



A Conversation between Like-Minded Colleagues and Friends: Alan Vaughan and Andrew Samuels

Alan G. Vaughan

To cite this article: Alan G. Vaughan (2018) A Conversation between Like-Minded Colleagues and Friends: Alan Vaughan and Andrew Samuels, *Jung Journal*, 12:2, 118-137, DOI: [10.1080/19342039.2018.1442108](https://doi.org/10.1080/19342039.2018.1442108)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19342039.2018.1442108>



Published online: 31 May 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

A Conversation between Like-Minded Colleagues and Friends: Alan Vaughan and Andrew Samuels

Questing for New Jungian Paradigms on Ethnicity, Racism, and Culture
within the Individuation of Analytical Psychology



Alan G. Vaughan and Andrew Samuels (right)

ALAN G. VAUGHAN

A convergence of events brought about this interview with Andrew Samuels. The memorial service for Tom Kirsch, MD, the much loved and influential Jungian analyst from the San Francisco C. G. Jung Institute, brought Andrew Samuels to California from London. He came to celebrate the life and the work of his recently deceased and beloved mentor, colleague, and friend. This convergence allowed us the opportunity to sit in dialogue at my home in the Oakland hills of California, of December 2017.

My interest in interviewing Andrew Samuels originated from my desire to engage deeply with him about the application of relevant principles of analytical psychology in the broader context of community health and healthier communities. Educated and trained as interdisciplinarian, I have

been interested in analytical psychology, historiography, law, political economy, and education as they intersect to affect consciousness and impact the human and environmental conditions of life in the twenty-first century. Because of my immediate interest in the critique, revision, reform, and reconciliation of Jung's ideas and experiences of the African Diaspora, I engage with Andrew Samuels and others in the post-Jungian and postmodern critique of the strengths, limitations, and needed extensions of analytical psychology in these modern chaotic times. How relevant is analytical psychology today and how does analytical psychology interface with other disciplines to increase consciousness, to address needed transformative change, and to support our evolution? Andrew is swimming in these deep waters within Europe and across multiple cultures around the globe.

I first came to know of Andrew during my analytical training. I followed his ideas and scholarship for years before meeting him in person. His book on *Jung and the Post Jungians* (1985) along with Tom Kirsch's *The Jungians: A Comparative and Historical Perspective* (2000) were helpful to my understanding of the historical developments of analytical psychology. Both books filled gaps in my analytical training and offered a cohesive and comprehensive understanding of the field of analytical psychology from the international perspective. Andrew's book on psychopathology (1990) was also useful in grounding analytical psychology in contexts of clinical assessment, diagnosis, and treatment. His ideas are creative, and his presentations pointed. In fact, Andrew usually has a strong point of view. I once saw him in a heated dialogue about aspects of Jung's life and work with the historian Sonu Shamdasani at a symposium hosted by the San Francisco C. G. Jung Institute some years ago. He never seems to miss the opportunity to challenge the status quo with keen intellect, passion, and surgical precision.

In 2014, I attended the first Analysis and Activism Conference (A&A) held in London. Andrew was the developer and moderator of the conference. The conference brought me into contact with populations in ethnically and economically diverse communities. When I attended the 2017 International Association of Jungian Studies (IAJS) conference in Cape Town, South Africa, I had the opportunity to talk further with Andrew. I learned more about his blend of traditional and novel approaches to the practice of analytical psychology and the ideas in his scholarship.

Our San Francisco C. G. Jung Institute Committee on Diversity and Inclusivity invited Andrew and analyst Fanny Brewster to one of our meetings to discuss the International Association of Analytical Psychology (IAAP) statement of apology and acknowledgment of Jung's negative commentary on Africans and African Americans in his writings. Our committee supported the groundbreaking series of events that led to the IAAP statement of apology and has been active in moving the issues of diversity forward on an international level to be discussed at the 2019 IAAP Congress in Vienna. In this interview, Andrew and I exchanged ideas about the IAAP Africa statement, his political consultancy, and his international work.

Alan Vaughan: Good morning, Andrew, and welcome to California. I know you are in San Francisco for the memorial celebration of your dear friend and colleague, Tom Kirsch, who passed away recently. I offer my sympathies to you; Jean, his wife; and to his family. Many of us at the San Francisco C. G. Jung Institute will join you for the scheduled celebration of his life and work in the coming days.

To begin our interview, can you tell us a little about your background? By this I mean your professional training and clinical and consulting practice. How do you actually spend your professional time in London?

Andrew Samuels: I spend my time divided between a full clinical practice, my tenured professorship in analytical psychology at the University of Essex, writing, and political organizing and activism. I trained at the Society of Analytical Psychology (SAP) in London in the early 1970s. This was the heyday of the SAP (as everyone calls it), and they were having a love affair with Kleinian psychoanalysis. This has changed as the years rolled by. But at that time, we read more Klein and Winnicott than we ever did Jung. If I think about a one-word self-definition, then I'd say I am a "therapist." Everything stems from that—the professorship, the writing, and the politics.

So at the heart of me as a living person is my psychotherapy practice. As time passes, I truly become more and more committed to that. My work on finding responsible and relational ways to work with political material in clinical sessions brings my interests together (see Samuels 2006).

Alan: Do you draw distinctions between psychotherapy and psychoanalysis? You refer to yourself as a psychotherapist. Can you distinguish this from being a psychoanalyst?

Andrew: That's a really shrewd question, and I do have a very thought through position on this. I feel that the differences between the schools of therapy have been hyped and that we have become tribal or cult-like. Then in many countries there's a hierarchical distinction between the analysts, the psychotherapists, and the counselors. If a Martian came to earth, they wouldn't notice the distinctions that we die for—or rather kill each other over. So, I like to speak of myself as a psychotherapist and a person who comes to see me as a client.

Yet, for me there's a clinical hybrid. This involves post-Jungian, relational psychoanalytic, and humanistic psychotherapies. I'm not saying I'm the only person who developed such a hybrid, but I think I may be one of the very few to write quite specifically about it. This is because I have done so much thinking about pluralism in the psychotherapies and in politics as well (see Samuels 1989). This is how we pluralists think: we don't over accentuate the differences between the different approaches.

