C.G. Jung Society, Seattle

Inside Pages: In-Depth

September 11th: Piercing Our Unconscious

Jerome S. Bernstein, M.A.P.C., NCPsyA

April 2006

Consciousness makes choice possible. Beyond the tragic loss of life and the destruction wrought by the events of September 11th, the events of that day thrust us into a deeper and more penetrating search for meaning. Why are we so hated by so many people in the world? What about our foreign policy and our image abroad has taken us to such a horrific present and foreboding future? What do we need to understand that we don't? Are we missing the core problem--mistaking symptoms for causes? How can we better differentiate between causal dynamics and the symptoms they manifest?

The focus of this piece is:

1. The horror of the events of September 11th pierced our national unconscious and forces a broader and deeper exploration of the underlying causes which have given rise to the U.S. "War on Terrorism."
2. Our government (regardless of the prevailing party controlling the White House or the Congress) tends to see all international problems as resolvable through political decisions (including military action) and/or money. This tendency is a major source of the dynamics which gave rise to the attacks of September 11th.
3. The problem of Islamic fundamentalist terrorism and the U.S. "War On Terrorism" cannot be separated from the Arab-Israeli conflict.
4. The determining causal factors of the Arab-Israeli conflict are religious more than they are political: a lasting functional resolution of that conflict cannot be attained by political action alone. Unless direct focus is placed on the underlying religious and archetypal dynamics of that conflict, they will continue to generate both conflict in the Middle East and fundamentalist Islamic terrorism aimed at the West, the United States in particular. My personal reaction in the ten days following the terrorist attacks in New York, Washington, D.C. and in the skies over Pennsylvania was profound sadness--not depression, not rage, not even anger. Just sadness. And for several days my analytical capacities did not serve me--or perhaps they did by simply shutting down. My sadness led me many places: to the realization that we had the tools with which we could have and should have been able to deal with the antecedents that led up to that terrorist attack and to a feeling that my generation has failed our children and their progeny by robbing them of an innocence--however flawed...and exacerbating that innocence may have been to much of the rest of the

world. It was an innocence preceding generations had enjoyed and taken for granted, and which I deeply resent losing, no matter the reason for its loss. That innocence enabled the presumption of the pursuit of happiness without undue intrusion of fear for our safety, and shielded us from unavoidable self-doubt regarding our culture and values.

Eventually my sadness led me to the most profound remorse regarding the nature of the human psyche--particularly the psyche that I know best, the American psyche. I am impressed with the psyche's tenacious dedication to its inherent inertia, its absolute resistance to any new consciousness that threatens to disturb its given state of supposed equilibrium. Our psyches--individually and collectively--want nothing to do with a new awareness that is perceived to threaten their existing comfort or require sacrifice or a change in life patterns, even change we know to be good for us. In this particular context, that resistance is so strong that nine terrorist attacks since 1983 on United States interests and personnel, resulting in nearly 1,000 killed--all attacks by Islamic fundamentalist terrorist groups and/or their governments--did not penetrate the American psyche as did the assaults of September 11, 2001. Eight of those nine attacks took place outside of the continental U.S., and we did not see them 'live' as we did the assault on the World Trade Center. The psyche will take every opportunity to deny an unwanted painful reality and most of us were able to repress what we knew was aimed at us.

What I mean by penetrating the American psyche is that the terrorist attacks prior to September 11th didn't affect the American populace to the point of feeling personally threatened. Nor did they affect U.S. government policy beyond a modest tightening of defensive strategies to protect American interests abroad and to a minimal degree at home. In point, these attacks did not effect a penetrating evaluation of American policy towards the Arab Islamic world with regards to the latter's growing antipathy, and in some cases murderous hostility, towards the United States. The attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon finally did. They pierced our psychic inertia by bringing terrorism home as a real and concrete conscious threat to the lives of every American. We have never been here before as a society and as a nation. We are woefully ill-prepared for this new psychic reality into which we have been thrust. It is a painfully high price to pay for consciousness.

And those attacks did something else. In the immediate wake of September 11th, the standard type of bellicose "good versus evil" and "we will dig them out of their holes" macho rhetoric presented by the Bush Administration as the only initial response to those attacks was not permitted to stand. The government began to ratchet down its rhetoric. To be sure many in this country and elsewhere in the world acknowledged the barbarity of those assaults and the righteousness and necessity of apprehending the perpetrators and the network that recruits, trains and supports terrorists. Nevertheless, the fact that such rhetoric was initially the only response to these events soon came under question here in the United States as well as abroad. Aided by many "yes, but" sympathetic responses on the part of many of our closest political allies, there began to emerge a growing unease with these old formulaic responses to threat. They seemed simplistic and inadequate. Categorical thinking, i.e. "good" versus "evil," will render us even more myopic. This terrorist attack uncovered a long lingering intuitive sense that there are much deeper roots to the genesis of our terrorist problem, and that we are part of the problem as well as a legitimate victim.

There is palpable tension inside and outside of government to bring a broader focus

to the causes of terrorism beyond the capture or killing of Osama Bin Laden and the destruction of the fundamentalist Islamic terrorist network, although these remain the most pressing and immediate objectives. And when the attacks on Afghanistan did begin, they were accompanied by food drops for a desperate population--an action unprecedented in American war-making. By this act, the impoverished innocents of Afghanistan became human again, whereas just two weeks before they had been discussed by our government as potential "collateral damage."

