

Dear Colleagues,

The Executive Committee is pleased to launch the first seminar in the Issues in Jungian Psychology Series with David Tacey's paper, 'Toward A New Animism: Jung, Hillman and Analytical Psychology.' From David some points to consider:

The ecological crisis of the contemporary world has urged upon us anew kind of animism, in which the things of the world are alive, animated, spirited, mainly because the body of the world is experiencing pain, pathological symptoms and suffering; the psyche of the world or *anima mundi* is being discovered in the same way in which psyche was first discovered in suffering individuals.

Hillman's work draws out contradictions in Jung's theorizing, and privileges Jung's post-Cartesian vision and its affirmation of an new kind of animism, which is easily mistaken as pre-modern animism, and hence as regressive.

Hillman's 'archetypal psychology' is an attempt to re-appropriate what had been left out of 'Jungian' or 'analytical psychology', but what he re-appropriates seems so foreign to established views that it is treated as alien and disruptive.

This paper raises several issues that may be found at the end of the paper after references.

Best wishes,
Maryann

Dear Colleagues,

We have had some thought provoking and inspiring discussions of late from many contributors under the headings of TERMS and ANTIMONY.

The spectrum of perception the IAJS membership hold collectively on Jung and what comprises Jungian Studies continues to demonstrate ongoing frontiers on both these topics. I suspect some of these debates will find a new frame in the first seminar of the Issues In Jungian Psychology Series that commences on October 1st.

The seminars are designed to raise the issues and put the emphasis on questions rather than answers. The issue David Tacey identifies is whether Jung's vision of reality is far greater than the clinical model of psychology that purports to be 'Jungian psychology.' Is Jung's psychology a psychology at all or is it a theory of culture and cosmos? Although Jung felt soul is not confined to the individual or human collective, the idea of soul has a habit of falling back into the human frame and becoming caught inside us. Identifying the issues in this seminar, begins with David and continues with you.

David's abstract and biography follow. His absence from the discussion list appears to be time well spent with two books due for publication in 2011 and more with the editors currently.

title: Toward a New Animism: Jung, Hillman and Analytical Psychology by David Tacey

abstract: Jung's psychology has focused not only on the psyche of the patient but also on the psyche or "soul" of the world. As Jung's work developed, he seemed less interested in the clinical setting and more interested in recovering the ancient notion of anima mundi or the "psychological" dimension of the world. This means that Jung was forced to reverse and contradict some of his earlier findings and positions. For instance, the notion of "withdrawing projections", a standard concept in clinical work and virtually unchallenged in therapeutic circles, was seriously challenged by Jung's own later work. He seemed to think that projections might tell us more about the world than had hitherto been considered. In fact, at the heart of Jung's vision is the development of a new animism, a direction of his thinking which is emphasised by the work of his follower, James Hillman. Hillman draws out and highlights a dimension of Jung's thinking which analytical psychology has tended to ignore or diminish.

biography: Dr David Tacey is Reader in Literature and Psychoanalytic Studies at La Trobe University, Melbourne. He is the author of twelve books, including *Gods and Diseases* (2011), *Edge of the Sacred* (2009), *The Spirituality Revolution* (2003) and *ReEnchantment* (2000). David was born in Melbourne, and grew up in Alice Springs, central Australia. It was here that he was inducted, as a boy, into the animistic worldview of Aboriginal cultures. He studied literature, psychology and philosophy at Flinders and Adelaide Universities in the 1970s, and in the 1980s completed post-doctoral studies in archetypal psychology and culture in the United States, under the direction of James Hillman in Dallas.

David is a specialist in Jungian depth psychology, and his books on Jung include: *The Jung Reader* (Routledge 2011), *How to Read Jung*, (Granta 2006), *The Idea of the Numinous: Contemporary Jungian and Psychoanalytic Perspectives* (edited with Ann Casement), (Routledge 2006), and *Jung and the New Age* (Routledge 2001). David regularly gives short courses at the summer school of the C. G. Jung Institute in Zürich and is on the editorial boards of several international journals of Jungian studies, including *Jung Journal: Culture and Psyche* (San Francisco). He is a public intellectual who is often invited to address contemporary issues including ecological awareness, mental health, spirituality and Aboriginal Australia. His books have been translated into numerous languages, including Cantonese, Korean and French.

I look forward to reading your responses to David Tacey's paper and the issues that come from it.

Best wishes,

Maryann Barone-Chapman

Seminar Muse

Member of the Executive Committee

Dear all,

First, David thank you for presenting this stimulating paper. There are a lot of directions which one might take here. I guess my initial response to the new animism is how it relates to technology. I now live in sunny California and my drives

to work and school proceed along the Pacific ocean. Indeed, there is eternal magic to the expanse of the ocean, especially when its surface is broken by the fins of peaking dolphins. My emotional response to this is most certain a combination of *it* (the ocean) and *me*.

Yet ... contra Robert Frost - "The people along the sand/All turn and look one way./They turn their back on the land./They look at the sea all day." - the people in the thick rush hour traffic next to me are typically not looking out to sea. Their noses are buried in their Blackberries. So, even if Jung has won a victory of sorts, is it a Pyrrhic one? Has technology overrun all? Or does technology partake in the new animism?

Best wishes,
Dan

Dear Dan and All,

Firstly, I have only been put back on the List a few hours ago, so only now do I have the chance to read and respond to postings.

It is great to be back on this List, even if for a limited time. I need a bit of self-imposed isolation to get my work done.....

I take my cue on the new animism from James Hillman, who has written about it in several places, and we talked about it last month in Montreal, at the IAAP congress. If anyone on this List is interested in my full discussion of this subject, I have an 8 thousand work unpublished paper on it, which I am prepared to send out on PDF format to those who might want to go deeper than my original 5-page paper could allow. The 8,000 worder explores Hillman's animism in depth.

I think the idea of a reanimated world extends far and wide today. Yes, technology is not to be seen as contra animism but as an integral part of it. Just think about how many people have pet names for their cars and bikes - that is animism, of course. Technology is obviously key to this reanimated experience of the world, but in technology we tend to find reanimation in both a positive and a potentially demonic form. That is, the world is "alive" with machines that at times seem hell bent on destroying the natural world. This is a large theme in late Heidegger - the technological world as a demonic form of animation.

You quote Robert Frost, but allow me to quote Hillman, who waxes lyrical here in ways that remind me more of Heidegger than of Jung:

'In the nineteenth century people didn't talk about psyche, until Freud came along and discovered psychopathology. Now we're beginning to say, 'The furniture has stuff in it that's poisoning us, the microwave gives off dangerous rays.' The world has become toxic and full of symptoms. Isn't that the beginning of recognizing what used to be called animism?' Hillman continues: 'The world's alive - my god! It's having effects on us. 'I've got to get rid of those fluorocarbon cans.' 'I've got to get rid of the furniture because underneath it's formaldehyde.' 'I've got to watch out for this and that and that.' So there's pathology in the world, and through that we're

beginning to treat the world with more respect.’[i] <#_edn1> [i] <#_ednref1>
Hillman, *We've Had a Hundred Years of Psychotherapy and the World's Getting Worse*, p.4.

best wishes,

David

Dear Dan

I have not had time yet to read and digest David's paper, let alone consider how to negotiate the set of stimulating questions which follow it. However, in part continuation of my recent remarks on the enchantment/disenchantment question, I would like to take up Dan's introduction of the question of technology into the debate.

It is a keystone of the old Weberian argument that one of the factors which has 'disenchanted' the modern world is technology. This argument sets up the binary: Nature, the wild, enchantment vs. Technology, the city, disenchantment. As urbanisation and technology spread, so, we are told, the world becomes disenchanted. Romantic and enlightenment thinkings agree about this, though they disagree about whether to rejoice or despair about it. At the risk of becoming tedious about the antinomial, I would suggest that we should really have left this polarity behind a long time ago. Is it really the case that technology and the city are less animated than the wilderness, or might it be that they are merely differently animated? I would be the first to agree that the modern world has seen a collapse of the kinds of overarching spiritual containers previously provided by the great religions, and furthermore that myths of the inexorable progress of science and reason can and have been dehumanising. However, if as moderns we want to engage with soul in the modern world we inhabit, rather than the lost world of nostalgia, we need to pay attention to the places of enchantment which show up in the midst of modernity, if, that is, we are not going to be blinded by our prejudices about what the numinous or animated world 'ought' to look like.

For example, from the moment of its invention, the entirely modern technology of photography was experienced "as an uncanny phenomenon, one which seemed to undermine the unique identities of objects and people ... creating a parallel world of phantasmatic doubles alongside the concrete world of the senses". (Uncanny Reflections, *Modern Illusions: Sighting the Modern Optical Uncanny*, Tom Gunning). The mystery of such a phenomenon becomes amplified in the 'animated' and dreamlike world of the cinema, which has never ceased to haunt modern life and fantasy, but it can also be found in successive waves of technological 'wizardry': the telephone, the gramophone, the wireless, the television, the internet... all have the capacity to penetrate the 'uneasy space between the physical and the imaginary' and thus destabilise the hard and fast boundaries of ego identity in parallel ways to what we expect from a animistic phenomena.

Best wishes

Mark

Dear Mark,

Thank you for your thoughtful comments. No doubt, television, the Internet, film, etc. is enchanting. The question in my mind is whether this enchantment has overridden or subtracted from nature's enchantment. Again, I have in my mind all those commuters when, stuck in a traffic jam and faced with the option of looking out to sea or checking their Blackberries, invariably do the latter. I agree that there is nothing that inevitably makes this a zero-sum game. But it seems to be playing out that way. It seems to me, as a practical matter, that the extraordinary special effects which animate not only our sci-fi films but even our commonplace TV commercials have become so alluring and so enchanting so as to render poor old Nature boring by comparison.

The spirit of Nature is a subtle one, and it strikes me that it is best received by a soul sensitive to subtlety and quiet. Does the ubiquitous availability of media, video games, e-mail, texts, etc. interfere with that? I am inclined to say it does.

Best wishes,
Dan

Dear Dan

When I use the term 'enchantment' I am not referring to a conscious deliberate attempt by photographer or film-maker to enchant or allure but to a phenomenon which can accompany our experience of the technological medium itself. In the modern world this seems to take the form of an uncanniness around the event, rather than an old-fashioned religious numinosity. Technological development, contrary to the doctrine of disenchanted modernity, seems to excite a sense of awe and the uncanny which parallels that which was in previous eras supplied by religious or mystical phenomena. Erik Davis for example talks about the "electromagnetic imaginary," signalling a transposition of notions which we find in animism or alchemy such as energies and spirits into the technological realm of electricity. For more on this see P. Thurschwell, *Literature, Technology and Magical Thinking: 1880–1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), Jeffrey Sconce, *Haunted Media: Electronic Presence from Telegraphy to Television* (Duke University Press 2000). There is an interesting article by artists Hollington and Kyprianou on *Technology and the Uncanny* at http://www.electronicunset.org/joint_projects/technology_and_the_uncanny

Best

Mark

Dear Mark,

You write, "Technological development, contrary to the doctrine of disenchanted modernity, seems to excite a sense of awe and the uncanny which parallels that which was in previous eras supplied by religious or mystical phenomena." I agree.

My question is whether this capacity of technological development to excite such awe has drowned out the capacity of nature to excite its awe.

Best,
Dan

Dear Dan

In order to answer your question I think we would need to unpack what we mean by 'nature'. After all, what we refer to as the natural world is, in a sense, a historico/socio/cultural construction. For us moderns 'nature' is often seen as half of a binary with 'culture' (i.e. technology); but this itself is a pretty arbitrary (and relatively recent) distinction. The 'awe' you describe as excited by nature derives precisely from our sense of separateness from it. An animistic culture would, I suspect, a) not experience nature as 'nature' and b) not experience nature as sublime, because of the thorough 'participation' of the human animal in clan, tribe, totem and world. So, paradoxically, if the world were 're-enchanted' then we would cease to experience its enchantment. Hmm...

Best

Mark

Mark:

I agree with your hypothesis as reflected through the lens of a binary world view. However, in my 40 year experience with American Indian culture, ceremonies and just daily life, i.e. for "traditional" natives (who have not been overly indoctrinated with a western binary point of view), what we call awe is very much part of their experience on a day-to-day basis. Their experience of it and the way they might or might not articulate it would be different, but it is there. For them awe is not a western invention or a projection from any point of view. It is inherent in life itself and so, as we would say in one sense, "mundane," for them is always awe-inspiring. (For those of you who have my book, *Living in the Borderland: The Evolution of Consciousness and the Challenge of Healing Trauma* see pp. 160-161 for an example of what I am trying to portray here.) Language is an enormous problem here and "translation" does not usually suffice to convey their *experience*. The Navajo word for what I am addressing here translates to "Beauty" (the capital B is important here). The Navajo word for Beauty in this sense is Hozho which also conveys such (western) concepts as balance, harmony, resonance, at-one-ness, healing, completeness, wholeness...not only in the earthly realm but in the cosmos as a whole.

Dan's point about "enchantment" through that binary lens rings true *in the absence of the capacity to get outside of that binary view*. I am more and more impressed with the problem of language, particularly the structure of language, is most limiting in this regard. Translation not only doesn't suffice in many instances, it exacerbates the problem because it is of, and therefore reinforces, a binary world view. I think

there is a way to bridge this gap which is what much of my current work is focussing on.

Jerome Bernstein

P.S. I forgot to say that it is for the reasons that I have stated that I do not like the word "enchantment" (or "re-enchantment"). It keeps on in the frame of that binary world view and does not open to a world view "from the other side of the mirror."

Dear David, Dan and All,

In light of your paper, I've been thinking about Jung's interpretation of UFO sightings. What interests me about this was how an increase in 'ufo sightings' was interpreted by Jung regarding a shift in the collective to look to the skies – in effect foreshadowing the new age as a social phenomenon – a rise in animism - perhaps. I don't read Jung as jumping on the UFO bandwagon but finding the increase in these sightings the desire for hope in the future.

What do you think?

Best,
Maryann

Dear Maryann and All,

You make a very important point here, which I had inadvertently overlooked while preparing my long and short papers on Jung and animism.

Of course, UFOs are key to the whole picture, but I had not seen this until now. The UFOs started coming, or more precisely, "being seen", in the year 1947, just after the War.

They combine a fantasy that involves technology + animated spirits - i.e. "aliens" from other worlds, which are nothing if not the spirits of animism in a new form. They are definitely the 20th + 21st century counterparts to the "spirits" that once animated the natural world in ancient cosmologies. But to link back to Dan's post, they take the form of technology.

So it's back to the drawing board for me, and possibly to a much longer paper than I had originally anticipated on this subject. Thank you very much for this post, which is helpful. As you would know, Jung was not so keen on the idea that the Ufos were literally real, but only on the idea that people were seeing them - i.e. phenomenology. But it is the phenomenology of a new animism. Now, I have to re-read Jung's 1958 paper on UFOs, with this discussion in mind.

David

Hi Mark,

I enjoyed your post, and thanks for it.

Yes, we set up an unnecessary binary between nature and technology, I agree.

But just as some of the spirits of the woods are (were?) demonic, cheeky and evil, so too some of the spirits of technology are apt to move in the demonic direction. So we must not create a further binary, i.e., that "spirits" are good, and "lack of spirits" (or disenchantment) bad. Enchantment gets good press today, but we have to recall that it is close to bewitchment, and needs to be seen in this context.

In his book, "The Re-enchantment of the World", Morris Berman accuses Jung of going back to a lost pastoral idyll, and not taking us into the postmodern or post-Cartesian world. I disagree with this reading of Jung's animism, but for what it's worth, here is some of Berman's critique:

Jung broke with scientism, but doing so propelled him backward in time. In Medieval and Renaissance alchemy he recognized a wholeness that permeated the psyche of the Middle Ages, and which was still present in human dream life. Clearly, dream analysis has a timeless importance, but any science constructed on Jungian premises would necessarily be a straightforward revival of the occult world view and thus a return to naïve animism. Jung shows us the path to a non-Cartesian world view, but his premises cannot be the basis for a post-Cartesian paradigm.[i] <#_edn1>

[i] <#_ednref1> Morris Berman, *The Reenchantment of the World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), p. 156.

I have been told by Maryann that you, Mark, have been discussing Zizek on this list, and Zizek has nothing but contempt for Jung's form of animism, which he sees as sentimental and regressive. Here is one quote I have found to date:

Jung advocates a return to the pre-modern universe of Wisdom and its sexo-cosmology, the universe of a harmonious correspondence between the human microcosm and the macrocosm – that is to say, for him the subject of psychoanalysis is the pre-modern subject living in a universe in which 'everything has a meaning'.[i] <#_edn1>

David

Dear David

Thanks for this stimulating paper. Good to have you back, however temporarily. As you have been informed it arrives synchronistically (?) in the wake of a short discussion on the list on the subject of enchantment/disenchantment which originally came out of a reference to the very quote from Lacan you cite in your paper. My responses to what you have written are inevitably coloured by this discussion and while I shall attempt to avoid repeating myself in what I say now, a certain amount of reiteration is probably unavoidable.

