

INTEGRATING SHADOW

Authentic Being in the World

Ann Casement



First published in 2026 by
Karnac Books Limited
62 Bucknell Road
Bicester
Oxfordshire OX26 2DS

Copyright © 2026 to Ann Casement

The right of Ann Casement to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with §§ 77 and 78 of the Copyright Design and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A C.I.P. for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-80013-385-3 (paperback)

ISBN: 978-1-80013-397-6 (e-book)

ISBN: 978-1-80013-396-9 (PDF)

Typeset by vPrompt eServices Pvt Ltd, India



www.firingthemind.com

Contents

About the author	vii
Foreword <i>by Frank N. McMillan III</i>	ix
Preface	xix
 <i>CHAPTER 1</i>	
Shadow	1
 <i>CHAPTER 2</i>	
Persona	23
 <i>CHAPTER 3</i>	
Scapegoating: The shadow of mimetic desire	35
 <i>CHAPTER 4</i>	
Professional shadow	45
 <i>CHAPTER 5</i>	
The savage mind: Complex psychology vs the anthropological gaze	51
References	71
Index	77

About the author

Ann Casement, LP (1938–2025), was an honorary professor at the Oriental Academy for Analytical Psychology; senior member of the British Jungian Analytic Association; associate member of the Jungian Psychoanalytic Association (New York); New York State licensed psychoanalyst; member of the British Psychoanalytic Council; member of the National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis (New York); member of the British Psychological Society; founder member of the International Neuropsychoanalysis Society; and patron of the Freud Museum in London. She worked for several years in psychiatry from the late 1970s; chaired the UK Council for Psychotherapy (1997–2001); served on the Executive Committee of the International Association for Analytical Psychology (2001–2007), and the IAAP Ethics Committee (2007–2016), becoming its chair in 2010. For two years from 1999 she conducted research working with Lord Alderdice and other stakeholders in the profession on a Private Members' Bill in the House of Lords on the statutory regulation of the psychotherapy/psychoanalytic profession. From 2015 until her death in 2025, she taught and lectured in China, at the initial invitation of Professor Heyong Shen.

She lectured and taught in many countries around the world, including the UK, China, Japan, Russia, USA, Canada, Israel, Lithuania, Switzerland, South Africa, Brazil, Mexico, and in several countries in Europe. She contributed to *The Economist*, and to psychoanalytic journals worldwide, being on the editorial board of some. She served on the Gradiva Awards Committee (New York) in 2013; gave the Fay Lecture in Texas in 2019; was a fellow of the Royal Anthropological Institute; a fellow of The Royal Society of Medicine; and was a member of the Council of the Metropolitan Opera in New York. She produced many articles, reviews, and several chapters for books. Her published books are: *Post-Jungians Today* (Routledge, 1998), *Carl Gustav Jung* (Sage, 2001), *Who Owns Psychoanalysis?* (Karnac, 2004), nominated for the 2005 Gradiva Award, *The Idea of the Numinous* (Routledge, 2006) with David Tacey, *Who Owns Jung?* (Karnac, 2007), *Thresholds and Pathways Between Jung and Lacan* (Routledge, 2021), and *Jung: An Introduction* (Phoenix, 2021).

Ann Casement passed away on 8 January 2025 and this book is published posthumously in her honour.

Preface

This book had its origin in the Fay Lectures I was invited to give at Houston in November 2019 on Jung's notion of *shadow*. The editing of the manuscript of the book took place while the pandemic of Covid-19 was still ravaging the world, that is, at a time when the global community was steeped in *shadow* and Jung's prescience is reified all around the world. Between that time of pandemonium and the publication of this volume, while the immediate ravages of the virus may be less in evidence on a day-to-day level, the emotional, physical, psychological, economic, and social aftermath of the pandemic will most likely still be in evidence. The pandemic itself was/is *not* one of those epoch-changing events such as the French and Industrial Revolutions in the Western world, or the rise of Communism in China, but, nevertheless, its catastrophic impact on people's everyday lives will continue to be felt for some time into the future.