I began as a Jungian, now I call myself a post-Jungian. I've become very involved with relational psychoanalysis after I left the IAAP as an officer. Subsequently, I became a founder board member of the International Association for Relational Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy (IARPP), and I served on its board for fifteen years. I think relational psychoanalysis is the best playmate for today's Jungian analysis. I think it's more useful than object relations or attachment theory, and I commend it to Jungian colleagues.

The humanistic piece is important to me because at one point, as a very young man in the late '60s, early '70s, I nearly became a humanistic practitioner. I was in encounter groups when that was the thing, and I became apprentice to a well-known encounter group leader,

but I was also in Jungian analysis. And although I'm a noisy extroverted kind of person, I found what went on in those twenty-four-hour marathon encounters to be way too noisy and hence shallow.

I actually found the sexual acting out of the encounter group experience (after an initial thrill) not to be what I wanted to do. So, you could say I became a Jungian analyst, in part, as a reaction to the excesses of the human potential movement. But there was also my drama and youth work project that I was running at the time. (I'll talk more about my theatrical background if and when you ask me.) The project consultant there gave me a book, my very first Jungian book: *Jung's Psychology and Its Social Meaning*, by Ira Progoff (1953). Everyone else starts with *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* or *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* or *Man and His Symbols*. Progoff's book still sits in a special place on my shelf.

I hope this makes sense to readers. For me, it's not a question of hybridizing or integrating so that the differences between the traditions are *smoothed out*. I want them to be there *competing with one another in my mind*. Pluralism is a conversation that doesn't have agreement as a goal. It means I like people to tell me the various things that influence and interest them.

I'll give you an example. I used to spend a lot of time teaching in Russia from the 1980s onward. You learn so much when you're in the frontier zones of Jungian analysis. And I met a person there and she said that her two main interests—and remember she was training to be a Jungian—were (1) Winnicott, and (2) neuro-linguistic programming. Now you would not find anyone in the West doing that kind of pluralistic mixture. I wish we did it more and that people began to use Jung's metaphor concerning difference that there are different strands in a spectrum. There's no point in pretending that these strands don't exist and should be respected—but you're allowed to move to and fro across strands.

Alan: Your thinking and clinical practice move between principles of analytical psychology, relational analysis, and humanistic psychology. You talk about pluralism and hybridity in some ways as containers and bridges for these theoretical approaches. Can you comment on whether or not the long-term consequence could be to dilute the focus and impact of these particular traditions in clinical practice?

Andrew: Oh, I absolutely love such dilution! That's what I'm all about. And later we can talk about how I apply psychotherapy to politics; I'm going to explain that dilution. It's the fanaticism, the desire to be right, the desire to prove that your approach is better than somebody else's approach. That's where a lot of the hang ups in our field come from. So, sure, my Jungian analysis strand is diluted compared to a really gung-ho Jungian analyst; and my psychoanalytic strands similarly so; and my humanistic strand is just a little permanent trickle and dribble at the back of my clinical mind—but it's there. I gain from the dilution.

Think about a cocktail. A cocktail is a wonderful, wonderful cultural invention because it involves dilution. And actually, if you put ice into it, it involves literal dilution. I'm a cocktail and the word that I like most from continental thinking and philosophy is *bricolage*. I want to be a *bricoleur*. And I think it is really worth Googling this word, *bricoleur*, because it means that, in a craft spirit, you use a bit from here, a bit from there, a bit from there. Yeah, you lose as well. You

really do lose. You don't become anywhere near as good as someone who specializes, but I want to be somebody who doesn't specialize and is good at that.

Alan: You are a prolific writer and thinker in the field of analytical psychology. Please tell us something about your writing and publications. Which of these are more important to you and why?

Andrew: There are eleven books with my name on them. I want to recommend only three. One I mentioned already is *The Plural Psyche: Personality, Morality and the Father* from 1989. It's where my engagement with politics as a therapist begins. Pluralism, as I worked it out, was an approach both to politics itself but also to how to apply psychotherapy ideas, *therapy thinking* as I call it, to politics. Also, it has my first stuff on the father in there and a chapter called "Beyond the Feminine Principle" (1989, 92–106), which nearly got me excluded from the Jungian world because it disputes Jungian essentialism around gender. Of course, as time passes, what was then the act of a very naughty boy indeed has become pretty much mainstream. That chapter may still be worth looking at because I do think that what I suggest about expanding gender roles via a different use of animus and anima is relevant now in the age of "trans."

The second book that I would like to commend from my work is the most recent one (which is something all authors do). It's called *A New Therapy for Politics?* (2015). Can there be such a thing? That's why I put the question mark in the title. I'm one of the inventors of this therapy for politics business, but it isn't really achieving very much. Maybe it's just the beginning, but I think we need to temper our enthusiasm for linking psychology and politics, especially Jungian psychology and politics, with a great big dose of skepticism because so many attempts, mine included, have the secret intent of proving that the therapeutic view of the person doing the application is correct.

What our friend John Beebe once called "the maddening rectitude of the psychoanalyst" comes into play. And although I try not to do it, I end up doing it. I just want to be right! At its worst, that's what it's about. At its best, though, I do think therapy does have something to offer political and social problematics and thinking about them. This leads to the third book that I want to draw people's attention to. It's an edited volume from 2016 with Emilija Kiehl and Mark Saban called *Analysis and Activism: Social and Political Contributions of Jungian Psychology*. It got nominated for the Gradiva Award of the National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis. The book did not win the prize, but it was nominated, which is something. This is a book by seventeen analysts from all over the world, Jungian analysts from all over the world talking about their activism.

Yes, there's a bit of theory in all these chapters and maybe one or two are full of theory. But, mostly, it's about *the doing*. The doing, the acting is really important. You know sometimes deep reflection is relatively easy. Successful, sustained, courage-involving social and political action taken together with other people is a hell of a bigger job. And I wanted to draw your readers' attention to this book because it characterizes the politicization of analytical psychology via action, not only via reflection. Don't misunderstand me. I'm not saying don't think or don't reflect or don't say nothing, that's all fine. But sometimes you have to stand up and be counted, and it's better to do it with other people, not on your

own. And this book shows an amazing array of projects worldwide, ranging from refugees, working with torture, working around German-Jewish reconciliation, and so many other interesting activist projects.

Later, I know we're going to talk about the whole analysis and activism project itself, but this book is the source book for quite a lot of that. And I always say when Jungians, in particular, say they're interested in politics, you really have to look at what they do. And this book shows quite clearly to the world what we do.

