

List of books for USA (Import for Germany)

Books of C.G. JUNG:

Analytische Psychologie und Erziehung  
Die Beziehungen zwischen dem Ich und dem Unbewussten  
Ueber die Psychologie des Unbewussten  
Ueber Konflikte der kindlichen Seele  
Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido  
Psychologische Typen  
Die Frau in Europa  
Ueber die Energetik der Seele  
Das Geheimnis der goldenen Blüte (mit Richard Wilhelm)  
Seelenprobleme der Gegenwart  
Die Beziehungen der Psychotherapie zur Seelsorge  
Wirklichkeit der Seele  
Das tibetanische Totenbuch (mit Evans-Wentz)  
Psychologie und Religion  
Paracelsica  
Einführung in das Wesen der Mythologie (mit Karl Kerényi)  
Psychologie und Weltanschauung (Schw.Ztscht, f.Psychol.  
Bd.I. 1943)  
Die Psychotherapie in der Gegenwart (Schw.Ztscht.f.  
Psych.Bd.IV)  
Psychologie und Alchemie

(Sämtliche Bücher erschienen im Verlag Rascher, Zürich,  
Limmatquai 50)

\*\*\*\*\*

Books of Dr. J. Jacobi:

Die Psychologie von C.G.Jung (American transl. by  
Yale-University-Press)  
Paracelsus-Lebendiges Erbe  
Psychologische Betrachtungen

(Alle drei erschienen im Verlag Rascher, Zürich, Limmatquai 50).

\*\*\*\*\*

Other recommended books:

"Der Weg zum Selbst" v.H.Zimmer (Rascher-Verlag, Zürich)  
"Wilhelm-Busch-Brevier" " " "  
"Heinrich Pestalozzi "Gesamtwerk" " " "  
"Die Gestaltwerdung des inneren Menschen" von E.Ruefer  
acht (Rascher-Verlag, Zürich-Verlag, Zc  
"Töchter der Sonne" von Karl Kerényi " " "  
"Wege zur seelischen Heilung" v.A.Maeder " " "  
"Traumsymbolik" v.A.Maeder " " "  
"Indische Psychologie" v.Emil Abegg " " "

\*\*\*\*\*

"Seelischer Gesundheitsschutz" v.H.Meng (B.Schwabe, Basel)  
"Psyche und Hormon" v.H.Meng (H.Huber, Bern)  
"Zwang und Freiheit in der Erziehung" (H.Huber, Bern)  
"Das psychoanalytische Volksbuch" v.Federn Meng  
(H.Huber, Bern)

- "Harmonia Planterum" v. Hans Kayser, (Benno Schwabe, Basel)  
"Elternfreuden" v. H. Henselmann (Rotapfel-Verlag, Erlenbach)  
"Werktag in Liebe und Ehe" " " "  
"Kraft durch Leiden" " " "  
"Der Traum und seine Deutung" v. E. Aepli (E. Rentsch, Erlenb.)  
"Das Mythologische in der Religion" v. Fr. Medicus (Fretz  
u. Wasmuth-Verlag, Zürich)  
"Fluten und Dämme" v. Hans Barth (Fretz-Wasmuth, Zürich)  
"Das Christentum und die Angst" v. O. Pfister (Artemis-V. Zeh)  
"Aus der Vereinsamung zur Gemeinschaft" v. P. Tournier  
(B. Schwabe, Basel)  
"Krankheit und Lebensprobleme" (B. Schwabe, Basel)  
"Schicksalsanalyse" v. L. Szondi " "  
"Trieb und Kultur" v. H. Christoffel " "  
"Vom Ursprung und von den Grenzen der Freiheit" v. G. Bally  
(B. Schwabe, Basel)  
"Die Ganzheit der Person in der Ärztlichen Praxis" v. Th.  
Bovet (Rascher, Zürich)  
"Allgemeine Neurosenlehre" v. R. Brun (B. Schwabe, Basel)  
"Psychophysiologische Probleme in der Medizin" v. H. v. Wyss,  
(B. Schwabe, Basel)  
"Biologische Fragmente zur Lehre vom Menschen" v. A. Portmann  
(B. Schwabe, Basel)

\*\*\*\*\*

Die Bücher können vom Verlag angefordert werden. Die hier angeführten bilden nur eine erste, allgemeine Uebersicht jener Bücher, deren erzieherischer Wert sie für eine Verbreitung in Deutschland geeignet macht.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
Area Division V, OIC  
Washington, D. C.

