German emigré psychologists in Tel Aviv (1934-1958): Max M. Stern and Margarete Braband-Isaac in conflict with Erich Neumann.

Ratified by the Council of the League of Nations on 24th July 1922 the Mandate for Palestine came into effect on 29th September 1923. In this document the League of Nations granted Britain the right to govern the region of Palestine and the territory known as Trans-Jordan, thus legalizing the British administration that had been in place since 1920 (Gilbert, 1998). Article 6 stated that the 'Administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced, shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions and shall encourage, in co-operation with the Jewish agency referred to in Article 4, close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes.'

During this time Zionist immigration to the area came mainly from Eastern Europe. The Third Aliyah (1919-1923) saw approximately 40,000 Jews entering the area, the Fourth Aliyah (1924-1929) around 82,000. The growing anti-Semitism in Germany and Hitler's accession to power in 1933 lead to a new wave of Jewish immigration to British Mandate Palestine, known as the Fifth Aliyah (1929-1939). Many of the new arrivals were highly educated middle-class Europeans whose way of living was quite distinct from that of earlier settlers. The newly arrived 29-year-old psychologist Erich Neumann touched upon these differences in his first letter to his mentor C.G. Jung:

> 'The situation here is exceedingly serious, as I see it. The original spiritual, idealistic forces who established the country, the core of the working class and of the land settlements are being repressed by a growing wave of undifferentiated, egotistic, short-sighted, entrepreneurial Jews, flooding here because of the economic opportunities. Thanks to this, everything is escalating more and more, and a growing politicisation of the best is

> obstructing all horizons. [...] I can well imagine that Palestine will get dangerously close to the abyss and I assume that the Jews, in a paradoxical situation, will then come to their senses – as ever. Everywhere the economy is booming, it's all hard work and speculation. There is little interest in intellectual things except amongst the workers and almost none in things Jewish. A newly prospering petit bourgeois middle class is evident everywhere, not only in Tel Aviv.' (Neumann to Jung, June/July 1934, 17)

Neumann, a dedicated Zionist, was among the few psychologists of Jungian provenance that arrived in Mandate Palestine at that time (Jung & Neumann, 2015). Amongst this small group was also the psychologist James Kirsch who had settled down in Tel Aviv in the previous year (Jung & Kirsch, 2011). But most of the psychologists arriving were Freudians. Psychoanalysis was the predominant psychological discipline among the Jewish population in British Mandate Palestine and during the formation years of Israel. The Palestine Psychoanalytic Society was founded by Max Eitington in 1933 and was formally accepted by the International Association of Psychoanalysis in 1934 (Rolnik, 2012).

In contrast to the psychoanalysts emigrating from Germany, there was hardly any organisational support awaiting Jungian therapists at that time. But due to the increasingly dangerous situation in Nazi Germany, others with ties to the Jungian world would follow and put their share in the development of Analytical Psychology in the region. It was not before 1958, however, when the First International Congress for Analytical Psychology was held in Zurich from 7th to 12th August 1958, that a representative body for Jungian therapists in Israel was created. On this occasion a small group of Israeli psychologists, represented by Erich Neumann, was accepted as a charter group member of the IAAP (International Association of Analytical Psychology), which marked the

foundation of the Israeli Association of Analytical Psychology (Kirsch, 2000, 179-188).

The history leading up to this official birth-date is mainly associated with the efforts of Erich Neumann – and rightly so – however, this has been to the detriment of a number of other therapists, scholars and patients that have been forgotten or deleted from this historical narrative. During my work on the edition of the correspondence between C.G. Jung and Erich Neumann I came across their names, often only casually mentioned as part of an episode, and tried to find the stories and fate behind them. In this article I discuss the contributions to the development of Analytical Psychology in British Mandate Palestine, later Israel, of two such figures, Max M. Stern (1895-1982) and Margarete Braband-Isaac (1892-1986). Both had been in personal contact with C.G. Jung and built a bridge between the isolated Jewish therapists in British Mandate Palestine and the Zurich circles. In Tel Aviv they collaborated for a while with Neumann, with whom both fell out for different reasons. This article shows the reason for these controversies with Neumann and tries to find the reason for the historical marginalisation of those two characters. It thus offers a new contribution to the neglected history of Jungian Psychology in British Mandate Palestine and Israel.

The controversy between Erich Neumann and Max M. Stern (1937-39).

On 19 December 1938 Jung wrote to Erich Neumann in Tel Aviv, that a certain Dr Stern had written to him informing him about his comprehensive correspondence with Neumann: 'It is obvious from this that the devil has stirred things up between you.' (Jung & Neumann, 2015, 147) Almost a year later on 15 November 1939 we find the following reply by Neumann:

> 'One more remark about Dr Stern. Without question, the devil has stirred things up there, the affair has taught me a great deal, also about myself.