In brief, I question the Weberian binary opposition of pre-modern enchantment/modern disenchantment, which I see as itself a modernist fantasy. It is an important fantasy because it underpins two very different perspectives on the world: first, the romantic narrative of a lost and irretrievable paradise, and second,

the enlightenment narrative of the triumphal progress of rationality overcoming superstition etc. Two sides of the same coin. We know that the Jungian perspective is much more sympathetic to the first of these, but my point is that both depend upon the same dubious assumptions. I think we need to be very careful about taking this enchantment/disenchantment fantasy too seriously as historical or ethnographic fact: it tells us a lot about where we are as moderns but not a lot about the supposedly enchanted world of animism.

Your (and Berman's and Hillman's) argument seems to rely broadly upon this enchantment/disenchantment narrative, but with the twist of suggesting the possibility of a third stage: re-enchantment. I find myself in agreement with much of what you say about the ways this third stage reveals itself, and its importance from a socio-/eco-/politico- angle, though I think we differ in that I see enchantment as being always already present in modernity. In other words modernity is and always has been thoroughly enchanted, and though this enchantment has remained hitherto, for various reasons, mostly hidden, nonetheless in recent years, in the light of a post-modern perspective on modernity, it has become more visible as enchantment, though in characteristically modern forms.

However, I'd like to point up a couple of issues and questions which, for me, get thrown up by the detailed argument of your paper.

In your first paragraph you describe a three stage model of the "development of human thought". The first stage ("enchantment through pantheism and animism") is characterised by what you call an "archaic literalism about 'spirits' in nature". Later you suggest that in animism the 'depth dimension in nature' is "interpreted... in literal and metaphysical ways". I am not sure what you mean by 'literal' in this context. It seems to me that the whole concept of literalness (as opposed to metaphoricity) depends upon a whole set of distinctively modern distinctions. Perhaps you could give an example of the kind of literal belief you are attributing to the animist.

You contrast this 'literalness' of the animist with a "fluid and metaphorical awareness about soul in the world" that is to come with the third 're-enchanted' stage. I have recently been reading anthropologist Willerslev on the Siberian Yukaghir tribe (whose religious beliefs tend to be categorised as animist, though the use of this label is itself controversial). In the light of this, it occurs to me that a "fluid and metaphorical awareness about soul in the world" would seem to describe the Yukaghir approach pretty well. Willerslev talks about the Yukaghir cosmos being saturated with liminality: souls are substance and not substance, people are soul and body, self and reincarnated other, hunters are human and animal, predator and prey, 'natural' and 'supernatural' etc. I don't think we can describe this very nuanced worldview as in any sense literalist; Willerslev describes the Yukaghir cosmos as a mimeticised world in which everything is paired with "an almost limitless number of mimetic doubles of itself, which extend in all directions and continually mirror and echo one another." The mimetic quality of their interaction with the world means that they are neither, on the one hand, fused with it in some kind of Levi-Bruhlian undifferentiated participation mystique, nor cut off into Cartesian 'objectivity'. While this is a worldview which evidently differs enormously from our own in the developed West, I would claim that there are fundamental aspects of this 'being in the world' which are shared by both cultures, though in ours these mimetic/animistic aspects are not thematised and therefore not theorised:

they tend to remain invisible, though still present. My suggestion is that the differences between these two very contrasting cultures are at least partly perspectival rather than qualitative, let alone evolutionary. Obviously these differences in perspective still need to be recognised as different, but it does make it harder for the animist perspective to be viewed as either an earlier 'primitive' stage of the evolution of soul or as a superior 'noble savage' state of nature, the twin pitfalls into both of which, as you point out, Jung fell at various times.

I would like to take up the important question of projection too, but this post is long enough already.

Best wishes

Mark

Dear Mark and All,

Thanks for your post. I need to point out that I do not have the time to respond to every post to this seminar, much as I might want to. My time for emailing is limited, as I have several projects that have already gone beyond the so-called deadline (!).

For me, a key difference between archaic and postmodern animism is the question of literalism. The archaic perspective seems to see "spirits" in landscape and nature as literal things, which could be, for instance, photographed if one were in the right place at the right time, or had the right kind of photographic equipment. The postmodern animist, and I would certainly count Jung and Hillman in this category, "sees" gods, spirits, souls in the world in primarily metaphorical terms. Such forces are "there", but not literally. Indeed, to regard them literally is for Jung a sign of psychosis, and for Hillman a sign of paranoia - or what he calls a "disorder of meaning". So this question about literal and metaphorical is central to this entire argument.

What you say about the Siberian Yukaghir tribe is very interesting. I have often wondered whether the "literalism" of archaic tribes is actually 1) a construct of early European anthropologists who did not understand what they were dealing with; 2) a misrepresentation of the animism by members of the tribe who are not sufficiently inducted / initiated into the tribal mysteries; or 3) a combination of these two. For instance, in my country, the Aboriginal tribes are said to be "animistic", but when one talks to men and women of high degree, as distinct from the average tribal member, one receives an entirely different, more sophisticated understanding of the spirit world. In my discussions with such elders, one gains the impression that reality is "saturated with liminality" - as you so rightly put it - rather than full of spirit beings who go bump in the night. This is similar to the difference between spirituality and spiritualism. Jungian analyst Craig San Roque, based in central Australia, has been working on this topic, and his research is very interesting. The notion of an entirely literal understanding of archaic beliefs and world views may be a misunderstanding, he has been saying.

As Hillman argued in "Re-Visioning Psychology" (p.12), the very idea of animism, originally introduced by Tylor (1871), may end up telling us more about late nineteenth century anthropologists and commentators than the tribal world itself.

The feeling I have had for some time is that those who seek to debunk Jung and Hillman always deliberately misread them as literal animists, and in this category one would place Richard Noll, who spectacularly read Jung wrongly to overthrow his argument. But this is a trick performed by many critics of the Jungian tradition, and it is, one could say, a dirty trick. It reads our field in bad faith or in the wrong spirit. On the other hand, there is a different school of debunking which tends to say that if a spirit or god is metaphorical it cannot be real. In response to this kind of criticism, archetypal and analytical psychology has to emphasize the reality of the metaphorical. The power of metaphor and symbol has to be restored, as pointing to something real, not merely to the allegorical or the decorative.

By the way, my paper does not quote Lacan, but rather Zizek commenting on Jung.

It is important to realize that Weber's schema is not as dogmatic as you suggest. In *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1905) Max Weber noted the drying up of religion and argued that we were moving into a period of increasing disenchantment. He used the phrase, *Entzauberung der Welt*, the 'demagicalization of the world', and observed that this had taken place not only in society but in religion itself, exemplified in the Protestant reformation against the Catholic Church and its mysticism. For him 'disenchantment' meant not only the release from a spell that had bound us to superstition, but more broadly, that the world no longer contained any inherent meaning or values around which human beings might orient their lives. However, even as he formulated this idea, Weber himself was critical of it. He argued that these were simply broad trends, and that even in the 'modern' era, it is, of course, possible to see enchantment everywhere, especially in the persistence of pre-modern religions. Weber commented that his own mother, a committed believer in Christianity, was evidence of the "persistence" of enchantment during the modern period. So for him, 'disenchantment' was a manner of speaking. In his later work, such as "Science as a Vocation" (1918), Weber conceded further on the persistence of enchantment in the modern era.

So we have to concede that Weber was not really caught in a solid binary opposition and he was already deconstructing his theory even as he was developing it. Weber scholars Edward Shils, H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills have established and gone over this argument a number of times.

It may help to think of these three terms: enchantment, disenchantment, re-enchantment, not so much as stages in a logical or chronological sequence, but as forms of consciousness or awareness. As such, they can and do exist side-by-side, simultaneously, and are not linear stages. Having said that, our time, in my view, is still locked into disenchantment. This is *still* the dominant note of our culture, and probably will be for at least the next couple of generations.

One could say that re-enchantment, or 'new animism', is an ongoing, continuous "recovery" project which has no real beginning or end. William Blake was engaged

in this project in the 1790s - and obviously not in response to a disenchanted 'modernity' as we know it, but in response to a kind of consciousness that was rapidly losing its capacity for vision. Blake championed re-enchantment in this way:

"How do you know but every bird that cuts the airy way, / Is an immense world of delight, closed by your senses five?"

On the other hand, disenchantment was for Blake an ever-present possibility, linked to fantasies of end of the world:

When imagination, art and science and all intellectual gifts, all the gifts of the Holy Ghost, are looked upon as of no use and only contention remains to man, then the Last Judgment begins, and its vision is seen by the imaginative eye of every one according to the situation he holds. (Blake 1810: 604)

If you get a chance to think about the question of projections, I would appreciate your reflections on this topic, as well.

best wishes, David

Dear David and All,

I'm glad that you seem to have had a rapprochement with Hillman's later work and would be most interested to hear your fuller thoughts on this. I'm not sure about new science leading us. Practitioners deal with synchronicities on a fairly regular basis whatever the latest scientific findings are. Just a few examples from my own practice are - the car that breaks down on the way to a session which will address a long avoided issue, the telephone that crackles and disconnects in a relationship that is itself breaking up, the man who's mobile phone accidentally speed dials his wife while he is having an intimate conversation with his lover in a parked car, the ring that inexplicably slips off a client's finger whilst they claim they have 'nothing to discuss', the light bulb that pops out of its socket in the middle of an intense and pregnant silence, etc, etc. The way we project our spatial awareness into machinery such as a car (with which we have a close and personal involvement) has its analogies and sometimes significant parallels to bodily life, engine for heart, windscreen for eyes etc. It's hard not to be at least a bit 'animistic' when dealing with the day to day material that clients present.

The 'old' science supports the notion established by the monotheistic religions that there is some outside place of truth (over and above) separated from creation. We can forget that notions of the divine as well as notions of scientific objectivity are themselves fantasies and products of the psyche. With equal justice we can see ourselves as embedded and immersed in the environment. Everything that we are is also to be found in the planet of which we are an integral part. Arguably this includes our consciousness and what we sometimes refer to as spirit and soul. Given this, the idea of projection takes on a different significance - parts of the psyche which are themselves a part of nature are projected into other parts of nature. In his new book David Abram raises the notion that we live in the earth rather than on it, in as far as the atmosphere is a part of the planet that spins along with the rest of the earth as it turns. Some Native American traditions believe that humanity is the 'little brother' of creation rather than the apex of evolution. Despite the fleeting apparent

success of our species we are creatures who are remain ill adapted to survival on earth with much yet to learn from others who have mastered this art.

Lawrence speaks well of the 'great swerve'. Practitioners are aware of the need to regress and to backtrack when important but neglected areas of the psyche demand attention through illness and symptoms. Different qualities are evoked in us not only by the imperatives of personal development or individuation processes but also from the needs and demands of a living, evolving and interactive environment. As they are brought into awareness sometimes through the alchemy of psychotherapy weaknesses can on some occasions become strengths as consciousness is adapted to the needs of the moment.

Guy Dargert

Dear Guy,

I will send you, off list, a copy of my fuller paper on this subject, which explores Hillman's later work. Happy to send it to anyone else who requests it off line. My argument is that Hillman is one of the few to take up the controversy about "projections", which has become a sacred cow of Jungian psychology, and almost no one ever questions it.

Yes, synchronicity and animism seem to share common ground, I agree with you.

I personally like David Abrahm's work very much, and always have his books close at hand. I can well imagine Hillman giving him a standing ovation at Pacifica, because Hillman has been under the "spell of the sensuous" for some time - even his early work on Image was about saving the appearances from those who would reduce them to concepts and ideas.

Lawrence is brilliant on the notion of our needing to take a "great swerve" - that particular quote is from his essay on Herman Melville, in his *Studies in Classic American Literature*.

regards, David

"Nothing has ever been projected; that is a wrong conception really: the term projection is wrong. Such a psychological content always has been outside, it never was inside. A so-called projection is simply a thing which is discovered to be outside and then integrated by the discoverer with himself. Our psychology was all found outside, it never was in our pockets to begin with." C.G. Jung, "The Interpretation of Visions: V. Excerpts From the Notes of Mary Foote." Spring Journal, (1964).

-Joel

Joel,

That quote is a real find, thank you very much (!) I will treasure this quotation, as it is a real gem.

It gives weight to what some of us have been suspecting for some time, that is, there is a real disjunction between Jung's psychology and Jungian psychology. Sonu was one of the first to point this out, and I have been noticing it ever since. Sonu: 'The history of Jungian psychology has in part consisted in a radical and unacknowledged diminution of Jung's goal'.^{[i] <#_edn1>}

[i] <#_ednref1> Sonu Shamdasani, *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology: The Dream of a Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 15.

Most texts on Jungian Psychology simply assume the theory of projections as self-evidently true and axiomatic. However, Jung never did, and as I have said before, this crisis in his theory has never been fully explored - it begs further investigation by someone with time to conduct it.

But one wonders if Jung "stayed relatively quiet" about this crisis, so as not to upset the development of his school? What factors might have been involved in this? Or was it merely a case of the Jungians not understanding Jung?

David

David,

Good to have you back on line. I would like to share with you where I agree with your paper and where I would distance myself from it though I think it raises crucial questions in many fields and is sound in its basic thrust..

I so much agree with your undermining of the natural/supernatural distinction that still prevails in monotheistic psychology and in cultures shaped by them. Jung's discussion with Buber and White demonstrate in box car letters that Jungian psychology simply does not reduce to a natural/supernatural paradigm and so to Jewish, Christian or Islamic orthodox main stream imagination. I've heard the response that this is less true of their mystical traditions but if so it is only because the mystics themselves are closer to the unconscious as the sole source of religious experience. You are quite right in affirming that we cannot go home to any

of these options after Jung. The question now is not how to be saved through any of these avenues but how to be saved from them. Eventually this would have to be done through a myth emerging probably through them but going beyond them toward a more universal sympathy than the supernatural and monotheistic imagination can proffer.

I would also very much agree with your implication that we should lose our fear of regression. In his appropriation of Meister Eckhart and Eckhart's regression to the Godhead, Jung defeats this fear explicitly. "As a result of this retrograde process the original state of identity with God is re-established and a new potential is unleashed." CW 6, par.431. In this passage he relates such regression to both Australian aborigines and Christian mystics. Elsewhere he relates such primitive consciousness to the Hindu tradition of the Purusha and uses the term "primitive" to describe it. Neither Eckhart nor aspects of the Hindu tradition can be termed "primitive" in a pejorative sense. Their use by Jung should be reevaluated when he argues the primitive regresses to the point where divinity, humanity and nature share joint being. I think these points are crucial if current culture is to evolve a myth beyond the superficialities of reason and consciousness divorced from its depths with the subject-object split they cannot evade and whose supersession they cannot imagine.

This said I depart somewhat from your contention that Jung moves from the need to withdraw projections to an endorsement of them in his understanding of animism. I think even in his Yale lectures he writes that consciousness demands the withdrawal of projections and specifically those that create the Gods, their revelations and communal faith in Them binding communities

to One or Other of the One and Onlies in patterns of now too evident social hostility. ".everything of a divine or daemonic character outside us must return to the psyche, to the inside of the unknown man, when it apparently originated." CW 11, par. 105 In this spirit he extends the recovery of divinity to human nature itself, contends that the Church has split what nature has united, the divine and the human, and terms a "systematic blindness" the idea that divinity is beyond the psyche. CW 11, par.100. In this context the natural pantheism Jung attributes to the psyche need not be dismissed or feared. In fact Jung is explicit that its negation by the church has contributed to the spiritual sterility of current culture. CW 14, par. 773 These typical passages would infer that the recovery of projections at this level would enable humanity to address the divine within as the basis of a vastly extended sense of the divine without, indeed one in which what exists would be perceived as alive with a life manifesting its divine origin, in short, with a profound animistic sense.

I also think that the division of Jung into what amounts to a solipsistic subjectivity over against an objectivity somehow beyond the psyche is exaggerated to the point of falsifying his psychology. I think at least the later Jung contends that the basis of a universal sentiment lies in the depths of the individual where the connection with both the soul of the world and the experience of the unus mundus rests on the "eternal Ground of all empirical being". CW 14, par. 760 The loss of such connection lies at the heart of the collective loss of the sense of the sacred or enchantment, a term currently being used on the list. In the dialectic between inner and outer and ego and the external the symbols of the soul of

the world and the one world break down the false dichotomy between inside and outside. They rest on the experience of the individual as natively related to the totality through the ontological structure of the psyche itself and that the recovery of the point of coincidence of individual with the totality is the psychic basis informing the experience of the soul of the world and the one world. So I don't think that these symbols arise from projection but from the experiential recovery of that depth in the psyche which is the common origin of consciousness, nature and the sense of God manifest in both.

Regarding Hillman I often wondered why he does not address the symbol of the unus mundus and never goes beyond the preceding stage, that of the caelum. At the Barcelona conference he amplified the conception of caelum as blue exhaustively and concluded with no conclusion. I realize his then understanding of deconstructionism may have forbidden him saying anything particular but in cutting off the culmination of the alchemical process prior to its universalism he deprives the culture of what it now needs most, a sense of the common origin of all the absolutes currently poised to destroy the humanity through which they are born much as a cancer destroys the body which gives it birth.

