

Foreword

Jung made several trips to Britain throughout his lifetime. In 1913, he delivered two papers in London: one to the Psycho-Medical Society on August 5th and one during the 17th International Congress of Medicine, held between August 6th and 12th (McGuire [ed], 1974: 549). At the end of July 1914, Jung gave a lecture to the British Medical Association at a congress held in Aberdeen (Jung, 1961/1989: 176). At the end of WWI, Jung was invited by the Royal Society of Medicine and the Society for Psychical Research to give three lectures in July 1919 (Bair, 2003: 304). Between July 30th and August 6th 1938, Jung participated in the 10th International Medical Congress for Psychotherapy held at Oxford, where he discussed his efforts to promote dialogue amongst the varying schools of psychotherapy (Hayman 1999/2002: 359-60; Shamdasani, 2005-2006: 3-5). During this visit, he was awarded an honorary degree by the University of Oxford. Barbara Hannah recounts: ‘A great many universities awarded honorary degrees on him [Jung], but the only time I remember Jung being at all excited by such an honour was at Oxford’ (Hannah quoted in Shamdasani, 2005-2006: 3). Amongst those who congratulated Jung was a familiar face – Dr. Hugh Crichton-Miller (Shamdasani, 2005-2006: 5)¹. Founder of the Tavistock Clinic, Crichton-Miller had chaired the first of five lectures Jung has given there three years earlier, in 1935, at the age of sixty². Crichton-Miller was later to prove to be a close acquaintance and ally during one of the most turbulent periods in Jung’s life when he was accused of anti-Semitism and collaboration with the Nazis, a period which was to cast a lasting shadow over his international reputation (Samuels, 1988).

¹ Also present was Eric Benjamin Strauss, who was a member of the Organizing Committee of the congress held at Oxford in 1938 (Adler [ed], 1973: 242). Strauss – an assistant physician at the Institute of Medical Psychology at the time – participated in discussions one, two and four of Jung’s ‘Tavistock Lectures’.

² As indicated in E. A. Bennet’s original Foreword, the Tavistock Square Clinic (also known as the Tavistock Clinic for Functional Nerve Cases [Adler {ed}, 1973: 271] was founded in 1920. The name was changed to The Institute of Medical Psychology in 1931 and again a few years later to The Tavistock Clinic (Bennet, 1968: xiii, n.1).

Jung certainly made an indelible impression on the British medical profession when he visited London to deliver what is now widely known as either ‘The Tavistock Lectures’ or ‘The London Seminars’. What is up for debate is whether that impression was favourable. In a climate in which psychoanalysis was ‘all the rage’ (Beckett quoted in Bair, 2003: 414), Deirdre Bair suggests that the overall consensus was a positive one, though she notes that Jung’s questionable views on contemporary politics would have been known to some in the audience (ibid.: 416). As evidence of this positive reception by the predominantly British gathering, Bair indicates that the applause Jung received at the conclusion of the lectures ‘was far more sustained than mere politeness required’ (ibid.), an assessment based on the impressions of Joseph Henderson, Joseph Wheelright, E. A. Bennet, H. G. Baynes and Samuel Beckett, all present at the event. It is equally important and interesting to note that four of the five individuals cited by Bair were within Jung’s inner circle, two of whom were American (Henderson and Wheelright). Samuel Beckett, as is widely known, attended the third lecture as a guest of his then analyst, W. R. Bion. Beckett was deeply affected by what Jung had to say and, arguably, analytical psychological concepts informed some of his later works (Bair, 2003: 414; Hinshelwood, 2013: 48; Campbell, 2005). Bair’s representation of Jung’s performance – in which he turned scepticism into ‘acceptance and appreciation’ (Bair, 2003: 416) – is largely drawn from accounts given by those with a vested interest in the advancement of analytical psychology. Bair supports her position by noting how Jung generously gave up his time, including early mornings and late evenings, for private conversations and therapeutic consultation (ibid.). Although Bair rightly notes that some tensions flared during discussions following the fourth lecture (ibid.: 414), there is little to suggest that the reception of the ‘Tavistock Lectures’ was anything but positive.

