

# Victim Power: A Clinical and Philosophical Paradox

DAVID FREEMAN, London, UK

**ABSTRACT** *This article is a personal attempt to understand the Holocaust and the inevitable question of “Why evil?” It draws upon personal experiences of the writer and suggests some possible religious and psychological understanding of the politics of the present state of Israel. Copyright © 2015 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.*

**Key words:** victim; victimizer; Shadow; Nazi; ego; self

This article is based on a talk I first brought to the Association of Jungian Analysts over 20 years ago and I have given it a few times more over the years, but always with caution. This has been for two reasons: one, because some of its contents are very hard to hear; and two, because it is extremely personal and revealing. It describes my long and painful search for some answers and resolution of the fact that six million Jewish people – men, women and children – were systematically murdered during my lifetime, amongst them about a third of my family. Most of the small number of those who survived are now gone, but there remain painful questions for succeeding generations. “How could this have happened? Why did it happen? Could it have any meaning?” These agonizing questions sit deep in the heart of most Jewish people to this day. So when I was asked to give the talk again, I first said no.

I have divided it into two sections. In the first I shall explain what I call “victim power” and its paradoxical nature – both in the general sense and also with some references to clinical aspects. In the second part I attempt to examine the wider implications of what has come to be known as “the Holocaust”. I shall look at what Jung called “the Shadow” and “the dark side of the Self”, and I shall examine the eternal and universal question of “Why evil?” I speak in more than one capacity: as a Jungian analyst and psychologist who has found many answers in the words of C. G. Jung, as a Rabbi, and of course as a Jew, a member of that tiny band of people who have carried a long and extremely painful history of being victims for at least the last two thousand years. I shall attempt to show that the Jewish collective is almost identical to being a victim and that the historical experience of the Jewish people is an example of the typical and classical victim pattern. Please note that where I use the masculine “him” I mean also to include the feminine.

## DEFINITION

What is a victim? At first this appears to be a relatively straightforward question. The *Oxford English Dictionary* (Burchfield & Oxford University Press, 1977) provided the following

\*Correspondence to: David Freeman, 222 Mackenzie Road, Beckenham, Kent, BR3 4SJ, London, UK.  
E-mail: dfreeman30@btinternet.com

definitions: “a living creature offered as a sacrifice” and “one who suffers severely in body or property through cruel oppressive treatment”. I would add to those: a victim is someone who has been made to suffer, mostly helplessly, from oppression, cruelty, exploitation and degradation; someone who is unable to find justice; who often, in the end, has given up and handed themselves over to despair.

Now that might sound complicated but it becomes even more difficult. There are some situations where, for example, someone was attacked or abused, situations of obvious cruelty and violence, where it can look fairly clear who is doing what to whom. However, there are other instances where it is not like that at all – where it is almost impossible to say who is the victim and who is the victimizer. A look beneath the surface reveals the very opposite of one’s first impression.

Imagine, if you will, the West Bank, alongside the state of Israel. The time is roughly 1988 at the start of what the Arabs who lived in the then occupied territories called the *intifada*, the campaign of civil disobedience and resistance. Western film crews happened by chance to be present at a certain spot and filmed events, some which many people all over the world saw vividly and grotesquely on their television screens the next day. An Israeli soldier, a young man who looked about 18 years old, grabbed a Palestinian boy from a mob of youths who were pelting him and his fellow soldiers with large stones. He took the boy to one side and beat him severely with one of those long sticks they seem to have to use. Then, quite deliberately he broke both the boy’s arms – and, after that, the whole group of soldiers fired bullets around the boy for several minutes. But that was not the end of it. They picked him up and buried him in a hole so that only his head remained above the surface of the ground. Finally, they left him and took a bulldozer to the house where he lived. Up until now the soldiers were in contravention of their own rules, but incredibly, what they did next was the legal and official policy of the Israeli government. The boy’s family were given a short time to vacate the family home and then it and the few possessions still left behind were reduced to a pile of rubble.