Since the end of World War II, when our nation exhibited the best of our generous nature through the implementation of the Marshall Plan in post-War Europe, our nation has existed as paradox. Our ability to engage in seemingly pragmatic domestic and foreign policy--particularly the latter--has cut us off from a feeling connection to what we do. (There are myriad examples, many of which are well documented in the book, "Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire," by Chalmers Johnson, published in 2000.) Beginning with the Cold War and continuing into the post-Cold War era, our government increasingly withheld information about the impact of our policies on others--peoples and nations--all the while convincing us of our many good deeds at home and abroad. We were sold on the suggestion that economic and material well-being for most Americans implied beneficent policies, if not material well-being abroad. And as our prosperity grew, we became willing accomplices in this self-delusion. Opposition groups were minimal in number and small in size, most of them concerned with environmental issues, until the demonstrations in Seattle against "globalization" in 2000. The third leg of this national self-deception has been the national media's emphasis on corporate profits to the detriment of more penetrating, and thus potentially less sensational and lucrative reportage. As of this writing there appear to be three camps in terms of response to September 11th: 1) the-root->em-out-and-kill->em (good versus evil) camp; 2) the peace camp, whose major theme is that killing people is both an immoral and inadequate solution to the problem; 3) the "searching" camp, which is reaching beyond the other two camps for a more far-reaching analysis of what increasingly is being intuited as a very complex problem. This third camp is sometimes plagued by varying degrees of self-analysis and self-blame, which in the extreme ("the U.S. deserved what it got") can paralyze analysis and discourse. But the important thing is that this camp is searching for new, more penetrating insights and understandings. I image this group as tending new shoots of emerging consciousness that have been released by this tragedy. The old split of "pro-war" or "pro-peace" is hardly any different from President Bush's "good" versus "evil." In the end what is called for is a pursuit of the dynamics of the problem wherever it may take us. An analysis that begins with a premise of any kind is one doomed to narrowness and ultimate failure. Categorical thinking–good (us) versus evil (them)–is a dead-end street at best; at worst, it threatens to seriously exacerbate the problem.

We must have, it seems to me, a two-track approach to our present circumstance. The terrorist networks around the world and the perpetrators of the terrorist attacks on September 11th (and the myriad attacks that have been carried out or thwarted over the years, most of which we have not heard about) are indeed deadly and immediate threats to our lives and our national safety. These criminals must be apprehended and/or destroyed—to the extent that that is possible. They are little worse than serial killers. The Bush administration is right to pursue this as a priority objective. At the same time, it is crucial that we recognize that there are compelling dynamics that give rise to Islamic fundamentalist terrorism. We must acknowledge the psychology behind the terrorists'

ability to recruit educated middle and upper class individuals who are prepared to sacrifice their lives for their cause at the expense of great pain and suffering on the part of their families. These factors do not fit Western values or thought processes. Our attempt to force these factors into analytical categories with which we are familiar in itself poses a threat to our future well-being.

My thesis is that the September 11th terrorist attack on the World Trade Center resulted from long roiling resentment on the part of the Muslim world in the Middle East that finally reached an explosive threshold. There are many aspects to that resentment. Central in the mix is the Arab-Israeli conflict, in which the United States has been a primary ally and backer of Israel. This protracted conflict has not found political resolution in fifty years of effort on the part of the United States and the protagonists. This political failure is due to the fact that the Arab-Israeli conflict is at its core religious more than it is political. As we have seen, political solutions cannot be successfully overlaid on unresolved religious conflict. Political realities must be adjusted to transcendent religious realities, not the other way around. Until this occurs a permanent political resolution to the Arab-Israeli conflict is not likely to be reached, and any resolution that is reached is not likely to hold over time.

Passion versus ideas

Since the end of the Viet Nam War there have been few problems that we didn't think we could quick-fix, either with money or at least with a slick heroic ending. (Consider the popularity of the Diehard film series or of Air Force One , where the hero defeats the bad guys.) Or, if all else fails, a Madison Avenue-type advertising campaign will convince us that we have fixed what ails us--even if we haven't.

Radical Arab Islamic fundamentalism resulting in the kind of terrorism that we have just experienced and which we face into the indefinite future is complex in its difference from anything we have had to deal with historically. Since the advent of the Viet Nam War right up until September 11, 2001, our engagements have been over conflicting ideas, not conflicting passions. Islamic fundamentalism, on the other hand, derives more from passion than anything else. Again, our country's feeling disconnection from the impact of our policies is profoundly relevant. Over the years the ideological passion on which this country was founded has eroded into dispassionate ideas. Historically, from the Revolutionary War through World War II, we fought our wars for ideals passionately held--life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. No other country tore itself to pieces as did the United States in its Civil War for a passionately held ideal--the elimination of slavery. With that war we more than paid our dues to establish ourselves as a nation concerned with humanitarianism – post-Civil War Jim Crow laws notwithstanding. Hence Americans can hardly metabolize the idea that our attitude of condoning the exposure of the female body could be taken as proof of our moral decadence, and therein a threat to the Islamic way of life and a justification for a group holding this nation hostage.

Although the September 11th terrorist acts have been justified by the perpetrators in the name of Islam, there have been numerous claims, both in this country and from within the Muslim world, that these actions run counter to the fundamental teachings of Islam as reflected in the Qu'ran itself. Although these assertions by Muslim clerics are true, it is also true that there has not been a hue and cry from the Muslim world with regard to these events. As Michael Skube wrote in an October 24, 2001 Op-Ed piece to *The Washington Post*, "But, as the text [of the Qu'ran] makes clear, the sword is to be taken up--

against those who deny Allah; against those who once believed but fell away; against foes of the faith, real or imagined." He goes on to cite evidence to the effect that Muslims were participants in 26 of 50 ethnic conflicts during the 1990s. And, as he says, "This is a fighting faith, not everywhere willing to live peaceably in a world of many faiths." Indeed there has been praise for Osama bin Laden throughout much, if not most, of the Arab Muslim world. (It is to be noted that Arab Muslims comprise no more than 20% of the total world population of Islamic adherents.) Virtually all the Arab nations in the Middle East that have been enlisted to "join" the U.S. coalition in the "war against terrorism" are on shaky ground with their own populace, who are much more fundamentalist in orientation than their governments. Not a single one of them – with the exception of Pakistan and Uzbekistan, which are not Middle East countries – has publicly agreed to participate in the fight against terrorism. Nor have any, with the exception of Oman (population 2 million) and Bahrain (population 645 thousand), publicly granted permission to permit the U.S. military to launch attacks on terrorist training camps from their soil--U.S. government spin notwithstanding.