I think the new "science" can also be a distraction. Admittedly Jung depicted his psychology as a "science" often. He frequently presented himself as a mere scientist without metaphysical or theological intent before going on to make blatantly metaphysical statements. He and Freud had to be "scientists" to gain a hearing in the face of the scientism of their time. The new scientism has shown itself as incapable of assimilating Jung

in his totality as did the older version. Jung knew his psychology in its further reaches towered above science as itself a myth and was frank in acknowledging it. In 1958 he writes of the unus mundus which elsewhere he relates to the mandala and synchronicity, "This far-reaching speculation is a psychic need which is part of our mental hygiene, but in the realm of scientific verification it must be counted sheer mythology." Letters 2, p. 449 Jung's theorizing in realms well beyond his psychometry is mythology. His therapy is a healing art. To make the new science somehow a combination of myth and art will need a torturous and needless manipulation of the term. Why not abandon the effort to reduce Jung to the level of a scientist and his psychology to science in favour of an intensified resonance with the myth the unconscious currently sponsors. Animism, pantheism and I would suspect a kind of monism in which the total cognitive possibility is realized as contained in the relation of ego to the unconscious are all involved in the emerging myth.

David, I think your paper moves along this way and this is the way it moved me. I remain grateful for it.

John

'This said I depart somewhat from your contention that Jung moves from the need to withdraw projections to an endorsement of them in his understanding of animism. I think even in his Yale lectures he writes that consciousness demands the withdrawal of projections and specifically those that create the Gods, their revelations and communal faith in Them binding communities to One or Other of the One and Onlies in patterns of now too evident social hostility.'

Thanks, John this is really interesting - it helps me get at something i am working on right now vis a vis Walter Benjamin and what he means by 'aura' - is this it, a bit?: he is critiquing cultural products (paintings, etc.) and the background is that he worries their commodification has rendered them flat, without 'aura' = a quality that i associate with animism - but the difficulty is where to ascribe this sort of transcendental longevity they might have, a primordial presence (his word), that is outside time: is it a function of the perceiver or is it a quality of the object.

the difficulty is that there is no object without a (or as he puts it, to gaze at an Other is to imply or to expect a response) - so it is not the case that a painting or a piece of music no longer has an 'aura' in itself, it is that in its perception, there is no 'aura' - but of course there never aren't 'perceivors' -

thereby he does not give up hope - there is a chance to try to discern what the primordial object is, or how it relates to the primordial, and so to re-align with its originality. of course i have not got it in all its complexities - but does this correlate to what you are saying? is this about projections? (it is also the beginning of his argument about distinguishing between philosophy and theology - he discusses time from there.) i am trying to see the ramifications psychologically here. thanks, again, Leslie

Leslie,

The withdrawal of projections may indeed be related to the capacity to view reality with a certain aura. What I am contending - I think with Jung - is that the withdrawal of projections and especially those that create the Gods turns the ego to the powers within that are the authors of such projections. To the extent that these inner powers become conscious divinity is removed from its location in the skies and becomes the ground of what is. Conscious contact with that ground enables a perception of the divine or sacred or ultimate or numinous (whatever it be called) as a residual capacity not limited to this or that existent but simply to what is. In this sense the aura would invade one's surroundings as they express their universal or common ground as the source of the aura transparent in them. Contemporary disenchantment ultimately traces back to a loss of the sense of the internal origin of the aura. In this the reduction of the human cognitive capacity to intellect, reason, or mind is largely responsible. Here the unlikely collusion of science and religion are obstacles to the aura. The former lives away from it and rightly within its legitimate ambit. The latter projects the aura into the skies and so has lost contemporary attention and credibility.

Thank you for your comments,

John

Dear John and All,

Thank you very much for your fine email. I appreciate your efforts in this regard. I always like to joust with you John, and we have been doing it for years now. I am sorry I missed your paper at Montreal, as at the time I was caught up in another session by Donald Kalsched.

In this email, I will simply respond to your point about projection and animism (and return to your other points later).

I will do something that I sometimes find irritating in others (now, surely, that's a projection?), and that is to splice my responses inside your comments. You wrote:

This said I depart somewhat from your contention that Jung moves from the need to withdraw projections to an endorsement of them in his understanding of animism.

This is not what I meant to say, and if I did say it, I am sorry. What I meant to say was: the whole issue of "projections" becomes problematised by Jung's theory of synchronicity and his late interest in alchemy and the animistic world view. It becomes problematised because "psyche" is no longer entirely "in here", but is seen as quite legitimately "out there" as well. I actually think that Jung was moving toward a position in which theoretical physics and psychology come together and meet. Note the quote from Jung that was sent to this list by Joel Weishaus on 3 October:

"Nothing has ever been projected; that is a wrong conception really: the term projection is wrong. Such a psychological content always has been outside, it never was inside. A so-called projection is simply a thing which is discovered to be outside and then integrated by the discoverer with himself. Our psychology was all found outside, it never was in our pockets to begin with." C.G. Jung, "The Interpretation of Visions: V. Excerpts From the Notes of Mary Foote." Spring Journal, (1964).

Actually, it would be good to get the original date of this, as dates are vital in Jungian Studies - : when did he say it? It was obviously not 1964, as he died in 61.

Of enormous significance to this discussion is this quote from the book edited by Robert Segal, June Singer and Murray Stein:

Gilles Quispel reports that after Jung delivered his lecture on synchronicity at Eranos in 1951, Jung told him that 'now the concept of projection should be revised completely'. from page 19, "The Allure of Gnosticism", Open Court, 1995.

My point, John, is that this "revision" of the theory of projection never really took place, although Jung called for it as late as 1951. Instead, we have two separate epistemologies running side-by-side in his work: one about the efficient need to withdraw projections, another about the fact that obviously "all" projections cannot be withdrawn because then there would be no basis for the experience of psyche in the world. Am I the only one seeing this contradiction? No, Hillman saw it and has written at length about it in a number of books. Way back in 1983 Hillman wrote:

'The idea of projection [is] one of depth psychology's denial of things as they are so as to maintain its view of the world'. [i] <#_edn1> Hillman claims projection is a 'defense' against anima mundi, and as such it 'needs reversing'. 'What psychology has had to call 'projection' is simply animation ... [in which] the soul of the thing corresponds or coalesces with ours'. [ii] <#_edn2>

[i] <#_ednref1> Hillman, *Anima Mundi*, p. 99.

[ii] <#_ednref2> Hilman, *Anima Mundi.*, p. 102.

Note there is a difference here between Jung and Hillman, Jung says it needs "revising", Hillman says, more radically, it needs "reversing". But what has happened? Actually nothing much, neither revision nor reversal has occurred in our field, as it seems to me most of us have sidestepped this issue. I love that phrase from Hillman: the soul of the thing corresponds or coalesces with ours. This is on another level, entirely, to the Cartesian project of withdrawing projections that dominates Jungian psychology.

I agree with Hillman, and applaud his courage in tackling this sacred cow of psychotherapeutic practice. Note: He is NOT saying that some projections don't need to be withdrawn in the average psychotherapeutic session. If you hate someone with a great intensity, Hillman would be the first one to request an integration of shadow. He is saying, however, that the notion of cleaning up the world of all psychic projections is an error of our thinking, and if we go down that road, we eventually lose all sense of soul in the world, and the importance of psychic connections with objects, things, people (animism). He is opposed to the Herculean effort of cleaning up the stables, and removing all psychic "shit" from the world, which for Hillman is tantamount to losing soul in things.

To say that Jung or Hillman endorse all projections is a misrepresentation of their position. They are saying that projections have to be viewed through a different lens or paradigm, now that we have discovered, or more correctly, recovered, the vital importance of psyche in the world, and the need to live in an animated universe. Not all projections originate from the human self, but some must come to us from outside, as Jung and Hillman put it.

Perhaps its a bit like differentiating between big and little dreams. Little dreams are our personal concern and need to be 'integrated' into consciousness, but big dreams come from the collective layer, and we cannot expect to "integrate" them in the same efficient way, but rather, our task is to learn from them, and regard them as objective and not merely subjective. I guess another parallel might be the shadow: there is personal shadow that needs integrating, but collective or archetypal shadow that needs respecting rather than integrating as such. Do you see my point? We are talking about different levels or layers of psychic experience. You wrote:

I think even in his Yale lectures he writes that consciousness demands the withdrawal of projections and specifically those that create the Gods, their revelations and communal faith in Them binding communities to One or Other of the One and Onlies in patterns of now too evident social hostility. ".everything of a divine or daemonic character outside us must return to the psyche, to the inside of the unknown man, when it apparently originated." CW 11, par. 105

Yes, you are right. He does have this aspect, this epistemology or method. But it is contradicted by the other epistemology, which comes up later. The Terry Lectures were 1937 from memory, and don't forget, Jung delivered them to impress the leading lights of the day at Yale. He was not going to tell them the whole truth, which is that he did not fully believe this line of thought, not even then, when he delivered it. He was tailoring his work to suit the purpose and context. He did not want to come across as some eccentric mystic, but in the line of Hercules cleaning up

the stables. However, even in the Yale lectures, Jung sounded this warning and cautionary note:

The individual ego is much too small, its brain is much too feeble, to incorporate all the projections withdrawn from the world. Ego and brain burst asunder in the effort; the psychiatrist calls it schizophrenia. This was the case with Nietzsche, the uncomprehended portent of a whole epoch. (1938/40: 145)

Here he indicating that "withdrawing projections" is not always such a great idea. In fact, it can be a recipe for madness. Let the world have its psychic contents, and let gods remain gods, and not reduce them to human contents. Why do we feel obliged to swallow the gods when they never did come from our subjective depths?

It is clear that by 1945 and then 1951, Jung did not believe (any more) that everything of a divine or demonic character originates outside us and must be "returned" to subjectivity. He felt, on the contrary, that divine and demonic aspects were in the world soul, and to "withdraw" them into the personal psyche would be 1) impossible, as they did not originate there; 2) likely to create terrible inflation if withdrawn; and 3) leave the world soul-less if withdrawn.

You wrote:

In this spirit he extends the recovery of divinity to human nature itself, contends that the Church has split what nature has united, the divine and the human, and terms a "systematic blindness" the idea that divinity is beyond the psyche. CW 11, par.100. In this context the natural pantheism Jung attributes to the psyche need not be dismissed or feared. In fact Jung is explicit that its negation by the church has contributed to the spiritual sterility of current culture. CW 14, par. 773

Yes, but once again, you are tracking one aspect of Jung and not the other, with due respect. I can provide just as many quotes where Jung is saying the opposite: Man conquers not only nature, but spirit also, without realizing what he is doing. To the man of enlightened intellect it seems like the correction of a fallacy when he recognizes that what he took to be spirits is simply the human spirit and ultimately his own spirit. All the superhuman things, whether good or bad, that former ages predicated of the *daimonia*, are reduced to 'reasonable' proportions as though they were pure exaggeration, and everything seems to be in the best possible order.[i] <#_edn1>

[i] <#_ednref1> Jung, 'The Phenomenology of the Spirit in Fairytales' (1945/1948), in CW Vol. 9, part 1, para. 454.

Then there is this major quotation, which definitely argues against "withdrawing" these so-called "projections"

The integration of the spirit means nothing less than its demonization, since the super-human spiritual agencies that were formerly tied up in nature are introjected

into human nature, thus endowing it with a power which extends the bounds of the personality *ad infinitum*, in the most perilous way.[i] <#_edn1>

[i] <#_ednref1> Jung, 'The Phenomenology of the Spirit', para. 454.

Don't forget that in some places, Jung argues that Nietzsche went mad precisely because he "withdrew" the so-called 'projections' of God or spirit into himself, and this caused his psyche to explode. There are some psychic contents which are clearly too large to be withdrawn, and the large ones are like big fish which will capsize the boat if we are naive enough to think they can be integrated into ourselves.

So while I agree with much of what you write in disagreement with my thesis, I would argue that there are (at least) two Junges in the collected works, and these strands battle for dominance in his psychological system. As it happens, the Cartesian Jung has won the day in the systematised psychology that operates under his name. This is so comprehensive that Hillman felt the need to create a separate, though related tradition called "archetypal psychology" to house and reclaim the Jung who had been lost. I guess my argument is that we need to bring these two psychologies, analytical and archetypal, together, so that they can benefit from the fruits of dialogue and conversation. Personally, I used to construct myself as more archetypal than analytical, but now I seek something different, which is to bring back the post-Cartesian epistemology which is present in Jung but not so much in Jungians.

I would be grateful for your response to these points, which are vitally important to me at the moment. So too: anyone else who is following this line of thought, please jump in and say something.

best wishes,

David

David,

Thanks for your extended reply. With qualifications I would grant that there are diverse epistemologies in his writing as Jung matured and his psychology with him. The following is unranked but may be better for getting at the issue.

Epistemology I would prefer not to call this epistemology Cartesian. Descartes's subjectivity was confined to reason and thinking. Jung's subjectivity never was at any stage of his development. However there are passages in which he will talk of the subjective psyche as relating to what amounts to an outside world. I think this is a preliminary epistemology to the epistemology evident in his alchemical works and in his Answer to Job, though I have indicated it is present at least as early as his Yale lectures. This preliminary epistemology would tolerate the model of a subject or psyche looking out on an object much as Descartes might understand a rational subject looking at an object.....an outstanding example of which would be God as the ultimate guarantor of reason.

Epistemology II. In this epistemology the perception of such universal strata of reality captured in the symbols of the anima mundi and unus mundus imply that such consciousness is only possible if one's soul or psyche is reconnected with the universal structure of the deeper psyche and through this inner connection is related to reality beyond itself in the "outside world". It must be said in this epistemology there may be no outside world since the psyche is all encompassing through its role as grounding consciousness and even the sensorium. This epistemology is incompatible with any form of Aristotelian logic or thought and has its roots in Platonism this dynamic informs animism. But the crucial point here is that the perception of the soul of the world or the unus mundus implies and rests upon the connection of consciousness with its universal ground enabling the perception of what is as a joint expression of ego and the beyond. What I fear is that this inner connection as the key to the out connection is being lost in Jungian theory and possibly in practice. Without this interiority, which breaks the subject/object dichotomy, and also informs, at times dangerously, the participation mystique and many forms of mysticism the universal sense is lost; the only alternative is a regression to Cartesian epistemology

In substance I am saying that your understanding of the anima mundi is a form of what you call Cartesian epistemology.

As regards Hillman I would reiterate that his truncation of the alchemical process at the level of caelum denies the power of the unus mundus at the ground or latency of the sense of the universal which has given rise to all religion and analogous absolutes in political and cultural life and would be a valuable, if not the final, resource in turning humanity away from the threat of killing itself for the truth. I think that Jung had such a scenario in mind when he cautioned toward the end that if humanity did not "...work out the way of salvation by a symbolic death..." (loss of its current religious configurations) it faced the likelihood of a "universal genocide." CW 18, par, 1661.

The suggestion of the universalism implicit in animistic consciousness is helpful in evading such an outcome. This is why I think your paper is important but may need to transcend its own Cartesian conclusion.

Again, David, many thanks for the opportunity to exercise these questions.

Sincerely,

John

Dear David Tacey,

I'd like to thank you for your succinct and as usual, well-argued paper. It's good to have your input again on the list. As you know, my way of thinking, which may be broadly described as Orthodox Christian, doesn't match that of most list members, so I admit that I read everything from this point of view, and find myself naturally drawn to certain perspectives more than others.

I suppose it comes as no surprise that I think you (and Hillman) are onto something in your different approach to projection, in your location of psyche in the cosmos as much as in man. And, having heard the doctrine of (needing to withdraw) projections repeated in chant-like manner on this list, it is refreshing to see that someone is capable of transcending this prejudice, and indeed reading Jung again in a way which does not necessarily tow the dominant psychotherapeutic / solipsistic party line. I agree, too, with your comparison of certain subjective projections to 'little dreams', since clearly the concept of projection is useful psychotherapeutically for sorting out self (lower case 's') from other, but is quite inappropriate when it is, erm, projected onto the cosmos at large. Hence, too, 'withdrawing' a 'projection' or more correctly a content of consciousness from the cosmos into the psyche may well lead to madness, either as schizophrenia or the inflation and pride of people who imagine they've killed God, like Richard Dawkins or Stephen Hawking, or even really bright and creative ones like Nietzsche. The water is both inside the fish, and around it. I don't agree with the notion of animism as a theological proposal (though I'm not suggesting your paper was meant as such), but for me, I can gladly report as Daniel and others surely can, the whole material universe is teeming with life, much more of it than I've detected in many professionals. If I may use a theological analogy, in a prayer to the Holy Spirit we say "Thou art everywhere and fillest all things".

So once again, many thanks for your paper and the seminar, I hope that your thinking continues down this creative and innovative path. I also hope you will revise Hillman's prejudice against Christianity and the Church Fathers at some point, because far from being the source of dualism as Mark suggests, Jesus the God-man as the Incarnation of the Logos is the resolution of all dualism, and also seems to me to fit neither the Tylorian definition of 'primitive animism', nor that of 'modern animism'. But fortunately such issues are bigger than I can ultimately handle, and I'll therefore say no more on it, leaving it to superior intellects to put these things into words.

Best regards,

Byron

if an experience takes a form that is so like something else, how to tell the difference? i am wondering about your comment, mark, that uncanniness accompanies technology in a way that is similar, yet different, to numinosity (does numinosity occur only when some form of religion is present?)

Marie-Laure Ryan (in her piece 'Immersion vs. interactivity:virtual reality and literary theory' 1994 PMC vol. 5 1) talks about the distinctions (or not) of the experience of total immersion in video games over against the 'ordinary' experience of reading a novel which is also completely engrossing.

it is the medium of the experience, the headsets or the feel of a book in your hand, or the presence of the edges of the computer screen that are somehow both the boundaries and the gateways to an experience that is transporting, is that what the

disenchantment contrasts to? a kind of flatness or a kind of literalness? all too canny...?