> Anyway, the fact that he has become a passionate Freudian with all the accessories in the meantime confirms to me that his analysis with me was abysmal, but it has also shown me that my scepticism towards him that he did not "experience" and realise the contents was not completely incorrect. I understand that one cannot always reach Jung from Freud, but to regress from Jung to Freud seems to me to be a moral defect, […]' (Jung & Neumann, 2015, 153)

The argument between them took place in October 1937, when Stern gave a lecture in the presence of Neumann. (Stern to Jung, 6 November 1938) In the discussion that followed Neumann declared himself as the only representative of Analytical Psychology in Palestine and denied Stern any right to publicly represent Jung's psychology. In the aftermath a letter exchange between Neumann and Stern developed, which Stern sent together with the text of his presentation to Jung.

At that time Stern was 43 years of age. Born into a German-Jewish family in Frankfurt he had come to Tel Aviv in 1935. During his military service in the First World War he contracted a haemorrhagic peptic ulcer that led to an intermittent disability and years of hospitalisation. Once recovered, he studied medicine and became interested in analytical psychology. Already an assistant medical doctor at the Frankfurt Psychiatric clinic he encountered Jung for the first time when he took part in the Fourth General Medical Congress for Psychotherapy in Bad Nauheim (11-14 April 1929). In 1935 he left Frankfurt for Paris, where he trained amongst others with Elisabeth de Sury. In Palestine he continued his training with Erich Neumann. It was on Neumann's recommendation that he started working independently in 1936, taking on patients and giving introductory courses.

In his letter to Jung, Stern referred to his analysis with Neumann and accused him of breaking analytic confidentiality. He wrote of Neumann's attempts to bar people from attending his lectures on the grounds of dreams, which Stern had discussed with Neumann in previous analytic sessions. Neumann also told others that Stern would not be able to undertake an analysis without his supervision, which Stern found patronising, as he had been working independently as a therapist for a year and a half.

Stern participated in the seminars that Neumann held on a weekly basis in his flat in Tel Aviv. One evening Stern contradicted Neumann's statement that every affect was unconscious. Neumann rebuked Stern accusing him of lacking the fundamental principles of Analytical Psychology and that he should take a psychology course for beginners. Jung, by the way, agreed with Stern: 'Dr Neumann's statement that affects are always unconscious is certainly ambiguous. It would have been better to use the term partially unconscious.' (Jung to Stern, 19 December 1938)

Stern did not accept Neumann's apology that his aggressive tendency would be part of his character, which one has to affirm with the rest. Not only would it reveal his ignorance of fundamental analytical concepts such as resistance and affect, but would also demand that the patient to give in to the sadistic side of the therapist.

Of course Stern was aware of the transferences going on between Neumann and himself, as Neumann also undoubtedly would have been. Both nevertheless accused each other of being ignorant of this. Stern referred to a letter, in which Neumann accused him of resistances and dishonesty, which had undermined their relationship. According to Stern, Neumann had mistaken the analytical resistance for a character flaw of the patient.

Stern's letter to Jung ended with a plea for clarification, to which he - as a supporter and representative of Jung's psychology – believed he had the right. Jung's reply is dated the same day as the letter to Neumann. He assured Stern that his presentation was in line with the principles of Analytical Psychology, followed by a slightly cryptic passage about transference and supervision:

> 'One should never accuse the other one of something. Freud shall never say of Jung that he has not been sufficiently analysed, because otherwise Jung would say Freud has not been analysed at all – and this will lead to a fruitless argument. The only possible question is "Have I been analysed sufficiently? Do I know my motives?" The case of the other is only of interest to me in so far as he is my patient. Otherwise I have to leave him to himself. Therefore: where dispute arises, the wise man remains silent.' (Jung to Stern, 19 December 1938)

Having written that, the manuscript and letters were sent back to Stern. In a similar way he responded to Neumann: once the devil had stirred up things – meaning transference had taken its toll – and one has become aware of this, one must not say any more, but return to oneself.

This is where the affair ended concerning Jung. What happened next is not entirely clear. Whereas Stern had declared his allegiance to Jung in November 1938, in November 1939 Neumann reported of Stern's conversion to Freud and psychoanalysis. And, indeed, another source tells us of Stern having graduated at the Institute of the Palestine Psychoanalytic Association already in 1938. When Stern died in 1982 in New York, where he had emigrated to in 1947, the author of the obituary expressed his gratitude to Stern for more than thirty years of service as a training and supervising analyst at the Psychoanalytic Institute of the New York University Medical Center (formerly the Downstate Psychoanalytic Institute) (Abrams, 1983). For a time he also served as the