Alan: As you mention the book title *A New Therapy for Politics?*, the question that comes to mind is, can you really move analysis out of the consulting room and have it be effective? It also makes me think about Jung's idea of the reciprocal alchemical influences on mutual transformation in psychoanalysis, the analyst being changed and the analysand being changed in the mix.

Andrew: I like your perception that it's got something to do with *reciprocity*, Alan, and that's how I'll couch my answer. It is a two-way street because you can't seriously engage psychologically with the politics of your time if you don't also engage politically with the psychotherapy of your time. You have to do both because they are reciprocally linked. If therapy doesn't change itself, it is useless as a source of ideas and energy about changing anything for the better in the world. Well, my work in progress at the moment is called *Transforming Therapy —But Therapy Really Has to Want to Change*.

My friend Jessica Benjamin, at the same time as I was thinking of this title, also played with the joke. And her punchline of the joke is, "It only takes one analyst to change a light bulb, but first the analyst has to change."

Alan: Yes, amusing and interesting. Say more...

Andrew: It's quite interesting actually when I compare my work to Jessica's, how it's evolved since the '80s without any serious sitting down and thinking, "What can we do together?" It's developed some very similar ideas, as has the work of another great colleague of mine, Susie Orbach in London. I've been very privileged to have these two writers/activists in my life. We don't agree about everything, but we're on the journey.

The question was a gift, if I understood your reciprocity of transformation correctly. You can pounce around talking about Trump but continue to offer clinical work that hasn't changed its style for thirty years. If you're going to talk about changing the society, you have to look at what the present-day demands are on the practice of psychotherapy. What society today demands as a practice of psychotherapy is not the same as twenty-five or thirty years ago. And—this is very important—we have to change our institutions too, as well as how we work as individual therapists.

We are useless as critics or activists in contemporary politics if we run institutes that haven't changed for decades, whether in terms of their values, whether in terms of their social and ethnic composition, whether in terms of how they're structured organizationally.

If we don't change how we organize ourselves and what we do, then we're not worth our salt when it comes to political change, and I think that was the back of your question, something along those lines. Am I right?

Alan: Yes, in classical analytical theory, the psychoanalyst and the analysand are mutually influenced and changed by the alchemical processes and stages of the treatment. You take this idea a step further to suggest that the field of psychotherapy has to change itself in order to accommodate, even facilitate change within cultural institutions of the modern times in which we now live. Transformation from psychotherapy on the couch equates with transformation of psychotherapy and the culture in which it is practiced. This is certainly an interesting proposition. It feels right!

Andrew: Good. Yes, I like the question. It helped me a lot.

Alan: A third question: before psychotherapy, did you have an earlier set of career interests, training, or practice?

Andrew: I always say to people my background was in theater, and I understood the notion of performativity long before I came upon it with people like Judith Butler: that the gap between performance and actuality is almost nonexistent at times. I like to bring in a theatrical touch to the way I write and the way I speak and above all the way I do workshops where theater is alive in me. It's my big regret that I didn't stay in the theater as an artistic director. But in the end, I found the atmosphere not sufficiently committed enough politically, so I left it and began to do drama activity with dysfunctional or underprivileged young people and then that moved into becoming a psychotherapist.

The other background is politics. The other day my youngest son was around, and he's fourteen and a half and he gets these school reports, and I found my old school reports from the last few years at school, from about fourteen to eighteen, and they all commented that I was a highly political young man. I knew about current affairs; I was provocative and troublesome and challenging with visiting speakers when they used to have politicians and judges and things like that who came to talk to the school. Your question reminded me that politics is even older in me than theater. And so there are these two things, theater and politics. And psychotherapy, well it brought in something new. I would not like to say it is just an amalgamation of the previous interests. Later, came the interest in spirituality (for example, in *Politics on the Couch* in 2001).

Alan: Where and how did your interest in psychotherapy and psychoanalysis originate? Can you comment on the arc of its development and evolution over time? In other words, I would like to know the genesis of your interest and the epigenesis.

Andrew: Given the way the interview has gone thus far, I think I'd like to answer by focusing on what has influenced personally the directions that my work has taken. I never forget Jung's idea that every psychology is a "personal confession."

Alan: Your individuation?

Andrew: I've written about this. It's so clear to me how the basic facts of my early life influenced what I write about. I wrote a paper called "The Image of the Parents in Bed" (1989, 12–142), and I had parents who had a very conventional, very conflict-free marriage apparently, but I sensed from day one that there was a passionate absence or an absence of passion, and I wrote about this. My father was a very nice man, a gentleman, but he was what I subsequently called a "dry father." It's not surprising that I write so much about the father. In all my books there are chapters on the father, different ways of experiencing a father and being a father. This is undoubtedly connected to the father I did not have.

My mother's influence on me, it's fascinating. I had a very poor relationship with my mother, which continued like that until she died. But when we were having discussions that you have in families about what was I going to "do," she said, "Be a journalist." My father said, "Be a lawyer," but that's the dry father. My mother said, "Be a journalist." I said, "Why?" She said, "Because people read what journalists write." And although I wouldn't say I write like a journalist (I've been accused of it, believe me, Alan), I have always recalled what my mother said. Well, some very stuffy academics and old-style Jungians think I do write like a (bad) journalist at times.

I like the impermanence of journalism. Indeed, I like impermanence. I remember going with my late dear friend Takao Oda, a great Japanese analyst who died tragically young, to a Shinto temple. He told me he was a Shintoist and that the ideal for a temple is that it gets replaced every few years. I loved this impermanence because growing up in those shabby little synagogues in Liverpool, where I was born, or visiting Chartres or Westminster Abbey, I thought that a place of worship and faith should be permanent, but the thought never felt quite right to me. And then I had somebody who is a devotee of their particular faith, Shinto, telling me that the whole point was it would just come down. I loved it. I loved it.

Alan: Go on...

Andrew: You know something? That's enough on my personal life and how it influenced my work. I wrote it up in the *Journal of Analytical Psychology* (2014). Any serious writer in the therapy field should try to explain in simple ordinary language how their early life and their writing gel.

Alan: Yes, understood, but just a bit more on this question. Can you say how psychotherapy has been transformative for you? Now we've talked a little bit about your being a psychotherapist, a psychoanalyst; how have either or both of these processes affected you?