Sonu Shamdasani has, however, suggested the possibility of a different reaction to Jung's Tavistock Lectures. In his notes to a mimeographed edition of the lectures printed in 1936 and held at the Wellcome Library Archives in London, Shamdasani refers to a conversation he held with Michael Fordham in which Fordham, who had been present at the 1935 lectures, stated that the edition published for public consumption in 1968 was heavily revised. In particular, what was deemed to be Jung's 'rudeness' to the gathering of prominent British psychiatrists and psychologists was edited out. A comparison of the five discussions in the 1936 mimeographed edition and the published 1968 version unearthed no less than two hundred and seventy-seven modifications. These ranged from minor stylistic changes and deletions to more significant alterations (for instance, sentences omitted and others rewritten). A few of the changes are significant enough to prompt one to question Jung's intended meaning. However, my own study of the discussions did not unearth any such compelling variations intended to tone down Jung's rudeness; in my opinion Jung's 'rudeness' to his audience remains quite evident, despite the editorial changes. To all intents and purposes, then, accounts of the discussion periods remain the same. One cannot, however, dismiss the possibility that Jung's alleged disdain for his audience was mitigated by several editors: R. F. C. Hull, Mary Barker and Margaret Game. The very fact that at least two hundred and seventy-seven alterations exist brings into question the assertion that R. F. C. Hull made only 'minor stylistic revisions' (Jung, 1968: ix). A thorough comparison of extant versions of the text is certainly required. Shamdasani indicates that an involved correspondence arose concerning the editing of the text, especially around the question of whether Jung's words *should* be tempered. An equally comprehensive examination of Jung's correspondence, and that of his followers, is not only necessary but may unearth more details concerning the general reception of Jung in Britain.³

³ The main correspondence is housed in the Bollingen Archive at the Library of Congress. A thorough investigation

My decision to start with a comparison of the discussions was far from cursory. A major reason why the ‘Tavistock Lectures’ are important is because of the lively exchanges that followed each lecture. Although I was disturbed to discover the number of editorial changes made to the discussions, I was relieved that their general ethos and tone had been preserved (as far as we can tell at the time of writing). The questions posed to Jung forced him to clarify his own position and thinking, which at times could be both vague and controversial. At other points, the discussions offered Jung an opportunity to define key analytical psychological concepts (see Jung’s definition of *active imagination* [1968: 190]). Here, we perhaps find Jung at his most lucid, providing detailed examples that crystallize his complex theories, thereby making them accessible to a wider public.

What is refreshing is that Jung’s audience was not merely comprised of the converted, which meant that many were unafraid to challenge Jung on several points throughout his five lectures. The excitement born of the tension and atmosphere of intellectual debate is palpable; we get a sense that those in the room who participated in the discussions were passionate about their profession and, that the profession itself was changing because of the important discoveries being made in the field. This brings me to another reason why the discussions are crucial to an understanding of analytical psychology – they force us to acknowledge that Jung’s thinking cannot be divorced from its intellectual milieu. The people in the room specifically and the discussions more generally serve as keyholes through which we can glimpse the living context of psychology and medicine in which Jung’s work was inevitably situated.

The general direction and identity of the Tavistock Clinic at the time help to explain why Jung was invited to deliver the lectures. The clinic’s eclectic range of interests and general open-

of Fordham’s papers held in the Wellcome Archives might also prove fruitful (Shamdasani, personal communication).

mindedness – described by Nuno Torres and Robert D. Hinshelwood as an ‘integrative urge to bring biological, social and psychological studies of human beings together’ (2013: 38) – provided Jung the optimum environment and a timely platform to present his unique perspective and psychological theory as distinct from that of psychoanalysis. Hinshelwood describes the type of psychotherapy being practised at the Tavistock as ‘a school of [...] its own, dedicated to a kind of integrative eclectic practice which included the ideas of Jung as well as Freud’ (Hinshelwood, 2013: 45). The clinic’s willingness to explore different depth psychological models even aroused the ire of Ernest Jones, who forbade psychoanalysts from working at the Tavistock (ibid.).