## VICTIM POWER

What was going on in the minds of the soldiers as they performed these brutal actions? Well, deep down inside, without any consciousness of it at all, these soldiers were in terror of the boy and were silently saying “Why are you persecuting us?” In some hidden place within themselves they were experiencing the boy as being the victimizer and themselves as the victims. During their long history, the Jews have suffered persecution so persistently that it is now often impossible for them to see themselves as anything other than victims.

Nowhere is this clearer, in my opinion, than in the modern state of Israel. For example, one Israeli prime minister would frequently justify criticisms of the policies of his government with statements like, “We who are the survivors of the Holocaust have no choice in what we must do!” And indeed it was true that he and many of the founders of the state *were* survivors. Again and again we hear these statements: “The world has always been against us Jews and it always will be, no matter what they say; so what difference will it make what we do or don’t do!” My own late mother would often tell us, “Never turn your back on a Christian. You will get a knife between your shoulder blades!” Some years ago a leading Jungian analyst of considerable stature, who had himself escaped Nazi Germany, told me, “Every non-Jew is an anti-Semite!”

In all of these you can listen to typical victim feelings and you can hear and feel that repressed rage of the victim which in his mind gives him permission to do anything he wishes. It will even justify him victimizing others in exactly the same way that it was once done to him. Now the victim and the victimizer have become one and there is no distinction between them except in their individual subjective perception of themselves. The murderous anger of the victim, the chthonic rage inside him, provides so powerful an unconscious defence that he is omnipotent!

A story was told, I believe by the Russian writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn, which more or less goes like this:

A prisoner in the gulag was brought before the camp commander for stealing some bread. The commander spoke to him of serious punishment but, incredibly, the man just began to laugh. "Punish me," he said, "how can you punish me? What on earth can you possibly do to me? Beat me. You have beaten me so many times that I don't know if I feel anything anymore! Kill me perhaps? How I pray for the blessed release of death! Take away my family, my possessions, my dignity, my health? All of these you have already taken! You have taken everything away from me and now I have absolutely nothing more to lose. So what can you possibly do to me? You should be afraid; you are the one with something to lose because you will be called by your superiors to answer why you have failed to prevent the stealing of bread in your camp!" The commander suddenly began to feel afraid! Just consider how great was the power of that prisoner at that moment.

Some years ago the then Soviet Union set free its most prominent Jewish dissident, a man called Anatoly Scharansky. He was a political prisoner of the KGB who, in spite of repeated coercions and imprisonments over many years, had maintained his refusal to withdraw his application to emigrate to Israel. At the very end, just before his release, it actually looked as if the authorities had been the ones who were afraid. They seemed far more in fear of Scharansky than was he of them! It was as if the whole mighty power of the then Soviet Union system had felt so threatened by this one man that they had to lock him away and persecute him. I think it was much the same in South Africa with the long imprisonment of the man who, in my opinion and the opinion of many with me, might well be the greatest statesman and hero of our time: Nelson Mandela. Both Scharansky and Mandela were enormously powerful men, and countries which operate on the basis of denial, manipulation of the truth and totalitarian systems are extremely vulnerable. The tiniest morsel of truth can do them great harm, so they need a tyranny in order to protect themselves and maintain their status quo. Paradoxically it is they, tightly imprisoned by their own lies, who can be called the victims and, in these two cases, victims of two very strong men.

Furthermore, what works for a country will work in the same way for a single individual. The greater the denial that we carry inside ourselves, the bigger are the lies that we have to go on telling ourselves, the more we have to be afraid of, and the more we must censor the truth. To guard ourselves from harm we have to establish an inner tyranny. Say, for example, a person is living a life of pretence, denying what they know to be the truth, pushing truths away because they are afraid to look at them. They will need to be utterly tyrannical and will require their own inner equipment, bullies, and a secret police force to protect their deceptions and allow through only that which will not change anything. They will victimize any parts of themselves which are striving to be free, parts of themselves that are Scharansky or Mandelas. We all have these parts – bits inside of us which from time to time rise up and try to challenge the lies – mostly unwelcome but nonetheless pure gold; they are calls for individuation from the unconscious. In

denial, a person may believe that they are strong and can conquer all but, in actual fact, they, like all totalitarian states, require vast armies to enforce their will and maintain the lies.