Andrew: It has put me deeply in touch with why I needed to be a therapist and some of what has come up is not pleasant. I think I was born constitutionally a very aggressive person. And somehow the practice of psychotherapy requires me to address my aggressivity and transmute it into more therapeutic virtues such as inquiry, empathy, intimacy, and the like. It's given me a place, a locus to do that work. It has also taught me so many specific lessons. I don't know where to begin, but I'm going to tell you one from my Jungian analysis. I had a lot of different therapies. But in my Jungian analysis, what I discovered was that if you take a potshot at somebody, they'll zap you back. What's the point in then complaining about that? So, for example, when I went out there and said Jung was anti-Semitic and people were nasty to me, I didn't complain. Of course, they were nasty to me. I had been nasty to them. It is the ultimate adolescent idea that you can deal a blow on somebody and then complain when they come back at you. That was a great discovery that I got from my first analyst, Kate Newton.

But I had so many therapies. I've mentioned the encounter groups, the Jungian analysis, and I had three years in body psychoanalysis. I had a hell of a lot of couple's therapy because my couple life has been complex, checkered, controversial, and a great source of gossip for all my friends and colleagues. So I needed a lot of couple's therapy. I'm not a great believer in couple's therapy frankly, but I've needed it a lot.

What else have I gotten from my experience in therapy? A lot of my ideas about the ordinariness of spirituality have come out of being in therapy and having enhanced experiences about very ordinary things and realizing that the spiritual is everyday and it's ubiquitous and it's ordinary. It's not sensational. It's not awesome. It's not big. Bani Shorter, who is an old friend and colleague of mine, dead, of course, now, wrote a book called *Susceptible to the Sacred* (1995), and I love this phrase: everything is susceptible to the sacred.

Alan: Andrew, your scholarship and professional practice suggest that you have a particular interest in psychotherapy, psychoanalysis, and politics, and you have certainly talked about these interests earlier in the interview. Politics can have many dimensions and dynamics beyond the legislative branches of government. Political organization and activism seem important. Can you share more about your politics and activism beginning with a short history on the origins and mission of the International Association for Jungian Studies (IAJS)?

Andrew: I don't think I need to say any more about politics, but I do want to say something about Jungian studies and the International Association of Jungian Studies (IAJS). Let me backtrack a bit. I like to start small organizations; if they survive, good; if they don't survive, frankly equally good. IAJS was started by a group of us around Essex in 2002—notably my friend and colleague Renos Papadopoulos. And it was needed at the time because there was no organization where somebody interested in Jungian studies who was not an analyst could go.

In those days, the IAAP was just for the analysts, so we needed this. And now there are people doing PhDs in all kinds of Jungian topics in several countries in the world, and this IAJS is a little marvel. I mean it's got huge problems because there are no entrance qualifications.

Anyone can join, and sometimes it's just like a club or friends of Jung. But at its best, you can, for example, put an email out there saying, "Guys, I need some help with adoption," let's say. "What is the Jungian literature on adoption? Can you help?" Within a week, you'll have twenty-five references. This is an amazing thing. And, of course, a lot of the analysts get very snooty about this because, heavens above, there are masters students in this organization. That's a really serious problem for some, but I think it's great.

Also, I started something called the Confederation for Analytical Psychology (CAP). That's where you and Fanny Brewster will be speaking in London in October 2018. This is the only place in London where the five IAAP groups can come together. It's not very big. It costs 25 pounds. That's like 30 dollars to join. Not much. It's a very important place because it says that we're not going to get completely caught up in the Jungian professional politics of London.

Another one that I started that I'm perhaps the single most proud of—it's my best and biggest baby—is Psychotherapists and Counsellors for Social Responsibility (PCSR) in Britain. It's unique and I love it. And again, there are many things wrong with it. People join with chips on their shoulder, but you know anyone interested in politics has a chip on their shoulder. No big deal. It's no disqualifying factor. It's actually a badge of honor to feel oppressed and persecuted and want to do something about it. It's not a problem. So PCSR is also very much high up in my list of affections. I want to be remembered, not as somebody who started some massive great Andrew Samuels' Institute, but as somebody who either founded or inspired four or five small groups. Of course, I broke my own rule by getting elected chair of the UK Council for Psychotherapy, the main national regulatory body.

Alan: Here in America many of us know little or nothing about these professional organizations. Briefly, can you comment on the missions of each of these organizations?

Andrew: IAJS is to provide a place where Jungian scholarship and research can function that is not owned by the clinical community, and where the academic virtues of skepticism, critique, and argumentation set the tone. There are no believers in IAJS. Well, if there are, there shouldn't be.

PCSR was a way of letting people in our field of therapy join together to do things politically, to go to demonstrations, to mount campaigns, to write letters, to concoct petitions, the whole range of political activism. And although it doesn't have a specific party affiliation, it is, of course, hanging to the left of center.

As for CAP, I don't want to give you the full history of British Jungian professional politics. Let's just say: can you imagine living in a city where there are five Jungian organizations plus a club, plus a guild of Pastoral Psychology? It's nuts! We needed a place like CAP where all are welcome. Now, of course, CAP isn't very popular because the essence of these five IAAP organizations is that they're competing, and we're the place where we just have no interest in that. Nevertheless, it's been fun, this CAP, and maybe it is coming to an end now because, in spite of what I've just said, relations between the five London groups are getting better and better.

Those are thumbnail sketches of all these organizations, and I want to tell you, brother, that's the first time anyone has asked me to define their purposes. I mean, it's all written down, but I've never been interviewed precisely on what each of them is for. Each of them may represent a part of my personality, the scholarly, the pluralistic, the political. This is a new thought that our interview is stimulating in me. It never occurred to me before that; there's been a little bit of rhythm and reason in all of this organizational innovativeness. I think I have discovered this in this interview.

Alan: As you speak, I'm very interested in CAP because some of the institutes in America have splintered, and they've split and reformed and formed new Jungian organizations. Could you say more about these five independent IAAP groups in London? Why and how did they split?

Andrew: I could do it, but I don't think it's interesting for this readership.

Alan: It certainly is of interest to me, as this has happened to some degree in the New York programs where some of my analytical training took place. I think the fissures were there but undetectable before my transfer to the San Francisco institute.