The Tavistock’s broad-minded approach was nourished by its founder, Crichton-Miller, and two of his early associates, James Arthur Hadfield and Ian Dishart Suttie (Torres and Hinshelwood, 2013; Hinshelwood, 2013). All three were present at Jung’s ‘Tavistock Lectures’ – Crichton-Miller and Hadfield served as chairs for the first and second lectures respectively, and Hadfield and Suttie participated in the discussions. The influence of Crichton-Miller and Hadfield on the profession was considerable, and their connection to Jung strong, which explains why Jung was their obvious choice to deliver the 1935 lectures.

Crichton-Miller, a practicing psychotherapist before WWI, forwarded a doctrine of psychophysical parallelism to which Jung spoke in discussions one and two. The Tavistock grew out of Crichton-Miller’s wartime experience with those suffering psychological difficulties as a consequence of the war, and much of his work centred on what he termed a ‘binocular approach’ – a ‘psychophysical interactionist model [...] in which emotions, mental stability and physical factors [...] interacted via the endocrine and circulatory systems’ (Torres and Hinshelwood, 2013: 37). Crichton-Miller was not, however, a psychoanalyst and held a non-

partisan view of psychoanalysis, which inevitably shaped the Tavistock's relationship to the field. Although his resignation as Director in 1933 marked his declining influence, something of Crichton-Miller's integrative outlook persisted amongst the Tavistock staff (Hinshelwood, 2013: 46).

It is not unreasonable to suggest that Crichton-Miller's interests and eclectic approach to the psyche lead Jung to consider him a friend. When Crichton-Miller died in 1959, Jung wrote a fond reflection of his impressions of the Tavistock's founder. When he first met Crichton-Miller, Jung recalls being 'deeply impressed by the friendly, open, and unprejudiced manner of his [Crichton-Miller's] welcome' (Jung, 1961/1989: 639). Although the two held differing opinions, Jung felt that they 'were speaking the same language' and referred to Crichton-Miller as 'the only man of my age with whom I could talk as man to man, without constantly fearing that my partner would suddenly throw a fit or become otherwise impolite' (ibid.). Their supportive friendship would prove crucial to Jung during his presidency of the General Medical Society for Psychotherapy (renamed the International General Medical Society for Psychotherapy [IGMSP] as a condition of Jung's acceptance of the role in 1933) (Vannoy Adams and Sherry, 1991/2003: 226-27). As vice-president of the same organisation in 1938, Crichton-Miller supported Jung's general goal of promoting the non-German membership of the society to counteract the increasing German influence. By 1939, there was growing pressure from Professor Matthias Göring (head of the German General Medical Society for Psychotherapy from 1936 to 1945 and elder cousin of the Reichsmarschall, Herman Göring) to admit Italy, Hungary and Japan, a move that would have strengthened the influence of the Axis countries in the society (Adler [ed], 1973: 286 n.1). In what he describes as a 'decisive showdown with the Germans in Zurich' (Jung, 1961/1989: 640), Jung knew that Crichton-

Miller's support as vice-president, and as a 'representative of higher reason', would be pivotal (Adler [ed], 1973: 271). In a letter to Crichton-Miller dated 28 June 1939, Jung admits that the suspicion surrounding his alleged collaboration with the Nazis made Crichton-Miller's presence all the more important (ibid.: 271-72). The founder of the Tavistock did not disappoint. Jung recounts that, as vice-president of the IGMSP, Crichton-Miller 'lent him personally his invaluable help to ward off the German intrigue' (Jung, 1961/1989: 640), which incurred the indignation of Professor Göring (Adler [ed], 1973: 275 n.1). Jung was 'forever grateful' for Crichton-Miller's 'sturdy co-operation' and 'loyal friendship' (Jung, 1961/1989: 640).