president of the Psychoanalytic Association of New York. He wrote a number of articles, amongst others, 'Modern Science and Freud's Trauma Theory' (1956) or 'Der biologische Aspekt der Übertragung' ['The biological aspect of transference'] (1956a) which was published in *Der Psychologe*. Neumann was a frequent author in the same journal. He contributed articles in 1950 (on the occasion of Jung's 75th birthday), 1951, 1954 and 1957. In psychiatry, Stern is remembered for coining the phrase 'blank hallucination' (Blom, 2009; Campbell, 1996), which he understood as 'stereotyped sensory perceptions without appropriate external stimuli. Lacking any content related to persons, objects, or events, they are close to elementary hallucinations as which we designate such unformed perceptions as sparks, lightning streaks, cloudlike phenomena, etc. They differ in intensity, frequency, and duration, ranging from *formes frustes* like hazy blurring of perception, to full hallucinations.' (Stern, 1961, 205) According to Stern these hallucinations appear for the first time in childhood during the oedipal phase and might later recur during the individual's lifetime under psychologically stressful circumstances. Far removed from his early Jungian roots Stern declared the blank hallucination as a defence mechanism that would be reminiscent of the infant's experience of falling asleep after being nurtured by the mother's breast.[1]

Given the problematic experiences of his personal therapy with Neumann, it is little wonder that the question of transference and counter-transference became one of Stern's main scholarly interests. In the 1950s this topic featured not only in 'Der biologische Aspekt der Übertragung' ['The biological aspect of transference'] (1956a), but also in 'Trauma, dependency and transference' (1957), and 'The ego aspect of transference', where he wrote:

> 'The inevitable frustration of the patient's expectation, together with the upsurge of traumatic reminiscences in analysis, remobilize the infantile

[1] Stern followed here Otto Isakower (1938).

> conflicts and create the so-called transference neurosis. In the latter, the manifest aspects of the transference complex are replaced by the unfolding of the latent transference manifestations relating to earlier phases of libidinal dependence.'(Stern, 1957a, 154)

And here, in the letter to Jung, is what Stern wrote about his therapy with Neumann twenty years earlier, which seems to give a vivid picture of precisely the frustration Stern was writing about:

> 'He [Neumann] obviously does not know anything about an unconscious resistance that has to be made conscious by the analyst. This is a bad moral flaw of the patient's character, which brings to a breakdown every analysis. Disgraceful analysis, he writes turning scarlet. O sancta simplicitas!
>
> I even spoke about the resistance in analysis repeatedly. I explained to him that I won't visit his lectures anymore in protest and much more. Presumably he did not believe that I was capable of such wickedness.' (Stern to Jung, 6 November 1938)

We can assume that the failure of Neumann's treatment was partially responsible for Stern's turn towards psychoanalysis, which puts a greater emphasis on the aspect of transference. However, Stern was not uncritically repeating Freudian theories, but tried to bring psychoanalysis in tune with the findings of modern science, especially biology. His main work was posthumously published under the title *Repetition and Trauma. Toward a Teleonomic Theory of Psychoanalysis*: '[The] analyst can no longer shy away from the task of reformulation and continue to cling to admittedly wrong postulates on the ground that "psychoanalytical clinicians find it very difficult to do without [them]".' (Stern, 1988, ix)

In the writings of Stern I have not found a passage where he relates this criticism to Neumann, but the lack of a scientific basis for his theory was

brought forward by someone else, namely by Michael Fordham. (Astor, 1995) In the late 1950s Neumann and Fordham started to become suspicious of each other. Neumann warned in letters to beware of the scepticism of the 'regressive school of Fordham', which he believed would endanger the Jungian project; Fordham, on the other hand, refused to publish Neumann's articles in the Journal of Analytical Psychology. In his final critique of Neumann in 1981 we find the following sentence: 'I can enjoy the experience of his "poetry", especially when he interprets myth and legend; that, however, no longer justifies using vague, contradictory metaphor with which to capture states of consciousness in infancy and childhood. It was a device which used to pass muster, but today research has made that approach inappropriate. Both Jungians and psychoanalysts have constructed theories of childhood […].' (Fordham, 1981, 100) It seems to me that Stern would have subscribed to this verdict on behalf of psychoanalysis.

Erich Neumann and Margarete Braband-Isaac: Two pioneers of Analytical Psychology in Palestine and Israel.