In London in 1972 the press reported the case of a 17-year-old black youth, a large young man, who had viciously and brutally attacked, murdered then mutilated his 80-year-old grandmother, who had cared for him since he lost his parents as a child. This fragile old lady was clearly the victim of this youth. It was only later, however, that that the cruelty of this woman came to light. She had victimized him so thoroughly since he was 3 years old that he was completely terrified of her. Such is the archetypal power of parents, as we know. In an attempt to escape her, in desperate, terrified and insane feelings of helplessness, he killed her. He mutilated her dead body because even when she lay dead in front of him, he could still feel that she had power over him and was terrified of it.

Yet another example of victim power was depicted in a television documentary about a young Greek man. He was a captain in the Greek army during the regime of the Greek Colonels in the military junta of 1967–1974, where he was trained to become a torturer. It was a very good documentary which showed how this was done. The transformation from friendly family man into torturer was brought about by completely isolating him from his normal environment and then subjecting him to a systematically harsh regime of torture and personal humiliation. Once he had been tortured, once he had come to feel that *he* was a victim, he was able to carry out acts of torture on those who he now believed were the cause of his suffering. By the end of his training he believed torture was necessary to protect the state from those who threatened its safety and security – those who threatened the very safety of his own family. These were the so-called subversives who opposed the military dictatorship. Therefore to torture them was a necessary act of self-defence.

Victims sometimes *have* power and the fact that it is kept hidden is what makes it enormous. It enables them to override the usual personal human boundaries of morality, ethics and, above all, respect for human dignity. It is not a power which is experienced in the usual way of experiencing things; it is a power that is unconscious and that is why you cannot tell victims that it is they who have the power. They feel utterly impotent and would just look at you in angry astonishment. Armed Israeli soldiers are obviously more powerful than young boys throwing stones, a gulag commander more than a prisoner, Russia and South Africa more than Scharansky and Mandela, and so on, but the unconscious experience can be the very opposite of that and it is the Israeli soldier, the gulag commander, and the mighty Soviet and South African nations who each felt that *they* were the victims. That their power is unconscious makes it difficult to distinguish victims from victimizers. It is held in the shadow of what Jung called “the dark side of the Self”.

The centre of the conscious part of us is what we call “I” or “the ego”. That is the part of us which is aware of our thoughts, the sensations in our bodies and, to one degree or another, our feelings. It contains all the experiences accessible to memory, but there are other experiences which we cannot remember at will – very important areas of experience which we have forgotten or repressed and which stay alive in us even though we may not know it. That is what is meant by “the unconscious”. Our behaviour is not always determined by free conscious choosing but by memories, feelings and dynamics going on inside of us of which we can be totally unaware. We all like to think that we are in control of what we do and that we make free rational choices in our daily lives, but that is not the case at all – there are deep, unknown, unconscious things within us which can drive us to behave in ways that we would *not* choose.

The unconscious is frightening to us all because it is the dark unknown within us and it contains all those experiences and things which we do not want to remember. For example, some terrible childhood or other traumas that were just too painful to live with at the time and so, in order to survive, we pushed them away. They appear to have gone and yet they have not; they stay in the unconscious and continue to influence our lives without us knowing. Analysis is sometimes able to bring about healing by encouraging us to bring forgotten memories back into consciousness. Most people would agree that if there was something controlling what they did or did not do it would be better to have it out in the open rather than keep it hidden, working away in secret in the dark.