Alongside Crichton-Miller, Hadfield also played a role in cultivating the early eclectic and integrative atmosphere of the Tavistock. In particular, Hadfield was influential in shaping the psychotherapeutic training offered by the clinic. Like Crichton-Miller, Hadfield was interested in the relation between mind and brain. He had practised hypnosis on shell shock victims in WWI and was responsible for 'the "training analysis" of many younger psychiatrists in the 1930s' (Hinshelwood, 2013: 46). He wrote extensively and was psychoanalytic in his thinking, though his efforts were nonetheless 'regularly panned by Ernest Jones on the grounds of being divergent from Freudian psychoanalysis' (ibid.). Hadfield's divergence from classical psychoanalytic thinking was probably informed by his preference for Jung, cultivated, no doubt, during his time at Oxford, where he learned from William McDougall (ibid.).

McDougall, an English psychologist and co-founder of the British Psychological Society, is probably best known for his *An Introduction to Social Psychology* (1908/1998). Like many psychologists of his time, McDougall treated shell-shock victims during WWI. The start of the war in 1914 also interrupted his analysis with C. G. Jung. The potential influence Jung had on McDougall is more evident in his later life, when his research interests 'veered towards psychic

phenomena and Lamarckian inheritance', and served to alienate him from his colleagues (Richards, 2004: 331). McDougall also claimed to have anticipated certain psychoanalytic ideas that were becoming more mainstream and accepted. He is ultimately remembered for 'the range of perspectives he sought to integrate' and his insistence to maintain 'a teleological approach to understanding human nature' (ibid.: 332). Such a focus finds no better expression than in Jung's psychology. It is not surprising, then, that Hadfield – as McDougall's student – developed a distinctly Jungian orientation. Nor is it surprising that Hadfield, as one of the original figures appointed by Crichton-Miller in 1920 and named Director of Studies in 1933, extended an invitation to Jung to deliver a set of lectures to the Institute of Medical Psychology, between September 30th and October 4th, 1935. When Jung wished to build stronger links between the IGMSP and an 'Anglo-Saxon organization', he did not hesitate to contact Hadfield for his opinion (Adler [ed], 1973: 202-03). What I am suggesting, and what I have tried to show, is that the lectures themselves were given at a crucial point in Jung's life. They provide a particularly advantageous vertex from which we may critically assess the development of analytical psychology – as a clinical approach, depth psychological theory and academic discipline.

In addition to providing an invaluable starting point for the contextualization of Jung's thinking in relation to that of his contemporaries, as well as affording an answer to the question, 'Why was Jung invited to the Tavistock Clinic in 1935'?, the lectures are relevant because they serve as an excellent introduction to analytical psychology. Not only are the major tenets of Jung's thinking covered throughout, but his mindfulness of his audience – some of whom, as we have noted, were situated on the periphery of depth psychology and included medical professionals, journalists and writers – certainly informed the way in which he presented his theories. Jung's style of presentation, combined with the discussions that prompted clarification

from Jung (albeit at times defensive in tone and rhetorical in style), make for a lively read. Of particular value are the numerous clinical vignettes that Jung intersperses. Unlike Freud, Jung is not known for writing detailed case studies demonstrating how he applied theory to, and how he distilled theory from, the practice of analysis and dream interpretation. However problematic Freud's case studies may be (Borch-Jacobsen and Shamdasani, 2012: 179-234), they are rich resources for those interested in psychoanalytic thinking and technique. While Jung's 'Tavistock Lectures' cannot and should not, in all fairness, be considered an equivalent to Freud's case histories, they do clearly communicate, and conveniently locate in one volume, Jung's approach to dreams. More importantly, Jung's inclusion of clinical vignettes throughout the lectures reminds us that Jung's theory-building was not only the result of a 'subjective confession' (Jung, 1931/1961: 336), but one steeped in 'empirical' research, a point he staunchly defended numerous times during his lifetime (see Jung, 1952/1989: 663). For all of these reasons, I am delighted that *Analytical Psychology: Its Theory and Practice* is now a part of the Routledge Classics series, so that it may be enjoyed and appreciated on multiple levels. The text provides a rare snapshot of Jung's charisma and 'rudeness', and captures both the complexity and simplicity of his thinking. Most importantly, while I have no doubt that the text will be critically assessed by many, I hope that it will be cherished for its beauty by all.