Margarete Braband's interest in Analytical Psychology was first triggered by a presentation of Jung on 'Das Seelenproblem des modernen Menschen' ['Soul problems of modern man'] in the great hall of Zurich University in 1928.[2] She later participated in Jung's Berlin seminar in 1933, on the occasion of which Erich Neumann established contact with Jung for the first time. Braband's early biography bears some similarities to Max Stern's: Like Stern she studied medicine and specialised in psychiatry. In 1934 she got to know Jung personally at the 7th congress of the General Medical Society of Psychotherapy in Bad Nauheim – the same place that Stern met Jung at the occasion of the 4th Conference in 1929. The 1934 conference was Jung's first conference as the

[2] Jung held a lecture of the same title at a conference in Prague (1.-3. October 1928). See Jung (1928).

president of the society, a role he used to implement the internationalisation of the society and to introduce the option for individual membership, aimed to support the German Jewish members, who were expelled from the German section.[3]

In Bad Nauheim Jung wrote a recommendation for Braband to the Frankfurt patron of the arts Lilly von Schnitzler (1889-1981), friend and supporter of artists like Max Beckmann, who was labelled a 'cultural Bolshevik' by the Nazis, but also the wife of Georg von Schnitzler, the director of IG Farben – a company inextricably linked with the mass murder of Jews during the Holocaust – who was convicted as a war criminal after the war. In 1934 the Schnitzlers also gave a great reception. In a letter to Mary Mellon of 24 September 1945 Jung states that he had, "challenged the Nazis already in 1934 at a great reception in Frankfurt in the house of Baron von Schnitzler, the director of the I. G. Farben concern. I told them, that their anticlockwise swastika is whirling down into the abyss of unconsciousness and evil". (Jung to Mary Mellon, 24 September 1945, unpublished)

At the time Braband lived in Frankfurt with her non-Jewish husband and two children. During this time she, as she wrote to Jung on 3 March 1936, introduced Jungian psychology to medical colleagues and laymen. In 1935 she attended the Bad Nauheim congress one more time before she left Germany for good in March 1936. From Amersfoort she wrote to Jung:

> 'Seit dem Nauheimer Congress zu Ostern hat sich meine Lage in Ffm. bedeutend verschärft, es gibt inzwischen eine Unmenge äusserer und innerer Kämpfe. Eigentlich täglich lebt ein Dank an Sie in mir, denn ohne Ihre Hilfe, sehr verehrter Herr Professor, hätte ich nie und nimmer so sicher

[3] It is a bitter irony that Margarete Braband and Wolfgang Müller Kranefeldt went together to the gymnasium in Mülhausen. Whereas the Jewish Braband had to leave Germany, Kranefeldt made his career during the Nazi period as Jung's representative in Nazi-Germany.

gewusst, welchen Weg ich gehen muss und was der Sinn meines Lebens ist.'

['Since the Nauheim Congress at Easter my situation in Frankfurt has exacerbated significantly; in the meanwhile there are plenty of outer and inner conflicts. Actually, a thanks to you lives in me every day, because without you, revered Professor, I would never have know with such certainty which way to go and what the meaning of my life is.'] (Braband to Jung, 3 March 1936)

Her two children were with her: she had not told her husband about her decision, in order to spare any distress to him. The couple officially divorced, but her husband continued to support the family abroad. Her way to Palestine led via the Netherlands and Switzerland, where she met Jung at the end of March 1936. In Palestine she settled down in Haifa, where she opened a clinical practice. Similar to Neumann, who opened his practice in Tel-Aviv in 1934, she was confronted with prejudices in a mainly dominated Freudian territory:

'Der Kampf der Freudianer gegen uns ist noch grösser als ich erwartet hatte. Die meisten Menschen hier, Laien und Ärzte, sind entweder eingeschworene Freudanhänger oder eben fanatische Gegner, und damit verwerfen sie auch jede psychotherapeutische Tätigkeit. Nach und nach lassen sie sich aber doch belehren, ich habe im Laufe dieses Jahres schon von 8 Ärzten, zum grössten Teil von alteingesessenen, − die neueingewanderten sind zum grossen Teil in einem entsetzlichen Existenzkampf – Patienten zugeschickt bekommen."

['The fight of the Freudians against us is greater than expected. Most people here, albeit laymen or doctors, are either confirmed supporter of Freud or fanatic enemies, which means they reject any psychotherapeutic work. But bit by bit they listen to reason: In the course of this year I have

received patients sent to me by eight doctors, for the greatest part old-established – the previously immigrated are for the greater part in a terrible struggle for existence.'] (Braband to Jung, 4 May 1937)

Soon after her arrival she got in contact with Neumann who, due to his seminars in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem, had already established himself at the centre of the small Jewish Jungian community in British Mandate Palestine. For Braband it was a relief to find someone likeminded:

'Ich empfinde mein Alleinsein hier in Haifa oft als recht schwierig und war froh, im vorigen Monat endlich mal wieder nach Tel-Aviv fahren und öfter mit Dr. Neumann allerhand Berufliches sprechen zu können.'

['I often experience my being alone here in Haifa as very difficult, and was glad to be able to finally go back to Tel Aviv once again and to be able to discuss all kinds of professional matters with Dr. Neumann from time to time.'] (Braband to Jung, 4 May 1937)

Braband began to hold courses and seminars on Jungian analysis in Jerusalem – similar to Neumann in Tel Aviv. One of the participants of her seminar series in Jerusalem in 1938 wrote to Alice Lewisohn Crowley asking Jewish Jungians in Zurich for donations in order to acquire Jung's books for the university library of Jerusalem. Jung promised her to help by sending available copies of his books (Jung to Braband, 2 April 1938). In addition Crowley sent $100, money that was later used to support destitute patients of Braband.

