

JUNG WAS RIGHT ABOUT WOMEN TOO

Full script, first draft | For Kait Willett | August 30, 2026

Target runtime 34 to 40 minutes. Every quote is verbatim from the Hull translation of the Collected Works, pulled from the volume text. Paragraph numbers are on screen as marked. Nothing here is published or sent anywhere without your approval.

Pacing marks: `[beat]` is a hard stop. `[SLOW]` means drop to roughly 145 to 155 words per minute. `[PACE]` means push back up to 175 to 185. `[ON SCREEN]` is a title card or citation. `[SLOT]` is a place where something of yours goes and I have left it empty on purpose.

COLD OPEN

No greeting. Read this straight, flat, like you are quoting a comment.

"She develops a kind of rigid intellectuality based on so-called principles, and backs them up with a whole host of arguments which always just miss the mark in the most irritating way, and always inject a little something into the problem that is not really there."

[beat]

"Unconscious assumptions or opinions are the worst enemy of woman. They can even grow into a positively demonic passion that exasperates and disgusts men, and does the woman herself the greatest injury by gradually smothering the charm and meaning of her femininity and driving it into the background."

[beat]

Now.

If I told you that was pulled off a podcast last week, you would believe me. If I told you it was a quote tweet with forty thousand likes, you would believe me. If I told you a man said it and lost his job over it, you would believe that too.

[SLOW]

It was written in 1927. In German. By a Swiss psychiatrist, in an essay for a Berlin review, thirty-three years before the pill was approved, forty-three years before no-fault divorce, and about a century before any of us were arguing about this on the internet.

[ON SCREEN: C.G. Jung, "Die Frau in Europa," Europäische Revue, Berlin, October 1927. Collected Works vol. 10, §245.]

His name was Carl Jung, and I am not here to defend him.

[PACE]

I want to be clear about that in the first thirty seconds, because you have seen the other version of this video. Somebody puts a black and white photo of a dead man on screen, reads a quote that may or may not be real, and uses him as a hammer. That is not what this is. Half the Jung quotes on your feed are fabricated. There are entire channels built on lines he never wrote, run by people who have never opened a volume of the Collected Works, and I will show you one of those fakes later so you can see how it is done.

Everything in this video has a paragraph number attached to it. Not a page number, a paragraph number, because that is how Jung is actually cited and it is how you check me. If I put a number on screen and you go pull the volume and I am wrong, tell me in the comments and I will pin it.

[beat]

So here is what we are doing.

In 1927, Jung looked at the change happening to women in Europe and he named five things. Not vague things. Five specific claims about what would happen and why. And he made them early enough, and with enough of a date attached, that we can go back and grade every single one of them against where we ended up.

Some of them he nailed so precisely it is uncomfortable. One of them he got completely wrong, and I am going to spend real time on the one he got wrong, because a video that only grades the hits is not analysis, it is astrology.

[SLOW]

And the reason I want to do this with him rather than with somebody alive is simple. Jung has no stake in 2026. He is not selling anything, he cannot walk it back, he was not writing to win an argument with a woman on the internet, and he did not know how it turned out. He wrote it down and then he died, and now we get to open the envelope.

[beat]

Five claims. Let's go.

ACT ONE: WHO IS TALKING AND WHY IT COUNTS

Register: clinical authority. Fast. This is scaffolding, do not linger.

Two minutes on the man, because if I skip this the whole video is worth nothing.

Carl Gustav Jung, born 1875, died 1961. Swiss psychiatrist. He worked at the Burghölzli, the major psychiatric hospital in Zurich, under Eugen Bleuler, and rose to senior physician there. He is the reason you have the words introvert and extravert. He is the reason you have the word complex, in the psychological sense. Half the vocabulary you use to describe your own inner life came out of this man or out of the argument he had with Freud.

He is credentialed, he is dated, and he is dead. Those three things are the entire reason I will build a video on him and will not build one on somebody currently posting.

Now, the essay.

[ON SCREEN: "Woman in Europe," 1927. CW 10, §§236 to 275.]

It is called "Woman in Europe." It is about twenty pages. It is not in *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, it is not in *Man and His Symbols*, and it is not in the book your algorithm keeps showing you. It is in volume ten of the Collected Works, which is titled *Civilization in Transition*, and I bring that up because the number of Jung videos that cite the wrong book is genuinely funny.

And the first thing he does in that essay, before he says a single thing about women, is this.

[SLOW]

"Moreover, what can a man say about woman, his own opposite? I mean of course something sensible, that is outside the sexual programme, free of resentment, illusion, and theory. Where is the man to be found capable of such superiority? Woman always stands just where the man's shadow falls, so that he is only too liable to confuse the two."

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §236]

[beat]

Read that again in your head.

He is saying that when a man describes women, he is usually describing his own unconscious and putting a woman's face on it. He is saying the shadow, the part of yourself you refuse to look at, lands on her, and then you argue with it and think you are arguing with her.

He says that. And then he writes twenty more pages about women anyway.

I love that. I love it because it is the most honest thing anyone in this entire genre has ever done, and because it is a warning label he wrote for his own product, and because you should hold it over everything that follows, including the parts where he is right.