References

- Adler, Gerhard (ed). (1973). *C. G. Jung Letters, Volume 1: 1906-1950*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bair, Deirdre. (2003). *Jung: A Biography*. New York and Boston: Little Brown and Company.
- Borch-Jacobsen, Mikkel and Shamdasani, Sonu. (2012). *The Freud Files: An Inquiry into the History of Psychoanalysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, Julie. (2005). 'The Entrapment of the Female Body in Beckett's Plays in Relation to

- Jung's Third Tavistock Lecture' in *Samuel Beckett Today/Aujourd'hui*, 15, pp. 161-72.
- Hinshelwood, Robert D. (2013). "The Tavistock Years" in Robert D. Hinshelwood and Nuno Torres (eds), *Bion's Sources: The Shaping of his Paradigms*. Hove: Routledge, pp. 44-55.
- Jung, C. G. (1931/1961). 'Freud and Jung: Contrasts' in Sir Herbert Read, Michael Fordham, Gerhard Adler and William McGuire (eds), *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung, Volume 4: Freud and Psychoanalysis*. R. F. C. Hull (trans). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 333-40.
- (1936). *Fundamental Psychological Conceptions: A Report of Five Lectures by C. G. Jung*. Mary Barker and Margaret Game (eds) for the Analytical Psychology Club, London.
- (1952/1989). 'A Reply to Martin Buber' in Sir Herbert Read, Michael Fordham, Gerhard Adler and William McGuire (eds), *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung, Volume 18: The Symbolic Life, Miscellaneous Writings*. R. F. C. Hull (trans). Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, pp. 663-70.
- (1961/1989). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Recorded and edited by Aniela Jaffé. Richard and Clara Winston (trans). New York: Vintage Books.
- (1961/1989). 'Foreword to "Hugh Crichton-Miller, 1877-1959"' in Sir Herbert Read, Michael Fordham, Gerhard Adler and William McGuire (eds), *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung, Volume 18: The Symbolic Life, Miscellaneous Writings*. R. F. C. Hull (trans). Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, pp. 639-41.
- (1968). *Analytical Psychology: Its Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- McDougall, William. (1908/1998). *An Introduction to Social Psychology*. Bristol: Thoemmes.
- McGuire, William (ed). (1974). *The Freud/Jung Letters: the Correspondence between Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung*. Ralph Manheim and R. F. C. Hull (trans). Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Richards, Graham. (2004). "McDougall, William (1871-1938) in H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (eds), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Volume 35, Macan-Macpherson* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Samuels, Andrew. (1988). "Foreword" in C. G. Jung, *Essays on Contemporary Events: Reflections on Nazi Germany*. London: Ark Paperbacks.
- Shamdasani, Sonu. (2005-2006). "From the Uncollected Jung: Jung in Oxford, 1938" in *Jung History: A Semi-Annual Publication of the Philemon Foundation*, 1(2), pp. 3-5.

- Torres, Nuno and Hinshelwood, Robert D. (2013). "The Wider Medical Culture of Bion's Biopsychosocial Framework" in Robert D. Hinshelwood and Nuno Torres (eds), *Bion's Sources: The Shaping of his Paradigms*. London: Routledge, pp. 35-43.
- Vannoy Adams, Michael and Sherry, Jay. (1991/2003). "Appendix A. Significant Words and Events. Revised and Updated by Jay Sherry" in Aryeh Maidenbaum (ed), *Jung and the Shadow of Anti-Semitism*. Berwick, ME: Nicolas-Hays, Inc., pp. 219-57.