Secular Government

In an Op-Ed article entitled, "Faith and the Secular State," in the September 23, 2001 edition of *The New York Times*, Yale University history professor Lamin Sanneh observed that:

> ...what most inflames anti-American passion among fundamentalist Muslims may be the American Government's lack of religious zeal. By separating church and state, the West--America in particular--has effectively privatized belief, making religion a matter of individual faith. This is an affront to the certainty of fundamentalist Muslims who are confident that they possess the infallible truth. For them this truth is not a private revelation but a public imperative, and states, like people, are either Muslim or infidel. America's government is not anti-Muslim, but it is among the most secular. For fundamentalists like Osama bin Laden, that amounts to more or less the same thing. To the extent that this analysis is correct, not only is this primary difference not fixable by political intervention, but for the secular governments of Middle East states to attempt to intervene in this conflict on behalf of the West would be to risk the very survival of secular government at all. Virtually none of them retain their power and "legitimacy" through popular franchise. Not a single member nation of the 51 nation Arab League is a democracy. In this regard, United States intervention is a contradiction in terms since it has only negative standing with most Muslims, and in this context is seen as a godless nation.

In his article, Dr. Sanneh observes that the Muslim fundamentalist movement began in earnest in 1979 with the Iranian revolution that brought down the Shah. The Shah had been put in power in 1953 by a CIA engineered coup that overthrew the legitimate government of Iran after it had nationalized Iranian oil and forced the British Oil Company to withdraw from the country. He was replaced in 1979 by Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. It was Khomeini who dubbed the U.S. the "Great Satan" (sound familiar?). He called for jihad against Israel and the West. There followed the assassination of President Anwar el-Sadat of Egypt who, at the time, was the greatest proponent of peace with Israel and accommodation with the West. And soon followed a series of attacks on the American presence in the Middle East. Professor Sanneh goes on to say:

[The] religious certainty [of the Ayatollah was] at odds with the very idea of the nation-state....When he met with students from Saudi Arabia in November 1979, Ayatollah Khomeini explained that the demands of Islam went beyond--and often against--the demands of nationalism. He declared that Islam appealed to all mankind, not only to Iranians, and not only to Muslims . And he argued that secular states drained Islam of its vitality. Western governments "have completely separated [Islam] from politics," he said. "They have cut off its head and [given] the rest to us."

In seeking to reunite Islam with politics, Muslim fundamentalists have embraced globalization as zealously as their capitalist counterparts have, ignoring state boundaries to create a multinational movement [the Nation of Islam]... (emphasis added) The United States and the West as a whole have not registered that for most Muslims in the Middle East, secular government is an imposed invention of the West. There is strong resistance among the populace to the idea of separating government and religion. Thus the attempts by the United States to remind an increasingly fundamentalist Muslim world that terrorism does not have legitimacy in the teachings and holy scripture of their religion amounts to the "Great Satan" lecturing the faithful on the faults of their religious practice. The hypocrisy in these reminders is glaringly apparent to present-day Muslims. It does not help when our government engages in assassinations and overthrowing of governments we don't like (Iran 1953) while professing a holier-than-thou allegiance to our own Judeo-Christian ethic on which we turn our back when it suits our perceived needs. In the age of television and the internet, this behavior does not escape the attention of even uneducated Muslims.

Professor Sanneh's analysis does not fit the mind set and political science of the present U.S. government. And even if it did, what functional approaches could we take to deal politically with what is at its core, a religious problem--- what *The Economist* in August, 1994, referred to as a potential "general war between Islam and the West"? How long can the U.S. succeed in propping up usually corrupt secular governments in Middle East countries, most of which are oppressive to their own people? How far are we willing to go in protecting them from their own growing fundamentalist populace?

Hypocrisy

There are deeper psychological roots to the problem we face. On closer inspection there is something disturbingly true about this fundamentalist Muslim view of the secular West. We adamantly profess higher moral and political ground based on our Judeo-Christian ethical roots. We inscribe our allegiance to God (and implicitly our religion) on our money. We swear our oaths of allegiance, and in numerous ways-- including the current administration's commitment to "faith-based programs" -- piously claim to alleviate our social ills. We preach our ethical superiority to ourselves and to the world. But when it suits our convenience and our definition of national security, we behave as if the moral tenets we derive from our religious roots do not apply. Even worse, some would say that our deeper allegiance is not to the Judeo-Christian god but to capitalism, materialism, militarism and the "almighty dollar."

We have engaged in our own forms of terrorism in the post-World War II era: in Iran, Iraq, Guatemala, Chile, Nicaragua, and Cambodia, among other areas of the world. Breaking our own laws is seen as a regrettable violation of our moral tenets, justified by national security needs--even when they may not be and when other more material reasons may be driving our behavior. And in so doing we betray a trust that much of the world has

placed in our country. And in branding others as "evil" and ourselves as "good," we are at best hypocritical, and at worst, in a dissociated state.

The Arab-Israeli Conflict{ TC \l2 "The Arab-Israeli Conflict}

Notwithstanding our government's initial pained attempts to isolate the September 11th terrorist attack as an assault by individuals and groups and as not directly connected to the Middle East conflict between Israel and Arab Palestinians, that connection is unavoidable. Less than a week after the attacks, various groups and fundamentalist religious leaders throughout the Muslim world made that connection clear. They called for the U.S. to abandon its support of Israel. Some called for the wholesale annihilation of Israel as a beginning price to end jihad against the United States. On October 7th Osama bin Laden stated that the United States would know no peace until the State of Israel ceases to exist. From the fundamentalist Muslim point of view, the State of Israel represents an illegitimate presence historically, religiously, and politically, and exists solely because of the support of the United States.

No matter how successful the United States may be in killing terrorists and disrupting terrorist networks, the sources of the terrorist threat may keep producing terrorists in an endless stream. With over one billion Muslims in the world, if only 1 percent were "fundamentalist" - far less than is the reality - that would leave over ten million individuals from whom to recruit future terrorists, all other factors aside. Only nineteen were directly involved in the September 11th attacks.

One has only to turn on the TV at night to experience the passion and rage of the Muslim world: to hear the father of a four year old boy say that he would be proud to see his son grow up to give his life in the struggle against Israel; to see a tearful, anguished mother at the burial of her teenaged daughter, declaring through her tears that her daughter died for a just cause and that she would not have it any other way. Our political system, our religion, and our psyches can hardly process thinking of our children in this manner. Certainly this kind of psychological reality is based in the deepest religious fervor, one not readily susceptible to political negotiation.