Jung used the word “Shadow” to denote that unconscious part of us where we put all that we dislike and do not wish to know about ourselves. Unfortunately, it does not stop at that because, having hidden things away in the Shadow, we put them on to other people in a process we know as “projection”. Two old Jewish sayings illustrate this phenomenon well. First is an 18th-century Hasidic adaptation of a saying by a famous Jewish teacher called the Baal Shem Tov. He said, “Sinners are mirrors. When we see faults in them, we must realize that they only reflect the evil in us.” Later it became simply: “The sins we hate in others are mirrors to ourselves.” Second is an adaptation of a Yiddish folk saying: “A thief trusts no one. To a thief everyone is a thief and to a liar everyone is a liar.” The trouble is that the thief or liar may not know it or not be able to admit it to himself, so he simply thinks that it is everyone else who is a thief or a liar. Do we not all know the kind of person who is quick to complain about all the things that are wrong in the world and how terrible people are? That is, other people – not themselves. I recall the picture of the fiery preacher who stood in his pulpit and fiercely castigated his congregation for their terrible sins. In reality very few of them were guilty of anything of the kind. It seems to me that he was actually preaching about himself; he who could imagine such terrible sins in others may well have been the only sinner there.

Sometimes it appears to be far easier to blame and hate someone else, even to go to war and destroy countless lives, than it is to face that it is something inside ourselves which we hate and seek to destroy.

I think this begins to explain the amazing paradox whereby the victim can be the victimizer and vice versa, where the one who appears totally powerless can sometimes be the one who is in charge of what is going on. Take, for example, someone brought up by bullying parents who consequently becomes a very hurt adult. It may well be that he once vowed that he would never ever allow himself to be bullied again. Indeed, he may be so determined about this that he will bully everyone around him in order to ensure that he is not bullied. The tiniest amount of hurt done to him will produce the most massive effect of anger and hurt, but at the same time he will be completely unaware of what he is doing to other people. When people back away from him because they feel bullied and attacked, he feels outraged, even betrayed and amazed that what keeps happening to him has happened yet again; he cannot understand why and he cannot see that the common denominator is himself.

As we all know, it could be that when that person was small, like any one of us, he observed the way his parents behaved towards each other, towards the family and towards the world, and there occurred in him the natural process of modelling, of copying. Quite naturally, he imitated the behaviour patterns of his father and mother. To the child, mother and father are archetypes – they are gods and are perfect. If they are not such good parents and we suffer at their hands, we tell ourselves that it must be because it is our fault, not theirs. We deny the hurt that we feel from them

by the victim pattern of blaming ourselves. We will rationalize and do anything in the world rather than admit that our parents are not gods. The whole process can be completely unconscious and we can go on blaming ourselves and feeling inferior for the rest of our lives. We have built a model of our parents inside us. It is like having them constantly present, introjected, doing and being exactly as they did when we were little. In this manner, unconsciously, we can carry on treating ourselves in the very same way that they did, and often even more so. Since we cannot bear the way these inner parents behave, we push them into our Shadow. We always said that we would never do as they did, and it is quite disturbing when we see we are following in their footsteps. So the bully will only see the bully in others but not the bully in himself. He is unconscious of the fact that his real enemy is not in other people onto whom he projects it, but it is within himself. How often tortured victims come to us – people who have suffered the most terrible psychic pain during their lives. Because of their history they dare not trust anyone. Yet, they continue mercilessly to victimize themselves from within: blaming themselves, criticizing themselves, and torturing themselves with no defence at all against their inner victimizer which crushes them, except perhaps some illness or depression or the like. The outer world feels so threatening that an impenetrable defence has been built against it, while behind it they live in Hell. Such a patient is desperate that the analyst should help him and understand him, but he cannot allow the analyst in. He will project his inner victimizer on to the analyst and tyrannize any attempt to get near him. The analyst experiences feelings of impotence and, ironically, the victim sits there defended against the destructive power that he feels the analyst possesses, yet all the time it exists within him.