This request is described by Jung vis-a-vis Neumann as an effort to bring together the Jungian community of Palestine:

'I have learned from Doctor Braband − whom you probably know, that attempts are being made to gather together all those interested in Analytical Psychology. I have therefore sent some of my books and papers to the

University Library in Jerusalem in support of these efforts.' (Jung to Neumann, 4 April 1938, 137-138)

Neumann, who regarded himself as a kind of main representative of Analytical Psychology in Palestine, did not respond to this. His reaction was in stark contrast to the jealousy and animosity between him and Kirsch in 1934 and 1935 (Liebscher, 2015). Perhaps it helped that Braband's practice was located in Haifa and not as close as Kirsch was to Neumann in Tel Aviv. Another fruit of Braband's seminar was the first Hebrew translations of a text by Jung, 'Psychology and Education', by Netta Blech, a former student of Braband, in 1954.[4]

Braband returned one more time to Zurich. In 1938 her former husband organised for her and the children to come to Europe. She used the opportunity to work psychotherapeutically with Jung, and to attend the Eranos conference in Ascona on the 'Gestalt und Kult der Großen Mutter'. Neumann's famous book later originated from the pictorial material of this conference, though he himself did not participate in it and would only come back to Switzerland in 1947.

After the end of the war Braband moved to Tel Aviv and lived in close proximity to the Neumanns. They were in regular contact and would discuss their cases with each other. From that period stems a rather obscure remark of Neumann about Braband in a letter to Jung:

'I am sure you will speak to Dr. Braband; as I have the fully ungrounded impression that she wishes to leave Palestine, I would like to urge you not to believe all the negative things she says – if she does so. She does not see the truly hellish shadow problem at all, not in micro or in macro, it seems to me. Possibly we will all perish from it – only we? – but it is

[4] The Hebrew translation of 'Psychology and Education' (Jung, 1946) by Netta Blech came out in 1958 as *Psykhologiah analytit we-khinukh* (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1958)

> terribly overwhelming to see how the acceptance of the shadow, earth and blood all belong together and how obviously, even today, the longing for roots and the offering up of blood sacrifices to the earth belong together. The fact that one has the 'evil eye' because one comprehends but is distanced from it does not make it easier, especially as one can only do anything about it in individual work and otherwise one must be silent for the time being.' (Neumann to Jung, 3 April 1948, 220-221)

Neumann refers to the political situation of Palestine. Ongoing civil conflict between Jews and Arab would soon turn into a fully-fledged war. In what way Braband was ignorant of the shadow problem, personally and collectively, is not made clear from this passage. However, she indeed had plans to move close to her former husband and his second wife, and to her daughter, who had married and moved to England. She also travelled a lot at this time, which might have been an expression of uneasiness with her situation: her journeys brought her to Switzerland, Germany and England.

In 1946 she had established contact with John Layard (1891-1974), the English anthropologist and Jungian psychotherapist, as she saw similarities between her own psychological understanding and his as expressed in his book *The Lady of the Hare*. (Layard, 1944) In contrast Neumann was suspicious of the Christian tendency of Layard's position:

> 'With the exception of you, of course, they have not experienced the evil which has the whole world by the throat, and this is the bourgeois-ethical inadequacy which endangers your students. (This is what, for example, brings a man like Layard, despite everything, much closer to me than Mrs Jacobi with her "Shadow Lover and the Rautendelein"[5]).' (Neumann to Jung, 1 January 1949, 240)

[5] Jacobi (1946).

Braband did not hold such reservations against Layard's Christianity, and even travelled to Oxford to meet him at the International Council of Christians and Jews in Oxford in 1947, which was organised to counteract anti-Semitism.

Another important relationship was formed closer to home, when she was visited by Martin Buber:

> Er suchte mich auf, da ihn Verschiedenes aus meinem Traummaterial interessierte. Wir hatten mehrere mich erfreuende Unterhaltungen: Buber gibt sich persönlich und nimmt das Wesentliche des Partners in sich auf. Ich kenne keinen Juden, bei dem ich das in der Weise erlebte. Aber selbstverständlich war es mir dauernd gegenwärtig, dass ich nicht versuche darf in Einzelbegriffen uns gegenseitig verstehen zu wollen. Er erwähnte seine Diskussion mit Ihnen über Ihre Schrift 'Abraxas'; diese interessiert mich zu lesen. Wenn Sie noch ein Exemplar davon hätten, ware ich Ihnen sehr dankbar wenn Sie es mir leihweise schicken könnten.
>
> ['He visited me because various aspects of my dream material were of interest to him. We had a few delightful discussions: Buber comes across quite personal and incorporates the essentials of the conversation partner. I do not know any Jew, with whom I had similar experiences. But certainly I was constantly aware that I should not try to understand each other in singular concept. He mentioned his discussion with you in your text "Abraxas"; I am interested in reading it. In case you still hold a copy of it, I would be very grateful, if you send it to me as a loan.'] (Braband to Jung, 17 September 1946)

