

Jung, Freud and India.

*Sudhi Kakar*

In 1938, the Government of India invited Carl Gustav Jung, one of the great psychologists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, to take part in the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebrations of the Indian Science Congress in Calcutta. Jung was glad to accept the invitation since his interest in Indian thought had been longstanding and deeper than of most other European intellectuals. In the years between the two World Wars, when Jung wrote his seminal works, there had been a general fascination with Buddhist and Hindu philosophies in the European cultural world, a fascination Jung shared. His works show a familiarity with the writings of leading Indologists such as Max Mueller, Oldenburg and Deussen. Jung's interest in Indian and generally in so-called eastern thought was further stimulated by his longstanding friendship with the widely traveled philosopher Hermann Keyserling. Keyserling's book, Travel Diary of a Philosopher which, by the way, I would recommend to you all, first published in 1919, attempted to grasp the Eastern "soul" and pleaded for some kind of synthesis between Eastern and Western thought.

Jung did not completely share his friend's interest in searching for parallels between European and India traditions which would lead to a universal religion or a world philosophy underlying all cultural differences. This project of establishing the oneness of mankind had been of singular interest for many philosophers, including our own former president Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan. Jung was more pluralistic and emphasized essential differences between European and Indian ways of thinking. He was especially dismissive of movements such as Theosophy, which sought

15<sup>th</sup> Posthammer Memorial Lecture, 24 Sept '98. Revised version of a paper published in the author's Culture & Psyche.

2

to merge Indian and European traditions in a global, syncretic philosophy. "You cannot mix fire with water," he admonished. What Jung shared with Keyserling and other European intellectuals of his time was the second theme underlying European intellectual engagement with India. This theme had to do with a critique of the narrowness and decadence of Western civilization, a critique which goes back to Voltaire but became especially acute after the carnage of the First World War when an expression of doubt about the intrinsic value of modernity became fashionable among European intellectuals.

Jung's visit to India was disastrous. He liked very little about the country or its people, his judgements revealing both the depth of his indoctrination and a taken for granted superiority as a European. Commenting in the very first days of his arrival in Delhi on the dhoti worn by Indian men, he says: "There is something effeminate or babyish about it. You simply cannot imagine a soldier with such garlands of cloth between his legs. It is quaint but not very masculine. A real fight in such a contrivance is impossible."

The sights, except for the stupa of Sanchi, did not really grip him and Jung is quite caustic in his description of his experiences. One hot night he witnesses a Kathakali dance with its "demonically clever and incessant drumming that shake up the ever dominant plexus solares of the European". In Madras, a meeting with Ramana Maharishi, one of the greatest mystics of this century, had been arranged but by that time Jung, as he says, "was so involved with the obvious Maya of this world that I didn't care anymore if there had been twelve Maharishis on top of each other." Like any other Western tourist he was impatient with what he perceived to be Indian

indifference to the problems and tasks of the present. Commenting on the Autobiography of a Yogi, he writes:” 100 percent pure coconut oil, standing at 105 degrees F in shade and 100 percent humidity...unsurpassed as an antidote to disastrous population explosion and traffic jams and the threat of spiritual starvation... happy India! Halcyon coconut palm-fringed elephantiasis isles, chuppaties reeking of hot oil—oh my liver can't bear them anymore!”

On top of everything, Maharishis and coconut oil, Jung contracted amoebic dysentery in Calcutta and was confined to a hospital bed for ten days. Here he had a dream in which, along with some companions, he is searching for the holy grail on an unknown island somewhere off the southern coast of England. One by one his companions drop off to sleep and Jung must swim alone across a narrow channel and recover the Grail all by himself. I will not go into the details of the dream but its message for Jung was that he should not waste any more time in India, that his real discoveries—the Grail—were to be made in Europe and not India. Jung set out on the homeward voyage, absorbed in reading his alchemical texts, by now so indifferent to India that when the ship berthed in Bombay he decided not to waste time going ashore.