The policy of elimination of terrorists offers little long range promise without accommodation, if not resolution, of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Osama bin Laden said so directly on October 7, 2001. Without resolution of this conflict, the Western world will be a very large dog being wagged by a geographically tiny tail. At the same time, abandonment of Israel by the United States and the West as a political expedient offers no solution either. Islamic fundamentalism eventually would feel emboldened by such weakness on the part of the West and the conflict would continue beyond Israel-Palestine and the Middle East. Ironically, abandonment of Israel would undoubtedly be seen as equally immoral on our part, thus providing further "proof" of our moral decadence.

The Islamic fundamentalist movement appears to be split into two major factions: 1) the group that wants Western presence removed from Islamic land, politics, and economic influence, including withdrawal of U.S. support for Israel; 2) the group that embraces these beliefs of the first group while also seeing Islam as the one and true religion of the world. This group sees all other religions as heretical and illegitimate , destined to be replaced by Islam. Osama bin Laden professes allegiance to the first group. In his public pronouncements he has stated that terrorist acts of his cadres will cease when the West gets out of the Middle East and withdraws its support for the State of Israel. It is not

known what proportion of the first group in fact embraces the policies of the second group. Potentially, what the West faces is a modern-day Crusade, not unlike those of a thousand years ago. But this one would be a Crusade in reverse--carrying Islam to the West. As the Ayatollah Khomeini asserted, "Islam appeals to all mankind...not only to Muslims."

Treating the Symptom Instead of the Problem

We cannot resolve problems that are fundamentally psychological and religious through political processes alone. The Arab-Israeli conflict remains the oldest implacable on-going conflict in world history. It has withstood exiles and diasporas, crusades, endless invasions, and colonial occupations by all manner of national and international powers and institutions. It has had more outside political pressure than all of the political crises experienced heretofore put together. It outlasted the Cold War, which it managed to grasp in its tentacles.

The implacability of the present-day Arab-Israeli conflict takes its roots in a history that dates back over three thousand years--not just to 1948 and the creation of the State of Israel. And these roots are primarily religious more than they are political. When a conflict is as intractable as this one and, when despite a great imbalance of power, it still eludes all attempts at political solution, perhaps it would be wise to look for deeper, more elusive dynamics that perpetuate conflict--political power and pressure notwithstanding.

In my 1989 book, *Power and Politics: The Psychology of Soviet-American Partnership*, I made the case for underlying archetypal dynamics that prevented a political solution between the two superpowers during the Cold War, and which were responsible ultimately for the collapse of the Cold War (not a U.S. victory over the Soviet Union, as the U.S. has claimed ever since.) Indeed, one of the first symptoms of powerful underlying archetypal dynamics determining political possibility in international conflict is the very intractability of the problem. In other words, if, despite best efforts over a protracted period of time, political resolution is not possible, the likely cause is the presence of prevailing archetypal dynamics of which the proponents are unaware. In this regard, it would be instructive to consider the observations of the pre-eminent historical authority on the Cold War, Harvard University professor John Lewis Gaddis, in an article entitled, "International Relations Theory and the End of the Cold War." He raises a critically important question:

> The end of the Cold War...was of such importance that no approach to the study of international relations claiming both foresight and competence should have failed to see it coming. None actually did so...and that fact ought to raise questions about the methods we have developed for trying to understand world politics.

And, again, on page 18, he asserts:

> What is immediately obvious...[is] that very few of our theoretical approaches to the study of international relations came anywhere close to forecasting any of these developments. One might as well have relied upon stargazers, readers of entrails, and other 'pre-scientific' methods for all the good our *scientific* methods did; clearly our theories were not up to the task of anticipating the most significant event in world politics since the end of World War II.

> (See *Journal of International Security*, Vol. 17, No. 3, Winter 1992/93, pp.5-58. Italics those of Dr. Gaddis.)

What is most important about this article by an acknowledged authority in the field is that he addresses the essential question: "If political science is a science, then why did no one come even close to perceiving the events that ultimately took place?" After comprehensively analyzing the three major schools of political analysis, which he identifies as "behavioral, structural and evolutionary," and determining where and how each failed to perceive the underlying dynamics of the Cold War, Dr. Gaddis concludes: "My point...is not to suggest that we jettison the scientific approach to the study of international relations; only that we bring it up to date by recognizing that good scientists, like good novelists and good historians, make use of all the tools at their disposal in trying to anticipate the future. That includes not just theory, observation, and rigorous calculation, but also narrative, analogy, paradox, irony, intuition, [and] imagination...." (Ibid., pp. 57-8)

Dr. Gaddis' courageous article implies an anxiety: "We may not get off so easily next time if we do not come to understand what happened between 1989 and 1991 and why our science failed us." Last year I spoke to Dr. Gaddis and asked him if he had ever received any significant response to his 1992 article. He said that there was none--total silence from the very individuals and groups who should be most concerned. He indicated that he, personally, had given up on the attempt to get the political science community to address the issues he had advocated in his article. Are we not now facing that "next time"? We might not be so lucky this time if we fail to probe more deeply into our repertoire of tools to make our political science as optimally responsible as possible.

In the above quote, Dr. Gaddis suggests that we utilize other scientific tools at our disposal, i.e. "narrative, analogy, paradox, irony, intuition, and imagination." I would add to this list "archetypal psychology," as formulated by Swiss psychiatrist Carl G. Jung. Jung's theories provide a framework for working with transpersonal dynamics such as religious doctrine and imperatives that typically do not respond to political analysis or any other rigor that is based on the notion of negotiating a change in doctrine (in this case, Scripture) or a change in the mind set of adherents to that doctrine. To explain what I mean I will cast this argument using the Arab-Israeli conflict as a case in point.

Since the Arab-Israeli conflict is, at its core, a religious conflict more than it is a political one, reconciling the festering religious antagonisms between Jews and Palestinian Arabs is essential before political transformation can take place. To approach that conflict purely in political terms is to treat the symptoms while ignoring the underlying problem.

In archetypal terms, the present day conflict dates back to the beginning of Scripture. In the Hebrew Bible, God – Yahweh, as He is called – intervenes at several crucial points to lay the groundwork for conflict between Arabs and Jews. It is Yahweh who tells Abraham, revered Patriarch of both Islam and Judaism:

1. "Raise now your eyes and look out from where you are: northward, southward, eastward and westward. For all the land that you see, to you will I give it, and to your descendants forever. I will make your offspring as the dust of the earth so that if one can count the dust of the earth, then your offspring, too, can be counted..."(Genesis 13:14-16) [This promise by Yahweh applies to all of Abraham's descendants, including Ishmael who is not yet born at this point in Genesis.]