[SLOT: 20 to 40 seconds of you, on the experience of being described by men who have never met you. Only if you want it. Do not invent a story here, and if nothing true comes to mind, cut this slot entirely and go straight to Act Two. The act works without it.]

ACT TWO: CLAIM ONE. IT IS PERMANENT, AND THERE IS NO GOING BACK

Register: clinical authority into controlled provocation. This act is the inoculation for the entire rest of the video, so do not rush it.

Claim one, and we are starting here on purpose.

Jung says the change in women is real, it is structural, and it cannot be reversed. Not should not. Cannot.

[SLOW]

"Masculinity means knowing what one wants and doing what is necessary to achieve it. Once this lesson has been learned it is so obvious that it can never again be forgotten without tremendous psychic loss. The independence and critical judgment she acquires through this knowledge are positive values and are felt as such by the woman. She can never part with them again."

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §260]

[beat]

"She can never part with them again."

That is 1927. Women had had the vote in Britain for nine years and only if they were over thirty and owned property. And this man is writing that whatever has just been let out of the box is not going back in the box, that women will feel it as a good thing because it is a good thing, and that any attempt to take it back would cost more than it returned.

[PACE]

So before we go one inch further, let's kill the video you think you are watching.

I already know what a chunk of the comments are going to say. So you want to go back to the 1950s. No. And more to the point, neither did he, and he is the one who supposedly hates women. The man everyone quotes to argue that feminism broke the world opens by saying the door is welded open. You cannot use him for that argument. He will not hold it.

[beat]

Now, look where we are.

[ON SCREEN: NCES Digest, Table 318.10, 2022-23]

Women earned 59.3 percent of bachelor's degrees in the most recent year we have data for. Not 50. Not 52. Nearly sixty percent of the people walking across that stage.

[ON SCREEN: Pew Research Center, April 2023]

In 16 percent of American marriages, the wife is the sole or primary earner. In 1972 that was 5 percent. Another 29 percent of marriages are roughly equal earning, and in 1972 that was 11 percent.

And on the other side of the same ledger, because this is not a story where only one thing moved:

[ON SCREEN: BLS series LNS11300061]

Labor force participation for prime age men, meaning men from twenty-five to fifty-four, is running around 89 percent against a long run rate closer to 93. That is a few percentage points. That is also millions of men.

[SLOW]

So one line moved up, one line moved down, and they crossed somewhere in the middle while everybody was arguing about whose fault it was.

Jung called the direction of the first line in 1927 and said it was permanent. Grade that one a hit. It is the least controversial thing he said and it is the thing that makes everything after it worth listening to.

[beat]

And now the video gets harder, so stay with me.

ACT THREE: CLAIM TWO. THE TRADE HAS A BILL, AND HE SENDS IT

Register: controlled provocation. Inoculate in the same breath as the material, not before it, and do not soften the quotes.

Claim two.

Jung says that this change, the one he just called permanent and good, costs something. And he does not use a gentle word for it.

"But no one can get round the fact that by taking up a masculine profession, studying and working like a man, woman is doing something not wholly in accord with, if not directly injurious to, her feminine nature."

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §243]

"When I speak of injury, I do not mean merely physiological injury but above all psychic injury."

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §243]

[beat]

Okay.

That is the hardest sentence in the essay and I am not going to walk it back for you, because a video where I read the soft parts out loud and paraphrase the hard parts is a waste of both our time.

Here is what I will do instead. I am going to tell you exactly what he means by it, because the word injury is doing something specific in his vocabulary and it is not what the clip is going to say it is.

[SLOW]

Jung's whole model runs on the idea that a person has a conscious side and an unconscious side, and that the unconscious side is built out of the opposite of whatever you have made your identity out of. In a man, the unconscious carries a feminine figure. He called that the anima. In a woman, the unconscious carries a masculine figure. He called that the animus. Two halves, one person, and the one you are not using is running in the background the whole time.

And his claim, the load-bearing one, is that when you build your conscious life out of the half you were not primarily made of, you do not become that half. You run it in your background, badly, and it drives you from underneath.

That is what he means by injury. Not that a woman cannot do the job. Not that she should not. He says elsewhere in the same essay that only the blind could fail to see the good in what these women achieved, and he means it. His claim is that the machinery that gets you there was not built for the route, and that it makes a specific noise when it runs, and that everyone can hear the noise except you.

[beat]

Now let's do the thing this channel does.

Flip it.

Because if he only says this about women, he is a crank and we are done. He does not. Two paragraphs later, same essay:

"So, too, man will be forced to develop his feminine side, to open his eyes to the psyche and to Eros. It is a task he cannot avoid, unless he prefers to go trailing after woman in a hopelessly boyish fashion, worshipping from afar but always in danger of being stowed away in her pocket."

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §259]

[PACE]

A man who will not do it does not get to stay a man in his model. He gets to be a boy in a woman's pocket. Jung wrote that in 1927 and it is meaner than anything he says about women, and it is aimed directly at the guy watching this video, and I would bet money it is the line that gets clipped and sent to somebody's husband tonight.