Jung had not written a book entitled 'Abraxas', but Abraxas was the Godhead in Jung's 1916 text *Septem Sermones ad Mortuos* (Jung, 1916), which resulted from his personal engagement with the unconscious, later included in *The Red Book*. Jung had a private print run and attributed the text to the Gnostic writer

Basilides of Alexandria. The text was distributed amongst selected friends and students as, one of whom was Erich Neumann. In 1952 Buber launched an attack on Jung in the journal *Merkur,* based on precisely this text, labelling Jung a Gnostic and criticising him for overstepping the boundaries of psychology into the metaphysical realm. Jung defended his position in a letter to the editor of *Merkur* stating that his conclusions were based on empirical facts, such as clinical and mythological material, and asked Buber to read 'an analysis of mythological material, such as the excellent work of Dr. Erich Neumann, his neighbour in Tel Aviv: *Apuleius' Amor and Psyche.*'. (Jung, 1952, § 1510) Neumann had been in contact with Buber in 1935 when he sent the unpublished manuscript of his Kafka interpretation to Buber, who replied in a letter of 13 November 1935 praising Neumann's text for its clear and precise method. (Buber to Neumann, 13 November 1935, in Löwe, 2014, 376-377) In 1955 Neumann was asked by the editor of *Merkur* to publish an article on the occasion of Jung's 80th birthday. In his text Neumann included a critical remark on Buber, and was consequently asked by the editors to remove or change it in order not to put salt in open wounds. (*Merkur* to Neumann, 20 May 1955). Neumann replied: 'I am aware of the controversy in the *Merkur,* and the remark is my short contribution to it, and I fully intended your readers to consider it a reference to Buber. Should a 'wound' still exist, I would be delighted to act as a soothing ointment for Jung.' (Neumann to Merkur, 23 May 1956). In the end Neumann agreed to change the Buber reference in exchange for the offer to publish an open letter on the Buber-Jung debate in the journal.

In the years to follow, Braband came to Switzerland on a regular basis to visit the Jung family and attend the Eranos conference. She held seminars lectures in Zurich and Basel.

In 1953 Braband-Isaac, now married again, received a grant to undertake research with schizophrenic patients in the Friedmatt clinic in Basel. She

intended to continue her project in the Burghölzli with Manfred Bleuler (1903-1994), for which purpose Jung wrote a recommendation. In 1956 she worked as visiting doctor in Frankfurt, Washington (National Institute of Health in Bethesda), and Oxford. Her research was mainly concerned with the psychotherapeutic treatment of schizophrenic patients, experimenting with physical exercise, music, or chiromancy along the lines of Hugo Debrunner and Julie Neumann.

In 1951 she started the treatment of the psychotic patient Aryeh B., 29 years of age, in Tel Aviv, who had been referred to her by Neumann: 'Dr. Neumann hatte mir diesen Pat. im März 51 zugeschickt, sofort als er sich bei ihm gemeldet hatte. Den Grund gab mir Neumann nie an. Wir waren beide in der Diagnose "Grenzfall, fragliche Schizophrenie" einig.' ['Dr Neumann sent this patient to me in March 51 as soon as he was contacted by him. We both agreed on the diagnosis of 'borderline, debatable schizophrenia'.] (Braband to Jung, 17 October 1953) Over the next few years Neumann and Braband –Isaac conferred about this case on a regular basis.

While she was in Basel in 1953, the condition of Aryeh deteriorated rapidly. Earlier attempts to refer him to Neumann while she was abroad were shattered by the patient's strong resistance against Neumann. This resulted in the sectioning of the patient in a psychiatric institution in Jerusalem. After Braband-Isaac's return Aryeh was invited to live with her and her family, and she wrote extensive letters about the progress of the case to Jung. During his treatment the patient reported several dreams concerning Neumann, who was subsequently asked by Braband-Isaac about his opinion. Though they agreed on the diagnosis of borderline schizophrenia, there was disagreement about Neumann's interpretation of the patient's dreams and drawings and Braband's use of music in the course of the treatment:

‘Interessanterweise sagte Dr. Neumann auf die Kirche sofort von sich aus zu mir, das sei ein Gespenst, wie es die Primitiven machen, und er wollte gar nicht darauf eingehen, dass der Pat. selbst es als Kirche geschildert hatte […] Auch fand Dr. Neumann, ich hätte ihm beim ersten Traum von mir und meiner Mutter mit Käppi und Tomate lieber eine Zote erzählen sollen, mit der Musik hätte ich eine Inflation bewirken können. Ich erklärte ihm, dass der Traum des Pat. einige Monate später doch gezeigt habe, dass er durch das “Lied von der Erde” wieder an seine Kindheit, an der Geruch und an seine bereits damals bestehende Aufgeblasenheit gekommen sei. Aber wir konnten uns absolut nicht einigen und ich hielt wie immer bald den Mund.’