Andrew: OK, then, I'll do it.

Alan: Thank you.

Andrew: It's a bit like those Old Testament passages when Manasseh begot Ephraim who begot this who begot that. Okay. Jung supported Michael Fordham in starting the Society of Analytical Psychology in 1946. It had a predecessor in 1921, but really it starts in '46. And this group split in 1977 when Gerhard Adler's group, the Association of Jungian Analysts (AJA) started. This was intended to be a better blend of Jungian psychology and psychoanalysis than Fordham managed in the SAP. Then, AJA split over personalities really and something called the Independent Group of Analytical Psychologists was founded, and then that split and people with a more spiritual bent started something that became in the end called The Guild for Analytical Psychology.

Personalities played a part obviously. People ask me what I think about these splits, and I have perhaps a slightly tricksterish answer. If people want to go, let them go. Why try to hold things together? If the center isn't holding, maybe it isn't meant to hold. I say: "Let them go. Do we look stupid in British psychotherapy circles to have five quite small Jungian groups? Yes! We look completely idiotic." Of course, but then we are idiotic. We're Jungians. We're used to being idiotic. We're Jungians and we like being idiotic—we call it being different!

There was a time twenty-five years ago when I had visions of working with others to bring them all together in something called a C. G. Jung Institute of London; I would never even go there now. Let the water flow where it wants to flow. Listen, if you can have Catalonia's

independence, and you can have Scotland as independent—and even, indirectly, California—and so on and so forth, you can have five Jungian groups.

Alan: Understood! Andrew, on the Analysis and Activism conferences, I was able to attend the first conference in London in 2014. It was a very special event for me, grounding the idea of moving analysis out of the consulting room into communities and the public domain to work toward health, economic and social justice, and transformative change. Really to experiment with how principles of analytical psychology could be applied in the real world to help people and to help the societies in which we live, to grow, differentiate, even individuate into a humane collective of communities with an equity stake in the sustainability of human lives and the planet.

Can you sketch a narrative on the development of the conferences and perhaps the themes? There were Analysis and Activism conferences: London 2014, Rome 2015, and recently Prague in December 2017.

Andrew: The first segment of your question is priceless for me because it summarizes it exactly. That was when you talked about the application of analytical psychology principles in the world and of taking analytical psychology out of the consulting room. You summarize things perfectly. I would not say that there has been any significant development between one conference and another. They have all been around those important points. But as the nature of the political obsessions of the day changes so the papers change, but the overall thrust of the project has not changed from what you said.

In Prague in 2017, everything was colored by refugees and migrants, on the one hand, and Trump and Brexit, on the other hand; whereas in the earlier conferences, especially in London, those were not perhaps issues in quite the same way. I'm pleased that the groups of people who constitute the Analysis and Activism project are moving with the times. And this is good because our stated goal was to couple the spirit of the depths with the spirit of the times. Is this happening deliberately due to intellectual decisions by me and the other organizers? No. It's just responsiveness to what is.

I think another theme that is generating much more interest is the theme of "the Other." In fact, there are so many conferences on the Other, for example, the IAAP Congress in Vienna 2019. Recently, I just gave a paper in London entitled, "Oh, No! Not Another Fucking Conference on the Other," because it's become a little bit of a fad.

Analysis and Activism is an organic living thing and how much longer I'll go on being one of its leaders is an interesting question, because I've put a lot of energy into the topic and there are younger people who are going to take it over and it'll be great. However, there is an important problem with the Analysis and Activism project. It is too Anglophone. It's been okay to do it in the European heartlands; this especially helps people from Russia and Eastern Europe to come, but I mean what about the Latin Americans and the Asians? We have a serious problem of how to make Analysis and Activism more international.

The IAAP, you know, for all its failings, and it does have some failings, is an impressively international organization. The amount of time and money spent on translation into five

languages is staggering. It is exemplary in this regard, and we are having officers and presidents from all over the world. But it's more difficult for an unfunded project conceived of by a few friends, which is what Analysis and Activism is, to become as international as it wants to be. Nevertheless, in Prague, the speakers came from thirteen different countries and the attendees came from twenty-four or twenty-five different countries. We are not too bad about it, but the English language domination—I don't know what to do about it.

Alan: I take note that you do not mention Africa in relation to the Analysis and Activism project, but we can come back to this. Following the thread, could you comment more on the structure and organization of the Analysis and Activism project? How do they work? And then, too, whether there are funding issues? Is this project something that could be adopted and funded by IAAP, with the presumption that the IAAP has greater resources and could support the project? And a third part of the question, could the Analysis and Activism project happen globally and on a regional basis, where there could be A&A America, A&A Latin America, A&A Africa, A&A Europe, for example?

Andrew: I wouldn't want A&A to become part of IAAP because we would lose our critical position. Debates like the current one having to do with what Jung wrote about Africa and Africans would be much more difficult to develop. Within the mainstream of the IAAP, I think the tiny little Analysis and Activism project has had a disproportionately massive cultural impact by raising this whole question. IAAP is now taking it up and looking at what to do in terms of issuing a public statement about it. I think we better stay outside the IAAP.

The therapy world has changed. Everybody has a little bit of a political outlook now. And when you're in a gathering of analysts, they talk politics as much as any other topic. I think the IAAP is changing and paying much more attention to political issues. But inevitably, as a large mainstream professional organization, it tends to seek the center ground, wants to hold everybody in a comfortable portmanteau. Analysis and Activism is more radical than that. It's not overtly socialist because nobody is socialist these days. To use old-fashioned language, it's "on the left." And I don't think a big professional organization could operate from out of the leftist position.

That said, there's a shadow angle with everything that I've just said. The personal shadow is that I like being a rebel. I stepped out of the IAAP after my long time on the committee as an honorary secretary. I didn't want to go through the whole ladder of becoming a president. As I mentioned, in Britain, I was in effect the president of the national psychotherapy organization. But, in general, I want to be the outsider or maverick, the contrarian, the challenger, and so on. I'm not sure I'd know what to do if I had the responsibility and the power of running a big mainstream professional organization like IAAP.

When I say I don't want Analysis and Activism to become part of IAAP, there is this little bit of shadow there. A fear of losing who I am—and I think a lot of other people would lose who they are as well.

Alan: Understood, the undertow of the shadow can generate alarm. Can you comment on how the Analysis and Activism project started as an organization and its current administration?