2. Yahweh tells the pregnant Hagar, mother-to-be of Ishmael from whom the Arab peoples will descend, to return to Abraham's wife and submit to her abuse. He then tells Hagar directly: "Behold, you will conceive, and give birth to a son; you shall

name him Ishmael...and over all his brothers shall he dwell." (Genesis 16:9-12)

3. Yahweh to Abraham: ...this is My covenant with you: You shall be a father of a multitude of nations....I will make you most exceedingly fruitful, and make nations of you; and kings shall descend from you. I will ratify My covenant between Me and you and between your offspring after you...as an everlasting covenant...and I will give to you and to your offspring after you the land of your sojourns--the whole of the land of Canaan--as an everlasting possession. (Genesis 17:1-8)

4. And, a further piece of mischief: Yahweh says to Abraham: "...your wife Sarah will bear you a son and you shall call his name Isaac; and I will fulfill My covenant with him as an everlasting covenant for his offspring after him. But regarding Ishmael I have heard you: I have blessed him, will make him fruitful, and will increase him most exceedingly; he will beget twelve princes and I will make him into a great nation. But I will maintain My covenant through Isaac whom Sarah will bear to you..." (Genesis 17:15-17)

5. And more mischief: Sarah saw the son of Hagar, the Egyptian, whom she had borne to Abraham, mocking. So she said to Abraham, 'Drive out this slave woman with her son, for the son of that slave woman shall not inherit with my son, with Isaac!' Abraham takes the problem of his wife's jealousy of Hagar to Yahweh Himself. Yahweh says to Abraham, "Be not distressed over the youth or your slave woman: Whatever Sarah tells you, heed her voice, since through Isaac will offspring be considered yours. But the son of the slavewoman [Ishmael] I will make into a nation for he is your offspring." And then Hagar and Ishmael are banished and sent off into the desert of Beer-sheba. (Genesis 21:9-21)

6. This conflict between Ishmael and his offspring and Isaac and his offspring is continued in Genesis with the birth of twin sons to Isaac and Rebecca. While Rebecca is pregnant Yahweh says to her: "Two nations are in your womb; two regimes from your insides shall be separated; the might shall pass from one regime to the other, and the elder shall serve the younger. " (Genesis 25:23) Esau, the elder, was cheated out of his birthright by his younger twin brother, Jacob, through the duplicity of their mother. Esau goes off to marry a daughter of Ishmael and continue the line that is to become the Arab people and nations, and his twin brother Jacob, whose name is later changed by Yahweh, Himself, to "Israel," continues the line that is to become the Jewish people. (Genesis Chapters 25-28) The above quotes are all from the Hebrew Bible, from "The Tanach," Stone Edition. For the faithful, this is Scripture, sacred writing, the word of God in written form. All three patriarchal religions--Judaism, Islam, and Christianity--refer back to this text, and to Genesis in particular, as the basis for their later Scripture. And all three embrace the Hebrew patriarchs of Genesis as their own. And herein lies the problem. With all due respect, if the above outlined story taken from the Hebrew text was presented as a tv drama, it would seem outrageous to most of us. Here is the patriarchal God, Yahweh, conspiring with His chosen patriarch, who fathers two sons, half brothers to each other, promising to each the same land, the same status. Each will be the father of nations and kings, and through each will pass God's covenant with his chosen patriarch, Abraham. But then he tells the father of both, Abraham, that it is through the descendants of Isaac that He will maintain His covenant in perpetuity. And neither Yahweh nor Abraham bothers to tell Ishmael that a deal has been cut

to make him the lesser of two equals. This insult is later compounded by the conspiracies by his own mother against Esau. Yahweh has told her that Esau will serve his younger twin brother. Neither Yahweh nor his mother Rebecca bothers to tell any of this to Esau.

The innocence of the player/victims in this drama is reflected in Genesis 25:9-10: "...Abraham expired and died at a good old age, mature and content...His sons Isaac and Ishmael buried him in the cave of Machpelah...." A touching scene between half-brothers burying their father--just as it should be.

And then, Genesis sasy: "After Abraham's death God blessed his son Isaac, and Isaac lived near the well of Lahai Roi." (Genesis 25:11) No blessing for Ishmael, not even in this moment. Only silence from God. That is the end of Ishmael excepting the record of his death at age one hundred and thirty-seven and a recording of his descendants, and the statement, "He set himself to defy his brothers." (Genesis 25:18) But there it ends, and there it begins--three thousand years of fratricidal conflict between the descendants of these half-brothers that carries on to the present time right up to and through September 11, 2001.

If this story were told to any of us as a personal story of individuals that we knew, would we not advise both sons that they had been set up for conflict by their father who left each the same legacy and lands in two wills, excusing the conflicting mandate by saying that one brother would be more equal than the other? Would we not say to them that they should not be fighting with each other but that they together should look at the mischief done to them by their common father and the conspiracies of the mothers (Sarah and Rebecca)? Would we not point out to them that they are both victims of treachery--by their father, their mother(s) and even God, Himself--and that to continue fighting over that same land promised to each of them is to perpetuate the treachery and insult visited upon them by their patriarch? And, let us remind ourselves, that this story and its plot are contained in Holy Scripture and are the foundation of all three of the patriarchal religions. Therein it has a hold on us–on all of us--beyond any other story which guides and governs our lives, our culture(s) and religion. The problem is that in secular American culture we have lost much of our connection to the sacred. We tend to relate to such "stories" concretely rather than symbolically. And with the loss of the symbolic, we lose our connection to the sacred. Over time our Scripture and the very mythological foundation of Western religion and culture, more than not, have come to be related to as if they are "stories" (not mythology) about historical events which have taken place in secular (rather than sacred) time.