January 10, 1946

Dr. David Levy,  
ICD, USFET Main  
APO 757, Postmaster, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Levy:

Your letter of December 11 reached me only yesterday. It was addressed to the New York Office of the OWI and apparently held up there. I am sorry for the delay in my answer.

In my conversations about Bad Orb with General McClure, Colonel Powell, and Lt. Col. Waples, I made the following points:

1. Screening of Germans must be as strict and thorough as possible. It is both thorough and strict in Bad Orb.
2. The screening should be carried on either under the responsibility of the (former) DISCCs or under the responsibility of ICD. If it is carried on in two places, the procedures should be coordinated. The DISCCs should forward their findings to Bad Orb. (This criticism was shared by your competent "political" colleague in Bad Orb - whose name I forget - who complained to me that the DISCCs had not forwarded their findings to him. I mentioned this also to Toombs. In the meantime, all this seems to have been straightened out).
3. I suggested to Colonel Powell and also to Colonel Kinard that it might be possible to run the Bad Orb center as an ambulant unit in order to eliminate the waste resulting from uncoordinated vetting in both the field and Bad Orb. From this, you can see that I have never suggested anything like the closing of the Bad Orb school.
4. I mentioned to several people in Bad Homburg and here in Washington that the staff at Bad Orb should be increased and the procedure "streamlined" (I used this word) in order to increase the efficiency of the work.
5. Any intelligence test is superfluous as long as you have to process people who through a successful career in a specialized field have proved their intelligence.
6. I used the intelligence test as an illustration in calling attention to the danger to the American occupation authorities of being held up to ridicule by the Germans. The applicants are not only vetted; they also go home and talk about the vetting.

I don't think I mentioned it, but I should like to add now that I would be in favor of eliminating the Incomplete Sentences Test and the essay on "My Emotional Life Under the Nazis" as well.

7. I mentioned to General McClure that I don't think the idea of re-vetting Germans who hold licenses is a sound one. For example, the reliability of licensed editors can be checked upon the basis of their performance. I take it that this is part of the function to be performed by the press control officers. Besides, what these licensed Germans write is open to political checking by all ICD officers in Bad Homburg who read German and particularly by the members of the press section. General McClure agreed.

8. I stated my doubts regarding the usefulness of intensive psychiatric investigations for political purposes (as over against research) to General McClure, Colonel Powell and Lt. Col. Waples. I restated it here in Washington. In every case, however, I added that I am not a psychiatrist. You are. Nor did I fail to acknowledge the great importance of expert advice on whether or not a prospective licensee is a liar.

I am sorry that I had no opportunity to discuss this question fully with you in Bad Homburg, but you will understand that I hesitated to dampen the enthusiasm of an expert by the opinions of a layman. Now that the ice is broken I should like to try to be a little more articulate about my prejudices.

We successfully invaded Germany. We should refrain from invading privacy unless reasons of military security demand it. The childhood, sex life, relations to parents, etc. of a person are his private concern and have no bearing on military security, as far as I can make out. No stranger has a right to explore the intimate aspects of somebody else's life except for doctors and priests. The psychiatrist who works for the military government of the conqueror is, of course, in a position to investigate any German he chooses, but he can do so only because the man he examines must submit to the examination in order to stay out of trouble. This raises the question in my mind whether you are not really doing your job on the point of a gun, the gun being the apprehension of the applicant that his refusal to submit to any part of the examination will mean our refusal to grant a license. (For this reason I would discount as worthless any statement from a licensee that he did not object or was satisfied with the examination).

I am aware of the fact that many psychiatrists regard the moral point I am trying to make as the manifestation of some sort of psychological mechanism. But that impresses me only as a fact in appraising our civilization, not as an argument.