Andrew: Emilija Kiehl had the idea in 2013 to have one meeting at one Jungian society in London on politics and she asked me to do it, and I said, “No, let’s do something bigger.” With some encouragement from IAAP, we developed the idea of an international conference on politics as a special topic in London. We didn’t think beyond the first one and then Stefano Carta, who organized the A&A Conference in Rome 2015, joined us. Insofar as there’s a leadership, it’s us three: Andrew, Emilija, Stefano, with no committee, with no constitution, with no bank account (which worries me), with no funds. Essentially, we’re held together by a group and the conferences and the feeling that we can sense the comrades out there. There’s a lot of communication on our Google Group between people who are in A&A. But organizationally, as I hope readers will come to understand more, it’s hardly there. Still, like all organizations that are hardly there, we have our critics and our rebels as well who tell me, Emilija, and Stefano that we don’t consult them, that we have too much power, and that kind of thing. That’s fine. Probably that’s correct.

Alan: Yes. I wonder about putting it on firmer ground without compromising its autonomy and independence. Have you considered perhaps more conventional institutional features, organizational structures, and administrative practices with memberships and dues, things such as these?

Andrew: I would like Analysis and Activism to have the bare minimum of organizational structure as the other small things that I’ve helped to start: the bank account, a constitution but not an elaborate one, and a committee of some kind, and this will I think slowly start to happen. The other thing is that there are a lot of younger people out there. Many of those who are deeply knowledgeable about politics may or may not be Jungian analysts or candidates—and then we must make sure that their place in this organization is maintained as it is with the IAJS because the analysts are not the be all and end all of Jungian psychology. And that’s a good thing, not an insult to the analysts, but it’s just a good thing.

Alan: During the Rome conference or at the end of it, as I understand it, a statement was drafted by a working group. I believe the group included you; Fanny Brewster, an African-American woman and Jungian analyst; and the British analyst Gottfried Heuer along with the departing president of IAAP at the time, Tom Kelly. The statement was related to the pejorative attitudes and commentary written by Jung, in *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, about Africans and African American “Negros.” Can you provide a narrative on developments?

Andrew: This is a fast-moving situation, and I cannot say with any confidence what the current situation is. What I’d like to do is talk about the process as I have experienced it. The IAAP issued a statement in the general area of Jung and “Africa.” What follows is my

experience of the process. I have learned a lot from the Jungian community, and even from its reluctance to do anything that resembles *apologizing* for and on behalf of C. G. Jung.

At first when there was a manifest reluctance to apologize, I was furious because, without an apology, I thought, there can be no reparation. But gradually I began to see that there was a mass of opinion that was in favor of having the matter raised in public—but not at all in favor of saying things like “Jung was a racist.” And, gradually, I have shifted my ground in response to the shifting mass opinion as I sense it: which is to say that we need to gently differentiate ourselves from what Jung wrote about Africans. We need to acknowledge the hurt that it has caused and the possible damaging effect on people who might want to train to be analysts or want to seek Jungian analytic treatment if those people come from what we in Britain call a minority ethnic background.

We are saying this isn’t Jung’s issue anymore—it’s our issue—and we want to say something about our commitment to behaving differently, thinking differently, practicing differently in the future. This has been a very fascinating process for me, a political lesson. If the Jungian community moved too far away from issuing any kind of statement that dealt with the basic issues, I would denounce it, but I no longer insist that I’m right and believe an apology is the only right way to go. I think “statement” is a neutral term, but what you put in the statement is what counts.

It could be anodyne and conventional blah, blah, blah cliché, or it could be something interesting. That’s really what I’ve learned. I should have known this anyway, because when I did all that work on Jung and anti-Semitism in the late ’80s and early ’90s, I wrote over and over and over again, “I’m not interested in Jung the man; I’m interested in us, in what we do about what he said.” But I forgot it and I let my name go forward on something that was too Jung centric. I came *dangerously close to apologizing for my good friend Carl Jung*.

Alan: Yes, Andrew. Please share more about the history leading up to the statement drafted by the IAAP executive committee and now circulating among the IAAP Institute memberships, as it relates to Jung’s pejorative comments about Africans and African Americans.

Andrew: I would like to draw the reader’s attention to three specific things. First and perhaps most important, Jung never revised or apologized for what he wrote about Africans and African American “Negros.” This is a radical difference from the “Well, I slipped up” comment that he said about what he wrote about the Jews and his subsequent exploration of Jewish mysticism and other aspects of Jewish culture after the Second World War. That is something to reflect on. The editors of the *Collected Works* allowed statements comparing bushman to monkeys to be published in the *Collected Works* in English and in *Psychological Types* in 1971. Other things were revised or even sanitized by our editors, but this was not. So where’s the apology? Where’s the revision? Where’s the recantation? Where’s the deep reflection that we associate with Jung about what he wrote about Africans? I’d like our readers to think about that.

The second thing is that it’s certainly true that persons of color are underrepresented in the psychotherapy professions worldwide, but I’ve done some social research and the underrepresentation is even more pronounced in the Jungian professional communities. In other words,

there is a general problem, but we Jungians have a bigger version of that general problem. You can't escape the Jungian piece of this by referring to a general or universal problem. Ours is bigger, and we need to acknowledge that.

And the third thing that I think is important to say is that while Jung can validly be claimed to have been a man of his times, there need to be some very important qualifications made on that. The first and biggest one is that it's just not true.

In 1927, Paul Radin, who everybody knows as the Trickster guy and who was a friend of Jung's and was teaching at the Psychology Club in Zürich, wrote a book called *Primitive Man as Philosopher* (Radin 1927/2017). And he looks at this famous passage about a monkey-like bushman who killed his son after his unsuccessful days hunting, and he basically says, "First of all, Jung got this from someone else; he wasn't there, whereas all of us had thought that Jung somehow was around. He just read it. Secondly, it is total nonsense to refer to a bushman as monkey-like. It just doesn't accord with anything that even contemporary anthropology of our time was saying."

These things need to be thought about, but most important of all is to ask why it's taking so long for the Jungian analytic profession to gently and respectfully *differentiate itself from what Jung wrote about Africans*. We've done it about Jews, about women, about homosexuals, but somehow for Africans, the day has not arrived.