[beat]

And then there is the sentence almost nobody uses, which is the one I actually think is the most interesting thing in the essay.

[SLOW]

"The masculinity of the woman and the femininity of the man are inferior, and it is regrettable that the full value of their personalities should be contaminated by something that is less valuable."

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §261]

He is not saying women are inferior to men. Read it again. He is saying the borrowed half is the weak half, in both directions, always. Her masculinity is a worse masculinity than a man's. His femininity is a worse femininity than a woman's. And both of them are walking around treating the borrowed half as their best feature.

[beat]

I'm going to leave that there.

ACT FOUR: CLAIM THREE. THE MECHANISM

Register: clinical authority, then a hard drop into warm directness at the end. This is the center of the video. Longest act. Do not compress it.

Claim three, and this is the one I built the video for.

Jung does not just say there is a cost. He says how it works. And this is where he stops being a man with an opinion about women and starts being a psychiatrist describing a mechanism, which is a completely different thing and it is why we are still reading him.

Here is the whole passage. I am reading all of it.

[SLOW, this is the centerpiece]

"Thus it can happen, indeed it is almost the rule, that the mind of a woman who takes up a masculine profession is influenced by her unconscious masculinity in a way not noticeable to herself but quite obvious to everybody in her environment. She develops a kind of rigid intellectuality based on so-called principles, and backs them up with a whole host of arguments which always just miss the mark in the most irritating way, and always inject a little something into the problem that is not really there. Unconscious assumptions or opinions are the worst enemy of woman. They can even grow into a positively demonic passion that exasperates and disgusts men, and does the woman herself the greatest injury by gradually smothering the charm and meaning of her femininity and driving it into the background. Such a development naturally ends in profound psychological disunion, in short, in a neurosis."

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §245]

[beat]

[beat]

Let me take that apart, because every clause in it is load-bearing.

"Not noticeable to herself but quite obvious to everybody in her environment."

That is the first move and it is brutal. He is describing something that is invisible from the inside and unmissable from the outside. Which means you cannot check it by asking yourself. You cannot introspect your way to it. The only instrument that detects it is the room.

"Arguments which always just miss the mark in the most irritating way."

Not wrong arguments. Not stupid arguments. Arguments that are structurally fine, delivered with total confidence, and slightly off the actual thing being discussed. Every one of you has been in that conversation. You could not point at the error, and you could not get to the thing either.

"Always inject a little something into the problem that is not really there."

An extra term. A motive that was not in the room. A subtext somebody added and then argued with.

"Does the woman herself the greatest injury."

[SLOW]

Stay with me here, because this is the clause that changes what kind of video this is.

He does not say the primary victim is the man across from her. He says the primary victim is her. The mechanism is not hurting men, it is costing her the thing he calls the charm and meaning of her femininity, and it takes it slowly, and by the time it is gone she has no memory of trading it.

That is not a man complaining about a difficult woman. That is a diagnosis, and the patient in it is her.

[beat]

Now.

Where does that voice come from? Because it has to come from somewhere.

He answers this a year later, in 1928, in a different volume, and it is the best paragraph he ever wrote on the subject.

[ON SCREEN: CW 7, §332, 1928]

[SLOW]

"The animus is rather like an assembly of fathers or dignitaries of some kind who lay down incontestable, rational, ex cathedra judgments. On closer examination these exacting judgments turn out to be largely sayings and opinions scraped together more or less unconsciously from childhood on, and compressed into a canon of average truth, justice, and reasonableness. Sometimes these opinions take the form of so-called sound common sense, sometimes they appear as principles which are like a travesty of education. People have always done it like this. Everybody says it is like that."

[beat]

"Everybody says it is like that."

1928.

[PACE]

An assembly of voices you did not choose, absorbed before you were old enough to evaluate them, compressed down into something that feels like your own reasoning and arrives with more certainty than anything you actually worked out yourself.

Tell me that is not a description of a feed.

Tell me that is not what happens to a person who spends four hours a day being handed opinions by an algorithm optimized for the ones that produce the strongest reaction, until the borrowed ones are indistinguishable from the earned ones, except that the borrowed ones are louder and they never have doubt in them.

[SLOW]

And he says why they are so hard to move. Same chapter, one paragraph earlier.

"But in reality the opinions are not thought out at all. They exist ready made, and they are held so positively and with so much conviction that the woman never has the shadow of a doubt about them."

[ON SCREEN: CW 7, §331]

[beat]

Ready made. Never thought out. Held with total conviction precisely because they were never thought out.

That is the whole mechanism, and it has nothing to do with intelligence, and I want to be careful here because this is exactly where this argument usually goes stupid.

[PACE]

He is not saying women can't think. He says the opposite, in writing, in the same chapter, and I will put it on screen because somebody in the comments is going to need it.

"An inferior consciousness cannot eo ipso be ascribed to women. It is merely different from masculine consciousness."

[ON SCREEN: CW 7, §330]

And in the 1951 version he goes further and refuses to even define his own terms tightly, which for a man in his seventies with a Collected Works is a remarkable thing to do.

"But I do not wish or intend to give these two intuitive concepts too specific a definition. I use Eros and Logos merely as conceptual aids."