Something else takes place here as well. Sometimes, somehow, the victim can make the analyst want to victimize him. In counter-transference the analyst can feel so battered by the hidden yet attacking rage of the victim as to want to victimize him. Somehow, again unconsciously, the victim can demand to be victimized. He knows no other way to relate. He has introjected the victimizer into himself, he projects it onto the whole world, and perhaps in some mysterious and deeply unconscious fashion he even compels the world to victimize him. Acknowledging the part played by the victim against himself and bringing it into consciousness is the hardest task of all.

Through this process of introjection, the one who has been made a victim will carry within himself an inner victimizer, modelled upon the behaviour of those who victimized him. This inner victimizer persists unconsciously, continuing the bad treatment or abuse in hidden and subtle ways, giving a continuing sense of guilt, worthlessness and shame. It may well be the greatest Divine injustice of all that in the Shadow of the victim you will find a victimizer and in the Shadow of the victimizer you will find a victim. When one considers all the implications of this phenomenon throughout history theologically, collectively and individually, it is quite terrifying to see that such a relationship between victim and victimizer, unconscious and almost unbelievable, is taking place. That is why, for someone to become a torturer, they must first be tortured. Only after someone has been made into a victim can they be a victimizer; that alone will give a person the power to be unmoved by the screams of the victims as their bodies are torn apart.

Rudolph Hoess was the concentration camp commandant at Auschwitz. Adjoining the camp was a lovely house where he lived with his family, and at the bottom of his garden was a garden wall. The garden went right up to the camp itself so on one side of the wall it formed the garden wall and on the other side it was the wall of the camp. He and his family played in the garden at the same time as men women and children were being butchered and tortured on the other side of

their wall. Furthermore, some concentration camp guards would go home from the gas chambers at the end of their day to the families they loved, to play with their children just like good parents do. The next morning they would kiss them goodbye and return to their work of gassing and torturing, completely unaware of the beast Shadow so obviously working away within them. They had been indoctrinated to believe that it was the Jews who held all the power in the world and that they, their children, and the German people were victims desperately fighting to defend themselves, fighting for survival against this plague of filthy parasitic rats that would inevitably pollute and poison the whole country until all ordinary good Germans were destroyed. In Nazi propaganda, images of rats infesting the streets and houses were constantly used in the cinemas and elsewhere to brainwash the people. The German people were made to fear the Jews – is that not a paradox indeed?

### WHY EVIL?

When C. G. Jung described what he called “the Self” he was in fact describing something indescribable. Broadly speaking, the Self is the total personality, the sum of all aspects, of all the parts and bits of us. It contains ego, Shadow, anima, animus, victim, victimizer, and everything else. It cannot be understood by the intellect alone because it is beyond definition. It has been called “the Divine spark within us”, not G-d but of G-d. It is simultaneously us and yet also not us. It has been called “a light in the dark”, “a spark”, not a flame, but it has the potential to become a flame. It is not extinguishable but it is capable of extinguishing us. Ego is the conscious “I”; the Self is the unconscious “I”. It is the higher authority in us to which, in the end, the ego must submit. It has many fascinating symbolic representations. Jung said: “Anything a man postulates as being a greater totality than himself can become a symbol of the Self” (1940/1960, p. 232). The Self is numinous and it contains all the opposites, it is the holder of every possibility, it is the paradox. He went on to say: “The paradox is one of our most valuable possessions” (Jung, 1952/1980, p. 18). In that same paragraph he wrote: “All religious statements contain contradictions and assertions which are impossible.” He was commenting on what he called “Tertullian’s avowal”.

Tertullian, or Quintus Septimus Florens Tertullianus to give him his full name, has been called the founder of western theology. He lived from 160 to 225 CE, and was a prolific writer of early Christian literature. What Tertullian said was: “and the son of G-d is dead which is worthy of belief because it is absurd. And when buried he rose again, which is certain because it is impossible.” Jung had an extremely low opinion of those who are unable to accept paradox and would sometimes refer to them as “psychological weaklings”. He also said: “Uniformity of meaning is a sign of weakness” (1952/1980, p. 18).