Samuel Weber in his examination of Freud's essay on the uncanny has this to say that may work in here about the mix of subjective and objective - technology and feeling - 'it is quite another matter to assume that the uncanny is essentially or exclusively an emotive phenomenon...such a position misconstrues the peculiar structure of the uncanny, or, more precisely, ignores the fact that the uncanny has a particular structure which however intimately bound up with subjective feelings ... is nonetheless determined by a series of 'objective' factors that in turn stand in a certain relation to discourse.' (this is from Weber's piece 'The sideshow, or: remarks on a canny moment' in MLN vol 88 no. 6 (1973).

it is that shift, that shimmer, when something familiar is somehow laced with anxiety, that tells us something is not right, and that is the touchstone of the uncanny. is animism located in here too?

yet total immersion via technological or any other means, makes the rules and constraints of that other 'place' very familiar, very at home. so this animated matter is not the message itself but the gateway, the borderlands, boundaries. i guess what i am trying to get at is the numinosity and uncanniness might perhaps be achieved (if it is something to achieve at all - and i do believe that an artist can create and then get lost in her own creation, actually) comes out being the same thing.

it is always hard for me to believe that we actually have different interior experiences in response to what might be very different stimuli - our synapses and fingertips are the same as ancient peoples' were - so our visceral experience - a component, after all, of numinosity or uncanny reactions, are the same. how we get there might be different, i suppose. and you want us to hold these two notions together, i think, mark.

yours, Leslie

I don't see enchantment as particular to the 'new animism' David is referring to. Under the influence of a complex we become enchanted. When is it a personal complex and when is it cultural? I associate the new animism David is identifying more to a cultural complex (Singer, Kimbles) rooted in one of the cultural attitudes Henderson identified as a 'religious attitude'. One of David's contributions has been, through my own lens, a thorough Jungian perspective on how religious attitudes are finding new homes, now with new animism a projection onto nature. Technology then begins, in the course of the discussion so far, to be the antimomial (perhaps even antinominal in alchemical terms) substance. My question is what then, in light of this new animism is the irrational third?

Thomas Singer posted on 14 May 2009 "I think David hits the nail on the head when he talks about learning to "internalize" the notion of a cultural complex. It goes to the essence of value/use to us- and this is true not just about 'cultural complexes' but any theory or 'technical' word that we use. They don't really mean anything unless they become part of us in a real and inner way." Tom goes on to support a question

David had raised at that time to do with how we recognize or identify what is a cultural complex and when it is simply a “problem”.

So as David is back for the time being, it seems a good idea to ask if the “new animism” is a symptom of a cultural complex or is it the complex itself?

Again, drawing from Singer’s post, to precis and quote:

is there an unconscious affective force that underlies the ‘problem’? Does it present with a big dose of collective emotion? (the flying saucers, eg)

does the problem seem to have a life of its own – is it autonomous?

does it recur over time in such a way that it gains a history and selective memory of its own that becomes self-fulfilling? Is it repetitious?

does it have a set of relatively simplistic beliefs and ideas, (that are) also repetitive and tend to reduce problems to simplistic and formulaic or stereotypical ideas?

does the problem seem to be highly resistant to becoming more conscious of itself?

is it triggered by words or phrases that lead to powerful affect, somewhat like stepping on a land mine?

By the way I also could have gone down a route of response to Mark and Leslie’s post in consideration of Roger Brooke’s paper (*JAP* 36, 4, 1991, 505-518) ‘Psychic complexity and human existence’, but as Mark is more studied on Merleau-Ponty than I am, I’m hoping either he or Roger will bring some of this to bear on the ‘new animism’.

Thanks to Leslie, Dan, Mark, David and Thomas Singer and hopefully, Roger Brooke.

Best wishes,

Maryann

thanks for your posting, maryann of october 2 - it helps to contextualise David's paper - i have not been sure what 'animism' is and i see that you suggest he means it is located in a cultural dimension, in a sub-division, as it were, of religion?? i have been thinking of it in a broader way, as radioactive matter, animated matter. perhaps it is meant in a more specific context? yours, leslie

Hi Leslie,

In David’s paper animism involves projection, in fact one of the implications is that Analytical Psychology would have us do away with projections. I read animism as seeing into the inanimate something more that may cross over toward the numinous. There is a thread in this conversation now, thanks to Joel, on a quote from Jung that begins, “Nothing has ever been projected...”

(see Joel’s post 10/3). David’s paper is picking up on a post Cartesian shift, ‘curve’ in Jung’s psychology that questions whether Analytical Psychologists have turned their back on. Broadly speaking we are in the realm of the anima mundi. When I said below I don’t see enchantment as particular to the ‘new animism’ what I should have said was *limited to the new animism*.

Within this new animism I see a place to explore complexes in personal and cultural dimensions, possession, spirits. (Lucy Huskinson has written brilliantly on spirit possession). The curve David is picking up on, as I read it (which may not be what

anyone else reads into it) is about Jung's shift toward culture and cosmos. At the moment I am finding cosmos in the cultural manifestation. This is where I brought in Henderson's religious attitude as part of what became known as a cultural complex. Another way of looking at anima mundi, and animism. Perhaps for some this amplification is a bridge too far.

I know nothing about radioactive matter but if you see any, stay clear of it. Yours,
Maryann

Dear All,

I just wanted to let everyone know that a computer search on the subject "New Animism" in my La Trobe University library, yields 2,565 results. I further notice that none of these entries include references to Jungian psychologies. These 2,565 results include entire books written on new animism, as well as many articles, essays and individual chapters in edited volumes.

The field is quite enormous, and let's not imagine that it is limited to our own field(s).

Yes Maryann, this discussion probably does relate to Lucy Huskinson on spirit possession, but I have not yet read or seen her recent book on this topic. Waiting for the library to get it, or for someone to send me a review copy (!).

A few months ago, the Anthropology and Sociology departments of my university held an international seminar on The New Animism. It was packed with delegates, and incredibly interesting from a Jungian and/or Archetypal point of view, but none of the discussants or audience members were in the slightest bit aware of parallel developments in Analytical and Archetypal Psychology. We so rarely get on the radar of leading-edge university discussions, unfortunately. By the way, I explore this problem in a chapter of a forthcoming book with OUP New York, on *Teaching Jung in the University*, which will appear next year. Robert Segal, Murray Stein, Susan Rowland, John Dourley and David Miller are in the same volume.

best wishes,

David

Dear David and All,

I was remiss not to include a full reference on Lucy's new book and the chapter in it I've been referring to:

Huskinson, L. (2010) "Analytical Psychology and Spirit Possession: Towards a Non-Pathological Diagnosis of Spirit Possession" in B.E. Schmidt and L. Huskinson (Eds.) *Spirit Possession and Trance: New Interdisciplinary Perspectives Continuous Advances in Religious Studies* London and New York: Continuum

Thanks David for acknowledging the probable link to spirit possession I've reported on, which Lucy tackles so well in advancing the subject of complexes. New Animism appears to be no more owned by a Jungian Psychology than notions of culture, but as ever in Jungian Studies we bring another dimension to the field. While we may not have time to cover all the dimensions of new animism in this seminar I would like to continue to invite contributions that take their inspiration from David's excellent paper and seminar.

Best wishes,
Maryann

But spirit possession is 'old' animism... The field is even larger, for arguably there's a truly new animism in late-modernity.

My point links to this list's earlier thread apropos modernity and disenchantment. This new animism seems hidden in taking hi-tech for granted. We're surrounded by hi-tech, live within it; and it's like a mysterious force of nature - not because you or I don't have a degree in computers, but because of the subtle ways in which the technology (email, mobile phones, etc., Twitter, Facebook, YouTube...) profoundly influences everyday existence in our society whether we personally use it or not. It has a life of its own.

I can't claim originality to that idea. It's explored in an excellent book by R. L. Rutsky, "High Techne: Art and technology from the machine aesthetic to the posthuman" (University of Minnesota, 1999). With a reference to Weber's modernity+disenchantment, he posits that the 'machine aesthetic' is a new enchantment. He also proposes and explores what he calls the 'technological unconscious', to do with how we are collectively acculturated into seeing the world through technology and into seeing technology in particular ways (notably in sci-fi). No mention of Jung there, but if you read it I'm sure you could see numerous links - e.g., Jung's UFO essay. The 'technological unconscious' notion lends itself to a comparison with 'cultural complex'.

Cheers,
Raya

I don't think spirit possession belongs to either new or old animism, as to see the "spirit" in the inanimate can run along a continuum between matters of faith through to insanity, depending on the culture in which it occurs. If the ego is flooded or overwhelmed the clinical perspective as a 'culture' will view it one way, if it happens in Lourdes or Fatima the content of the possession may be viewed as a manifestation of the divine. Analytical Psychology is uniquely equipped to consider this spectrum. In David's longer 8,000 word paper, which he has invited discussants to request off list, he goes into more detail on how where and how AP goes with Jung's 'swerve' to cosmos and culture and where it doesn't.

One of the many interesting threads I see in this seminar is the way in which that old devil technology keeps coming up as if a 'force of nature' (back to nature?) within new animism. Thank you for your comparison of Rutsky's 'technological unconscious' to a cultural complex. Though not strictly speaking an example of the numinous, it is right up there with other fine applications of analytical psychology on inter-disciplinary subjects the IAJS has become known for.

Best,
Maryann

Dear All,

I find it interesting how the focus of this conversation so far has been language. I have mixed feelings about this. Certainly, language is important. And David's choice to use terms like "enchantment/disenchantment/re-enchantment" and "new animism" does demand that we make an attempt to figure out what he meant by these terms. I share many of Mark's concerns (expressed in his 10/2 post) regarding the possibility that the three stages of the development of human thought David enlists spring from a "modernist fantasy". And yet, my gut grumbles at the possibility that we would get bogged down in the absolute deconstruction of David's argument/provocation, finishing in egg-headed nihilism where, as Bob Dylan once sang: "Nothing was delivered <<http://www.bobdylan.com/#/songs/nothing-was-delivered>>".

For instance, although it is a campaign button slogan of postmodernist rhetoric to call something a "modernist fantasy", I have to ask the ignorant person's (perhaps also "wise") question: what part of the life we know and have known and can reconstruct from the artifacts of the historical era is not a "modernist fantasy"? This fantasy dates back to our earliest writings, stories of Fall in the Bible and elsewhere, the Epic of Gilgamesh, etc. These tales (in the oral traditions) probably date back to before the Bronze age and draw on the radical shifts in human culture generated by agriculture. And if the "modernist fantasy" has been with human culture from that time to the present, how much is really achieved by evoking it as a criticism?

Additionally, I am one of those troglodytes who remains unconvinced that postmodernism has achieved anything like a transcendence of, or even a removal from, modernism. The mystique of postmodernism seems to be primarily propaganda to me. That is, it does not manage to "treat" the condition of modernism. It only (at best) illuminates modernism's arbitrariness (and modernism is not unique in being arbitrary). But adolescent (or "puer") culture illuminates the arbitrariness of adult culture in every era. Part of the getting on with (or initiation into) adulthood involves, not a blind ignorance of cultural arbitrariness, but a kind of self-sacrificing acceptance that some of this arbitrariness must be embraced if one is to relate responsibly to others, to family, and to community. "Embrace" here need not mean belief, and this is part of the tenuousness of adult responsibility, a tenuousness that demands a sophisticated ethical consciousness to arbitrate it.

Mark also makes another claim that needs to be contrasted with David's claim that "Postmodern science will lead us into a new kind of animism". Mark says:

modernity is and always has been thoroughly enchanted, and though this enchantment has remained hitherto, for various reasons, mostly hidden, nonetheless in recent years, in the light of a post-modern perspective on modernity, it has become more visible as enchantment, though in characteristically modern forms.

Of course, either claim is complex and highly debatable. But if modernity "is and always has been thoroughly enchanted", how does this relate to the fact that modern disenchantment or Fall has been a consistent modern myth or fantasy throughout all modernity (i.e., at least the entire historical era)? Also, I think it is quite possible that many (perhaps even most) moderns don't feel any more or less disenchanted than premodern or tribal peoples. Disenchantment is largely a concern of those moderns who lean toward romanticism (like Jungians). Question to ask for those of us of romantic persuasion are what is it really that is missing . . . and why?

In the quote from Mark above, another important contrast with David's claim needs to be illuminated. Mark attributes increased awareness and presence of enchantment "in recent years" to "a post-modern perspective on modernity". But David clearly states that "postmodern *science*" will lead to re-enchantment/new animism. Of the two claims, I would argue that David's is substantially more radical and original. Postmodernists have been claiming special insight for decades, but reaction to these claims has been severely divided. One contingent of contemporary thinkers generally not persuaded by such postmodernist braggadocio would be scientists (or perhaps naturalists in general). David states his belief that the animating/re-enchanting factor will be "natural" . . . and that does not seem to me to be compatible with a "post-modern perspective on the modern".

I've written another reply to David's paper that I haven't sent yet (and may not) that deals more extensively with this issue, so I won't go into it further here. But I will say that whether we label them modernist and postmodernist or whathaveyou, we have two contrasting fantasies that deserve equivalent deconstruction and analysis. Implicit in Mark's "postmodernist fantasy" is a kind of declaration that "the Kingdom of Heaven (i.e., enchantment) is at hand", at least for those illuminated by "post-modern perspective". David's "modernist fantasy" is not so "always already", but is on the cusp of being born (or, equally perhaps, of being lost or missed). I don't think David's "new animism" is a thing there only for those "who have eyes to see". And in this sense, that "new animism" bears a closer resemblance to premodern animism/enchantment (regardless of whether or not this condition was as absolute as Levy-Bruhl or Jung imagined it to be) than it does to something like Christian (or other cultic or religious) salvation.

Jerome wrote (10/2):

"traditional" natives (who have not been overly indoctrinated with a western binary point of view), what we call awe is very much part of their experience on a day-to-

day basis. Their experience of it and the way they might or might not articulate it would be different, but it is there. For them awe is not a western invention or a projection from any point of view. It is inherent in life itself and so, as we would say in one sense, "mundane," for them is always awe-inspiring.

This "awe" Jerome mentions is not just for the chosen few. It is both mundane and sublime/enchanted. I take David's claim that "postmodern science will lead us into a new kind of animism" to suggest that this "new animism" would be both sublime and mundane and would not be based on any specific lens or identity affiliation.

My point is that in approaching the subject matter of David's paper, yes we must try to define and debate the definition of some terms, but we must also wrestle with some interesting and potentially radical contentions. I would hate to see a discussion of language serve the avoidance of deeper reckonings with David's primary contentions. Specifically, if it is to be "postmodern science" that re-enchants the world, this stands to clash mightily with prevailing postmodernist perspectives that have been decidedly anti-science. Moreover, Jungianism (especially "post-Jungianism") has been more receptive to postmodernist ideas and influences than it has to science. So David's provocation carries additional impact, and perhaps threat, for a Jungian audience. That is the topic of my potentially forthcoming post.

So let's ask what is animism, what is "new animism", what are enchantment and disenchantment and re-enchantment, what is postmodern science? But let's not get too lost in chalking everything up to a cultural construction, complex, or fantasy and forget to wrestle with the implications of David's argument. I am not adverse to considering modernism a cultural complex (I have after all repeatedly argued on this list that postmodernism and Jungianism are based in cultural complexes) . . . but like any psychological complex an individual (with or without a psychotherapist to assist) might have to contend with, calling it a fantasy does not amount to an effective *treatment* of the complex. It is in the tradition of Jung to treat the psyche as real and to reckon with psychic reality, even if this requires some indulgence in transference or acceptance of mutual, arbitrary "fantasies" as bridges between individuals and conduits for healing and transformation.

A personal complex can be seen as an emergent language in which a deeper, more complex, and less tangible issue allows itself to be talked about. Psychotherapy (and/or individuation), at least in the Jungian tradition, strives to recognize, seize onto and develop this emergent language . . . to continue the story therapeutically toward increased robustness (and away from repetition compulsion), to bump the skipping phonograph needle back into a groove where the song can play out (let's not forget in the digital age that the path of the phonograph needle is an inward spiral). The challenge in facing David's essay is much like the challenge patient and analyst face in an analysis. It doesn't matter whether the fantasy is right or wrong, false or true. What matters is how its arbitrary constructions might be used to language something complex, emergent, and essential to modern psychological life. The language of the fantasy is revised and refined along the way, but some effort (a "therapeutic effort") needs to be made in order to understand what is being expressed.

Obviously, "new animism" and "re-enchantment" remain as yet un-, or at least inadequately, defined. But I contend that these things cannot be adequately defined until we venture into the story (and its central conflict) more thoroughly. We have no means yet to define these terms. Postmodernism, Jungianism, and science do not have ready made definitions we can adopt. David suggests that postmodern science may be developing the language and definition we need (albeit "unwittingly", which is all the more intriguing). I'd like to see what would happen if we actually walked in these shoes before rejecting them.

Best,
Matt

Dear Matt,

Regarding David's identification of a 'new animism' your question "what is it really that is missing . . . and why?" is a good one and I would add... in the personal and collective culture.