Jung's involvement with Indian thought was certainly deep and extensive and influenced his work although, as we shall see later, the nature and extent of this influence has been vastly overestimated by Indian intellectuals. In this he was not unlike many Western Indologists who admire ancient India but dislike the present country and its people. A part of Jung's attraction to Indian thought had to do with his feud with Freud. Yoga, he felt—and we must remember that for Jung ‘Yoga’ is a general

term for all Eastern religious thought and psychological practice—confirmed his position that there is more to the unconscious than sexual libido. India was thus an ally in his effort to prevent Western psychology from becoming a hostage to Freud's sexual theories. Some of concepts of Yoga that Jung found common with his own work and incorporated in his own theorizing are chitta, with its parallel to the Jungian psyche, tapas and what Jung calls active imagination, guru and 'thought-beings', atman and the Jungian self, samskaras and the archetypes, especially mandala, the pre-eminent archetype of wholeness. Although Yoga played a role in stimulating his awareness and perhaps contributing to some of his insights, it was, above all, a field for appropriation in the sense that Jung took from it parallels that confirmed his own theories. He has thus been accused by modern scholars of simply substituting his own theoretical constructs for equivalent religious concepts, thereby systematically distorting the intentions of Eastern thinkers.

Jung was indeed at pains to distinguish his own work from Indian mystical and religious thought, often dismissing the latter as non-scientific, speculative, and metaphysical while emphasizing his own scientific empiricism. In one of his letters to an Indian correspondent he wrote: I know it is a special feature of Indian thought that consciousness is assumed to have a metaphysical and prehuman existence... as far as my knowledge goes, however, we have no evidence at all in favor of the hypothesis that a prehuman and preconscious psyche is conscious to anybody and therefore a consciousness... the Western mind has renounced metaphysical assertions which are per definitonem not verifiable, if only recently so. In the Middle Ages up to the 19<sup>th</sup> century, we still believed in the possibility of

metaphysical assertions. India, it seems to me, is still convinced of the possibility of metaphysical assertions. Perhaps she is right and perhaps she is not.

In his autobiographical Memories, Dreams and Reflections, he writes:

He(the Indian) wishes to free himself from Nature; in keeping with this aim, he seeks in meditation the condition of imagelessness and emptiness. I, on the other hand, wish to persist in the state of lively contemplation of nature and of psychic images. I want to be neither freed from human beings, nor from myself, nor from nature; for all these appear to me like divinity unfolded—and what more could I wish for!“

In his conversations, Jung is much less polite than in his written word. In one of his interviews near the end of his life he says: ”the Hindus are notoriously weak in rational exposition. They think for the most part in parables or images. They are not interested in appealing to reason. That, of course, is a basic condition of the Orient as a whole....

So far as I can see, an Indian, so long he remains an Indian, doesn't think—at least not in the same way as we do. Rather, he perceives a thought. In this way, the Indian approximates primitive ways of thinking. I don't say that the Indian is primitive, but merely that the processes of his thought remind me of primitive methods of producing thought.“

Jung's admiration for India was for the Indian as a civilized noble savage possessing certain vital sensibilities that the Westerner could be nostalgic about but which he could no longer adopt.

”In India we find a civilization which has incorporated everything that is essential to primitivism and, as a consequence, we find man considered as a

whole... It is true that the life he leads is close to nature. It is full of hope, of brutality, misery, sickness and death; nevertheless it has a completeness, a satisfaction and an emotional beauty which is unfathomable...

It has no sense of persona; it only knows the archetype. And that is why I made no plans to visit Swamis or Gurus when I went to India. I knew what a Swami was; I had an exact idea of his archetype; and that was enough to know them all, especially in a world where extreme personal differentiation does not exist as it does in the West. We have more variety, but its only superficial."