The Self is beyond us; we may not make it but it makes us. It is both wonderful and terrifying, miraculous and monstrous. Rabbi Dr Ignaz Maybaum of blessed memory is thought by many to have been the foremost Jewish philosopher of our time. He was a pupil of the great Rabbi Dr Leo Baeck of blessed memory, one-time friend in Germany of C. G. Jung and to whom Jung apologized at the end of the Second World War. Rabbi Dr Maybaum was a German Rabbi who managed to escape from Hitler and it was my privilege to be one of his pupils at the Rabbinic training college from 1961 to 1967. In his book *The Face of G-d after Auschwitz*, he wrote: “The death of six million martyrs should not be called a tragedy, but should be called a monstrosity. The death of six million Jews was a monstrosity!” (Maybaum, 1965, p. 46).

The victimizer can be the ultimate monstrosity. What was evoked in the Holocaust was that very aspect that exists in each of us; and what it is capable of doing is unspeakable! It was the very worst of the unconscious victim wound. Jung said: “The healthy man does not torture others – generally it is the tortured who turn into torturers” (1977, p. 1354). Martin Luther was a seminal figure in the 16th-century Protestant Reformation. In a sermon on the Lord’s Prayer he commented on one particular verse which says “... deliver us from evil”, and his sermon theme was: “We receive evil from everything that hurts us. Its whole meaning points to the devil” (as cited in Dillenger, 1961, p. 226). When we are hurt, when we are victims, the victimizer can rise up with all its devilish possibilities and then the victim and the victimizer join together in an age-old archetypal, paradoxical and most bizarre dance.

But Jews do not have a devil. In a prayer recited every morning there is a quotation from the *Tanach* from the prophet Isaiah, which translates:

I form light and I create darkness;  
I make peace and I create evil;  
I the Lord do all these things.

In the liturgy it is softened by using the word “all” to replace the word “evil” but it is understood that it is this quotation.

G-d is absolute power and *the* totality, *the Eternal, the Infinite*. G-d is the combination of every imaginable possibility plus infinitely more! G-d is the creator of good and G-d is the creator of evil. This is affirmed every morning in prayer. That is why, for example, G-d could betray Job in such a monstrous fashion. The story of the Book of Job is of G-d giving the Satan permission to victimize Job. The first chapters of the book tell how Job was the most righteous of all men about whom G-d boasted to the Satan. The Satan had previously been G-d’s favourite and had fallen from grace and the boast was more or less that now Job was the favourite, hence making the Satan very angry and deeply envious. (In Jewish tradition the Satan is not the Devil of course, but is known as “the Adversary”.) Now he challenged G-d to let him put Job to the test. G-d agreed, imposing only one condition, that the Satan was not allowed to kill Job, but apart from that he could do anything at all, however hideous. In *Answer to Job*, Jung (1952/1973) suggested that Job was the subject of Divine envy. Since G-d has no limits G-d cannot be conscious and it was Job’s consciousness that was envied. This is a most profound question that I cannot explore right now except to ask, “In the story of Job who was doing what to who?” Was Job the victim and the Satan the victimizer or could it be the other way around? Could the Satan be the victim? Why did G-d allow the Satan to inflict such torment upon Job who was, after all, the most righteous of men? The story of the Book of Job is a portrayal of the Self in all its most terrible aspects and at the deepest level it carries within its pages a stark description of that horrifying victim and victimizer dance.

Nowhere was the dark side of the Divine more evident in our time than during the Holocaust. In a theology lecture at the seminary Rabbi Dr Maybaum once put this question to his students: “What do you think G-d was doing at Auschwitz?” As you can imagine, we were struck dumb, shocked by such a question. How could any of us possibly answer it? In hindsight, I can remember how threatening it felt to be asked this – a question that tested me to the very core. We were all silent. Then he gave us his answer – an answer which he alone with his personal experience on

the one hand and his wisdom on the other, could give. He said: “What was G-d doing at Auschwitz? He was up there looking down on it all and He was crying His eyes out ... and at the same time, He was splitting His sides with laughter.”

