

A Response to Sonu Shamdasani

By Maurice Krasnow, Ph.D.

I found Sonu Shamdasani's topic and its thesis quite interesting and wished to know more about the background he sketched and its influence on the development of Jung's paradigm of psychotherapy. I also wanted to know more about his ideas on the topography and dynamics of mental activity and its influence on his understanding of the nature of the human psyche.

Though I am aware of the pioneering work by Ellenberger that traces the roots of depth psychology to the magnetic practitioners who preceded Freud by nearly a century, I have often wondered how formidable an influence the scientific context of Jung's age was on the development of his thinking. I believe 1884 was the one-hundredth anniversary of the discovery of magnetic sleep, and I imagine this rich tradition of thought and experimentation was in the air at the time. Although Shamdasani makes note of this in his paper, everywhere in the great learning centers of Europe and England scientific practitioners were writing and publishing cases and anecdotal evidence. Some of these cases became quite renowned and were used for teaching purposes. Indeed, a whole tradition and a large body of scientific literature grew up from some of the most brilliant researchers and thinkers in the medical

field. Thousands of medical treatises were written describing cures and treatments, and with its offshoot, effective forms of psychotherapy. Even in the historiography of the psychoanalytic literature, and I imagine Shamdasani must know this literature better than I, this body of evidence has not been investigated very thoroughly. I wonder how much Jung acknowledged his debt to this scientific tradition and its influence on his ideas.

From what Shamdasani has written, I understand that Jung critiqued Freud's position on the "magical method" after his break with psychoanalysis. Doesn't it seem that Jung's reaction was a parallel of sorts to Freud's reaction to Breuer after he separated himself from Breuer and his concept of hypnoid states and the whole tradition of magnetic literature? Yes, Jung's system embraces more dissociative phenomena, both morbid and normal, than did Freud's. And Jung's system attempts to come to terms with the issue of multiple streams of consciousness that the magnetizers discovered experimentally. But on the issue of "suggestion" and "rapport," as well as on the question of the structure and dynamics of mental activity, I wonder how much more Jung knew of the literature than is suggested in this paper? It must have been a large part of his medical studies. Did he only learn of this scientific tradition through Forel and Bleuler? Didn't Jung, in a way similar to Freud, also attempt to obscure the full extent of his knowledge of this vast body of scientific literature?

Maurice Krasnow, Ph.D., is a Jungian psychoanalyst in practice in New York City, and a graduate of the C.G. Jung Institute of New York where he is on the faculty, is currently the coordinator of the C.G. Jung Referral Service and the president of the Kristine Mann Library.

This paper stimulated my interest in this topic, and I glanced over a copy of the bibliography of Jung's library. His library contains many more works relating to this field than the article mentions. There are some of the standard references that Shamdasani lists and alludes to: Binet, Bernheim, Bleuler, Breuer, Forel, Freud, Janet, etc. There are many more volumes listed on this subject and, of course, it is doubtful that this bibliography is complete. For example, there are works listed by Carl Adolph von Eschenmayer, Joseph Ennemoser, Johan Jung-Stilling, Justinus Kerner, Albert Moll, Max Dessoir, Morton Prince, and Edmund Gurney. And what about the *Proceedings of the Society of Psychical Research* found in Jung's library? Many articles were published by Frederic W. H. Myers, whose book *Human Personality and Its Survival of Bodily Death* was published in 1903. Myers has never been properly credited for the contributions he has made to the development of a theory of the psychology of the unconscious. He draws extensively on the scientific tradition of magnetic sleep and, for instance, lays out the concept of the "unconscious self" or "secondary self." Was William James, who is also found in Jung's library, drawing on this tradition when

he published a paper called "The Hidden Self" in 1890? I am wondering whether Jung was aware of the famous cases of Alexandre Hébert and Victor Race by the magnetizer marquis de Puységur. He discussed in detail the issue of hypnotic suggestion--what he called "intimate rapport." And I believe a great deal of research literature and controversy emerged as an offshoot of his work and this was the legacy to Jung. How could Jung not have known about this large body of experimental evidence and the scientific tradition from which it emanated? Of course he did, and he alludes to it in various places in the *Collected Works*, for instance in *CW 10* (para. 21), and in *CW 9ii*, where he extensively outlines his interest in the symbolism of the magnet and magnetic attraction when examining the alchemical texts on the Echeneis remora fish and the *aqua doctrinae* and the Gnostic imagery in Hippolytus' work.

Shamdasani's paper stimulated many thoughts and left me wondering even more about Jung's awareness of this tradition, its legacy to him, and the scientific context of his time. Perhaps Shamdasani too was alluding to this when he ended his paper by referring to a further discussion of some of the issues. I look forward to that later work.