[ON SCREEN: *Aion*, CW 9ii, §29, 1951]

[beat]

So anyone who tells you Jung proved women are incapable of logic is quoting a man who explicitly declined to make that claim, in the same paragraph they are quoting from. Which most of them have not read.

[SLOW]

Here is the distinction he is actually making, and it is the single sharpest phrase in the entire body of work, and I want it on screen by itself.

[ON SCREEN, large: "her masculine rationalism, assuredly not true reasonableness". Credit line beneath: CW 10, §246]

Masculine rationalism, assuredly not true reasonableness.

[beat]

The thing that shows up is not thinking. It is the performance of thinking. It has the shape of an argument, the temperature of certainty, and the vocabulary of principle, and none of the actual work underneath it.

And it is louder than real thought. Always. Because real thought has doubt in it, and doubt is quiet.

[SLOW]

Now let me do the thing I promised at the top, the thing this channel does, and flip it.

Because if this only ran one direction I would not be making this video.

[ON SCREEN: CW 7, §333, 1928]

"It goes without saying that the animus is just as often projected as the anima. The men who are particularly suited to these projections are either walking replicas of God himself, who know all about everything, or else they are misunderstood word-addicts with a vast and windy vocabulary at their command, who translate common or garden reality into the terminology of the sublime."

[beat]

[PACE]

Misunderstood word-addicts with a vast and windy vocabulary, who translate ordinary reality into the language of the sublime.

[beat]

He wrote that in 1928 and I want you to sit with the fact that it is a perfect description of about nine accounts you follow.

Men who know everything about everything. Men who have a framework for every human situation and a special word for each part of it. Men who take something ordinary, like a woman being tired of you, and translate it upward into a cosmic principle with a Greek name so that it stops being about them.

Same machine. Different output. He says the effect on the ego is in principle the same, and he says it in one line, in 1951.

[ON SCREEN: *Aion*, CW 9ii, §34]

"The effect of anima and animus on the ego is in principle the same."

[beat]

The mechanism does not care who is running it. It cares whether you can see it.

ACT FIVE: CLAIM FOUR. THE ENERGY HAS TO GO SOMEWHERE

Register: clinical authority. Heaviest data act. This one needs the most care and the most citation on screen.

Claim four, and this is the one I did not expect to find.

1. Thirty-three years before the FDA approved the pill. Jung is looking at the diaphragm and the condom and the beginning of reliable contraception, and he makes an argument that is not moral and is not medical.

It is an energy argument. Watch.

[SLOW]

"Finally, contraception is a fact of enormous importance to women in general, because it does away with the constant fear of pregnancy and the care of an ever-increasing number of children. This deliverance from bondage to nature brings a release of psychic energies that inevitably seek an outlet. Whenever a sum of energy finds no congenial goal it causes a disturbance of the psychic equilibrium. Lacking a conscious goal, it reinforces the unconscious and gives rise to uncertainty and doubt."

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §253]

[beat]

Take the first half seriously, because he does. Deliverance from bondage to nature. That is his phrase and it is not sarcastic. He is calling it a liberation, in 1927, as a Swiss man in his fifties.

And then he sends the bill.

[PACE]

His model is hydraulic. There is a fixed amount of drive in a person, it was pointed at something, and if you remove the something, the drive does not evaporate. It goes somewhere. And if it does not get a conscious goal, it goes down, into the unconscious, and what comes back up is what he calls uncertainty and doubt.

Not sadness. Not regret. Uncertainty. The sense that something is unresolved and you cannot name it.

[beat]

He also called the childlessness piece years earlier, in a lecture to university students, before the essay everybody quotes.

"But a marriage that remains artificially childless is always rather problematical. Children are the cement that holds it together as nothing else could."

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §215]

And in that same lecture, so that nobody mistakes what register he is in:

"I pass no sort of moral judgment on sexuality as a natural phenomenon, but prefer to make its moral evaluation dependent on the way it is expressed."

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §235]

[SLOW]

That is a man refusing to moralize, in writing, in the 1920s, on the record, which is more than most people managing to weigh in on this topic in 2026.

[beat]

Now. Let's grade it, and this is where I have to be extremely careful, because this is the exact spot where this genre starts lying.

[PACE]

[ON SCREEN: NSFG 2022-2023, via Guttmacher Institute]

Fifty-seven percent of American women aged fifteen to forty-nine are using some form of contraception. That is 42.8 million women. The pill specifically is 23 percent of that group, about 9.9 million women. And the age split matters. Among users under thirty, depending on the age band, between 34 and 56 percent are on the pill. Among users in their forties, it is 14 percent.

So the exposure is concentrated in exactly the years he was talking about.

[SLOW]

Now the finding, and I want to tell you what it is before I tell you the number, because the number without the design is just noise.

Denmark keeps a national prescription register and a national psychiatric register, and researchers linked them. Every woman in the country. Not a survey, not a self-report, not a panel of volunteers. The actual prescriptions and the actual diagnoses.

[ON SCREEN: Skovlund et al., JAMA Psychiatry, 2016. n = 1,061,997]

One million and sixty-two thousand women, followed for an average of six and a half years.