[‘Interestingly, Dr Neumann immediately said without prompting that the church is an apparition like the primitives make it, and he did not at all want to go into the fact that the patient had himself depicted it as church [...] Dr Neumann was also of the opinion that I should rather have told him a dirty joke at the first dream about me and my mother with a kepi and tomato, I could have triggered an inflation with the music. I explained to him that the patient’s dream showed some months later that, through the “Song of the Earth” he had arrived back in his childhood, at the scent and at his conceitedness, which had existed even back then. But we could absolutely not agree and I soon kept my mouth shut as always.’ (Braband-Isaac to Jung, 17 October 1953)

Subsequently, Braband-Isaac expressed doubts about Neumann’s psychological credential and refused to send the patient back to Neumann because of Neumann’s one-sided interpretation and the complete misunderstanding between her and Neumann in regard to this patient. In the same letter to Jung she reported a conversation with Dr. Winnik, the psychiatrist who treated Aryeh in the mental hospital, in which Winnik had expressed his concern about the

irrationality of Jungian analysts who would drive their patients into psychosis: ‘On my request […] he told me that he Aryeh B. would have been the first of my patients, but there had been a few patients of Dr. Neumann.’ [‘Auf meine Bitte, mir zu sagen, wen er von meinen Pat. bekommen hätte, sagte er, dass dieser jetzige Pat., Aryeh B., der erste meiner Patienten sein, aber schon mehrere Patienten von Dr. Neumann seien zu ihm gekommen.’] (Braband-Isaac to Jung, 17 October 1953)

To express her unease with Neumann vis-a-vis Jung by criticising Analytical Psychology’s ability to deal with neurotic patients, and to insinuate that Jungian psychology would drive patients into psychotic episodes, would certainly not go down well with Jung. It goes without saying that he parted side with Neumann.

Comments that were added to the letter of 17 October by someone in Zurich – not by Jung – but probably for Jung to discuss, speak of Braband’s ‘non-Jungian methods’, how she would ‘drive patients into inflation’, and of ‘badly disguised resistances towards Neumann’. She seems, so the commentator continued, to ‘pose as a representative of Jungian psychology in Israel’. The only positive comment mentions her commitment for the patient.

In her letter from 2 November 1953 Braband sent a text she had written in 1947 as an attachment. The article is called ‘C.G. Jung and Israel’. In the text she followed Jung’s argument that Israel would have had no prophets without the introverted intuitive type. But only a small group of people would understand this today. She continued to write about the question of an inner homeland in regard of the creation of Eretz Israel. Fate, she wrote, would put the Jews in the centre of suffering and each individual Jew had to work for redemption.

The ‘psychological commentator’ remarked again the absence of a method and that an aspect of inflation on behalf of Braband-Isaac would become clear through this very text.

One can only speculate about these comments, which were written behind Braband–Isaac's back. Whatever the reason, and whoever wrote and read them, from then on, Jung began to distance himself from her, and letters were mainly answered by his secretary. Jung reacted with displeasure about certain passages in letters from Braband-Isaac. The request to see the pictorial material of the Jewish patient of 'Zur Empirie des Individuationsprozesses' was first denied, but when granted, Jung refused to meet her while she visited his hometown of Küsnacht. Finally, she was denied the use any of the material for her work.

One final episode reveals how Braband-Isaac had fallen into disgrace, even without having been aware of it herself. In 1957, Braband-Issac published two poems about Jung in the *Neue Zurcher Zeitung*, to which Aniela Jaffé responded that Jung had not been very amused about the fact that Braband-Isaac had published these rhyming couplets, and that they had shown excessive enthusiasm, which did not belong in public (Jaffé to Braband-Isaac, 3 September 1957, unpublished).

The case of Margaret Braband-Isaac as well as the biography of Max M. Stern vividly illustrates the difficulties and problems of the formation and institutionalization of Jungian psychology in British Mandate Palestine and Israel. The lack of any organisational representation of Jungians until the late 1950s meant it was left mainly to individual therapists to sort out professional differences. Where conflicts could not be resolved, the parties involved resorted to Jung in Zurich. This meant that the nature of one's personal relationship with Jung was to a certain extent vital for the further career prospect and the position in the Jungian circles of Israel. And in spite of all the resentments he had to endure from certain members of the Zurich Jungians, it was Erich Neumann who most successfully gained Jung's trust and thus established himself as the founding father of Analytical Psychology in Israel.