I was unable to accept this answer; I did not understand it nor could I tolerate it. It horrified and revolted me and, to my shame, I remember that I walked out of his lecture in protest. It took me 25 years, 20 of them in analysis, before I knew what he meant. His answer described *the* most awesome paradox and only after all these years have I dared to think that it is possible that there existed some kind of relationship between the Nazi and the Jew. This being so, what is the nature of that relationship? Can the psychology of victim and victimizer apply here? The answer has to be a rather dreadful “Yes”. In the Shadow of the Nazi there is a Jew and in the Shadow of the Jew there is a Nazi, and the Holocaust was the most hellish and chthonic orchestration of the victim/victimizer dance. Further, just as in some mysterious way the victim draws victimization to himself, it seems to me that the same collective complex has unconsciously played a part in the terrible suffering of my people throughout the ages. I doubt that we Jews are ready or able to look at that yet – perhaps we never will be. That is why it is so hard for us to allow ourselves to acknowledge the terrible things that have been done by the Israelis to the Palestinians in the occupied territories. Victim power is something that must always be kept secret, hidden in the Shadow; then, of course, projected out.

When it was suggested to the Jewish world that the Israelis might be taking it out on the Palestinians for what the Nazis did to the Jews, there was an outcry. The reaction was one of enormous anger and indignation, just as one would expect when an individual is faced with their Shadow and looks it straight in the eyes. It is terrifying and every instinct is to run away as fast as possible. So all pervading and powerful is our collective victim complex that sometimes we Jews have projected the concentration camp on to the whole world. We have been persecuted for so long that it is hard for us to see ourselves in any other way than as victims and, because we feel that we are only protecting ourselves from ever being victimized again, we are capable of victimizing others with as terrible a Shadow as was ever turned against us. At the time of the *intifada*, in a 1989 newsletter of the International Association for Analytical Psychology (IAAP), the Israeli Jungians wrote about a meeting where they discussed it in depth. They described how they had worked on dreams and reactions to it in themselves and in their patients. It was very interesting until the concluding paragraphs, where psychological insights were suddenly and unbelievably replaced by political propaganda protesting to the worldwide IAAP readers that it was outrageous to say that Israel would victimize the Palestinians, and anyway it was the Arabs not the Israelis who started the Palestinian problem. Here you see it clearly once again; it must be kept in the unconscious even by those who are dedicated to the pursuit of consciousness.

This goes deep into the very fibre of human life. It can make one feel uncomfortable because it speaks to the victim part in each of us, that deeply hidden and enormously powerful aspect of our unconscious. It also draws us into the whole question of human suffering in the most perplexing and paradoxical way. It leads us to that mysterious place in ourselves where oppressor and oppressed come together as one. There is a victim part in each and every one of us; it can be a part that is hurt or damaged, and it can feel very afraid and begging for protection. If it remains unconscious it is well capable of tyrannizing ourselves from within and those around us from without. It can even destroy a whole world. It is only through consciousness, through the awareness of these inner patterns, that we human beings can have

more influence over the way we relate to each other and the way that we understand ourselves. We all have a Shadow. No one has the complete answer, no priest or rabbi, no philosopher or psychologist, no man or woman. I do not think there is a complete answer. If there were then we would have stopped fighting wars against each other, we would have no suffering, and there would be no more victims or victimizers. But then there would be no more paradox and no more mystery of life. And that just cannot be. That is why we can only have part of the answer, I guess. The day that any person thinks that they have fully understood and have dealt with their Shadow, or that they have no victim feelings inside themselves and would never ever victimize another, that could be the day when the victim complex has them in its power and their Shadow rules their life. Of course, there will always be those who say that what they are doing is for the very best of reasons. Have we not heard them throughout human history? "To protect one's family, to protect our society, to defend our country". "patriotism, freedom, self-defence" and so on. And so often it has been in the name of G-d or gods – for the greater good. The greatest ally that the Shadow possesses is the human intellect and its limitless capacity to rationalize and deny.