Women on combined oral contraceptives were 23 percent more likely to start an antidepressant than women who were not. Rate ratio of 1.23.

That is a real effect and it is a modest one, and if that were the whole finding I would tell you it was interesting and move on.

[beat]

It is not the whole finding.

[SLOW]

Break it out by age.

Girls aged fifteen to nineteen on combined oral contraceptives were 80 percent more likely to start an antidepressant. Rate ratio 1.8. On progestin-only pills, 2.2, which is more than double.

[ON SCREEN: Skovlund et al., JAMA Psychiatry 2016. Ages 15-19: combined OC RR 1.8 (95% CI 1.75-1.84); progestin-only RR 2.2]

[beat]

The age group where the pill is most common is the age group where the association is strongest.

[beat]

And then the same team ran it for suicide.

[ON SCREEN: Skovlund et al., American Journal of Psychiatry, 2018]

Nearly half a million women, average age twenty-one, 3.9 million person-years of follow-up. Women currently or recently using hormonal contraception had roughly double the rate of suicide attempt. Hazard ratio 1.97. For completed suicide the estimate was 3.08, and I will say plainly that the confidence interval on that one is wide because suicide is thankfully rare, so treat the attempt number as the solid one and the completion number as directional.

The risk peaked about two months after starting.

[SLOW]

Two months. That is the shape of a drug effect, not the shape of a personality.

[beat]

Now. The honest part, and I am doing this on camera because if I do not, somebody will do it for me and they will be right.

[PACE]

These are association studies. Every one of them. Nobody randomized a million teenage girls onto hormonal birth control, and nobody is going to, and there are real arguments that women who choose hormonal contraception differ from women who do not in ways the models cannot fully strip out. I am saying that once. I am not going to hedge it in every sentence for the rest of the act, because saying "associated with" fourteen times is not rigor, it is flinching.

And I am going to kill a claim that lives in this exact corner of the internet, because it is wrong and because it is the easiest way to discredit everything else I just said.

[SLOW]

You have heard that hormonal birth control changes which men a woman is attracted to, and that when she comes off it, she looks at her husband differently and the marriage falls apart. It is everywhere. It is a great story.

It failed replication.

[ON SCREEN: Jern et al., Evolution and Human Behavior, 2018. N = 948. Statistical power $\geq$ 98.7%]

Nine hundred and forty-eight women, statistical power above 98.7 percent to find the effect if it was there, and it was not there.

I am not using it. And I want you to notice how much better the real evidence is than the fake evidence, because that is the whole argument for doing it this way.

[beat]

So how does Jung grade?

[SLOW]

The mechanism he described, the drive with nowhere to go turning into something formless that comes back as uncertainty, is not something a prescription register can test. Nobody has measured psychic energy, and nobody will.

What we can say is that a man in 1927 predicted that mass contraception would produce a psychological disturbance in women that would show up as something diffuse and hard to name,

at a time when the entire conversation was about whether it was moral. And then a hundred years later the national health registers of a Scandinavian country show a dose-shaped, age-graded, timing-consistent association between hormonal contraception and depression and suicide attempt in exactly that population.

He does not get credit for the pharmacology. He had no idea about synthetic progestins, and the thing the registers are picking up is probably chemistry rather than metaphysics.

He gets credit for looking at the most celebrated liberation of the century and asking, out loud, in public, what it would cost. And for being one of the only people who asked in a register that was not about sin.

Call it a hit on the direction and an unknown on the mechanism, and I would rather tell you that than round it up.

[beat]

And here is the part that I think actually matters, and it is not about the pill at all.

[SLOW]

[ON SCREEN: NCHS Data Brief 528, April 2025]

In 2023, 15.3 percent of American women were taking prescription medication for depression. For men it was 7.4 percent. More than double.

Now hold that next to this.

[ON SCREEN: Pew Research Center, Nov 2025, analyzing Monitoring the Future]

In 1993, 83 percent of twelfth grade girls said they wanted to get married someday. In 2023 it was 61 percent. Twenty-two points, gone.

The boys? 76 percent in 1993. 74 percent in 2023. Essentially flat.

[beat]

[SLOW]

The girls' line fell off a cliff and the boys' line did not move.

Whatever happened, happened on the girls' side of the room. And for thirty years the entire public conversation about young men and young women has been an argument about which group is more at fault, while one of those two lines was dropping twenty-two points and almost nobody was looking at it.

I do not know what caused it. Nobody does. Anyone who tells you they have identified the cause is selling you something.

But I will say this. If a group is medicating for depression at twice the rate of the other group, and its stated desire for the central bond of adult life has fallen by a quarter in one generation, calling that liberation and leaving it there is not analysis.

The math stops mathing.

ACT SIX: CLAIM FIVE. MARRIAGE STOPS BEING A BUILDING

Register: clinical into warm directness. This is the act where the male audience is going to feel most seen, so give it room.

Claim five. The last one, and the one he spends the most pages on.

Jung says that once women are independent and children are optional, marriage stops being an institution and becomes something else, and that the something else is much harder to survive.