Alan: Yes. I just wanted to pick up on this problem. I attended the London conference, and I was struck with the sense that people of African ancestry were not being considered in the discourse about Jung's theories of personality and psychoanalysis. I was really happy to encounter you there and to now have the portal and pathway to discussing the Africa issues today. Could you say more about raising the issue of Jung's commentary on Africans and African Americans in his writings? I believe there was some discussion of Africa, Africans, African Americans, and analytical psychology during the IAAP Cape Town conference in 2007. Can you provide a brief historical overview of the effort to address this issue of people with African ancestry and analytical psychology?

Andrew: In 1987 Polly Young-Eisendrath wrote a paper asking why there were so few Black-American Jungian analysts. Mike Adams wrote his book *The Multicultural Imagination* in 1996. And other people have raised the issue from time to time. But even now, when it's firmly on the agenda following those Analysis and Activism conferences, there's a real reluctance. I'm going to put it in frank terms, and I need to know whether the English expression "going to bat" means anything.

Alan: Yes, it means standing up for something or someone, taking a clear and firm position. I read Polly's paper while applying to the New York training program in the 1980s. Michael came into the program while I was on leave and before my transfer to the San Francisco Institute to compete the certification process.

Andrew: People across the Western countries don't want to go to bat for Africanist people. Whether this means there is a global implicit or institutional racism is something to think about; whether it's that people don't realize that this is what they need to do and they'd be very happy to do it if somebody only said please do it, I don't know. That's perhaps rather a generous viewpoint, but there is definitely a question in my mind about a link between worldwide prejudice against people of African ancestry and the slowness and cumbersomeness with which we Jungians have addressed our piece of this matter.

Alan: Yes, there was a global system of slavery in which most European countries participated, including European America. Psychologically, at the depths of global cultural history, racism has to do with the negative attitudes, projections, and behavior of Europeans, people claiming European ancestry, and white identities in America, toward people from the African continent and, in general, People of Color. Racism has been institutionalized in the agency of colonialism and systems of apartheid that have rationalized torture, murder, theft, greed, and confiscation of land by church, state, and private enterprise. Through this agency of a violence-enforced white privilege and psychological dissociation, humanity has been truly compromised by these same destructive impulses of which Jung spoke, forces that will likely destroy the planet. "The great danger is the psyche of man." Psychological defenses against truth, honesty, shame, and guilt among people of privilege leads to inhumanity that continues to exist as the psychopathology of racism. It eats away at the soul of humanity and continues as pathos for all. The healing for racism requires a soul searching, reflection in the self, truth telling, reconciliation, and reparation. Nelson Mandela has given us a treatment plan with which to begin. We are stuck at the first stage in Jung's recommended treatment of neurosis/psychosis: confession. That is, approaching the truth and the sins of the patriarchy and capitalism.

Now I ask you to briefly pick up on the A&A conference narrative. You talked about Michael Adams's book in 1996, *The Multicultural Imagination*. What happened in 2015 at the Rome Analysis and Activism Conference?

Andrew: Well, after interventions from Fanny Brewster and Gottfried Heuer and myself, I was very pleased that the then-president of the IAAP, Tom Kelly, asked for a draft of a statement. I don't think this is the right place to go through all the internal struggles and twists and turns that the IAAP is experiencing about issuing a public statement because it's a very fast-moving situation, and a learned journal like this one is on a relatively slow and drawn-out timescale as it should be.

All I will say is that everybody now is thinking about this question in a way they never have before. Incidentally, I hope that you're going to develop all these points you've made in your forthcoming book to be published by Routledge.

But there is one thing you've been telling me, Alan, and I think it took me a long time to realize that what you were saying was true. You basically said: "Nobody asks us." Nobody asks Africanists for information. Never mind feeling, just information. It's as if you're invisible, and I didn't realize this until you started talking about it in these terms.

What are we to think when people say issuing a statement about Jung and Africans is “patronizing and infantilizing” to persons of color in the Jungian world or those thinking of entering the Jungian world? Or when some say that for the majority to issue a statement is “arrogant,” what is going on? Your point is that nobody has even asked the people concerned about what they think. It’s quite staggering to be told that it would be “patronizing” to African American Jungian analysts to have a statement made about what Jung wrote about Africans. Who the hell has the right to say that it would be “patronizing and infantilizing”? Putting it another way, isn’t saying, “Don’t do a statement because it will be patronizing and infantilizing to African Americans” the summit of being patronizing and infantilizing? Don’t ask them. They don’t really know.

Alan: It is they (Europeans) who don’t really know and remain unconscious, if they do not understand the importance of asking directly. The colonial attitudes of white supremacy and negative projections continue even among those in the IAAP, the professional association whose members are in the business of recognizing and taking back projections. Jung reminds us that the nature of projections is that they are unconscious.

Andrew: They—persons of color in the Jungian world—are just like babies. They don’t know. You don’t ask a baby, “Do you want an injection?” or something like that. Actually Alan, this is something you have opened my eyes to. How could anyone possibly write that it’s patronizing and infantilizing to issue a public statement about Jung and Africans without asking Africanists?

Alan: Yes, this is a defensive reaction formation and denial of the problem. This is extraordinary given the nature of clinical practice in analytical psychology where we deal with projections, and this is a massive collective projection. It brings to mind the Berlin Conference in 1885. Europeans got together in Europe and decided how the continent of Africa should be divided and which countries were to be pathways for commercial development aiding European economies. The Guyanese economist Walter Rodney (1972) wrote about the resulting underdevelopment of Africa. These were the beginnings of European international trade laws emerging from bilateral and multilateral agreements among Europeans. Likewise, it is still a colonial attitude that is being enacted in the IAAP as a professional organization. This is what I was feeling strongly during the Analysis and Activism Conference in London. Also, I think American analysts with Jewish cultural-ethnic identities attending that conference held some of the same dissociated and patronizing colonial attitudes about Africans and seemed more interested in discussions on Jung’s anti-Semitism, even in the context of protest from Palestinian conference participants. I appreciated your holding the boundaries so that the international meeting did not veer off into a preoccupation with anti-Semitism that has been many times addressed by the Jungian community. However, as you suggest, I think consciousness is emerging in the collective about attitudes toward persons with African ancestry and the African Diaspora.