Why do I get the feeling Jung has been down the road of answering this question before and came up with a lack of rituals in the culture and faith in organized religion. You, as David has previously, may be suspicious of the jargon of a complex', cultural or personal, but your language below also 'flirts' with the word complex. Without knowing the object of a projection it is impossible to judge some of these imponderables. But to explore through specifics instances of looking at the sea/not looking at the sea, or up to the sky, begins to help with understanding where this new animism comes from. And if there is 'possession' about it, it may be no bad thing. We need our complexes to show us the answers to your question above. They can only do that if we're willing to hold them by whatever nominative clues we find. I can tell you the intention behind this inaugural seminar, and all those in the Issues in Jungian Psychology Series, is to walk into the forest, hand in hand with the authors. Thank you for your provocative and insightful post.

Best wishes,

Maryann

Dear Matt

Much of what you say is, as usual, perspicacious and thought-provoking. However, I would like to briefly attempt to clear up the ways in which my argument (and more broadly the post-modern perspective) differs from your representation of it.

First – fantasies. "The challenge in facing David's essay is much like the challenge patient and analyst face in an analysis. It doesn't matter whether the fantasy is right or wrong, false or true. What matters is how its arbitrary constructions might be used to language something complex, emergent, and essential to modern psychological life." I agree. However, you omit to mention that before the fantasy can be engaged with therapeutically in the way you describe, it is necessary for the fantasy to be recognised as fantasy. So long as the patient insists that her mother is,

in fact, an evil witch, only so much transformative psychological work that can be done. The important shift happens when this 'fact' is seen through as fantasy. My aim in my comments on David's post was to suggest that the enchantment/disenchantment narrative was not a historical fact but a fantasy. Once it is seen through as fantasy we can begin to work with it psychologically because this move breaks us out of literalism. In this case it is far from being a trivially linguistic point because it breaks us out of the idea that there was literally once a time when we were enchanted, and then another time when we were disenchanted, but if we do the right things there will be yet another time when we can become re-enchanted: past - present - future. Once we have broken out of this literal narrative we can entertain all kinds of creative possibilities. As you say, it is a perennial fantasy. Hesiod tells us that there was once an enchanted age of gold, and bliss it was in that dawn to be alive, but it gave way to an age of silver, the age of heroes, and we now (c. 700BC) inhabit the disenchanted age of iron, nasty brutish and short. Perhaps more relevant is the story of Philemon and Baucis, set in a disenchanted time when most have forgotten or turned their back on the gods. But in this story the gods have not died, the enchantment is still there, so long as, like Philemon and Baucis you can find it in your heart to offer it hospitality, and when you do so, says the myth, the whole world is transformed. But the point is that it was there all the time, in the midst of 'modernity' for those with eyes to see it, and for them the world was/is always already transformed. My point is that what our 'modernity' is about is the awkward and uncomfortable fact that we as moderns are enchanted and disenchanted at the same time, and indeed that that is what particularly characterises modernity. Jung's psychology, growing as it does out of his uncomfortable awareness that he is both personality one and two (enchanted and disenchanted), is well suited to engaging with the duality that cuts right through modernity, while Zizek's (and Lacan's) resolutely disenchanted psychology, by refusing to allow for the enchanted aspect only engages with one aspect of it.

You have harsh words for postmodernism. It would be absurd for me to try to defend postmodernism tout court. The term covers a multitude of attitudes and agendas. When I invoke the world, I mean mostly Derridean deconstruction. As I understand it, Derrida is not attempting an adolescent provocation in the face of his elders and betters, but a destabilisation of sedimented ideas with the aim of keeping thinking fresh and alive. The deconstructive move is critical, but not in the sense that it attempts to knock down or disprove an argument. When Derrida, for example, deconstructs Levi-Strauss's structuralism, or Levinas' Totality and Infinity, he does so with enormous respect, and the effect is to open out the argument. Far from obliterating their thinking, it serves to reveal Levi-Strauss and Levinas in a much wider and more fluid perspective, untethered to totalising essentialist assumptions. So, in this case, my aim is not to show how David is wrong, but to complexify the picture. If I try to reveal the ways in which animist cultures are not simply enchanted, and the ways in which our modern culture is not simply disenchanted, I do so not in order to score points off David and his argument, but to add a different dimension to an issue which I take seriously. It is far too early to decide that "Nothing was delivered", we are only beginning to discover the complexities and depths of what we discuss. I assume that David is reading these responses in the spirit in which they are intended, and I am encouraged in this by noting his own

deconstructive comments on the importance of destabilising the binary:
 enchantment good, disenchantment bad.

Best wishes

Mark

Re: [lajsdiscussion] Toward A New Animism: Jung, Hillman and Analytical Psychology by David Tacey you omit to mention that before the fantasy can be engaged with therapeutically in the way you describe, it is necessary for the fantasy to be recognised as fantasy. So long as the patient insists that her mother is, in fact, an evil witch, only so much transformative psychological work that can be done. The important shift happens when this 'fact' is seen through as fantasy.

Dear Mark,

You are correct, of course. That is an important distinction, and my analogy doesn't hold up in every therapeutic situation. I had been imagining a more robust psychotherapeutic/transference narrative where, as Jungians might say, some emergence of the "transcendent function" has peeped up and perhaps gestured toward a progressive direction.

My aim in my comments on David's post was to suggest that the enchantment/disenchantment narrative was not a historical fact but a fantasy. Once it is seen through as fantasy we can begin to work with it psychologically because this move breaks us out of literalism.

I agree with you, and I ask your forgiveness for using your post as a taking off point for my previous response. I meant really to respond to a trend that I noticed in the posts of a few people. You always articulate postmodernist ideas so well, though, that I only quoted from you. And this isn't entirely fair, because I agree with many of your articulations . . . even as my stance is decidedly skeptical where postmodernism is concerned. As with Jungianism, my skepticism is addressed to ideological (and ethical) interpretations of postmodernism. The seeing-through and generic deconstruction that the postmodernist lens offers does not offend me and even seems entirely compatible with Jungian/psychoanalytic analysis of culture, complex, and psyche in general.

My feeling is that all trends in intellectual discussion that have the potential to move toward unconscious fixation (where they become arguments for group identity rather than for logic) require a counterpoint. I.e. cultural complexes, whether postmodernist, Jungian, scientific/scientistic, modern, romantic, etc. tend to distort perception and derail communication (or the capacity to recognize and relate to otherness). As always, my take on anti-science attitudes in either postmodernism or Jungianism is that they are based in a cultural complex and become distorted by the irrational (and archetypal) dimensions of such a complex.

Therefore, I did not want to see David's valuation of "postmodern science" obscured behind a cloak of *postmodernism*.

In this case it is far from being a trivially linguistic point because it breaks us out of the idea that there was literally once a time when we were enchanted, and then

another time when we were disenchanted, but if we do the right things there will be yet another time when we can become re-enchanted: past - present - future. Once we have broken out of this literal narrative we can entertain all kinds of creative possibilities.

I don't disagree. The central problem in this language (as I see it) is that enchantment/disenchantment is a mythopoetic construction . . . which (to be simplistic but not, I think, totally inaccurate) is "romantic", and the romantic is a decidedly modern mindset. Much Jungianism operates in this mythopoetic/romantic/modernist fantasy or grammar. That is a potential problem (at least a complication) in itself . . . but not David's fault, nor is it important (I think) to the primary argument of his paper. David's audience is Jungian, and one speaks to Jungians in Jungian dialect if one is to be understood (think how much my talk of tribalism drives Jungians crazy . . . it is not part of the Jungian dialect). So my feeling is that we cannot only deconstruct the mythopoeticism of "enchantment". We must also try to understand what it might mean. We have to interpret it.

David does not pursue this in his paper, but he suggests that "postmodern science" has been developing the necessary language for such an interpretation. I am entirely in favor of moving out of the mythopoetic construction of enchantment/postmodern science. But I think we have to move *through* it first. If we render it to dust, then we have no way to talk about the issue David is trying to introduce.

So, can we understand what enchantment/disenchantment means to the Jungian mindset? I think, yes, we can . . . because enchantment like this is, as you rightly note, a "modernist [and specifically a *romantic* modernist] fantasy". And Jungianism is fundamentally romantic (albeit, I think, not *only* romantic). "Enchantment" may still be available all around us, but the romantic modern feels disenchanted. I don't think this feeling of disenchantment is purely delusional. Something *is* missing that is felt to be needed (at least by the romantic). And one of the primary struggles regarding this feeling of disenchantment is that it is damn near impossible to language adequately. If we could language it well enough, we would know how to look right in front of our noses to find that missing "enchantment" or soul. But we fail again and again to do this in a sustainable way. Jungian psychotherapy strives to develop a treatment for this. Therefore, I would argue that deposing of the modernist fantasy of "enchantment" is akin to neutering the Jungian psychotherapeutic project.

What needs to be worked at instead is the relanguaging of this woundedness and need . . . because the mythopoetic language is not robust enough, does not work well enough for a diversity of people. I think David's hunch that "postmodern science" holds an important key to this relanguaging project is a good one. But currently (for the romantic or the Jungian), this "postmodern science" is a vague otherness, a mystical archetype, a fantasy itself. That is, it is being imagined only through the mythopoetic imagination and it appears as a kind of inferior function (to us). What I see at the core of David's paper is a call for the reevaluation of the inferior function that has been spontaneously and autonomously emerging and inveigling itself into our egoic, romantic mythopoeticism . . . the character of our cultural complex.

But the point is that it was there all the time, in the midst of 'modernity' for those with eyes to see it, and for them the world was/is always already transformed. My point is that what our 'modernity' is about is the awkward and uncomfortable fact that we as moderns are enchanted and disenchanting at the same time, and indeed that that is what particularly characterises modernity.

As I mentioned in the last post, I think it is only fair to call this construction a "postmodernist fantasy". The question (as with David's construction) is, can this be relanguaged/reimagined in a more progressive way? For instance (and as before), this fantasy is very exclusive ("for those who have eyes to see it"). And since it is thus based on the utilization of a certain (probably arbitrary) lens, it is bound to divide people up into believers and non-believers, the chosen and the infidels (to state it more dramatically). But is there any way of determining (in a more universal language) whether this particular lens or paradigm is functional or accurate? Is there any way to *avoid* telling those who still feel "disenchanted" that it is really their own fault for not having the right beliefs, not picking the right religion or God? I worry that this dissolves into a tribalistic Us vs. Them dichotomy. And is that kind of tribalism modern or postmodern? I don't think so, because it doesn't respond to the reality of the modern world which is massively diverse, population dense, and increasingly culturally "global".

This is to be contrasted with prehistoric and premodern tribalism where the "enchanted" religion was supported by the entire tribe. Today there is no "one tribe", but there is a common language and a largely shared social/political/economic/environmental reality. The project of "re-enchantment" cannot be a conversion of all moderns to one religion or worldview. It would have to be a universally available set of languaging tools that did not require those who used them to belong to a specific tribe or uphold a specific tribal ideology.

But more specifically, we are talking about the relationship of human beings with nature. And the problem (perhaps this is the disenchantment) is that human culture tends to function as a prophylactic against nature. That may be an evolved adaptation . . . that capacity to control and manipulate the environment so extensively as to make it almost a non-factor in survivable living. But our species' environmental footprint has become so severe that nature is once again howling barbarously at our gate. It demands that we radically rethink the way we interact with nature (in much the same way that insurgent psychological complexes demand we reorganize our relationship with our own personal nature or with the structure and dynamics of the autonomous psyche). In this context, enchantment/disenchantment is at best an extremely abstract metaphor for the problem at hand.

I would suggest that this is less a "religious" issue than a matter of developing a stronger sense of conscious responsibility for the effects and externalities our habitual, modern maintenance of selfhood has on others and otherness (including other species and other/external ecosystems).

You have harsh words for postmodernism. It would be absurd for me to try to defend postmodernism tout court. The term covers a multitude of attitudes and agendas. When I invoke the world, I mean mostly Derridean deconstruction. As I

understand it, Derrida is not attempting an adolescent provocation in the face of his elders and betters, but a destabilisation of sedimented ideas with the aim of keeping thinking fresh and alive. The deconstructive move is critical, but not in the sense that it attempts to knock down or disprove an argument. When Derrida, for example, deconstructs Levi-Strauss's structuralism, or Levinas' Totality and Infinity, he does so with enormous respect, and the effect is to open out the argument. Far from obliterating their thinking, it serves to reveal Levi-Strauss and Levinas in a much wider and more fluid perspective, untethered to totalising essentialist assumptions.

I have no real objection to Derridean deconstruction as an analytical or perspectival tool. I'm nowhere near an expert on Derrida, but from the readings I have done, I agree that he is respectful and not inherently adolescent or nihilistic. But I also think the Christian ethical message in the Gospels is relatively sound . . . and yet I am adamantly opposed to the many atrocities committed in the name of Christ and Christianity. The problem is that deconstructive tools are potentially powerful weapons. Deconstruction (from what I have seen and read, and please correct me if I am wrong) does not have an ethical component to accompany the use of its tool and manage the way it is used. The result is something like selling handguns cheaply at street side stands to anyone who has the cash. That is, the people most inclined to purchase and use these weapons are the ones who are most likely to use them violently and tribally (where we could imagine the tribe as a street gang). The weapons enable the already existent gang violence impulse. What develops is an ideology of the gun, a sense that the gun is the "god" behind one's identity (as we see in gang mentality). These gangs are predominantly adolescent. The adolescent mentality is most susceptible to this form of tribal empowerment and self-definition.

I don't think it can be contested that Derridean deconstruction has been used tribally and violently and repeatedly so over the last decades in academia. I am inclined to think ethically about this. I am opposed to the cult of the gun. I see it as dangerous and purely destructive. My objection to postmodernism is an objection to this kind of "violent" tribalism *as it has been and continues to be practiced*. A secondary objection I have to such postmodernism (and even to its more dignified founders like Derrida) is that no ethical system of tool/weapon management was written into the philosophy. The potential dangerousness/divisiveness of the tools coupled with the lack of ethical maintenance leads inevitably to adolescent, gang-like, tribalistic culture and the use of the tribal tools for identity-protection (which includes both the defense of cultural identity and the attack/destruction of those with other cultural identities and affiliations).

From a pre-modern tribal standpoint, what is lacking in the culture of postmodernism is ego-dissolving initiation into responsible adulthood. The same problem is presented to psychoanalysis and analytical psychology where analysis and pathologization are potentially dangerous weapons. Sometimes this has created unnecessary "violence" and gang-like behavior, but it has been mediated (with reasonable effectiveness) by a more mature sense of therapeutic concern for patients (the other in this equation), and also by some (albeit remote) relationship to the pattern of initiation into adulthood.

Postmodernism has no such mediating factor or ideology/value system. What I see as potentially dangerous in the incorporation of postmodernism into Jungian thought is that this demands a radical increase in ethical consciousness and awareness of the potential gang-like/"violent" usage of postmodernist tools. Can we adopt the tools without adopting the culture*? And how much awareness of this problem of adoption has been demonstrated in the Jungian community and literature so far? From what I've seen, essentially zip. And that frightens me, because I think it threatens to regress Jungian thinking. Jungianism has always existed on the cusp of adolescence (as the obsession/complex with puer/senex suggests). It has classically envisioned and been attracted to initiation into adulthood, but has always had "threshold jitters" (e.g., moral polarization of archetypes, a problem with the hero, a distaste for/devaluation of the physical/biological, and no effective response to/treatment of inflation).

[* see how this same question plays out currently with evolutionary psychology's potential incorporation into Jungianism. Here, many Jungians show awareness and voice opposition. This is a double standard, a sign of clear unconsciousness in our relationship to postmodernism.]

This makes postmodernist insemination all the more dangerous. Can the adoption of the postmodernist tools and culture be ethically mediated by already an shaky Jungian cultural apparatus of initiation into adult responsibility? Or will that influx of adolescent aggression and temptation bog down the initiation capacity of Jungian culture, pushing Jungianism into an increasingly dysfunctional and non-adaptive tribalism? In other words, are we "mature" enough to use postmodernist tools wisely and ethically and resist their attraction to tribalist dynamics? Without any demonstration of awareness about this issue in the Jungian community, one must conclude that no, we are not "mature" enough as a culture or tribe. And therefore, we have no *Jungian* perspective on postmodernism, no counterpoint, no ability to mediate it. In essence, we may not have a functional immune system (i.e., cultural identity) to deal with the parsing of ideological postmodernism.

So, in this case, my aim is not to show how David is wrong, but to complexify the picture. If I try to reveal the ways in which animist cultures are not simply enchanted, and the ways in which our modern culture is not simply disenchanting, I do so not in order to score points off David and his argument, but to add a different dimension to an issue which I take seriously.

I support you in the objective of complexification, and you present essential questions that we definitely need to wrestle with. My intention is not to oppose you in this, but to add additional complexification in the form of advocating that we must both deconstruct the language being used and also maintain an ethical awareness of how we accomplish that deconstruction and what its ramifications might be.

I definitely *don't* see you as guilty of wanting to destroy David's argument. I don't feel that "nothing was delivered". I meant to speak up in the name of making sure that we are conscious of the possibility that, left uncontested and un-complexified, the systemic attraction of "nothing was delivered" deconstructive nihilism could potentially become the Charybdis to the mythopoetic/romantic Scylla. I am hoping

we can steer between them and find the underlying current that might move this journey onward.