Clearly, no applicant for a license has a right to object to the most searching investigation of his political record in the widest possible sense of the word. Nor has he the right to object to a psychiatric investigation which confines itself to determining his veracity. I assume that it is possible to determine a man's veracity without going into the most intimate aspects of his life. If I am wrong, I would be in favor of entrusting the decision about the veracity of the applicant to the common sense judgment of experienced political investigators. This would probably somewhat increase the number of errors we make, but it would also increase the respect we pay to the human right to privacy.

Let me repeat, that I have not stated my case as articulately and as sharply to anybody else before, either in Bad Homburg or in Washington. I merely advocated "streamlining" the procedure and indicated my personal doubts as to the political necessity of intensive psychiatric investigations for the purpose of granting licenses.

I should very much appreciate the opportunity of talking all this over with you at Bad Homburg, where I expect to be within a month. I am anxious to learn from you in greater detail just precisely what the operational value of your work in Germany has been in addition to the many valuable insights into the Nazi and anti-Nazi mind which you have gained. Needless to say, that I am very much interested in learning from your findings.

When I received your letter, I read it to Toombs over the telephone. He told me that the whole matter is water over the dam. But I am anxious to clear up any misunderstandings that may have arisen and to state my case more clearly to you than I managed to do in conversations at Bad Homburg. Hence this long letter.

Since you asked me to do what I could "to rectify the damage" I did to your work in Germany through my conversations, I am sending copies of this letter to General McClure, Colonel Powell, Lt. Col. Kinard and Lt. Col. Waples.

Sincerely,

*Hans Speier*

Hans Speier  
Area Division V, Occupied Countries

HEADQUARTERS  
UNITED STATES FORCES EUROPEAN THEATER  
INFORMATION CONTROL DIVISION  
APO 757, U. S. Army

*from  
notes  
you  
to  
with  
2  
copy  
to  
drop*

ICD Screening Center  
Neuhaus b. Schliersee  
23 January 1946

MEMO : To Gen. McClure.  
FROM : Dr. David M. Levy.  
RE : Letter of Mr. Hans Speier to Gen. McClure, dated Jan. 10, '46.

Dr. Hans Speier wrote a letter to me dated Jan. 10, '46, copies of which he mailed to you, Col. Powell, Lt. Col. Kinard and Lt. Col. Naples. The letter contains criticisms of the ICD Screening Center and recommendations. If they were fulfilled, the usefulness of the Screening Center would, I believe, be destroyed. Dr. Speier visited us at Bad Orb on one occasion. I invited him to do so hoping he would remain for one entire session, and read our reports of the candidates he saw there. Unfortunately he was not able to stay. Otherwise certain points noted in his letter could have been clarified.

His main points in "streamlining" the procedures consist of eliminating intelligence tests, two tests that we regard as valuable in depicting political and other attitudes, and the psychiatric interview. That would leave out everything except investigation of the political record. He considered utilizing psychiatric investigation to determine a candidates veracity, but then favored eliminating that function also.

As a reason for eliminating the intelligence test he states that such tests are superfluous "as long as you have to process people who through a successful career in a specialized field have proved their intelligence". He implies also that intelligence tests expose us to "the danger to the American occupation authorities of being held up to ridicule by the Germans". He gives no reason for the elimination of the other two tests.

Of the numerous objections to intelligence tests, the argument that success in a career is proof enough of intelligence has been dispelled many times. It has been proved time and again that a man may attain such success in spite of less than mediocre intelligence. We have had several examples in the Screening Center of men who became heads of large concerns

by virtue of being their fathers' sons. In screening of a publisher, for example, it is important to know if he has discernment, judgment, analytic skill and such other factors that are considered under the term "intelligence". However anti-Nazi in attitude a candidate may be, lack of intelligence on his part may make him too great a risk for our purpose in so important a post. Considering the limited number of such posts, certainly we should select the better men. The tests are valuable aids in this process.

Another point in regard to intelligence for which tests are so important, is related to modification of intellectual functions by a number of circumstances, including emotional factors and organic disease. Actually we have found instances at Bad Orb of deterioration due to such circumstances.