Americans are good at ignoring those parts of Scripture that don't suit us at any given moment. Our capacity to do so is greatly enhanced by the separation of religion and government that we have more or less successfully practiced for over 200 years. Indeed, most Americans believe that it is the very separation of church and state that was part of the creative genius of our founding fathers. We typically pursue political goals and resolution of international conflict, paying little if any attention to Jewish or Christian Scripture. Indeed, both are seen as largely irrelevant in the pursuit of our power-based objectives.

However, such a separation has never been the case in the world of Islam. Secular government is a relatively new construct in the Middle East, and one that did not emerge out of their culture or religion as it did in the West. Rather, secular government is an alien invention imposed by the Western powers at the end of World War I and the collapse of the

Ottoman Empire--80 years ago. On October 7, 2001, Osama bin Laden said, "And what America is facing today is something very little of what we have tasted for decades. Our nation since nearly 80 years is tasting this humility..." (The "nation" that Mr. bin Laden is referring to above is the one nation of Islam that Mr. bin Laden and other Islamic fundamentalists wish to see.) Mr. bin Laden is not only speaking for himself, but I think is also representing the feelings of the majority of the Muslim people in the Middle East. What we take for granted--that Scripture has little or nothing to do with political reality in the modern world--is the core of what they see as Western blasphemy. Scripture is a sacred and divine promise for a people who organically do not separate religion and politics. Until the West learns this fundamental fact, we will never have an adequate grasp of the question that we have been asking ourselves since September 11th, 2001: "Why do they hate us so much?"

Religious roots: The archetypal core{ TC \l2 "Religious roots: The archetypal core}

Although Israel is a society whose government, economy and politics are modeled after the Western democracies, at the same time it has never fully transcended its own psychic and religious commitment to its own biblical history and Scripture. For a state where the people are overwhelmingly secular in terms of religious (non)practice, the degree to which it is captive of its own religious roots is fascinating to contemplate. No matter how secular it tries to be, Israel is caught in the quagmire of its biblical roots. And this takes us directly to the question of land: more than anything else, it is the sacred promise of land that lies at the core of the present-day Arab-Israeli conflict.

A primary stumbling block to a "peace agreement" attempted between Israel and the Palestinians, as represented by Yasser Arafat, at Camp David in December of 2000, was Israel's unwillingness to compromise on the "Settlements Issue." These are Jewish settlements, established by the Israeli government in the West Bank and Gaza Strip of Palestine--lands over which the 1979 Camp David Peace Accords committed Israel to granting Palestinian self-government. Shortly after the signing of the Camp David Peace Accords between Egypt's President Anwar el Sadat and Israel's Premier Menachem Begin in 1979, Premier Begin's government continued its policy of establishing Jewish settlements on the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights in Arab Israel. President Carter, the U.S. broker and signatory to the Camp David Peace accords considered these settlements an egregious violation of the accords.

Since 1983, nearly 200,000 Jewish settlers have been moved into these lands and an additional number into the Golan Heights, formerly Syrian land annexed by Israel. At the present rate of expansion, it is estimated that nearly 400,000 settlers will occupy these Palestinian territories by the year 2005. From the Palestinian and Islamic point of view, this constitutes de facto Israeli occupation of Palestinian territory--lands that were to be an integral part of a future Palestinian state. Again in the Oslo Agreements of 1993, these lands, on which most settlements continue to be built, were already designated as Palestinian. The Oslo Agreements designated three zones on the disputed territories: 1) Palestinian, 2) Israeli, and 3) Shared. The implementation of these agreements broke down in 1998.

The aggressive expansion of Jewish settlements in the disputed territories was a focused and deliberate policy on the part of the Begin Government between 1979 and 1983. This policy has been carried out without interruption by all successive Israeli governments. Premier Begin never referred to these territories by their modern geographical names, but

only by their ancient biblical names--"Judea" and "Samaria." He stated publicly and repeatedly that these territories--Judea and Samaria--belonged to the Jewish people by biblical right and history. From his point of view, these claims were supported by Scripture. He made amply clear that he would not preside over the handing over of traditional Jewish territories to Palestinians or any other group for purposes of political expedience. At various times, as Premier, he said: "What occupied territories? If you mean Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip, they are liberated territories. They are an integral part of the land of Israel."

Under no conditions will a Palestinian state emerge in the territory of western Eretz Yisrael [Israel]. At the end of the transition period set down in the Camp David Agreements, Israel will raise its claim, and to act to realize its rights over sovereignty over Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip. Settlement in the land of Israel is a right and integral part of the Nation's security.

[Judea and Samaria] are the cradle of the Hebrew nation and the *raison d'etre* of the Jewish people.

You cannot annex your own country. Judea and Samaria are part of the land of Israel, where the nation was born. Begin was the bane of Jimmy Carter's presidency. His religiously based intransigence defied rationality as far as President Carter and his State Department were concerned. Carter washed his hands of Begin, whose administration ultimately outlasted Carter's presidency. Those same settlement policies, which Premier Begin intended to be an obstacle in perpetuity to the ultimate establishment of a Palestinian State, are still in force and new settlements are being constructed as I write this piece. No subsequent Israeli premier has either sought, or felt he could politically survive, a decision to stop settlement development, let alone dismantle most of them in the name of a viable political resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The United States, notwithstanding periodic public protests, has tacitly accepted the Israeli policy of settlement expansion in the disputed territories.

For the most part, the resolution of some of the religious dynamics of the problem will have to precede political agreement. Another way of saying it is that healing the religious problem will make political resolution more possible. An interim political accommodation in some cases might reduce hostilities sufficiently to permit the more in-depth process of addressing the religiously-based dynamics of the conflict. But in most cases, lasting political resolution of this conflict likely will not be possible without endeavoring to heal the 3,000 year old religious conflict. This conflict is based in insult and emotional wounding more than in politics. The psychological and archetypal reality is that whether or not we subscribe to any form of Judeo-Christian religion, this archetypal backdrop is at the roots of our culture, our values and our politics, and it influences us all at an unconscious and conscious level.