Best regards (and Godspeed),
Matt

I have been following this discussion on David's fine paper "Toward a New Animism: Jung's Vision of Reality" for the last few days, coming into it a bit late, yet, I have been interested in the questions and ideas focused most recently on the metaphors David uses to get at the meaning of the paper's key terms. I want to begin with a quote by the most recent discussant, Matt Koeske:

Obviously, "new animism" and "re-enchantment" remain as yet un-, or at least inadequately, defined. But I contend that these things cannot be adequately defined until we venture into the story (and its central conflict) more thoroughly. We have no means yet to define these terms.

Here are some preliminary questions: "How might we enter more deeply into the terms of the story?" "Is there a central conflict to be ventured into revolving around the concept of projection?" "What might the means be to help us further attempt to define the terms 'new animism,' 're-enchantment,' and 'withdrawal of projections'?" There appears to be some mixed feelings about the use of the term "re-enchantment."

In the context of David's hypothesis, placed in a literary context that is poetical (Lawrence) and part of Jung's ongoing project to move beyond a "modernist and Cartesian project of the withdrawal of projections" in the "opposite direction towards the "reanimation of the world," I do not object to the use of the word "re-animation." Perhaps, in the interests of further asking David to be more precise about definitions of terminology, it would be helpful to amplify the context of Lawrence's statement "we can't go back." Can't go back to what? To David's stage one: enchantment through animism and pantheism? It seems that some amplification is missing here and may be helpful. Lawrence wrote in another place: "The truth of the matter is, one cannot go back.... and I know that I could never go back. Back towards the past, savage life. One cannot go back. It is one's destiny inside one."

A further question to David is this: "Did Lawrence arrive at his metaphor of the 'great swerve, that seems a retrogression" after he read Jung?" I assume he did. I read Lawrence's "great swerve" as a symbol that led him to a new style of *incantation* in New Mexico, and this swerve to what he called the "old, old root of human consciousness" might have a direct bearing on what re-animation in analytical psychology means in the category of a hypothetical stage three: "re-animating the world."

By "retrogression," was Lawrence thinking of Jung's idea of regression of the libido back to the mother? I don't want to go on at too much length about this, as I have written about it elsewhere in published and unpublished works, yet, I feel it is vital to insert into the discussion a fact that Lawrence was indeed reading Jung's "Psychology of the Unconscious" in December of 1918, at the same time he was writing his essays on "The Transcendent Element in American (Classic) Literature." He was also speaking in letters also about going to America, and arrived in Taos several years before Jung did, while searching for his own myth outside his culture and his time. It

was while listening to the sound of the chanting of Native Americans in New Mexico, furthermore, and the sound of the Taos drums, that Lawrence's Christian identity, upon which he says his European character had been established, was "shattered" and he was left with feelings of awe and reverence for something profoundly "religious." This may have been the moment of his great swerve. So when you write that "Jung attempts Lawrence's great detour toward the primal mysteries" it is important to consider whether it may not actually have been the other way around: Lawrence may have attempted Jung's detour and fell into it, in Taos.

Another question I have is whether Jung "kept hitting a conceptual and epistemological brick wall" in "his scientific thinking" that kept him from being carried "across the dualistic boundary which separates psyche and world." This sounds rather questionable, as Jung makes no distinction between his usage of the words "soul" and "mind" in "Mind and Earth," and he was already thinking from his heart, as Mountain Lake had taught him in Taos, as early as 1934, and was cautiously searching for a conceptual way to think with heart, from the depths of the oneness of body and psyche, or from "tap-root" to break the "space-time" barrier with parapsychological facts, which had interested him even prior to his advancing his theories of complex psychology.

I want to further question whether Jung's scientific hypothesis of the collective psyche really failed to "carry him across the dualistic boundary which separates psyche and world." Was Jung "groping in the dark for a science that has not yet been invented"? Or, did Jung lay down a cornerstone for it, with his theory of archetypes? The title of your paper and your references to poetry and synchronicity would seem to suggest that he did.

I like "re-enchantment" because of the context in which you situate it, David. Webster's traces the word enchantment to the Latin *incantare*, from *in* "against" + *cantare*, to sing or chant. Both Jung and Lawrence were attempting to find a way to chant against dualism. Jung's music can be heard throughout much of his works. Lawrence's is of course more obvious. The meaning of *incantare* I prefer in this context is a ceremonial chanting, or reciting of incantations (as for curing disease). Lawrence, after all, was a chanter, a poet and great writer, and Jung too relied on poetry and mythopoetic metaphors to get at his scientific meanings, as when he says in his opening line "mind and earth" has a "slightly poetic ring."

Paradoxically, it is precisely at this moment in the history of analytical psychology that "re-animation" is reasserting itself as a notion to assist in the process of healing disembodied thoughts of apparent splits by re-visioning Jung's views on projection. The idea of a return "back" to "tap-root" (Jung's term) or the "old, old root of human consciousness" (Lawrence's) as a way to move forward towards a new animism, as a destiny inside us, is present in Jung's *Seminars on Children's Dreams*, when he speaks of something in "the soul of the child, shaping his whole destiny, as well as those retrospective intuitions which reach back far beyond the range of childhood experience into the life of our ancestors." The roots for this idea may be found present in embryo form in his 1912 masterpiece, before Lawrence's reading of it, probably the 1916 Beatrice Hinkle translation lent to him by a friend. I submit these prefatory questions to ask for further clarification. I like your basic hypothesis, David. Thank you.

Steven B. Herrmann, PhD, MFT

Dear Maryann,

This by way of response to two of your posts:

I do not see the new animism, as I am calling it, as part of a cultural complex. I think that topic is riding on a different tram. I am co-editing a book on cultural complexes at this moment, so it is relevant to my interests. But I do not see any real overlap, apart from the obvious fact that cultural complexes and the new animism take our discussion and attention into culture and cosmos, as you suggest. The new animism is a return to modern consciousness of a different pattern of seeing. It sees the world as "alive", and this aliveness is not reducible to human projections onto the world.

There is something inherently alive about the world, and this has been kept from our sight for some time now, at least during the more rational phases of intellectual enlightenment. However, there were always those who were not convinced by rational enlightenment, such as Spinoza in particular, and now is the time to "rediscover" these thinkers, who will pave the way to the new consciousness, in my view. It is interesting to see how eco-philosophy is now retrieving Spinoza from the fogs of intellectual history, just as eco-theology is doing similar things with Meister Eckhart.

The crisis of the ecological emergency will do a great deal to hasten the return of animistic thinking - except that we have to learn to dissociate animism from Tylor, who gave it a merely negative definition. The term "animism" itself may be recoverable, however.

Yes, the new animism and re-enchantment are not the same thing, either. But again, there is overlap. Re-enchantment has the sense of a conscious project, a goal or aspiration in culture. The new animism, however, has the sense of something involuntarily rising into consciousness, an autonomous movement of the psyche. Far from being a conscious or deliberate project, it is often an interruption, an embarrassment of sorts, until properly claimed and understood.

I think one point I am trying to make in this seminar, is that some of what we habitually call projections, especially cultural constructions of gods and spirit, may not be projections. To assume that gods are projections of the human is not to think in accordance with a major vein of Jung's thought.

I am trying to get Jungian psychology to become more conscious of its own language and terminology - and its own methods.

best,
David

Dear Matt and All,

I think that most of the issues you raise in this long email have been responded to in the ensuing discussion, and therefore do not need special attention. Mark and I

have discussed shifting enchantment / disenchantment / re-enchantment from "stages" to "modes" of consciousness. As modes, they cannot be confined to stages, but may be found at the same time in history, within overlapping circles.

On the topic of postmodernism, I tend to agree with you that largely this movement has simply been a form of ultra-modernism. That is, it has not genuinely transcended modernity, but has merely extended it into new forms, and to some extent deepened its nihilism. One of my colleagues calls it "most-modernism". However, there is another side of postmodernism, which does not get as much air-play. This is its redemptive and theological aspect, in which traditional beliefs are brought back into play and experienced in new ways. One of the best books on this cultural phenomenon is Charlene Spretnak's *States of Grace: The Recovery of Meaning in the Postmodern Age*. This truly inspired book helps us see the element of transcendence that postmodernism has exposed us to, in ways in which modernism did not. Then there is the important volume by Graham Ward called *The Postmodern God*. The last 10 or 15 books by Jacques Derrida all operate in this redemptive mode, and should be consulted, especially his book *Religion*, but also *Of Spirit*. Everything written by postmodern philosophers John Caputo, Michael Scanlon and Kevin Hart operates in the transcendent mode.

Those who constantly complain about the nihilism of postmodernity should explore this library of works which opens up the possibility of re-enchantment in the postmodern period. If people spent as much time reading postmodern works instead of complaining about them, we might have a deeper level of discussion. I myself have made a small contribution to this field, with a book on re-enchantment and cultural studies, and individual essays on the return of mystical vision in the works of late Derrida, and in the postmodern Freudian psychoanalytic movement.

Then there is the separate but related field of postmodern science, which is another matter entirely. I don't have time to go into this at any length, except to say that what we are finding in philosophy, depth psychology and cultural studies is perhaps more strongly evident in postmodern science. Along with Samuel Beckett, we can conclude that "Something is taking its course".

best,

David

La Trobe University, Melbourne

Discussion on Projection & Animism

On the topic of Projections & Animism: There is a fine, if now old, essay by Giegerich on this topic: *The Leap After the Throw: On 'Catching Up With' Projections and the Origin of Psychology*. Originally published 1979 in German, this is now translated in Vol. 1 Collected English Papers 2005. It addresses points raised by David Tacey and John Dourley - from a different perspective, clearly, but fastidiously thought through as ever with G.

With thanks to thoughtful contributions. It is a pleasure to read IAJS posts once again.

Regards, Judith

Judith, I have not seen this article, and thanks for pointing it out. Are you referring to the Collected English Papers of Giegerich? My personal library does not have these papers, nor does my university library. I would like to order them, if possible, so thanks for pointing to this article. I try to read as much Giegerich as I can lay my hands on, but sometimes his works are hard to find. I have just finished reading his wonderful study on the *Red Book* in the current issue of *Spring Journal*, and am amazed at the high quality of his penetrating analysis. It has really set the pace for Red Book discussions into the future.

Thanks,

David

Hi John,

I have been pondering your reply for a few days, but I don't think you have grappled with the real issue re: projection and animism. The main point I made is that Jung does not support "withdrawing projections" in the blanket, automatic, unreflective, chant-like way in which this is repeated in Jungian and therapy circles. Your reply does not respond to this main point, but side-steps it by going into academic discourse about epistemology. We may not like the fact that Jung himself was ambivalent about the 'sacred cow' of withdrawing projections, but it is something that we have to try to face, however dreadful and shocking it seems.

Anima Mundi is certainly not a Cartesian perspective, and I don't see how you could even suggest this.

But there is no need to read me on this, or Hillman on this, but we simply have to re-read Jung himself with open eyes.

best wishes,

David

David,

I don't think getting to Jung's rather sophisticated late epistemology is side-stepping any issue. The point I want to dwell on is that the recovery of the soul of the world and the sense of the one world is a consequence of the recovery of that interior point in which the psyche connects with the soul of the world and its underlying unity. This reconnection is in the first instance a profoundly inner precondition to the perception of either the soul in the world or the sense of an underlying unity or substrate as the ultimate resource in grounding diversity in a generative unity. I think

in the end the recovery of the inner connection is one of humanity's greatest survival strategies. Otherwise our faiths will consume us. This is why I think your line of enquiry is so valuable in restoring the lost link with the inner point of coincidence of soul with world.

Anyway, I see where you say that you have more pressing fish to fry as do I. Thanks for the paper and its stimulation.

All the very best.

John

Thank you for the interesting discussion! For years ago I used to live in the Finnish Lapland, with the reindeer-keeping Sami people. For many of them the world of spirits is as real as houses, cars, shops and other visible things in the modern world. Those people also think in terms of mythology, which makes the life very poetic and romantic. There is a saying for almost anything: for the fire escaping the hearth, where to make a camp and where not, how to get fish...and so on. The mountain tops on the fells are characterised as personalities and their spirits are present in everyday life. It is, however, impossible to realise which part of the mythological state of mind comes from individual people's present fears and hopes, which is traditional knowledge passed on for generations, and which of the voices belong to the 'real spirits'. I think, and have the experience that much of the spiritual world corresponds to the unconscious that is personified and, in some cases, projected on the outside world. Much of the spiritual world is black magic, an evil eye turning on you, a spell or a curse, superstitious beliefs of all kinds. Even in the spiritual world, among the spirits, it still takes an individual and an individuated mind to decide whom and what to believe. Whether to believe in what everybody else seems to believe in, or make one's own choices and take the social responsibility for them. It is a good point that we have never left, and never will leave, the world of animism. Take the global epidemic flues, for example. Whole countries in Europe vaccinated their citizens against the H1N1 'swine flu', a process that was not completely free from signs of mass hysteria and fear of the unknown. The decision to not to take the vaccine was not easy to make, when almost everybody else was taking it. You should make a personal decision but also think of your children and family, of their friends and the whole society. The possibility of an evil eye staring from the crowds or the skies above at the ones disobeying the rule became strangely realistic.

Paivi

David,

Further to my earlier question - is discussion of 'animism' - and 'the new animism' - part of two disciplines - both anthropology and religious studies? These two fields are contingent rather than interwoven, I suspect.

The human phenomenon of religious belief can be contemplated in either of these disciplines. Perhaps a psychological investigation is closer to philosophy or religious studies than anthropology?

I know that in the grand scheme of things, this does not matter after all - but it helps to distinguish criteria; stories of how various people personify or animate (in other ways) material objects, or how electricity is perceived as a miraculous occurrence or as a scientific fact (which mechanisms we may never fully uncover) are ways of contemplating the same event. Anthropological reports or observations still keep the observer on the outside in that perspective. Religious studies gets closer to an inside, subjective look at these events, no? (I am still taking on Byron's passionate response about Zizek's piece for which, thanks.)

Jung's stories of his encounters with Pueblo Indians, as he called them, have a religious/psychological perspective - their morning practices urged the sun on its way; and he explores the nature of their belief - and conveys the closeness of their cultural outlook to their personal belief and psychology. In some ways, he empathises closely, + he begins to participate (to use a word laden with baggage in Jungian literature). But he is not an anthropologist - I am becoming confused as to how /why anthropological data is being employed here.

Just as in Jung's discussion in *Psychological Types* about nominalism points at the distinctions of a psychological approach to that ancient philosophical dilemma is explored in engaging terms; it is a psychological analysis closely intertwined with religious beliefs of Abelard and Luther. However, I do not accuse Jung of 'psychologism' in contemplating those philosophical issues because his fundamental point (in related ways like Nietzsche's ideas too) is that philosophy and psychology, or personality types, are constituted a priori by the contemplating philosopher - as are all our thoughts and studies.

a shaman is a religious figure and probably our contemplation of the shaman's powers are to do with those religious powers rather than to do with a study of the tribe, somehow. its hierarchy or status of women, etc. sorry for the ill-defined nature of my question here - Leslie from London

Dear Leslie and all,

The issue of disciplines is a vexed one, and difficult to answer clearly. If analytical psychology had been accepted into the university system, which it has not, then it would simply be a matter of pointing to "analytical psychology" as the appropriate discipline. Currently it seems to be an off-campus discipline, so to speak. It sometimes finds its way into various related disciplines, but not always. In some ways, Jungian psychology is technically "undisciplined" by the nature of its project.

Jung often drew our attention to the fluidity of disciplinary boundaries:

"I can hardly draw a veil over the fact that we psychotherapists ought really to be philosophers or philosophic doctors - or rather that we already are so, though we are unwilling to admit it because of the glaring contrast between our work and what passes for

philosophy in the universities. We could also call it religion *in statu nascendi*, for in the vast confusion that reigns at the roots of life there is no line of division between philosophy and religion". - "Psychotherapy and a Philosophy of Life", 1943, CW Vol 16, § 181.

The psyche does not respect disciplinary boundaries, and nor can a depth psychologist, up to a point. One needs to go where psyche is found, and in the case of the new animism, this means moving across depth psychology, religious studies, anthropology and sociology. Pedants and sticklers in the academic system will cry "foul" at this fluidity, and request that each scholar should keep to her/his own boundaries of expertise, but in the interests of pursuit of truth, such "silo" thinking is not always possible. The fact is that there can be no expertise where psyche is concerned; because psyche is our teacher, not we its teacher.

regards,

David

La Trobe University, Melbourne

Dear David, Lesley and all,
I so appreciate the phrase of Jung's you included, David:
the vast confusion that reigns at the roots of life.

It was precisely this issue that I thought Maryanne's reference highlighted and to which I responded, linking trauma (War and incest) with a buried Eros:

Jung's prefaces. The first one in this volume was written in Dec.1916, the next one Oct. 1918 and so on. In the first one Jung is writing about *the psychological concomitants of the World War* – and the problem of the chaotic unconscious which slumbers uneasily beneath the ordered world of consciousness.

(Jung explores further, and for the rest of his life as far as I can make out the need for the individual to return to the "ground of human nature", to digest 'neurosis'. Interestingly very early Jung recognized the order buried in chaos – that contemporary 'chaos theory' elaborates.)