[SLOW]

"In the eyes of the ordinary man, love in its true sense coincides with the institution of marriage, and outside marriage there is only adultery or platonic friendship. For woman, marriage is not an institution at all but a human love-relationship, at least that is what she would like to believe."

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §255]

[beat]

Look at the architecture in that sentence, because it is the whole act.

For him, marriage is a structure. A thing you enter, that has walls, that holds. You do the entering once and then the building does the work. And a man in that model can be a bad husband for a decade and still consider himself married, because the building is still standing and he is still inside it.

For her, in Jung's reading, there is no building. There is only the relationship, continuously, in real time, being what it is today. Which means it is being assessed today. Not renewed once at an altar. Audited.

[PACE]

And he is savage about what that does to the man, because the man does not know the audit is happening.

"Most men, though, are erotically blinded. They commit the unpardonable mistake of confusing Eros with sex. A man thinks he possesses a woman if he has her sexually. He never possesses her less."

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §255]

[beat]

He never possesses her less.

[SLOW]

And then this, which I think is the most quietly devastating line in the essay, and it is aimed at men, and it is 1927.

"In any other situation a man always finds the discussion of personal relations painful and boring, just as his wife would find it boring if he examined her on the Critique of Pure Reason."

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §256]

[beat]

That is a joke. He is being funny. And underneath the joke is the entire thing.

The conversation she keeps trying to have is not a small conversation to her. It is the building inspection. And to him it feels like an oral exam in a subject he did not sign up for, delivered by someone who seems upset that he is not enjoying it.

[SLOW]

Neither of them is lying. They are both accurately reporting their own experience. He genuinely does not think anything is wrong, because the structure is intact. She is genuinely telling him something is wrong, because the structure is not what she was ever measuring.

And by the time he finds out which of them was right, the assessment has been completed, filed, and acted on.

[beat]

[SLOT: 30 to 60 seconds of you here, on watching this specific mismatch play out in a real situation, yours or a close one. Structure, if you want it: name the moment he found out, then the fact that she had been telling him for a year, then one sentence refusing to make either of them the villain. Leave this empty if there is nothing true to put in it. Do not build it out of a composite.]

[beat]

Now, look where we are.

[SLOW]

Jung wrote in 1927 that in America about a quarter of marriages ended in divorce, and he called that alarming.

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §248]

Here is what actually happened. Divorces per thousand married women went from about four at the start of the twentieth century to 22.6 in 1980, and then it fell, and it has been falling for over forty years. It was 14.6 in 2022.

[ON SCREEN: NCFMR, "Divorce: More than a Century of Change, 1900-2022"]

[PACE]

So divorce peaked before most of you watching this got married, and it has been going down ever since. Anybody telling you divorce is skyrocketing right now is wrong, and it takes eleven seconds to check.

[beat]

[SLOW]

The reason it feels worse anyway is that people stopped getting married in the first place. The divorce rate quietly stopped measuring the thing everyone thinks it measures, because you cannot divorce out of a marriage you never entered.

The building did not collapse. People stopped constructing them.

And on children, which is the piece Jung tied everything else to. When Americans without children are asked why, the most common answer is not money. It is that they just do not want to. Preference, 57 percent. Cost, 36 percent.

[beat]

He said children were the cement. The cement is now a preference question with a majority answer.

Grade claim five a hit, and a bleak one.

ACT SEVEN: WHERE HE IS WRONG, AND I MEAN ACTUALLY WRONG

Register: clinical authority, brisk. This act is the price of admission for everything else. Do not shorten it and do not apologize for him in it.

Now the part that separates this from every other video about a dead man who was supposedly right about everything.

Jung got things wrong. Not stylistically wrong. Wrong.

One. His engine was garbage.

He needed a cause for why women were destabilizing marriage, and the one he picked was the surplus of unmarried women in post-war Europe. Millions of men had been killed in the First World War, so there were millions of women who would never marry, and Jung argued that their un-lived lives were leaking out into everyone else's marriages.

"Too much that is inadmissible, that has not been lived, is accumulating in the unconscious, and this is bound to have an effect. Secretaries, typists, shop-girls, all are agents of this process, and through a million subterranean channels creeps the influence that is undermining marriage."

[ON SCREEN: CW 10, §251]

[beat]

That is wrong. The demographic hole closed. The women in that cohort aged out and died. And the trend he was explaining not only continued, it accelerated, in countries that never had the war losses at all.

He identified a real change and attached it to a cause that evaporated. His mechanism outlived his explanation, which happens to good thinkers constantly and is worth saying out loud.

[SLOW]

And read the rest of that sentence, because this one gets clipped more than anything else he wrote:

"For the desire of all these women is not to have sexual adventures, only the stupid could believe that, but to get married."

Jung's claim is that those women wanted marriage. When you see that quote on a black background with only the first half, you are looking at someone who inverted his actual position, and there is a decent chance they never saw the second half either, because they got it from a quote account.

Two. The word natural is doing work he never justifies.

When he says a woman in a masculine profession is doing something injurious to her feminine nature, the entire claim rests on there being a fixed feminine nature to injure. He asserts it. He does not demonstrate it. He is working from patients in Zurich in the 1920s, in a society that permitted women a narrow range of lives, and he is reading the shape of that cage as the shape of the animal.