The objection that intelligence tests expose us to ridicule is rather surprising. The writer is under the impression that Germans are quite unfamiliar with "tests", that they are regarded as an American device. Actually numerous books and articles on intelligence tests have appeared in Germany since the time of Alfred Binet. The term "I.Q." was first employed by Professor Wilhelm Stern of Munich. Officers in the German Army were selected by a battery of intelligence tests, among others, in the early years of World War II. In the past month we have received a report from the German police administration in Stuttgart describing the intelligence tests (and also political attitude tests) they are now using in the selection of applicants for the police. At Bad Orb we examined a German psychologist, a prospective member of our Screening Center, who has been using intelligence tests professionally in Germany for over twenty years.

In the course of our experience at Bad Orb we have had a number of objections to the test on the part of our candidates. Several of these objections were spontaneous, others were elicited through the usual procedure of inviting a frank appraisal of the entire battery of tests. Two candidates, camera men, who did very poorly, objected on the ground that they were too hard to understand. Several thought the intelligence test was too easy. That point was considered valid and has since been corrected. One candidate, a publisher, who wrote us a detailed and enthusiastic account of his experience at Bad Orb, thought we should add vocational tests. Not one candidate, as far as I am aware, ever criticized the test as ridiculous.

The question of the intimidation of candidates arises at this point. Suppose they were afraid or thought it judicious to tell us only what they thought we would like to know? In this connection the writer regards the psychiatric interview as an intimidation and as invasion of private rights. He states: "this raises the question in my mind whether you are not really doing your job at the point of a gun, the gun being the apprehension of the applicant that his refusal to submit to any part of the examination will mean our refusal to grant a license." He conti-

ness, "for this reason I would grant as worthless any statement from a licensee that he did not object or was satisfied with the examination."

If the psychiatric examination is an intimidation, it is the same intimidation we used in selecting candidates for the OSS, and for the U.S. Army at the various induction centers. It is the same intimidation also that the British are now using with many more testing devices than we employ, for the screening of German key personnel, many of them applicants for licenses under their equivalent of ICD. The writer evidently is not aware that there is a difference in the utilization of a psychiatric interview for processing and for medical treatment. Both are "personal" in the sense that an inquiry is made into the childhood, social relationship, phantasy, emotional and nervous difficulties. The medical interview however, is much more detailed, intimate, and includes topics that are omitted in a processing interview. Questions concerning intimate details of the sex life, for example, are omitted. The same holds true for marital relations. For each topic a simple introductory question is asked, the elaboration depends on the spontaneity of the candidate. Actually the interviews consist largely of spontaneous expression. There is no similarity with the political interview which is a series of questions and answers. The "threatening" aspect of the latter is much greater than the former. I have witnessed frequently the emotional tension in a candidate who had just completed a political interview, and his gradual relaxation as the psychiatric interview progressed. In a recent discussion, two members of the British Screening Section shared the same impression.

Can we determine if a candidate feels intimidated? Spontaneity of expression, conversation, general behavior is certainly a guide. Anyone who reads the full notes recorded in our interview, will conclude, I believe, that the persons concerned could not have spoken so freely if they felt intimidated. We have several tests also, that indicate anxiety states and help to determine the candidate's attitude. One candidate, in my experience, was clearly intimidated. He looked frightened. He had been told as a joke by an American investigator that at Bad Orb he would learn what an American Gestapo was like. At Bad Orb he asked the other candidates about it. They added to the spoofing by telling him we used handcuffs and spotlights. He had to be fully reassured before the interview could go on. Even he, an unusually shy individual, became spontaneous and friendly.

As to the value of the psychiatric interview preference should be made to the DISCCs, to others who referred candidates to Bad Orb. They are familiar with the problems in vetting their candidates, and are in contact with them before and after their experience at the Screening Center. Both Captains Hart and Lert have expressed their confidence in our reports.