Even 'Yoga' or Indian metaphysical thought, which he admired, was essentially incompatible with the Western mind and could be even harmful if its teachings and methods were taken over directly. „Yoga, to me," he wrote in a letter, „is no more than a subject of research. It neither impresses me nor deceives me. During my stay in India I saw for myself that Yoga is not at all what we think. The Hatha Yoga is more often no more than aerobatics, or simply gymnastics, or else it is a physiological aid to concentration, an aid which these highly emotional people need very much in order to master themselves."

In various places in his writings and letters, Jung has characterized the Indian(i.e. the Hindu) as soft, passive, and feminine whereas the European is hard, active, and masculine. He contrasts the intuitive and introverted Indian with the scientific and extraverted Western man. The Indian lives in a timeless world, unconcerned with reality and history whereas the European's world is its opposite. Indian consciousness is exclusively matriarchal whereas the Western consciousness has undergone a differentiation of the parental images: it has both a father and mother though

it may have dispossessed the latter. India, for Jung, became the psychic opposite of Europe, the unconscious of the West, and the Indian a cartoon of everything the European was not—a caricature regarded with affection, even admiration, but a caricature nevertheless.

The question is not whether Jung was right or wrong in trying to understand the cultural psychology of India. The search for distinctive psychological characteristics of different cultural communities and historical epochs is an honorable undertaking. The search characterizes much of my own work and I would agree with Jung's general contention that "Psychological differences obtain between all nations and races, even between the inhabitants of Zurich, Basel, and Bern, differences which are parallel to those between individuals." I would even agree with some of Jung's insights into Indian cultural psychology even though they are oversimplistic and need to be much more qualified and nuanced. The grave shortcomings in Jung's understanding of Indian thought and Indians lie elsewhere. They arise from two sources. The first is that he arrived at his conclusions not through his much vaunted empiricism, that is, through a long engagement with the mental productions of Indian patients or with the products of Indian cultural imagination such as myths, legends and tales, but through the operation and needs of an essentially hegemonic European consciousness that found a home in India for all that was felt to be lost in Europe. India, for Jung, was a black mirror in which European man glimpses himself darkly, but a mirror nevertheless, an object to be used, appropriated when necessary, but not a subject in its own right. Like sexist discourse, which either looks down at women as whores or elevates them to untouchable goddesses, the European psychological discourse also

dismissed non-Western people either as irrational, less differentiated primitives or elevated them to a class of noble savages, close to unconscious rhythms of life and nature and possessors of an intuitive wisdom. Whereas Freud, as we shall see later, can be said to exemplify the former – the looking down—tendency, Jung is clearly the representative of the latter; both were part of their colonial times and influenced by the ideology of European hegemonism.

The second problem with Jung's assertions about India is that they are not only based on texts but are also characterized by inadequate scholarship. Consider, for instance, Jung's statement that „Critical philosophy is foreign to the East.“ To be fair to Jung, here he was only repeating a widely held view of Indian philosophy which continues to persist in Western educated circles till today. As the late Oxford philosopher B.K. Matilal observed:“Too often the term Indian Philosophy is identified with a subject that is presented as mystical and non-argumentative. A corrective to this view is long overdue. Ancient Indian thinkers were more rational than they used to look on the basis of the Upanishads.“

What is then important about Jung's encounter with India is not that he was often mistaken about Indian thought and psychology but that he persuaded many European intellectuals that Indian philosophers and sages had something important to say to the West, that they could offer sustenance for a general spiritual starvation. His was a welcome corrective to some of the distorted perceptions Europeans have had of their own civilization and its place in world history. It is the fact of his contribution to an East-West dialogue that is important, not its quality.