## CONCLUSION

Discussion of the Shadow and the dark side of the Divine is oppressive, dark and frightening. Therefore I want to end with some of the light. We need the light so as to be able to stay in this darkness, so I conclude by looking once again to the hope for consciousness. For, however powerful the dark side of the Self, there is also an equally powerful and opposite light side. There is human creativity in all its wonder, and the vitality of the human spirit is the greatest gift given to all humanity.

So I have here three quotations from my tradition which demonstrate the value of consciousness and the possibility that even the most devastatingly destructive forces within us human beings is nonetheless capable, somehow and somewhere, of transformation. The Shadow may roughly be compared with what we call "the impulse to do evil". Quotation number one is from a huge corpus of many centuries of commentary on the Bible which is called, *Midrash*: "You must not hide your impulse to do evil. You must take it out and place it before you every single day. You must look at it from every angle this way and that. The impulse to do evil can only have power over you when you cannot see it."

The second is from the Babylonian Talmud, which is a collection of the minutes of the discussions held in the Babylonian Academies from about 200 BCE to 500 CE: "In the world to come the Holy One Blessed be He will bring out the impulse to do evil and slay it in the presence of both the righteous and the wicked. To the righteous it will appear as a high mountain and to the wicked like a single hair. The righteous will weep and exclaim: 'How were we able to subdue so mighty a mountain as this?' The wicked will weep and exclaim: 'How were we not able to subdue a single hair like this?'"

Finally, a saying of Rabbi Nachman of Bratzlav (who lived from 1722 to 1810 and was a very famous Jewish mystic often quoted by Martin Buber): "Without the impulse to do evil there is no perfect service. In the righteous the impulse to do evil is transformed into a holy angel, a being of might and destiny" (as cited in Buber, 1974).

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This was initially a talk in the Association of Jungian Analysts series, “Cutting Edges”, instigated by Dr Gottfried Heuer. It was given on 25 March 2014.

## REFERENCES

- Buber, M. (1974). *The tales of Rabbi Nachman*. London, UK: Souvenir Press (Educational and Academic).
- Burchfield, R., & Oxford University Press (1977). *The Oxford English dictionary*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Dillenger, J. (1961). *Selections from the writings of Martin Luther*. London, UK: Anchor.
- International Association of Analytical Psychology. (1989, 10 December). *Newsletter*.
- Jung, C. G. (1960). Psychology and religion: West and East. *The collected works* (Vol. 11). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (Original work published 1940)
- Jung, C. G. (1973). *Answer to Job*. Yale, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1952)
- Jung, C. G. (1977). The symbolic life: Miscellaneous writings. *The collected works* (Vol. 18). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1980). Psychology and alchemy. *The collected works* (Vol. 12). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (Original work published 1952)
- Maybaum, I. (1965). *The face of G-d. After Auschwitz*. Amsterdam, Holland: Polak and Van Genneep.



**Rabbi David Freeman** is a Jungian analyst and psychotherapist, training analyst and supervisor, and has been in private practice in south London for about 30 years. He is an ex-Chair and a Professional Member of the Association of Jungian Analysts, London, a member of the International Association for Analytical Psychology, Zurich, and a senior member of the Independent Group of Analytical Psychologists, London. He lectures at home and in Europe and teaches in various analytical trainings. He is an ex-Chair of the Guild of Pastoral Psychology, where he has given lectures and led study groups exploring Jewish, psychological and mystical interpretations of Bible texts. David is an Honorary Fellow of the Leo Baeck College, London, where he trained to be a Rabbi and was ordained in 1967. During his time as a congregational Rabbi he served synagogues in Birmingham and London for 21 years and was also a Jewish chaplain to universities in the Midlands, a hospice chaplain and a member of the Religious Liaison Panel of Amnesty International. He was a supporter of the Movement Against Apartheid and is now a member of Rabbis for Peace and Jews for Justice for Palestinians.