Of the other points made by the writer, I would take issue with the recommendation that we become a travelling unit, "to eliminate the waste resulting from coordinated vetting in both the field and Bad Orb". Actually we are at present "ambulant", though for another reason -- the reduction of ICD personnel. The advantages of a central location are obvious. Besides the establishment of a smoothly running organization, the numerous tie/ups with local MG and civilians, the offices and equipment and time schedules are all gradually arranged to function in optimal manner. Our first experience "on the road" has already wasted a week in making arrangements for coal, telephone, rations, transportation, transformation of parlors and bedrooms into offices, etc. We have had to leave a library of books behind because it was too much an undertaking to transport it all. Moving from this place to the next will be the occasion of similar difficulties. We are now operating less efficiently. The problem in coordinating the vetting consists simply of getting reports of investigations by the fieldworkers in good time. That can also be done at Bad Orb.

There is an advantage also in having the screening independent of a local intelligence section. There would be an advantage in having two independent units, for the purpose of facilitating transportation --- one in the Munich area, the other in the Frankfurt area.

The point concerning "revetting" Germans who hold licenses". This matter once came to my attention through the suggestion of a press control officer who thought it would a valuable thing to do in the case of certain editors of whom they had grave doubts. In the one instance in which a German who held a license was revetted, it was clearly a mistake to have licensed him in the first place, because of his political record, even though his work was competent.

All in all Mr. Speier would destroy the basic concept of the Screening Center which, in essence, regards the study of a man's personality as necessary as the study of his politics. For people in important positions it is the only insurance against the choice of candidates who will endanger our objectives, no matter how "politically clear".

RICHARD M. BRICKNER, M. D.  
1000 PARK AVENUE  
NEW YORK 28, N. Y.  
BUTTERFIELD 8-7344

December 10, 1945.

Dr. David M. Levy,  
ICD, USFET,  
APO 757, c/o Postmaster,  
New York, N. Y.

Dear David:

How's this for a nice, quick answer to your very interesting letter of October 25th? You know the reason - C'est la paix. Your letter is full of interesting and suggestive points. What gratifies me is the difference between 1919 and 1945, - points of view and kinds of action it's possible to take. You will probably return with an intricate knowledge of Germans combined with some ideas of what might be done, or what approaches made, to allow the brain to catch up with its own technical prowess. It would be important to know why we use it (brain) so much better for technical than other employment. Technical stuff is concrete and ordinary use of the intelligence in human relations is not. Also technical thinking is the only kind free from emotion, so maybe it's the great escape.

I can sense the kinds of difficulties you are having, since I experience them myself in a slight degree, in my own connections with the Army. But we needn't stress those now. From my own contacts with PWs, I can also get an idea of the learning and succeeding you must also be doing. Of course the school is the outstanding thing, or at least it seems so from here.

*(in Rhode Island)*  
There is a very fine effort being made here, which I hope can be tied up with yours. They have heard nothing about yours, and having a notion of how the Army works, I assume vice versa. 500 PWs selected from all the camps in the U.S., have special training in the way to live democratically. First, who runs it - Col. T.V. Smith, a fine thinker even though he's a Professor of Philosophy (at Chicago). This is offset by his also being a former Congressman, and before that a champion cotton picker. He has with him Col. Alpheus Smith (educator), Maj. Henry Lee Smith, linguist and educator (Where Are You From? Radio program), Capt. William Moulton, same profession, and some other brilliant and also wonderful people. At least they are wonderful as a team. T.V. Smith gives lectures on American History; I heard one, and it was a new experience. He has as rich a knowledge of American History as I have of my family and he has a rare humanity, well used and well lived in, and a tawny humor. He is the idol of the Americans and the Germans up there. And of me, too, at least in my first enthusiasm. Such an urbane, energetic, erudite, quiet, mellow, loving figure I have not seen in some time. Our history is presented from the standpoints of our failures (the Civil War was the great failure), our self-criticism and our comprises - both in principle

*He founded  
the Chicago  
Newspaper*

and our specific great compromises. The lectures are followed by discussion groups, led by the others. These are a free-for-all, where they can disagree without getting red in the face,- disagree with each other and with the group leader, and kid both him (he's a man in uniform) and each other. I saw one group, led by a young American lieutenant who sat on a table with his legs crossed, smoking, and with a paper in his hand. He began by saying "You know what an expert I am in U.S. history. But I have an outline here, and we can discuss from that." There are also English classes and nearly everything is done in English. They told me of one impact received by some newcomers, who are incredible when they happen to see, on arrival, a volley ball game with PWs, U.S. enlisted men and U.S. officers playing together.

