis advocated by Jung. In a 1933 radio interview, the educator and psychotherapist Adolf Weizsäcker introduced Jung by saying that he had "opposed Freud's corrosive psychoanalysis with a constructive doctrine of the soul." That he understood "the core of our soul life, its creativity, which was decisive in our German intellectual history, that he does not tamper with this core and creativity and does not tear it to pieces, decompose it. Rather than devalue it, he shows deep reverence to it."

On January 30, 1933, Hitler was appointed Chancellor of the Reich. On the evening of February 27, the Reichstag building burned. The resulting emergency decree "for the protection of the people and the state" suspended all fundamental rights of the Weimar Constitution. The first concentration camps were established. On May 10, 1933, Freud's books were burned: to protect the German people "against the soul-destroying overestimation of sexual life" as the students chanted around the fire. Many politicians and intellectuals, including members of the Psychoanalytic Association, fled abroad. On September 15, 1933, the *German Institute for Psychological Research and Psychotherapy* was founded. C. G. Jung was appointed editor of the *Zentralblatt für Psychotherapie*. In an early 1934 editorial on *The state of Psychotherapy*, he shared, "The Aryan unconscious has a higher potential than the Jewish." It was "a grave

error of previous medical psychology that it transferred Jewish categories" to "Christian Teutons and Slavs." Freud, he went on to say, "did not know the Germanic soul, any more than all his Germanic followers did. Did the tremendous phenomenon of National Socialism, [...] teach them better? Where was the unheard-of tension and force when there was no National Socialism? It lay hidden in the Germanic soul, in that deep bottom which is anything but a dustbin of unfulfillable children's wishes and unresolved family resentments."

These statements were by no means the end of Jung's defamations against Freud's psychoanalysis. But they clearly show where the line was drawn between the "Aryan" and the "Jewish" unconscious. A few years later, Jung was to distance himself from the National Socialists. He even cautioned against the blending of faith and race, but with his Germanic religion he had himself set the course for a new theory of the unconscious that could be directly connected to old Christian teachings of the Jewish enemy. Thus, about one hundred and fifty years after the first mention of the unconscious, it had become the terrain of a secular culture war against the Jews.