Jung's discovery of *shadow* came about in the following way: "This work sprang originally from my need to define the ways in which my outlook differed from Freud's and Adler's" (Jung, 1971b, p. v). This notion first made its appearance in his book *Psychological Types*, which is devoted to the exploration of *shadow*, although the

term itself only appears sparingly within its pages. In another work, Jung wrote:

it fares with us all as with Brother Medardus in Hoffmann's tale *The Devil's Elixir*: somewhere we have a sinister and frightful brother, our own flesh-and-blood-counterpart, who holds and maliciously hoards everything that we would so willingly hide under the table. (Jung, 1966, p. 39)

Elsewhere he writes of the dangers of identification with *shadow* in relation to Nietzsche's bitter feud with Wagner:

A whole man, however, knows that his bitterest foe, or indeed a host of enemies, does not equal that one worst adversary, the "other self" who dwells in his bosom. Nietzsche had Wagner *in himself*, and that is why he envied him *Parsifal* Therefore Nietzsche became one stigmatized by the spirit ... when the "other" whispered the "Ecce Homo" in his ear. Which of them "broke down before the cross" ... Wagner or Nietzsche? (Ibid., p. 35)

There are echoes here of the acrimonious parting of the ways between Freud and Jung and the latter's "breakdown" following that split, which has been examined exhaustively over the years. Suffice to say that Jung, like the rest of suffering humanity, clearly had his own difficulties dealing with *shadow* parts of his personality.

John Beebe and Donald Sandner's paper on the assimilation of *shadow* contents that emerge during analysis is rightly critical of those who "have denigrated the ego and its defenses as mere identification with the hero archetype" (Beebe & Sandner, 1995, p. 345). Instead, like Jung, they point to the necessity for a strong centre of *consciousness* as well as the watchful and containing presence of the analyst as the prerequisites for a patient to be able to assimilate *shadow* contents as they emerge in the course of analysis.

Since its inception, the notion of *shadow* has become firmly lodged as one of Jung's major contributions to the world of psychology. According to the anthropologist and psychiatrist, Roland Littlewood, a distinguished past president of the Royal Anthropological Institute: "a malign shadow or double had been a common preoccupation of Romantic and Symbolist writers ... a schema which was to be elaborated most fully by

Jung” (Littlewood, 1996, p. 9). In previous times, this phenomenon had long been the subject of Romantic literature as evidenced in the writings of Goethe, Poe, Shelley, Nietzsche, Dostoyevsky, Stevenson, Wilde—with whose work Jung was familiar.

In fact, Jung appears to have borrowed the term *shadow* from poetry as may be seen in the following quotation:

the “realization of the shadow”, the growing awareness of the inferior part of the personality, which should not be twisted into an intellectual activity, for it has far more meaning of a suffering and a passion that implicate the whole man. The essence of that which has to be realized and assimilated has been expressed so trenchantly and so plastically in poetic language by the word “shadow” that it would be almost presumptuous not to avail oneself of this linguistic heritage. (Jung, 1960b, p. 208)

The notion of *shadow* continues to preoccupy creative artists such as the Nobel laureate Bob Dylan, whose recent album is titled *Shadows in the Night*, and I will explore this recurrent preoccupation in this book.

As *shadow* is usually experienced by the subject’s *ego* as the base, inferior part of the personality, it plays a large part in any psychoanalytical or psychotherapeutic treatment. This particularly applies to work in the transference–countertransference which is touched on in the first chapter of this book. If a patient can begin to come to terms with aspects of their own dark, unknown side and not continue to live those through projection onto/into objects “out there”, the contents of the *shadow* offer the greatest potential for *ego*’s growth in allowing for its development into a whole person, what Jung called *individuation*. It depends on the preparedness and attitude of the *conscious* mind whether the images that emerge are experienced as constructive or catastrophic.

I have cited a couple of examples of anthropological fieldwork in two of the chapters so I would like here to fill in a little more background about that discipline. As I will explore in Chapter 5, Jung himself made several forays into anthropology in his quest for a unifying *psychology of complexities*. His researches into that discipline, however, did not take in the work of the great pioneer of fieldwork, Bronisław Malinowski. The latter, who was Polish in origin, was technically an Austrian citizen, which meant he was classified an enemy alien at the outbreak of

the First World War. He was attending a meeting of anthropologists in Australia at the time when the question of his internment became a pressing matter. Fortunately, an enlightened Australian administration enabled him to set off to do fieldwork in the Trobriand Islands off the east coast of New Guinea. This heroic journey, undertaken unwittingly as so many journeys of that kind are—whether literal or metaphorical in nature—led to the creation of one of the great anthropological works, fittingly titled *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*.