Andrew: I have nothing to add to that except to repeat the chant that I've heard on countless demonstrations about inequalities of all kind whether ethnic, gender, or financial: *Nothing about us without us.*

Alan: One more question, what is next for Andrew Samuels? You are headed back to London after the celebration for Tom Kirsch and a few meetings. What's on the horizon for you professionally and personally?

Andrew: There is no way that I'm going to carry out my oft-stated intention to cut back. I'm just not that kind of a guy. I will probably continue with everything that I do: the psychotherapy practice, the political work, and the academic involvements. But there is something more I would like to do. I would like to meet younger people. I mean, you and I, Alan, are the same generation. Maybe we don't meet enough young people outside our families. I'm not talking professionally; I just mean generally speaking. I need to hear some new perspectives, and I'd like that to happen.

Apart from that, yeah, I would like a little more fun, but some people don't easily pursue fun; they're too driven, too guilt-ridden, too superego dominated. Maybe this is a Jewish trait, maybe it's just an Andrew trait, but I don't see myself retiring in any shape or form. I mean I would like to spend more time thinking about the anatomy of spirituality, hanging out in bars, going to soccer matches, going for walks, and going to different countries for vacations, but I have a horrible feeling about my future that this is not what's going to happen. I have to be honest. Everybody says I'm going to retire and go and sit *on* the beach. No way. It's just not going to happen. Is it a problem or a strength? Bit of both, maybe.

Alan: Well, we have arrived at the end. Thank you very much, Andrew Samuels. It has been an absolute pleasure getting to know you through your scholarship, thinking about analytical psychology, teaching, and your activism. Coming to know you personally is a rewarding experience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, M. V. 1996. *The Multicultural Imagination: "Race," Color and the Unconscious*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kiehl, E., M. Saban, and A. Samuels. 2016. *Analysis and Activism: Social and Political Contributions of Jungian Psychology*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Progoff, I. 1953. *Jung's Psychology and its Social Meaning: An Integrative Statement of C. G. Jung's Psychological Theories and an Interpretation of Their Significance*. New York: Knopf.
- Radin, P. 1927/2017. *Primitive Man as Philosopher*. New York: New York Review of Books.
- Samuels, A. 1989. *The Plural Psyche: Personality, Morality and the Father*. London and New York: Routledge.
- . 1990. *Psychopathology: Contemporary Jungian Perspectives*. New York: Guilford Press; London: Karnac.
- . 2006. "Working Directly with Political, Social and Cultural Material in the Therapy Session." In *Psychoanalysis, Class and Politics: Encounters in the Clinical Setting*, edited by L. Layton, N. Hollander, and S. Gutwill. London and New York: Routledge.

- . 2014. “Political and Clinical Developments in Analytical Psychology, 1972–2014: Subjectivity, Equality and Diversity—Inside and Outside the Consulting Room.” *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 59(5): 641–660.
- . 2015. *A New Therapy for Politics?* London and New York: Karnac.
- Shorter, B. 1995. *Susceptible to the Sacred*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Vaughan, A. 1985. “Organization of African Unity (O.A.U.)” In *Modern Legal Systems Cyclopedia*, edited by Kenneth Redden. Buffalo, NY: William S. Hein & Co.
- . 2004. “Analytical and Cultural Perspectives on the Life and Art of Jacob Lawrence.” *San Francisco Jung Library Journal* 23(1): 6–29.
- . 2013. “Jung, Analytical Psychology and Transpersonal Psychology. In *Handbook of Transpersonal Psychology*, edited by Harris Friedman and Glenn Hartelius. Oxford, UK: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- . 2016. “Jungian Dreamwork.” In *Working with Dreams and PTSD Nightmares*, edited by Stanley Krippner and Jacque Lewis. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Young-Eisendrath, P. 1987. “The Absence of Black Americans as Jungian Analysts.” *Quadrant* 20(2): 40–53.

ANDREW SAMUELS is a training analyst of the Society of Analytical Psychology, Professor of Analytical Psychology at the University of Essex, and in private practice in London. He is the former Honorary Secretary of the International Association for Analytical Psychology and the former Chair, UK Council for Psychotherapy; he is also the founder of Psychotherapists and Counsellors for Social Responsibility and the co-founder of the International Association for Jungian Studies. His eleven books have been translated into up to twenty-one languages and span the range from *Jung and the Post-Jungians* (1985) to *A New Therapy for Politics?* (2015) and *Analysis and Activism: Social and Political Contributions of Jungian Psychology* (edited with Emilija Kiehl and Mark Saban) (2016). Website: www.andrewsamuels.com.

ALAN G. VAUGHAN, PhD, JD, is an analyst member of the C. G. Jung Institute of San Francisco and in private practice as an analyst, and a clinical and consulting psychologist in Oakland, California. He serves on the core faculty of the clinical psychology program at Saybrook University. His psychology degree was awarded by New York University and his internship completed at Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute (University of California San Francisco). His law degree was awarded by the University of Virginia, followed by advanced studies in public and private international law at The Hague Academy of International Law, in Den Haag, Netherlands. He serves on the editorial board of *Jung Journal: Culture & Psyche*. His scholarship interests are in the intersections of analytical psychology, historiography, law, and African Diaspora studies and include “Organization of African Unity (O.A.U.)” (1985), “Analytical and Cultural Perspectives on the Life and Art of Jacob Lawrence (2004), “Jung, Analytical Psychology and Transpersonal Psychology” (2013), and “Jungian Dreamwork” (2016). Correspondence: alanvaughan@sbcglobal.net.

ABSTRACT

Alan G. Vaughan and Andrew Samuels, both Jungian analysts, met earnestly during the Analysis and Activism Conference first held in London in 2014. Impressed with the presentation of new paradigms and applications of principles of analytical psychology beyond the consulting room in communities of ethnically and economically diverse populations, our conversations increased through email exchanges and sharing ideas. In August 2017, we met in person during the International Association of Jungian Studies (IAJS) Conference in Cape Town, South Africa, the birthplace of Nelson Mandela. The exchanges were spirited and rich, the rapport genuine. Analytical psychology, analysis and activism, politics, economics, the African Diaspora, and the prevalence of the psychopathology of racism were discussed. Our conversations continued, in the Oakland hills of California, on December 17, 2017.

KEY TERMS

African Diaspora, analysis and activism, analytical psychology, politics, psyche, psychopathology of racism