References:

Abrams, S. (1983) Max H. Stern. *International Review of Psycho-Analysis* 10: 367.

Astor, J. (1995) *Michael Fordham. Innovations in Analytical Psychology*. London: Routledge.

Blom, J. D. (2009) *A dictionary of hallucination*. New York: Springer.

Campbell, R. J. (1996[7]) *Psychiatric dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fordham, M. (1981) Neumann and Childhood. *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 26: 99-122.

Gilbert, M. (1998): *Israel. A History*. London: Doubleday.

Isakower, O. (1938) A Contribution to the Patho-Psychology of Phenomena Associated with Falling Asleep *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 19: 331-345.

Jacobi, J. (1946) Der Schattengeliebte und das Rautendelein. *DU. Schweizer Monatsschrift* 11 (November): 19-20, 76.

Jung, C. G. (1916) *Septem Sermones ad Mortuos* (private print); English transl. by H.G. Baynes: *The Seven Sermons to the Dead written by Basilides in Alexandria, the City were the East toucheth the West.* London: private print, 1925; reprinted London: Stewart & Watkins, 1967.

Jung, C. G. (1931) Das Seelenproblem des modernen Menschen. In: *Seelenprobleme der Gegenwart*, Psychologische Abhandlungen, vol. III. Zurich: Rascher, 1931; again in: *Gesammelte Werke* X, pp. 91-113; English as 'The spiritual problem of modern man', *Collective Work* X, 74-94.

Jung, C. G. (1933) *Bericht über das Berliner Seminar von Dr. C.G. Jung, 26. Juni - 1. Juli 1933*, ed. Giovanni Sorge, Philemon Series [forthcoming].

Jung, C. G. (1946) *Psychologie und Erziehung.* Zurich: Rascher; English as *Psychology and Education*, vol. 17 of *The Collected Works* of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series XX, transl. R.F.C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Jung, C. G. (1952) *Religion and psychology*: a reply to Martin Buber. ['*Religion und Psychologie.* Eine Antwort auf Martin Buber'] *Merkur* VI/5; again in: *Collected Works* XVIII, 663-670.

Jung, C. G. & Braband, M. *Unpublished correspondence*. C.G. Jung Papers Collection, ETH-Bibliothek, ETH Zurich University Archives.

Jung, C. G. & Kirsch, J. (2011) *The Jung-Kirsch Letters*, ed. Ann Conrad Lammers. London, New York: Routledge.

Jung, C. G. & Neumann, E. (2015) *Analytical Psychology in Exile. The Correspondence of C.G. Jung and Erich Neumann*, edited and introduced

by Martin Liebscher, Philemon Foundation. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Jung C. G. & Stern M. M. *Unpublished correspondence*. C.G. Jung Papers Collection, ETH-Bibliothek, ETH Zurich University Archives.
Kirsch, T. B. (2000) *The Jungians. A Comparative and Historical Perspective* London: Routledge.
Layard, J. (1944) *The Lady of the Hare: being a study in the healing power of dreams*. London: Faber and Faber.
Liebscher, M. (2015) Introduction to *Analytical Psychology in Exile. The Correspondence of C.G. Jung and Erich Neumann*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, xi-lxi.
Löwe, A. (2014) *"Auf der Seite der inneren Stimme…" Erich Neumann – Leben und Werk*. Freiburg/Munich: Verlag Karl Alber.
Neumann, E. & Merkur. *Unpublished correspondence bewteen Erich Neumann and the Merkur*. Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach.
Rolnik, E. J. (2012) *Freud in Zion: Psychoanalysis and the Making of Modern Jewish Identity*. In: *The History of Psychoanalysis Series*, ed. B. Kahr and P. Rudnytsky. London: Karnac.
Stern, Max M. (1956): 'Modern science and Freud's trauma theory' in: *Acta Medica Orientalia*, 15: 183-188 (1956)
Stern, M. M. (1956a) Der biologische Aspekt der Übertragung *Der Psychologe* 8: 96-105.
Stern, M. M. (1957) Trauma, dependency, and transference. Presented at the Scientific Meeting of The New York Psychoanalytic Society, February 28 (1956). Abstracted in: *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 26: 152-153.
Stern, M. M. (1957a) 'The Ego Aspect of Transference' in: *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 38: 146-157.
Stern, M. M. (1961) Blank Hallucinations: Remarks about Trauma and Perceptual Disturbances *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 42: 205-215.
Stern, M. M. (1988) *Repetition and Trauma. Toward a Teleonomic Theory of Psychoanalysis*, ed. by Liselotte Bendix Stern, with an introduction by Fred M. Levin. Hillsdale: The Analytic Press.