What can archetypal psychology offer?{ TC \l2 "What can archetypal psychology offer?}

Because archetypal psychology deals with the transpersonal dimension in the form of "archetypes," which are universal psychic constructs such as the archetype of "religion" and the archetype of the "hero," the archetype of the "priest," etc. it is particularly suited for this type of religiously derived conflict. Since all archetypes are bi-polar, there is always a tension that arises between the two poles of any given archetype. Typically, and

particularly in a political context, there is a tendency to split the archetype, e.g. "peace versus war," instead of "peace-war." Central to the notion of archetypal psychology is the concept of holding the tension between these polar opposites. When this tension is held and not acted out (as was actually the case in the Cold War--neither the Soviet Union or the United States launched war on the other or used any of its respective nuclear arsenals) then what Jung called "the transcendent function" is invoked. What emerges then is a psychic "third," different from either pole of the archetype. In the case of the Cold War, the latter did not simply end, nor did the United States simply defeat the Soviet Union. What emerged was a third–-a transformation of the Soviet Union into a form which neither the United States nor the Soviets nor Russia or the various other states of the Russian confederation anticipated or even imagined. The primary archetypes involved in the Middle East conflict are the Patriarch/Father-Son pole of the Patriarch-Matriarch archetype; the archetype of Religion-Secularism (as applied to cultures and states); the archetype of the Shadow --the projection of the unconscious dimension of the archetype of Consciousness-Unconsciousness; and the archetype of War-Peace.

In the case of the Arab-Israeli conflict, archetypal psychology introduces the possibility of a neutral transcendent "third" into the fray. By taking seriously scriptural history common to both protagonists, not just as story, but as scriptural fact, it makes possible a common sympathy between the two antagonists and gives the two sides a designated problem (i.e. Abraham and Yahweh in particular) beyond themselves. This "common sympathy," which we see in the scene of Ishmael and Isaac together burying their father, Abraham, can become an avenue for re-introducing feeling into a situation that has been dominated by the emotion of hate. "Hate" is an emotion, not a feeling--i.e. it is a primitive emotional state unmediated by rationality . The present dispute over Israeli settlements in occupied Palestinian territory is dominated by the emotionally based conviction of both parties that the disputed territories were given to them by divine provenance. For each, the other is wrong. But according to Scripture, the argument can be made that both are correct. Theoretically this could make way ultimately for a more balanced negotiation, particularly if each could be made to recognize and feel that their deep injury derives from source(s) outside of the other.

By isolating the archetypal underpinnings of the conflict over land, it would be more readily possible to recognize and isolate from the core problem the political mischief Western governments bestowed after WWI: carving up territories; breaking promises (e.g. the Balfour Declaration by Great Britain promising a Jewish homeland in Palestine); the imposition of secular government on a culture for whom the separation of religion and government made little sense. It also would require the West to own up to its strategy of using the "protectorate" of Palestine as a political scapegoat for the expiation of its own guilt over complicity in the politics that brought about Hitler and the Holocaust. This guilt stems from the West's refusal to take preventive action, including the desire to not open its own borders to pre-WWII refugees and post WWII survivors. The recognition by the West of its shadow projection could provide a basis for taking more political and material responsibility for the Middle East conflict, instead of being complicit in splitting Israel and Palestinian Arabs in order to avoid its own culpability in the morass. The more the Western governments take responsibility for their role in the Middle East quagmire, the more pressure will be taken off Israel and the Palestinians, permitting differentiation of religious from political dynamics and thus a more reasoned and balanced discourse between the two parties.

Taken to the limits of its potential, archetypal psychology could make possible a much deeper sympathetic understanding by the West of Islamic culture in general and Arab Islamic fundamentalism in particular, and could provide a basis for appreciating the woundedness that both sides experience. And for the Israelis, it could provide an avenue of discourse that allows for contained passion as well as ideas as a legitimate basis for communication between both sides, however painful the honesty.

A more sympathetic understanding on the part of Islamic fundamentalists would be harder come by, since they give the most narrow interpretation to their Scripture, the Qu'ran. Transformation of Arab Islamic fundamentalism will have to result from the efforts of more moderate Islamic clerics and governments. Key to their capacity to do so is the capacity of the U.S. to better adhere to its own Judeo-Christian ethics and face the dilemma of its own power shadow in the Middle East. U.S. arming of both sides in the ten year Iran-Iraq War of 1979, for example, and the resulting million plus casualties, remains one of the most cynical and immoral acts in the eyes of Muslims throughout the Middle East. Such acts not only tarnish the image of the United States, but they also pull the rug out from under moderate Islamic clerics and governments.

Another archetypal energy central in the Middle East conflict, and by extension in our current "war on terrorism," is the archetype of war-peace. Traditionally, peace has been viewed primarily as the absence of war. Fundamentally, peace is not, and cannot be , the absence of war, because war is an archetypal energy that is universal and exists a priori. War was not invented by man, although man manifests and appropriates its energy. Rather, war derives from the aggressive instincts and power-drive inherent in man's nature and the psychic derivatives (that is, archetypal dynamics) that influence his behavior. It is not within the realm of man's choice to abolish the archetype of war as an energy that induces warfare. What is within his choice is to channel, manage, and direct war-inducing energy (that is, energy ensuing from the archetype of war, that may be manifested as warfare.)

From an archetypal standpoint, peace must be seen as the active management of war-inducing energies. It is one pole of the single archetype of War-Peace, war being the other pole. It is the Athena aspect of the Mars-Athena archetype in the collective psyche of the West--Athena being the wise dimension of this archetype that opposes uncontained aggression. Peace is a potential source of constructive power, not--as it has come to be seen--the absence of power. It may not be possible always to prevent aggressive energies from being destructive, but humanity can play a significant role in determining how destructive energy might be channeled. Therefore, from an archetypal standpoint, "peace" would refer to a conscious ongoing process of managing and containing the archetype of war both in its manifest and latent states. This definition, of course, includes, but is not synonymous with the discipline of conflict resolution. To the extent that this formulation of "peace" bears validity, it would require a complete reassessment of our concept of peace-keeping and nation building--concepts actively being debated within U.S. Government and the United Nations.

Although this cursory overview provides a sketch of how archetypal psychology could be brought to bear in the current crisis, obviously it is a long way from an applied technology. I hope that the reader can glimpse new avenues of possibility in the sketchy outline I've presented here. I am aware that this approach may sound naive. With regard to naivete, I would offer up the history of attempted political resolution in isolation from other

approaches and the three thousand year intractability of the problem.