Jung goes on to ask where is the mighty Eros in this muddle? The question is certainly alive today!

The difficulty of learning to actually 'see'/ etc. is how Jung sometimes describes the process of individuation. And yes, David, how to surrender to this 'learning', and engage with it? Personally, I don't think we need to 'animate' or re-enchant the world. More, I

am interested in a capacity to engage and live within what I am 'seeing'. The care required for looking...details...and the need to explore the art of being willing even NOT to see... leaving some 'things' BEYOND our reach/grasp. In this context I have found Randy Malamud's article (Animals on Film) in the recent *Spring* (Vol. 83, 2010) most evocative. And Judith, it is in the same volume as Giegerich's article on the Red Book – which I why I bought this volume too!

I find that few people I meet have any idea that there is actually a vitality within them that is more than a surface gush of what I am calling now 'the wow factor' that seems to blanket the person's 'essential' 'way' of living. In connection with this I have been re-reading Sean Mc.Grath (Dept. Of Philosophy, Memorial University Newfoundland, Canada) article in our **International Journal of Jungian Studies, Vol 2 No.1. March 2010 pp 1 – 20**. I am not referring above to being trapped in 'subjectivization'...I am connecting it more with what Mc.Grath is calling for – a fullscale reconstruction of Jung's relationship to Western esoteric traditions. (Footnote 2) This need rings true for me...

Actually the whole Journal issue is germane to our present topic. I wonder if 'our' academics feel their work is actually being read and related to? Our list hardly seems to refer to the scholars who are actually contributing to IAJS. Perhaps I am looking in all the wrong places...and heavens only knows how hard it is to 'be' 'current'.

Yes, Lesley I think both statements about the sun are true! The experience of always seeing the sun in 'this and that' position is (or at least, used to be, part the *experience of living in a cosmos, with feet on the ground*. What has gone missing is 'us in a cosmos', perhaps....

Best wishes,
Evangeline Rand

Dear Leslie

Thanks for this. My immediate response is to agree that a kind of Babel-like cacophony can result if there is insufficient notice is given to the specificity of the disciplines from which evidence is plucked. Jungian discourse can be very prone to this kind of almost random harvesting of vaguely appropriate but insufficiently digested information from whichever source is available, whether it be religion, philosophy, anthropology, quantum theory, brain science, history of ideas, sociology, literature, theory etc etc. Jung was guilty of this kind of thing himself. However, it is also true that analytical psychology is a rather liminal field: it inhabits the borders between disciplines, borders which do not always 'officially' exist, and as

a Hermetic science it makes connections where nobody expects connections. So the apparently bizarre juxtaposition of, say, anthropological discourse with, say, theological discourse, both presented within a psychological context do sometimes make a kind of Mercurial sense. The same kind of (in)coherent sense which can emerge from work on the strange and disparate elements of a dream. But this is a nice trick to pull off and it is very easy to fall on your face. It requires a very light hand. (sorry about the mixed metaphors)

With regard to anthropology, you suggest that “anthropological reports or observations still keep the observer on the outside in that perspective”. I make no claims to being more than a patchily informed layman in this field, but I understand that this very question is keenly argued over within anthropology. Anthropologists use a wonderful term to describe field work done in relative consciousness of this problem: ‘participant observation’. I like the paradoxical nature of this term, and it feels very relevant to what we do in psychotherapy. One foot in and one foot out. Enchanted disenchantment?

Of course the armchair anthropologists of yore (Tylor, Frazer etc) were observing the observations of other field workers, observers who took little cognizance of how their own presence was affecting the data they were collecting, just as the early dynamic psychiatrists were blissfully ignorant of the complex transference tangles they were getting into with their patients.

Best wishes

Mark

Dear David, Lesley and all,

I so appreciate the phrase of Jung’s you included, David:
the vast confusion that reigns at the roots of life.

It was precisely this issue that I thought Maryanne’s reference highlighted and to which I responded, linking trauma (War and incest) with a buried Eros:

Jung’s prefaces. The first one in this volume was written in Dec.1916, the next one Oct. 1918 and so on. In the first one Jung is writing about *the psychological concomitants of the World War* – and the problem of the chaotic unconscious which slumbers uneasily beneath the ordered world of consciousness.

(Jung explores further, and for the rest of his life as far as I can make out the need for the individual to return to the “ground of human nature”, to digest ‘neurosis’. Interestingly very early Jung recognized the order buried in chaos – that contemporary ‘chaos theory’ elaborates.)

Jung goes on to ask where is the mighty Eros in this muddle? The question is certainly alive today!

The difficulty of learning to actually 'see'/ etc. is how Jung sometimes describes the process of individuation. And yes, David, how to surrender to this 'learning', and engage with it? Personally, I don't think we need to 'animate' or re-enchant the world. More, I am interested in a capacity to engage and live within what I am 'seeing'. The care required for looking...details...and the need to explore the art of being willing even NOT to see... leaving some 'things' BEYOND our reach/grasp. In this context I have found Randy Malamud's article (Animals on Film) in the recent *Spring* (Vol. 83, 2010) most evocative. And Judith, it is in the same volume as Giegerich's article on the Red Book – which I why I bought this volume too!

I find that few people I meet have any idea that there is actually a vitality within them that is more than a surface gush of what I am calling now 'the wow factor' that seems to blanket the person's 'essential' 'way' of living. In connection with this I have been re-reading Sean Mc.Grath (Dept. Of Philosophy, Memorial University Newfoundland, Canada) article in our **International Journal of Jungian Studies, Vol 2 No.1. March 2010 pp 1 – 20.** I am not referring above to being trapped in 'subjectivization'...I am connecting it more with what Mc.Grath is calling for – a fullscale reconstruction of Jung's relationship to Western esoteric traditions. (Footnote 2) This need rings true for me...

Actually the whole Journal issue is germane to our present topic. I wonder if 'our' academics feel their work is actually being read and related to? Our list hardly seems to refer to the scholars who are actually contributing to IAJS. Perhaps I am looking in all the wrong places...and heavens only knows how hard it is to 'be' 'current'.

Yes, Lesley I think both statements about the sun are true! The experience of always seeing the sun in 'this and that' position is (or at least, used to be, part the *experience of living in a cosmos, with feet on the ground*. What has gone missing is 'us in a cosmos', perhaps....

Best wishes,
Evangeline Rand
Edmonton, Alberta,
Canada

Dear David,
Yes - there are now 3 volumes of G.'s Collected English Papers - and this essay is in Vol. 1. (Spring pub.s). The 4th Vol. is due out in November I believe.

It's a pleasure that someone else appreciated the in-depth review of the *Red Book*, my having bought a copy of Spring Journal for this purpose. Whether or not this "sets the pace for *R.Book* discussion in future" ?? I don't follow the Jungian Journals, but from knowledge of previous history I rather suspect he may not be taken up.

I am not a scholar, but I recognise "philosophical eros" when I come across it - which Giegerich's work embodies in good measure. Since hearing him address the Guild of Pastoral Psychology, I seek out & buy his volumes. Only in this way can I return to particular passages when my mind balks at something (regularly!) - and I want to re-read how he arrives at etc. He is through-and-through 'psychological' (and historical) - and this adds what, for me, is an absolutely needed dimension, a 'thickness' or layerd-ness, to the religious / metaphysical in which I move more naturally & perhaps too easily.

Hope you can get hold of a copy of the essay in question.

Regards, Judith

I'll jump in, David, though from the point of view of my own preoccupations.

Back in 1987, I argued that the notion of projection, specifically in terms of the patient projecting something into the analyst which the analyst experienced but knew was part of the patient's psyche, was not sound. The Latin verb *proicere* means to hurl across, and applies to the throwing of a javelin. Hence, aside from an unfriendly etymology, projection depends on the notion of empty space between humans. Does such an empty space exist? is this the only ground upon which to conceive of human relations? There are other metaphors and theories to consider. And I spent a lot of time later in the 1990s saying that the notion of empty space was such a problem because of its profoundly apolitical nature. (*The Plural Psyche*, pp. 143-174, and *The Political Psyche*, pp. 267-286).

As far as animism is concerned, I think there's a social aspect in that institutions and organisations have a 'life of their own'. I realise vitalism isn't the same as animism but I think there are links. (If this has come up before, I apologise, but I haven't been able to keep up with the discussion.) The reference would be *Politics on the Couch*, pp. 64-66. I can't remember who it was who wrote of the 'sensuousness of things'.

Lastly, one of my teachers, Joe Redfearn, wrote a paper on something like 'When are persons things and things persons?'. I know I've got the title not quite right but there'll be a *JAP* reader who will know.

Now, a personal note. I applaud and admire the sheer care you are taking in conducting this seminar. The layout of your replies, the footnotes and so forth, is way beyond what one usually gets on line. Reminds me of what we've missed on this list.

Andrew

Dear David and all,

I appreciate the conversations you've initiated so far. I especially like the talk about the limits of the concept of "projection" and the idea that the concept of "stages" of development may be able to be replaced with the idea of "modes of consciousness." I wonder if what we have problematically called "projection" might in part be more accurately be thought of as the interaction between modes of consciousness? Further, that this interaction, with all of its bumpiness, grinding, and seeming distress that we are inclined to "treat" reflects the way the modes of consciousness are inclined to relate to each other (possibly a telic relationship?).

From this perspective the possibility of a "reanimation" of the world might be taking place through this "transformational" or "emergent" relationship between the modes of consciousness, which might be a description of the activity of the "transcendent function" or "objective psyche." This might imply that the rise of the modern individuated subject is an expression of the objectivity of psyche; however, not at the expense of reducing the earlier "collective" psyche to something less objective. Rather, with both being expressions of the objective psyche could we say that the "telos" of each is the emergent "postmodern" mode of consciousness?

Also, when Wilhelm Dilthey says that "into each new home we must take the old gods with us" I think he is reflecting on the objectivity of the relationship between modes of consciousness within the objective psyche. An application of this is in both yours and Andrew's work in which what you are calling the "postmodern" mode of consciousness may be attempting to re-enchant our experience by challenging the "modern self" to come out of its shell back into the social fabric.

Just wondering about where the thought goes,

Peter T. Dunlap

Dear all,

I have been mulling over various strains of thought that have been expressed so far in this seminar. The first concerns projections. There are some problems with the notion of projection, not the least of which is that it incorporates an inappropriate physical fantasy -- that of a sort of thrower ejecting or projecting something into the world like a javelin or a football. Giegerich points this out in "The leap after the throw: On 'catching up with projections and the origin of psychology,'" *The Neurosis of Psychology* (Spring 2005). But literalist fantasies abound in psychology - "object relations," anyone? - and don't necessarily invalidate the phenomena which they address. I think this is the case with projections.

Recently, I heard a wonderful rabbinical saying: "We don't see things the way *they* are. We see things the way *we* are." Blake put it even more succinctly: "As a man is, so he sees." These wise statements seem much more psychologically apt. We see things the way *we* are. Thus, the work of say, object relations therapy to gradually remove the cloud of a suboptimal history from one's life and relationships. This has, to my mind, clear parallels with various Eastern spiritual disciplines the goal of which is to enable a true seeing of the world. It is, broadly speaking, the work of "withdrawing projections."

This begs the question: what happens when all the projections are withdrawn or all the harmful object relations healed? (For the purposes of teasing of the theory, we can ask this question even if such enlightened states rarely, if ever, occur.) Of course, the world always *must remain enchanted to the extent humans are spiritual beings*. Who knows, and who cares, what a landscape is in and of itself? A landscape always presupposes a "see-er" and if we see things the way *we* are, and if we are spiritual beings, then no amount of withdrawn projections will erase *our* spirituality, *our* soulfulness and the world we inhabit will remain animated by this. Because humans are inherently soulful, so must be our world.

Best wishes,
Dan

Dear Maryann, Jerome and all,
I have been following along the discussion. David I'm glad you are continuing with this presentation.

I have taken the liberty of enclosing a recent list of textbooks some of which include addictions research, - including online addictions. (What 'animation' are so many desperate for? www.lb.ca/psych)

Jung (CW7) is writing about *the psychological concomitants of the World War* - and the problem of the chaotic unconscious which slumbers uneasily beneath the ordered world of consciousness. (Jung explores further, and for the rest of his life as far as I can make out the need for the individual to return to the "ground of human nature", to digest 'neurosis'. Interestingly very early Jung recognized the order buried in chaos - that contemporary 'chaos theory' seems to take for granted.)

I find that Jung is distilling his insights regarding so called 'causality'. In chapter I on Psychoanalysis he is writing about the first move toward neurosis coming from the Charcot school at the Salpêtrière in Paris. As you say he considered that the old theory regarding the 'causality' of (hysteria) no longer adequate. (Much clarification has gone on here especially in the last 40 years. We have been using the term sexual abuse, incest and so on. Though I notice that in the past few years 'everything' seems to be about 'trauma'.) His footnote clearly shows he is NOT dismissing the trauma of war.

In his second chapter Jung elaborated something about the 'fabulous' nature of Eros – nothing here to do with splitting into gender biases which seemed to have crossed into the Jungian field causing much confusion.

What I understand Jung to be driving at is that in both the fields of incest and War is of loss of connection to a felt relationship and harmonizing with nature...and that at the heart of these human horrors is the "rebellion of the part of the animal nature that thirsts for freedom". On the other hand, in both 'fields' Eros, - as hinted through the wise Diotima to Socrates (Jung reminds us), - lies hidden in the rubble. This results in what Jung calls neurosis and which he addresses through so much of his alchemy work.

This is where I find resonance with Jerome Bernstein's letter: [For those of you who have my book, *Living in the Borderland: The Evolution of Consciousness and the Challenge of Healing Trauma* see pp. 160-161 for an example of what I am trying to portray here.\)](#) Language is an enormous problem here and "translation" does not usually suffice to convey their *experience*. The Navajo word for what I am addressing here translates to "Beauty" (the capital B is important here). The Navajo word for Beauty in this sense is Hozho which also conveys such (western) concepts as balance, harmony, resonance, at-one-ness, healing, completeness, wholeness...not only in the earthly realm but in the cosmos as a whole.

I find Jerome's book enormously rich in exploring the psychological nuances of addressing the wounding of *only* living within a binary world and language.

Sincerely,
Evangeline Rand

Dear Dan and all,

Certainly Blake is right, "as man is, so he sees." However, this does not mean that we (hu)mans are reduced to 'subjectivity', that we do not experience the world the way it 'is'. In fact, it maybe that the use of the idea of 'subjectivity' as 'flawed' is itself flawed, a hang-over from the time when it was once necessary to focus all of our attention on trying to create a way of speaking outside of religious traditions that showed a way for us to find some modicum of trustworthiness in our experience. Thus Descartes dodged most of our experience and found "clear and distinct ideas" inside his own primary intuition in order to build the language of Rationalism, which Locke followed by claiming even more of our experience could be trusted with his division of primary and secondary ideas leading to his language of Empiricism. In turn I'm pretty sure this lead to the idea that we could trust our experience if we held still long enough (i.e., the spectator theory of knowledge). I think this is part of the root

system of the idea that subjectivity is flawed. What if we've gone far enough in this direction and are now in a position of reinvesting in our subjectivity? Certainly neuro-science and affect theory have been clearing ground around the trustworthiness of our emotional experience, which John Beebe has captured with the interesting idea of "objective sympathy." And, I think this heads in an interesting direction for which Jung may still be one of the leaders. For all of the talk about him having two epistemologies, which has merit, I suspect that he actually was well on his way to differentiating a language that was quiet epistemologically consistent. Within this language he was using the idea of 'subjectivity' outside of the modern frame of subjective-as-flawed and using it within a new frame that has substantial philosophical roots (forgive me Robert if I return to John Dewey whom you may correctly think is outdated) whether Jung grasped this philosophy and its epistemology completely or not.

What if we had to give up the notion that subjectivity is flawed? What if, following Peter Reason's Action Inquiry as one of many, subjectivity leads to objectivity through what Reason calls "critical subjectivity?" Jung was clearly going in this direction when he wrote:

Nowhere is the basic requirement so indispensable as in psychology that the observer should be adequate to his object, in a sense of being able to see not only subjectively but also objectively...The recognition and taking the heart of the subjective determination of knowledge...is fulfilled only when the observer is sufficiently informed about the nature and scope of his own personality. He can, however, be sufficiently informed only when he has in large measure freed himself from the leveling influence of collective opinions and thereby arrived at a clear conception of his own individuality (Jung Vol. 6, 1971, 9-10).

I think the implications of this are substantial and if followed would lead to a use of language that would radically shift some of our conversations.

Any thoughts?

Peter T. Dunlap

Dear Dan,

You write beautifully here, and I would be tempted to agree with you, but something holds me back from doing so wholeheartedly. Inadvertently, I think Robert has pointed out why (in his usual direct manner) - Blake and the rabbi whose saying you quote (interestingly, both of whom would presumably inhabit very different spiritual worlds) do point to an important spiritual truth, which in Jesus' words has been expressed as "blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (Mt 5:8). But if God is left out of the equation, or if all religions and ideologies are placed alongside each other and deemed equally truthful, it is tempting to conclude that EVERY vision is simply a result of the phenomenon of psychological projection; "as a man is, so he sees" - this is the strength and weakness of the psychological approach. Strength in

the consulting room perhaps to some extent, but definitely a weakness in the observatory; and I would add here even in church, where it is otherwise acknowledged that, f.e. it takes a saint to see a saint, and where we are asked to "first remove the beam" from our own eye (Mt. 7:5), the goal is nevertheless to arrive at objectivity. As Robert points out, the sun does not in fact move around the earth as science has shown, and it is equally possible that certain visions of reality are closer to truth than others in spiritual life. Contrary to what Joel has recently argued (if I recall correctly), religion is not an escape into fantasy or wishful thinking, but an attempt to see reality more clearly, whether successful or not.