On the other side of the encounter, Indian intellectuals reacted to



Jung's professed admiration for their traditional thought and to his pointing of parallels between Jungian psychology and 'Yoga' with appreciation and pride. Jung's views were a much needed bolstering of nationalistic self-esteem, a valued source of collective narcissistic enhancement. Universities closely identified with India's national aspirations—Benares, Allahabad, and Calcutta—plied Jung with honorary doctorates and he was much feted during the course of his Indian sojourn. Unlike Freudian psychoanalysis, though, Jungian psychology could not establish itself as a therapeutic system in India. There is no institutional structure that trains practitioners in the craft of Jungian therapeutics and, with a rare exception, there have been no trained practising Jungian analysts in any Indian city.

In the pursuit of their own anticolonial agenda, Indian intellectuals felt that Jung had confirmed the „truth“ of Hindu metaphysics, a source of their „superiority“ over the West. In this view, they ignored (as they continue to do to this day) Jung's ambivalence and grave reservations about Hindu thought. Just as Jung had appropriated India for his own purposes, Jung was appropriated by Indian intellectuals for their concern about the preservation of an Indian Hindu identity and in service of their polemics against Western hegemonic strivings.

Let me now come to the second European psychological encounter with India, that of Freud and his school.

Freud's thought, and the method of treatment of emotional disorders he pioneered—psychoanalysis—arrived early in India. In fact, the Indian Psychoanalytic Society, formed in 1922, became a member of the International Psychoanalytic Association before such recognition was accorded to organized psychoanalysis in most European countries, for instance, France.

The moving spirit behind the reception of Freudian thought in India was Girindrasekhar Bose. Born in 1886, Bose was the son of the chief minister of a small princely state in Bengal. Although he studied medicine and practised as a physician in Calcutta after graduating in 1910, Bose's abiding intellectual passion was abnormal psychology. He learned hypnosis, and by 1914 he had begun to treat patients suffering from mental disorders by a technique closely akin, as he says, to Freud's original method, presumably hypnosis, suggestion and questioning to recall memories and encourage associations. Before the first English translations of Freud's writings reached Calcutta making a strong impression on the young Bengali doctor's mind, he had already developed some of his psychological ideas. These included the basic elements of his theory of opposite wishes—namely that for every expressed wish there is an opposite wish working in the unconscious. A man of great energy and a good deal of originality, Bose immersed himself further in his psychological studies and in 1921 received the first doctor of science degree in psychology awarded in India. Steeped in Hindu philosophy and cultural tradition, Bose had many other firsts to his credit: he held the first

professorship of psychology at the University of Calcutta; he was a founder of the Indian Psychological Association; and, for us the most important, he was architect of the Indian Psychoanalytic Society.

The founder's meeting of the society took place in 1922 with Bose in the chair. Of the fifteen original members, nine were college teachers of psychology or philosophy, five—including two Britons—belonged to the medical corps of the Indian Army, and the professional affiliation of the remaining member is intriguingly listed as 'Secretary of the Jute Balers Association'. In the same year, Bose wrote to Freud in Vienna. After expressing sentiments of respect and admiration for the master's work, he informed him of the founding of the Indian Society. Freud was pleased that his ideas had spread to such a far-off land and asked Bose to write to Ernest Jones, then President of the International Psychoanalytical Association, for membership in that body. Bose did so and the Indian Psychoanalytic Society, with Bose as its first President—a position he was to hold till his death in 1953—became a full-fledged member of the international psychoanalytic community.

Cut off from the thrust and parry of debate, controversy, and ferment of the psychoanalytic centres in Europe, dependent on books and journals that were not easily available for intellectual sustenance, Indian psychoanalysis was nurtured through its infancy primarily by the enthusiasm and intellectual passion of its progenitor. Informal meetings with eight to ten people were