The feminist critique of Jung has been making exactly this argument since the seventies, and it is a good argument. Naomi Goldenberg's is the one to read. She was not a hostile outsider, she

came out of the Jungian world, and her position is that anima and animus take a set of historically local gender expectations and promote them to eternal structures of the psyche.

I think she is substantially right about that, and I still think his mechanism describes something real, and those two things can both be true. The description of what unexamined borrowed conviction does to a person survives even if his theory about where it comes from does not.

Three. He would have been wrong about the pill and divorce, if he had made that claim.

He did not, quite, so I am not grading him on it. But everyone using him for it should know what happens when you check. When economists looked at pill access and divorce, they found it cuts both ways. Women who got access before marrying married later and more stably, and Goldin and Katz found access associated with a lower share of college women divorced. Women already married when access arrived were more likely to divorce. Same technology, opposite effects, depending on which side of the wedding you were standing on.

So if you want to argue the pill broke marriage, the literature will not carry you, and I am not going to pretend otherwise to make my own video tighter.

Four. There is material in the essay that has nothing to do with women and is just bad.

In the middle of "Woman in Europe," Jung makes an argument about Europeans in Africa becoming psychologically infected by the people around them, and he uses language and a framework that is straightforwardly racist. It sits four paragraphs before the passage I quoted a minute ago. I am not going to read it. I am telling you it is there because I read the whole essay and you are entitled to know what is in the parts I did not use.

He was a man of a specific place and a specific century, and he was wrong in the ways that place and century were wrong, and none of that changes whether the animus passage describes something you have watched happen.

[beat]

That is four. And I would rather hand you four failures I found myself than have you find one I hid.

ACT EIGHT: WHAT HE ACTUALLY SAYS TO DO

Register: warm directness, into quiet empathy. This is the payoff act. Slowest pacing in the video.

So we have a man who says the change is permanent, that it costs something, that the cost is a specific machine running in the background, and that the building everyone was living in has been quietly rezoned.

What does he say to do about it?

[SLOW]

Not go back. He already closed that. She can never part with them again.

Not push forward harder either, because the whole diagnosis is that pushing forward while the mechanism runs unexamined is what produces the damage.

What he says is that the thing has to be made conscious. That sounds like a slogan and it is actually the technical center of his entire practice, and he is specific about what it gets you.

[ON SCREEN: *Aion*, CW 9ii, §33, 1951]

"Just as the anima becomes, through integration, the Eros of consciousness, so the animus becomes a Logos, and in the same way that the anima gives relationship and relatedness to a man's consciousness, the animus gives to woman's consciousness a capacity for reflection, deliberation, and self-knowledge."

[beat]

Look at what that says.

The same faculty that produced the rigid intellectuality and the arguments that miss the mark produces reflection, deliberation, and self-knowledge. Same machine. The variable is not whether she has it. The variable is whether she can see it while it runs.

And the condition is in the sentence. Through integration. Not through acquisition. Not through taking the job and wearing the suit and adopting the vocabulary. Wearing it is what produces the failure mode. Owning it is what produces the capacity.

[SLOW]

And on why it is so hard to see, he wrote the best line of the whole chapter.

[ON SCREEN: *Aion*, CW 9ii, §41]

"Their power grows in proportion to the degree that they remain unconscious. Those who do not see them are in their hands, just as a typhus epidemic flourishes best when its source is undiscovered."

[beat]

[beat]

The less you know it is there, the more of you it is running.

Which means the person most possessed by this is, structurally, the person most certain they are not.

[SLOW]

And then he says the thing that disqualifies about ninety percent of the content made about him.

[ON SCREEN: *Aion*, CW 9ii, §40]

"Though the contents of anima and animus can be integrated, they themselves cannot, since they are archetypes. Hence they remain autonomous despite the integration of their contents. The unconscious, as we know, can never be done with once and for all."

[beat]

Can never be done with once and for all.

There is no completing this. There is no five-step shadow work program, there is no weekend, there is no point at which you have integrated your animus and can put it on a shelf. Every Jung video promising you a process that finishes is selling something the man himself said does not exist.

[PACE]

And there is one more, from the same paragraph, that I think is the real thesis of this entire video, and it does not mention women at all.

"The more civilized, the more unconscious and complicated a man is, the less he is able to follow his instincts. His complicated living conditions and the influence of his environment are so strong that they drown the quiet voice of nature. Opinions, beliefs, theories, and collective tendencies appear in its stead and back up all the aberrations of the conscious mind."

[ON SCREEN: *Aion*, CW 9ii, §40, 1951]

[SLOW]

The environment gets loud enough to drown out the quiet thing. And then borrowed opinion moves into the empty room and defends whatever is already going wrong.

He is describing 1951. He is describing a world with three radio stations and a newspaper.

[beat]

We have optimized that process. We have made a machine whose only function is to be louder than the quiet voice, and to hand you, free of charge, all day, an assembly of fathers laying down ex cathedra judgments, so that you never have to find out what you actually think.

[beat]

And the prescription is one sentence. It is from 1928 and it is not what anyone expects.