Let us allow Malinowski's own words to set the scene of the beginning of this heroic journey as follows:

Imagine yourself suddenly set down surrounded by all your gear, alone on a tropical beach close to a village, while the launch or dinghy which has brought you sails away out of sight ... Imagine further that you are a beginner, without previous experience, with nothing to guide you and no one to help you. For the white man is temporarily absent, or else unable or unwilling to waste any of his time on you. This exactly describes my first initiation into field-work. (Malinowski, 1922, p. 4)

One can compare this with what happens in the course of an in-depth analysis as there are several rituals the two have in common, namely, the withdrawal from the familiar world into one that feels strange and often uncomfortable. This marks the entry into an alien culture, namely, the realm of the *unconscious* and the slow acclimatisation that comes about through increasing familiarity with that realm. In other words, as one increasingly learns to live among *shadow* parts of one's personality, the more one can withstand the lure of the retreat to the safety of the known *ego conscious* world.

That does not mean one then allows oneself to become taken over by *shadow*, which is actually what happened to Malinowski, who clearly was suffering from severe separation anxiety. As he became immersed in the culture of the indigenous people of the Trobriand Islands on a *persona* level, that is what he depicted in his ethnographic accounts. This seeming acclimatisation was on the surface only as his *shadow* was poured into his secret diary, the contents of which, when published several years after his death in 1942, shocked the anthropological world. He used derogatory language against the people among whom he was

living; he indulged in promiscuous sexual activity and fantasy; and he was addicted to drugs.

This was in marked contrast to the high aspirations expressed in *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, where he wrote that the study of ethnology can foster the acquisition of wisdom and enable an understanding of the student's own nature to make it finer, intellectually and artistically. In his own words: "The study of Ethnology ... might become one of the most deeply philosophic, enlightening and elevating disciplines of scientific research" (ibid., p. 518). This is where Beebe and Sandner's paper, cited earlier in this Preface, is insightful in pointing to the necessity of providing a safe container for anyone who has embarked on a journey into the interior, whether literal or metaphorical.

In Chapter 5, I am critical of Jung's misuse of anthropological concepts, in particular, of derogatory terms like *participation mystique*. This is balanced by another side of Jung, what he himself called his No. 2 personality that was linked to Goethe. "Faust ... was the living equivalent of No. 2, and I was convinced that *he* was the answer which Goethe had given to his times" (Jung, 1963a, p. 87). It is from this No. 2 personality that many of his insights would seem to arise, for instance, into the innate split in humankind as a whole. He expresses it thus: "evil ... is lodged in human nature ... This realization leads straight to a psychological dualism, already unconsciously prefigured in the political world schism" (Jung, 1964c, p. 297). He continues: "It is in the nature of political bodies always to see the evil in the opposite group ... Nothing has a more divisive and alienating effect upon society than this moral complacency and lack of responsibility" (ibid., p. 299).

Jung's statement that the projection of collective *shadow* is the result of psychological dualism underlines the fact that it is archetypal. Possession by archetypal forces is extremely difficult to combat and the enduring conflict between opposing political groups stands testimony to that fact, for example, communism vs capitalism; Democrat vs Republican. This antagonism has its roots in the reality that "we are in a split condition to begin with" (ibid., p. 297).

Jung has, at times, been denounced as *racist*, but the following statements stand testimony to another side of him.

Quite apart from the barbarities and blood baths perpetrated by the Christian nations among themselves throughout European

history, the European has also to answer for all the crimes he has committed against the colored races during the process of colonization. In this respect the white man carries a very heavy burden indeed. It shows us a picture of the common human shadow that could hardly be painted in blacker colors. The evil that comes to light in man and that undoubtedly dwells within him is of gigantic proportions. (Ibid., p. 296)

That prejudice is everywhere to be seen and has ever been so illustrates the fact that the origins of prejudice are deeply rooted in the human *psyche* and are not only the result of colonialisation. The undoubted prejudice that is associated with the latter needs to be seen as stemming originally from innate splitting in humans that is lived *unconsciously* through projection of *shadow* not as the cause of that split. Jung's insight into this phenomenon has enabled millions to journey into the shadow-lands of their own *psyche*, where individuals are far more profitably engaged in examining those phenomena rather than in projecting their contents into any ready-to-hand scapegoats. Ubiquitous *shadow* projection results in increasing global hysteria and resentment—a far cry from what Jung was exhorting humanity to try to achieve, that is, more awareness of its innate capacity for evil.