held on Saturday evenings at the president's house—the house was to become the headquarters of the Indian Society after Bose's death. Bose read most of the papers and led almost all the discussions. Without the benefit of a training analysis himself, it was Bose who 'analysed' the other members in a more or less informal manner and otherwise endeavoured to keep their enthusiasm for psychoanalysis alive. In the 20s, psychoanalysis intrigued the Western-educated Bengali elite of Calcutta, Freud's concepts being popularized through radio broadcasts and magazine articles. Psychoanalytic theory was seen as an intriguing new tool for the analysis of Indian culture and social phenomena. Even Gandhi, in his search for a solution to the perpetual Hindu-Muslim problem, attended a meeting of the Psychoanalytic Society in Calcutta in 1925 at which one of the British members of the society, Berkeley-Hill, presented a psychoanalytic analysis of the tension between Hindus and Muslims. As a matter of some interest, following Freud's ideas in *Totem and Taboo*, Berkeley-Hill argues that one who violates a taboo, becomes a taboo and thus an object of detestation—more especially in the case of the Muslim because the violation of the taboo, the cow slaughter, often took place to ratify Muslim victories or show contempt for Hindu susceptibilities. The violators of a taboo are contagious and must be avoided for they arouse both envy (why should they be allowed to do what is prohibited to others?) and the forbidden desire to emulate the act. Christians and Jews, who also kill cows, do not provoke the same hostility because they do not kill cows ceremonially as do the Muslims or with a clear intention of offering insult to the Hindu. Berkeley-Hill's solution,

... in line with the fundamental ideas which underlie totemism (is that) any reconciliation between Hindus and Muslims would demand as a cardinal feature some form of ceremonial in which cows would be killed and eaten, either actually or symbolically, by Hindus and Muslims in conclave. It is quite conceivable that this killing and eating of cows could be so arranged as to fulfil every demand from a psychological standpoint without involving the death of a single animal, although in view of the great issues at stake, namely the formation of a real and permanent pact between Hindus and Muslims, the actual sacrifice of every cow in India would hardly be too big a price to pay.

We do not know that Mahatma Gandhi, a strict vegetarian who shared the Vaishnava veneration of the cow, thought of this suggestion.

Because of its relative isolation, Indian psychoanalytic practice has been decisively marked by the stamps of the first Indian analyst. Essentially, Bose's method is derived from the psychiatric practice of his pre-Freudian years, his theory of opposite wishes and his readings of Freud's writings on analytic technique. In a short communication to the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* in 1931, he described it as follows:

In suitable cases the patient is first asked to give his free associations to determine the nature of the repressed wish active at the time. He is then *ordered* (itals.mine) to build up wish fulfillments and fantasies with reference to the repressed wish, ultimately taking up the roles of the subject and the object in the wish-situation.

The patient was further instructed to repeat this at home and to report the resultant fantasies in the next analytic hour. In session the patient reclined in an easy chair with his eyes closed, the analyst sitting at the back diligently taking notes of what he or she said.

These detailed notes were more than an *aid-memoire* for the analyst. They were actively used in the process of analysis for breaking down resistance. 'The record is of value also in removing the resistances of the patient who may be denying some of his former statements in spite of the assertions of the analyst to the contrary. A reference to notes brings about a conviction of the truth of interpretations much more'. As late as in 1966, the brochure published on the occasion of the silver jubilee celebrations of Lumbini Park, the mental hospital run by the Indian Society, shows in its photographic illustration of an analytic session, a patient sitting with his eyes closed on a folding canvas chair while the analyst behind him is bent over a notebook writing down his utterances.

15

When Bose instructs the patient on the direction his fantasy should take, he is not far removed from some of the meditative procedures used in the Hindu psycho-philosophical schools of self-realization. Tantrik visualization such as *nyasa* or the *Yoganidra* of Raja Yoga come immediately to mind. They are techniques with which Bose, through his deep study of Yoga, was thoroughly familiar.

Many may have grave reservations about the content of the clinical material elicited by the active, didactic stance of the Indian analyst, a stance to which the analytic method of Bose has greatly contributed. One can legitimately wonder if the analyst's activity does not come perilously close to what a lawyer is forbidden to do in the courtroom, namely 'lead the witness', increasing the chances of suggestions and thus adulterating the clinical data beyond salvation.