[ON SCREEN: CW 7, §336]

"The woman must learn to criticize and hold her opinions at a distance, not in order to repress them, but, by investigating their origins, to penetrate more deeply into the background."

[SLOW]

Not be quiet. Not defer. Not stop having opinions.

Find out where the conviction came from before you defend it.

That is the whole ask. It is small, it is unglamorous, and almost nobody does it, including me, and I would say the same thing about the men in this comment section and their vast and windy vocabularies.

CLOSE: THE SPLIT, AND THE QUESTION

Register: quiet empathy. Slowest in the video. Do not speed up on the way out.

So let me split this, because it lands differently depending on who you are.

[SLOW]

For the men watching, and statistically that is almost all of you.

Do not take this video and use it as a diagnosis of your ex-wife. That is the exact move the mechanism makes. You would be taking a set of borrowed judgments you did not work out yourself, compressing them into a canon of average truth, and laying them down as if they were reasoning. He named that. He named it about you, in 1928, and he called you a word-addict while he was doing it.

The half of this that is yours is Act Three. He said a man who will not develop his feminine side ends up trailing after a woman, worshipping from a distance, in danger of being stowed away in her pocket. He was not being kind when he wrote that. He meant it as a warning and the warning has held up.

And the specific version of it is Act Six. The building is not the marriage. You can be inside the walls, current on the mortgage, faithful, employed, and be failing an assessment you did not know was running, and by the time somebody tells you the score, it will not be a conversation, it will be an announcement.

[beat]

For the women watching, and that is about one in twenty-five of you, and I see you in the comments.

The mechanism he described is invisible from the inside. That is the actual claim rather than an insult, and it applies to me while I am making this video.

The test he offers is not do I feel certain. The test is where did this certainty come from, and did I ever check.

And the other half is his, not mine, and he says it about your capacity rather than your limits. The same faculty that produces the rigid version produces reflection and deliberation and self-knowledge, and the only difference between the two is whether you are looking at it.

[beat]

[SLOW]

And for both.

He said the borrowed half is the weak half, in both directions. Her masculinity is weaker than his. His femininity is weaker than hers. And here we all are, in 2026, with a culture that has spent thirty years telling everybody that the borrowed half is their best feature and the native half is the problem.

Then we act surprised that everyone feels like they are running someone else's software.

[beat]

[beat]

Now, I said at the top that I would not tell you Jung was right. So let me be exact about the scoreboard.

He was right that the change was permanent, and right that it would cost something, and right about the mechanism in a way that is genuinely uncomfortable to read a hundred years later. He was right that marriage would stop being a building. He was wrong about why it was happening, wrong to call a cage a nature, and wrong in some other ways that had nothing to do with any of this.

That is four and a bit out of five, from a man who had no idea how it turned out.

[SLOW]

But the thing I keep coming back to is not any of the five.

It is that he opened the whole essay by admitting he was probably the wrong person to write it. That woman stands where the man's shadow falls, and he is only too liable to confuse the two.

Which means the most accurate description of women written in the twentieth century came from somebody who told you upfront that he might just be describing himself.

[beat]

So I am not going to end on whether he was right.

Here is the question I actually want in the comments.

[SLOW]

He said the voice arrives ready made, held with total conviction, and it feels exactly like your own thinking.

When was the last time you checked where one of yours came from?

[beat]

And if the honest answer is that you have never once done it, and you are about to type a comment about how this obviously applies to your ex and not to you.

[beat]

Respectfully.

Bleep off.

[beat]

If you want more of this, real philosophy and real sources with the paragraph numbers on screen, that is what this channel is. Schopenhauer is up there and he is meaner than Jung. Freud is coming, and he is going to be worse.

PRODUCTION NOTES

Two slots left empty on purpose. Act One and Act Six. Both are marked with structure but no content, because I do not invent your history. If nothing true fits, cut them. The script does not depend on either.

§246. The final clause of that paragraph is not in this script, per your note. Everything else from §246 is in, unsoftened, including the frigidity and aggressive sexuality material sitting inside the "masculine rationalism, assuredly not true reasonableness" section. If you want the two clinical

clauses read on camera as well, they go in Act Four right after the "performance of thinking" line, and I will write that insert.

The Aion §29 passage is not quoted and not mentioned. Per your note, no pre-defense. If somebody brings it in the comments, the honest answer is one sentence and you can give it live.

The §249 racism is named in Act Seven in two sentences without being read. That one is not about women and it is the single most likely opener for a response video, so it is in.

Fabricated quote demo. Act One promises to show a fake Jung quote and I have not written the beat, because I want to pick a specific one that is currently circulating rather than a stale example. Say the word and I will pull three live fakes with screenshots and their view counts, and write the thirty seconds.

Every citation in this script is verified against the volume text. CW 10 §§215, 235, 243, 245, 246, 248, 251, 253, 255, 256, 259, 260, 261. CW 7 §§330, 331, 332, 333, 336. *Aion* CW 9ii §§29, 33, 34, 40, 41. If a line gets cut in the edit, the paragraph number goes with it.

Runtime. At her measured range this reads long, roughly 34 to 40 minutes depending on the beats. That is on purpose and no cut path is offered.