Certainly most professionals involved in mediating the Middle East conflict have read the history of each of the protagonists and some have even read their Scripture. But--and this is crucial--the approach I am advocating must be undertaken independent of any political regime. Otherwise the entire approach becomes de facto subordinate to political interpretation and agendas. This is the dysfunctional disembarkation point for the current (and past) crisis. There is no space here in this article for an exploration of how this technology can be integrated with political science, but it can be--and from my point of view, it must be, at our peril.

Sobriety and complexity

There seems to be a recognition, albeit murky and very uncomfortable, that the crisis we are in is here to stay for the indefinite future. I believe that our unconsciousness has been pierced. If so, the current prevalence of categorical thinking--war versus peace--may transform into more grounded and sober re-thinking of our values and attitudes concerning power and foreign policy. This transformation is likely to take place fairly quickly when and if Osama bin Laden is killed or captured. There seems to be a widespread intuitive sense that this crisis is different from any other we have ever experienced, and that it poses a grave, and more serious threat to our cohesion as a culture and nation than we have faced in the past.

There are no simple answers here. If we are to emerge to higher ground, we must deal with lots of complexities, contradictions, and very difficult choices. Lastly we must face some hard and unpalatable considerations:

1. Each side in the present "War on Terrorism" has invoked the name of God in its own cause. However, God is not on anybody's side. To believe that God is on one's side leads to identification with the most inflating of all archetypes--the archetype of God--and blinds one to one's own shadow, i.e. one's own contribution to the genesis of the problem (to one's own "evil" side, to use the president's formulation of it.) In addition, the degree to which God is perceived to be on one's side calls for a more searching, engaging and challenging reflection on the conflicted and troubling nature of a monotheistic patriarchal God to which the three patriarchal religions in the world subscribe. We need to take responsibility for the strife that ensues from a God in conflict with Himself and his creation. For the most part, our religious leaders have failed us all in this regard. The data seems overwhelming that worshiping the patriarchal God without questioning His nature and empathically exploring His anguish (just read the Hebrew Bible for "data" on God's anguish) has had catastrophic consequences for humanity throughout history.

2. Although the terrorism threat that we face can be viewed as resulting from a clash of cultures, it is also a symptom of deep underlying religious conflict which is confounded by exacerbating political decisions. The latter avoid looking at the religious core of the problem. Part of the inability of the United States to perceive legitimate standing of the prevalence, if not dominance of, underlying religious dynamics in the present crisis stems from its own ambivalent and dissociated relationship with its professed allegiance to its religiously based ethical values.

3. Power is an exceedingly difficult psychic energy to manage. It appears to be more easily done when viewing the issues from the outside than it is when one has direct

responsibility for managing the reins of power. Power is never static. If we, the most powerful nation on earth, are not constantly managing our political, economic, and socio-cultural power as a nation, we are in imminent danger of having our national power complex managing us. Inevitably this is how we get into trouble as a nation. When we rest on our laurels regarding our success, our largesse, the spreading of democracy in the world, and when we indulge legitimate as well as narcissistic pride in our status as the world's only superpower, we risk the danger of not minding our power complex and it tends to run away with us. This seems to be a central issue in the current crisis. Most of us didn't see this crisis coming, and to the extent some did, we could not adequately integrate that new reality because it did not fit our self-image as an all-powerful and beneficent country.

4. As a nation we have done some horrendous things justified by our concept of national security. The concept of national security, by definition , is not nice. It is based on perceived power needs and rational and irrational threats to our citizens and our way of life. Some of the actions (a number have been detailed above) we have taken in the name of national security clearly have been more self-serving than not: for example, our greed for oil; our runaway power complex over Cuba; our service to the various special interest groups that compose our society. Certainly we can see some of these dynamics in the current crisis.

   At the same time, protecting our national security is a real responsibility of government. Doing so sometimes legitimately entails violating our own moral and ethical values as well as our own and international laws. I have referred to Osama bin Laden and his cadres as not unlike serial killers. They must be dealt with swiftly and decisively. We have already broken laws in their pursuit and no doubt will break even more in their pursuit and capture and/or elimination. Life and human safety and moral standpoints are seldom black or white; most often, they are both.

5. For all of the horrible things we have done as a nation, the United States has been and remains the glue that holds the world together politically, economically, and morally. Notwithstanding U.S.-owned or supported sweat shops around the world, our economic engine drives the world's economy. Without it, the world would suffer infinitely more in terms of poverty, starvation, disease, and death. Ours is one of the most compassionate and generous countries in the world. And yes, some of our policies have and do cause those very same problems. We must move beyond emotionality in our foreign policy and fully face the outcomes of what we do. This means that our policies abroad (for example policies that directly or indirectly sustain runaway population growth) do have moral as well as physical consequences. Feeding increasing numbers of starving people does not adequately address immoral consequences resulting from some of our own values. Everything we do has consequences. The struggle is to learn to improve our performance. More than anything else, this depends on a struggle to develop our moral consciousness. Moral consciousness may sometimes necessitate loss of power. Sometimes, too often, it may mean destruction and death.

6. The Reagan administration's decision, in its first year in power, to kill all federally funded research programs initiated in the Carter administration aimed at developing synthetic and alternative fuels has had severe consequences. We have lost that research--and the synthetic fuels they may have likely generated--and this

is impacting us in the current crisis. Our dependence on oil puts us into multiple conflicts of interest in the Middle East as a result. But it is not enough to self-righteously rail over the historical facts. The "white hats" --e.g. environmentalists, anti-globalization organizations, and more currently, the peaceniks -- in their finger pointing must also address just how much terrorism they are personally willing to live with. What aspect of their lives are they willing to personally curtail or give up while we do develop alternate sources of energy (a process that could take twenty years)? How much unemployment they are personally willing to endure? And at the same time, policy-makers and special interest groups must face the full import of the decisions they make. As noted above, everything we do has consequences. Is our addiction to Middle East oil, resulting in part from corporate greed and euphemistically referred to as our entitlement to the American way of life -- worth the events of September 11th? One could go on with numerous additional examples. The bottom line is that if we are to survive this crisis without undue destruction to life and to our way of life, we have to learn to hold the tension of the opposites. There are few rights and wrongs. The answers that we are looking for are more likely to be in the questions we have yet to ask.