Well into the 1940s, the published work of Indian psychoanalysts shows a persisting concern with the illumination of Indian cultural phenomena as well as registers the 'Indian' aspects of their patients' mental life. Mythological allusions to Hindu gods and goddesses like Shiva or Kali regularly crop up in case-history reports. Thus, for instance, T C Sinha, a student of Bose and later himself a president of the Indian Society, reports the case of a sixteen-year old youth whose intense passive homosexual wishes were accompanied by the fear of pregnancy. He countered the analyst's reassurance that men could not become pregnant by referring to the example of the mythical

Yuvasva. Though he had a hundred wives, the king Yuvasva had no son and approached sages for remedy. Taking pity on him they performed a special ritual. A jug of water was made potent by recitals of mantras to be given to the queens to make them pregnant. Unknowingly, Yuvasva drank of this water and after ten months gave birth to a child who came out of his body by bursting open the right side of his stomach. To protect himself from Yuvasva's mythical fate, the patient now developed the fantasy of having his own penis inside his anus.

We come across papers on the Hindu psychology of expiation, on the interpretation—in the light of *Totem* and *Taboo*—of *prasad*, that is, the food remains that of God or a superior person. There are studies of Indian sculptural motifs such as the *lingam*, *ardhanarishwara*, and *Mahisasuramardini* as representing various aspects of the oedipal situation in the Hindu family in the light of psychoanalytic theory. We also encounter scattered comparative observations such as 'The Indian paranoiac often turns to religion.'

By the 1940s, however, the interest in comparative and cultural aspects of mental life, as well as the freshness of writing by the pioneering generation of Indian psychoanalysts was lost. In the last forty years, to judge from the official journal of the Indian Society, Indian contributions have been neither particularly distinctive nor original. Even the best papers are little more than status reports on global analytic concepts or introduction to the theories of a few selected post-Freudians such as Klein or Bion.



What are the reasons for the Indian rejection of, or rather indifference to, Freud and psychoanalytic thought? Before I begin to formulate an answer, I must emphasize that I am not going to deal with the rejection of psychoanalytic therapy as a method of treatment of emotional disorders, a subject that has been competently discussed by others. My focus here will be on the rejection of psychoanalytic ideas that in the West have been often employed as powerful tools in the service of a radical cultural critique.

At first glance, the Indian hostility to psychoanalysis seems surprising, given the fact that there has rarely been a civilization in human history that has concerned itself so persistently, over the millennia, with the nature of the 'self' and with seeking answers to the question, 'who am I?' As a colonized people, however, reeling under the onslaught of a conquering Western civilization that proclaimed its forms of knowledge and its political and social structures as self-evidently superior, Indian intellectuals in the early twentieth century felt the need to cling doggedly to at least a few distinctive Indian forms in order to maintain intact their civilization's identity. The Indian concern with the 'self', its psycho-philosophical schools of 'self-realization', often appearing under the label of Indian metaphysics or 'spirituality', became one of the primary ways of salvaging self-respect, even a means of affirming a superiority over a materialistic Western civilization.

Psychoanalysis was then a direct challenge to the Indian intellectual's important source of self-respect; it stepped on a turf the Indian felt was uniquely his own. In his comments on Freudian theory, Sri Aurobindo, an influential mystic-philosopher, exemplified this trend when he wrote: '... one

cannot discover the meaning of the lotus by analyzing the secrets of the mud in which it grows.' He also stated that psychoanalysis as a science is 'still in its infancy—inconsiderate, awkward and rudimentary at one and the same time'. These sentiments have been echoed by others and still characterize the attitude of many Indian intellectuals, even of those who are not professionally engaged with Indian philosophy.