Of course, this is on the whole a highly selected group, of both Germans and Americans, and it's hard to measure the success of this venture. But I have interviewed one German up there whose thinking and general character seem to me to represent the regular authoritarian, "non-political", projecting, rationalizing, insightful German stuff,- regular run-of-the-mill as seen at Halloran, where we've done most of our work. I was interested in his having learned, with impact, that it is practically criminal to be non-political, and "the difference between a debate and a discussion - in a discussion you can compromise." Apparently it is possible to dent even this type and that seems important. There is another man who was wavering and uncertain, and has had a profitable experience by finding support for that side of him which wanted to feel and think more happily. This whole venture strikes me as a combination of Saroyan and Socrates. My impression is that nothing else but something of this sort, can work, and that this might, if applied broadly enough.

I have also run into at least one prize German,- note the name in case you run into him later - Hans Wissmann. Another whom I think is outstanding is Zander. Possibly another is Walther Killy. Unless we are all being terribly fooled, these are people who know what it's all about and are burning to start work in Germany.

This team of Americans, as constituted, can be of high usefulness, and should be kept together. All this is what I meant, in thinking of some kind of ultimate junction between the 2 schools. Since the plan is to fold them up soon, I am going to try to take steps from the outside to keep them intact. Have you any ideas?

Our own work goes right on. We've had about 90 interviews. I've done around 50, many of them several hours long, or in series. The safer Germans give the most informing interviews in general, as would be expected. The worst Nazis seem to want only to retire,- as one put it "to a house in the woods, with nobody passing by." And their interviews are equally retiring. On the whole, they are afraid of us, and are bound to link us with their ultimate fate. Not the ones in the Rhode Island School (Fort Getty). One observation I believe is well founded is an unusual dread of individual quarreling. This came out in discussions of whether or not wives should be allowed to discuss politics with their husbands. The almost universal "no" is more than a status question; they won't permit such conversations "because it

might lead to<sup>a</sup> quarrel." One man even said that if a wife did have political convictions differing from her husband's, she should never tell her husband, as it might cause a quarrel. This is a very interesting point, because their behavior in groups is of course just the opposite. Some of the conclusions to be drawn are intrinsic in the statement.

The conception of other people shown by many of these men is sterile, hollow and legalistic. "What sort of man is your father - as a person?" "He's about 5 feet 10, dark hair, brown eyes." "A child obeys his father, certainly." "Till when?" "Till he's 21; then he stops obeying his father; then he obeys the state." "I obeyed my father till I was 21. Now I'm married (age 30). If my father comes and tells me how to handle my children - he may do so, but not as an order. First I tell him he may not give me an order; if he agrees, I will see what I can do about his suggestions."

The docility pattern comes out in curious ways,- one man who had just read an account of Russian rape of German women and was trembling with rage and refused to talk, still did talk some because I didn't release him from the interview situation.

One observation we think we have made is that when the stern, power-weakness, authoritarian, sterile-human-relation, projecting, rationalizing, defensive, arrogant-obsequious, insightless attitudes are weaker and softer, the man is more likely to come from the group with an abnormal social history, where something happened to reduce or to change, the father. I.e.: father died in the PW's early life; father was killed or badly wounded in the first war (and is a war-hater); parents divorced; father 40-50 years older than the PW; illegitimate child with no male in the family; parents lived in other countries a long time.

Rhoda Metraux thinks the grandfathers are more loving than the fathers, and if father's father was a Social Democrat, the PW is better. We have some evidence for the first half of this.

More power to you, and best and warmest good wishes. I've tried to speak to Adele, but she's always out. Am still trying. Please write me again soon.

Yours always,

*Dick*