Another reason for the rejection of Freudian concepts had to do with their origins. Derived from clinical experience with patients growing up in a cultural environment very different from the one in India, some of the transposed concepts often did not carry much conviction. Different patterns of family life and the role of multiple caretakers in India pushed in the direction of modifications of psychoanalytical theory. Similarly, Freudian views of religion, derived from the Judeo-Christian monotheistic tradition, with its emphasis on a father-god, had little reverence for the Indian religious tradition of polytheism, where mother-goddesses often constituted the deepest substratum of Indian religiosity.

As far as the other side of the equation is concerned, the effect of India or Indian thought on Freud was minimal or even nonexistent. Although his correspondence with Indian analysts such as Bose is polite, Freud was fundamentally disinterested in Indian cultural particularities that might press towards any revision or questioning of his hard-won concepts. It also did not help that Bose had developed an idiosyncratic version of the basic free

association method that came dangerously close to the psychoanalytic sin of suggestion. India and Indian thought, such as its mysticism, was the indirect occasion of one of Freud's works, *Civilization and its Discontents*, which he wrote in response to a letter from Romain Rolland. Rolland had sought Freud's views on the mystical experience, 'the oceanic feeling', both his own and that of the nineteenth-century Bengali mystic Ramakrishna, whose biography he was working on at the time. Freud stated his attitude towards India and things Indian concisely when he wrote: 'I shall now try with your guidance to penetrate into the Indian jungle from which until now an uncertain blending of Hellenic love of proportion, Jewish sobriety, and Philistine timidity have kept me away' (p.392). A historian of Indian psychoanalysis attributes Freud's attitude towards India, his disinterest in an intercultural exchange that could go beyond a mere confirmation of his own 'expansionist strivings', to his being a man of his (colonial) times. Christiane Hartnack writes: 'His work on women and other cultures reflected prominent stereotypes of his time by presupposing that European men are the measure to which all human beings are to be compared. Thus, just as Freud was too bound by the social norms of his time to overcome the then contemporary misogynistic views, he did not question European hegemonic attitudes, and so his psychoanalysis remained eurocentric' .

As a psychoanalyst, however, I would go beyond Hartnack's political explanation and complement it with a psychological one to discern in Freud's reaction to the Indian jungle some unconscious, life-historical determinants.

Freud has taught us that an individual's passionately held convictions and ideas are not autonomous from his unconscious needs and conflicts, and we should not hesitate to apply this lesson to Freud himself. The Indian jungle, I believe, was for Freud the lushness of his mother's body, Indian mysticism, the siren song of the eternal feminine, which was to remain a source of ambivalence for Freud through much of his life. 'Oh, you Indians with your eternal mother complex!' he is reported to have exasperatedly remarked to Mulk Raj Anand who had sought him out for consultations. Freud's ambivalence towards the maternal is also reflected in the directions taken by his work. Until well into the mid-1930s, Freud's writings did not take the infant's early experience of its mother fully into account, though towards the end, his recognition of the impact of the mother on mental life was coming closer to conscious toleration. The ambivalence towards the maternal-feminine began to ease as he himself was being inexorably pulled into the embrace of the *ewig Weiblich*.

Viewing Freud and Jung through anticolonial glasses, Indians by and large rejected Freud's theories and chose to regard Jung's psychology as a homage. In both cases, however, a serious engagement with the contents of the psychologies, as they relate or run counter to traditional Hindu thought and psychology, together with a careful sifting of the available empirical evidence, rarely took place. Genuine encounters between Western and Hindu psychology, free of a hidden colonial discourse on one side and anticolonial polemical intention on the other, have yet to take place. Perhaps the time is not yet ripe for such a dialogue. Perhaps the first Pochhammer lecturer,

Wilhelm Halbfass is right when he maintains that a genuine dialogue cannot take place when one side is in virtually total control, when there is no escape from the despotic global

presence of European thought, where in the modern planetary situation, Eastern and Western 'culture' can no longer meet one another as equal partners since they meet in a Westernized world, under the shape of Western ways of thinking and I might add, talking in a Western language as I have done. Thank you and just saying dhanyavad in Hindi at the end does not really change this situation.