You are right perhaps, that no amount of withdrawn projection will erase our spirituality, but isn't it also true that 'we are what we eat' (Feuerbach)? Is it right to eat up revealed dogma, in the name of withdrawing projections? What happens to people when they consume such things? Not everything is subjective, but the methods of science cannot disclose everything that is objective either - and the extremes touch. As G.K. Chesterton has pointed out, "when people stop believing in God, they don't believe in nothing -- they believe in anything", whether that 'anything' is the scientific method, Jungian psychology (or Hillmanian, or Giegerichian (? sounds Armenian)), or even religion, when it is thrust on others in a fundamentalist and intolerant way, which to me suggests that its message has been distorted somewhere, that something basic to genuine spirituality has been left out.

Best regards

Byron

Dan,

I understand the humane impulse of your contribution, but that position would effectively dispossess me of all the distress, of body & spirit, the hard work, and years of intense thinking, for ... well - for much *more* than half a lifetime.

"Who knows, and who cares, what a landscape is in and of itself? " **I do, for one.** Exchange "landscape" for "person" - and more people would see clearly, that it matters a good deal. We may never adequately know "what s/he is in and of him/herself", but from a "Who knows, and who cares..." position, where is the love of truth? Not to mention, love of the person? Spirit exercised without the powers of discrimination either dwindles, or is extremely dangerous. Education is not for nothing. Disciplines such as science, mathematics, history, literature, etc. give us, or should give us, valuable criteria of discrimination, within different disciplines, from which to start. (E.g. "The sun [does not] revolves around the earth ...")

Blake put it even more succinctly: "As a man is, so he sees." These wise statements seem much more psychologically apt. We see things the way we are.

Indeed so. But "the way we are" encompasses, includes, all our intellectual and loving search into "what a landscape [or person] is in and for itself". Blake's life and work (as an artistic & poetic visionary)

are his full testament on this. Wordsworth's poem *Ode: Intimations of Immortality* is a testament to *ultimate care* of "what a landscape is in and of itself". Not to mention the vast body of prose works - scientific, philosophical, historical.... all devoted to discovering "what [a thing] is in and of itself".

As for Jung, his perspective is well summarised in: "*A full participation of consciousness is an essential precondition for the intervention of the transcending function.*" (Stephenson Bond) "Transcendence", i.e. enchantment, is not so readily come by, even if, thank God, sudden glimpses of beauty do catch us unawares from time to time. But really - how often does the experience of 'enchantment', or the world as full of soul, "intervene" with "full participation of consciousness" ? ... I mean, as distinct from the reverse?

So - I think this is a topic highly worthy of discussion. If we had, as the ancients tried to establish, a schema in which the different disciplines knew their place, their limits, their specific kinds of knowledge ... a "division of the sciences" discussion might be less frustrating. But perhaps less beguiling?

All good wishes, Judith

Dear All,

Today I came upon this of Jung's from 1939 (CW11 §760ff). I will quote it at length as it is so relevant to this discussion:

"The development of Western philosophy during the last two centuries has succeeded in isolating the mind in its own sphere and in severing it from its primordial oneness with the universe. Man himself has ceased to be the microcosm and eidolon of the cosmos, and his "anima" is no longer the consubstantial scintilla, or spark of the Anima Mundi, the World Soul... Psychology... holds that the mind cannot establish or assert anything beyond itself. If, then, we accept the restrictions imposed upon the capacity of our mind, we demonstrate our common sense. I admit it is something of a sacrifice, inasmuch as we bid farewell to that miraculous world in which mind-created things and beings move and live. This is the world of the primitive, where even inanimate objects are endowed with a living, healing, magic power, through which they participate in us and we in them. Sooner or later we had to understand that their potency was really ours, and that their significance was was our projection. The theory of knowledge is only the last step out of humanity's childhood, out of a world where mind-created figures populated a metaphysical heaven and hell.... [Man] has only to realize that he is shut up inside his mind and cannot step beyond it, even in insanity; and that the appearance of his world or of his gods very much depends upon his own mental condition. [Mind] has become a more or less individualized affair, with no trace of its former cosmic aspect as the anima rationalis. Mind is understood nowadays as a subjective, even an arbitrary, thing. Now that the formerly hypostatized "universal ideas" have turned out to be mental principles, it is dawning upon us to what an extent our whole experience of so-called reality is psychic; as a matter of fact, everything thought, felt, or perceived

is a psychic image, and the world itself exists only so far as we are able to produce an image of it.”

This is a very stark example of Jung at his most disenchanting. It also makes very clear that this disenchantment derives from a particular epistemological stance: ‘the mind cannot establish or assert anything beyond itself’. This much derives from Jung’s understanding of Kant. But he goes further: Man is, he says, ‘shut up inside his mind’. This strikes a strongly Cartesian note. His conclusion is that ‘our whole experience of so-called reality is psychic’, ‘the world itself exists only so far as we are able to produce an image of it.’ There appears to be no place in this approach for any recognition of the possible experience of unmediated otherness. It could only ever be the ‘so-called’ other. There would be no possibility of distinguishing between animation existing outside the mind (in which we are ‘shut up’), and animation existing inside the mind. There would only ever be the psychic image. Psyche thus becomes all. It would seem that the price paid for making psychology the queen of sciences is, in a sense, the whole world.

Now if Jung is stating in 1939 that ‘the world itself exists only so far as we are able to produce an image of it’ but it is also somehow true that, as David puts it, “the bottom line for Jung is not psyche "in here" but psyche in the world itself” this leaves us with a problem. If we read this as Jung realising the solipsistic trap he has made for himself and trying to extricate himself from it, then the next question is, what happens to his dogmatic insistence on the priority of the psychic image? How can that be maintained if his bottom line is psyche in the world itself? Or is it just in the so-called world itself?

Best wishes

Mark

Dear Mark and All,

this is a real find, thanks for that.

Yes, it is completely relevant to this discussion. It is odd, however, to see Jung having a bob each way, as the British like to say about hedging bets. That is, he argues that the anima mundi or world soul is important, and needs to be recognized, but in the same passage - almost in the same breath - he comes back with his familiar Cartesian line about the psyche being subjective and "inside" the human being. Jung is torn on this point, and can never seem to make up his mind. He needed, in my view, to submit these ideas to further theorizing, and not to contradict himself at every turn. He need only have said, I believe, that the "psyche" from which "projections" come is not merely human. Our psyche is our internal experience of a psyche which is beyond the human, and therefore not everything that comes from our psyche can be said to emerge from us. Hillman is much clearer on this point, and part of his genius is to have made this area clear, but Jung's thinking is muddy around these important issues. It is little wonder that eco-psychologists today are unsure whether Jung was friend or foe to their cause.

I agree with you that Jung makes for himself a solipsistic trap, but that he need not have done so, as he had the ability to theorize this in a clearer and more precise way. Indeed, the synchronicity papers show the way out of his own solipsistic trap or cul de sac.

A remarkable find, Mark, and thanks indeed for digging it up.

David Tacey

Brisbane, Queensland.

I have not posted at all but have tried to follow as closely as my time allowed. Thanks all for the excellent discussion.

I think it is helpful to understand that, for Jung, psyche and mind are not the same. Sometimes he use them interchangeably, that is true. But I once made notes on every indexed entry in his published works on mind and psyche. It slowly became clear that we get further in our understanding if we think of them differently. In a nutshell, mind is internal and a place of mental representations (Cartesian "ideas") and psyche is the psychological world in which we live our lives. I tried to develop this systematically in the JAP last year.

Cheerio,

Roger Brooke.

Dear Mark,

Thank you for the quotation from CW11. In a way, I wonder whether your question on what to do about the priority of the psychic image if psyche is in the world itself, isn't itself based on a theory of knowledge which privileges individual discursive reason over more collective and participatory avenues of experience? David Tacey has recently pointed out the distinction between personal (in the sense of individual) projections and 'collective projections', suggesting that it is perhaps inappropriate to withdraw the latter (and therapeutic to withdraw the former). This comes a little closer to my own understanding of collective and participatory experience being founded on shared knowledge, which has greater authority than individual thought. Jungian psychology calls on a (reified) Unconscious as an antidote to the hypertrophied rationalistic imbalance it rightly perceives in Western consciousness; but the Unconscious / unconscious is "only" that part of consciousness - for Freud individual, for Jung individual and collective - which is not immediately apparent to the ego. From an Orthodox gnoseological perspective, this still leaves us with only half the picture of reality, because apart from the created ego, there is also uncreated Divinity. Our communion with this uncreated reality takes place in prayer and through participation in the sacraments, particularly the Eucharist. This takes us beyond our individual psychic image of the world, beyond even psyche in the world, and beyond the "so-called world" of phenomenology. This debate goes back to the hesychastic controversy between St Gregory Palamas and Barlaam of Calabria; the latter argued that monks should use philosophy as the way to knowledge, while

Palamas insisted that what is essential is prayer of the heart (please note that this is not a variation on the theme of head / heart polarity, there is much more at stake). Of course, objections will arise that this is a faith perspective, not 'science', but I find it difficult to imagine psychology as a 'queen of sciences' Mark; I see her more as the bag-lady of sciences, collecting assorted theories in her trolley and putting on the mask of a scientific persona - Jung is a prime example - to whitewash those theories in papers and conferences. Nevertheless, I acknowledge the royal dignity of bag ladies as much as that of blue-bloodied sovereigns! I just think this dignity would be more apparent if the mask were removed. Maybe I'm just a disenchanting modern, after all. :-)

Best regards

Byron

Dear Byron, Joel, Leslie and all,

Byron, your religious perspective is helpful here. I see Jung's psychology as specifically geared toward those who have no access to the faith you describe so well, i.e. the heirs of a disenchanting world. In my understanding Jung wants to suggest that we moderns are not so disenchanting after all, because we have access to the enchanted riches of the unconscious, if only we can find access to it. He takes the further step of suggesting, in this quotation at least, that this is not just a consolation prize but is in fact the thing itself after all, ("Sooner or later we had to understand that their potency was really ours, and that their significance was was our projection") in other words it was never out in the world anyway, but always in our unconscious. As you rightly point out, the aspect that gets lost along the way (or one of them) is that of communal participation in a shared experience of the world. You mention the 'so called world' of phenomenology. My take is that the phenomenological approach avoids precisely this problem of 'so called worlds'. At the risk of crudely oversimplifying, phenomenology offers a vision of being in the world which is radically unmediated: when we see the tree we don't see 'our image of the tree which may or may not coincide with the real tree'. We just see the tree. As Husserl puts it, "Back to the things themselves!" Had Jung utilised a phenomenological approach he might have avoided the kind of solipsistic trap we have identified.

Joel and Leslie, re 'the earth moves', It occurs to me what we have here is a good example of an antinomial position: for us as modern westerners it is simultaneously true not only that the sun rises in the west and goes down in the east, but also that the earth moves around the sun. These are incompatible truths but we hold them both.

Best wishes

Mark

Dear Roger;

I can't get that issue of JAP until next month, when it's available on-line. I did read the abstract. So it could very well be that you answer my questions within your piece. For example: How do we distinguish mental representations (I almost wrote projections) from "the psychological world in which we live our lives."? (It reminds me of soul/Soul. Or, in Buddhism, mind/Mind.)

Also, doesn't phenomenology seek to erase the mind/psyche dichotomy as you state it by soaking up the atmosphere?

Best,
Joel

Dear David, and Mark, etc.,

From George Hogenson 'Archetypes' (*Analytical Psychology* ed. Cambray & Carter) - I note what seems to me fair comment (not unlike Jung's own remark, somewhere):

"A theory of archetypes must give rise to a viable theory of symbolization that satisfies the demands of the clinical setting, ... The first rule of truly scientific investigation is to preserve the phenomena. Jung struggled to get the phenomena to be clear enough that theory-building could take place. At times he clearly missed the mark, ... but if one is to engage Jung at all, one must begin by taking seriously the effort he was engaged in to bring the symbol to life in the lives of his patients ... "

This may give useful perspective on: "having a bob each way", and including, but not exclusively, "his dogmatic insistence on the priority of the psychic image". ?

Regards, Judith

Dear Mark and all,

Mark, thank you for acknowledging that a religious perspective can be helpful to this debate. We appear to agree that the Jungian (Jung's) perspective on the need to withdraw projection is perhaps overly individualistic, not paying enough attention to the collective aspect of shared experience. It seems a romantic, 19th century way of looking at life. I do see that Jung, among psychological pioneers, tried to point to enchantment within the modern person; but his 'offer' of the "riches of the unconscious" as "the thing itself after all" seems to me incomplete and inadequate, not only because - as David suggests - Jung failed to emphasize that the psyche was more than human, but also because he failed to emphasize that it is also more than cosmos. The unconscious is the 'other side' of consciousness, but both open out towards the uncreated, not-of-this-earth. I think this is also why the Jungian use of (Otto's) 'numinous' lacks the genuine *mysterium tremendum* evoked by the Wholly Other, focusing as it does on subjective emotion.

I take your point about phenomenology, and hear Hillman's "stick to the image!" behind Husserl's "back to the things themselves!". Both approaches are of course invaluable for any serious analysis of subjectivity and the intersubjective. The reason I refer, however, to the "so-called worlds" of phenomenology, is because

however richly we describe what the mind perceives as phenomena, we will still only have access to the contents of our own perceptions, not the essence of these phenomena - in other words, we will be describing the psychic image. Jung, via a Hegelian phenomenology of spirit, ended up idolizing the psyche, absolutizing the human spirit, and indeed rendering it the only avenue by which Divinity may come to realise itself. I think Jung probably sensed this, and tried to exit the solipsistic trap through notions which challenge the 'in here' paradigm of projection, such as synchronicity and the *unus mundus*, but even so it remains a *mundus* hopelessly cooped up in itself....

Have a nice weekend,

Byron

Dear David, Lesley and all,
I so appreciate the phrase of Jung's you included, David:
the vast confusion that reigns at the roots of life.

It was precisely this issue that I thought Maryanne's reference highlighted and to which I responded, linking trauma (War and incest) with a buried Eros:

Jung's prefaces. The first one in this volume was written in Dec.1916, the next one Oct. 1918 and so on. In the first one Jung is writing about *the psychological concomitants of the World War* – and the problem of the chaotic unconscious which slumbers uneasily beneath the ordered world of consciousness.

(Jung explores further, and for the rest of his life as far as I can make out the need for the individual to return to the "ground of human nature", to digest 'neurosis'. Interestingly very early Jung recognized the order buried in chaos – that contemporary 'chaos theory' elaborates.)

Jung goes on to ask where is the mighty Eros in this muddle? The question is certainly alive today!

The difficulty of learning to actually 'see' etc. is how Jung sometimes describes the process of individuation. And yes, David, how to surrender to this 'learning', and engage with it? Personally, I don't think we need to 'animate' or re-enchance the world. More, I am interested in a capacity to engage and live within what I am 'seeing'. The care required for looking...details...and the need to explore the art of being willing even NOT to see... leaving some 'things' BEYOND our reach/grasp. In this context I have found Randy Malamud's article (*Animals on Film*) in the recent *Spring* (Vol. 83, 2010) most evocative. And Judith, it is in the same volume as Giegerich's article on the Red Book – which I why I bought this volume too!

I find that few people I meet have any idea that there is actually a vitality within them that is more than a surface gush of what I am calling now 'the wow factor' that seems to blanket the person's 'essential' 'way' of living. In connection with this I have been re-reading Sean Mc.Grath (Dept. Of Philosophy, Memorial University Newfoundland, Canada) article in our **International Journal of Jungian Studies, Vol 2 No.1. March 2010 pp 1 – 20.** I am not referring above to being trapped in 'subjectivization'...I am connecting it more with what Mc.Grath is calling for – a fullscale reconstruction of Jung's relationship to Western esoteric traditions. (Footnote 2) This need rings true for me...

Actually the whole Journal issue is germane to our present topic. I wonder if 'our' academics feel their work is actually being read and related to? Our list hardly seems to refer to the scholars who are actually contributing to IAJS. Perhaps I am looking in all the wrong places...and heavens only knows how hard it is to 'be' 'current'.

Yes, Lesley I think both statements about the sun are true! The experience of always seeing the sun in 'this and that' position is (or at least, used to be, part the *experience of living in a cosmos, with feet on the ground*. What has gone missing is 'us in a cosmos', perhaps....

Best wishes,
Evangeline Rand

Dear all,

I have been mulling over various strains of thought that have been expressed so far in this seminar. The first concerns projections. There are some problems with the notion of projection, not the least of which is that it incorporates an inappropriate physical fantasy -- that of a sort of thrower ejecting or projecting something into the world like a javelin or a football. Giegerich points this out in "The leap after the throw: On 'catching up with projections and the origin of psychology," *The Neurosis of Psychology* (Spring 2005). But literalist fantasies abound in psychology - "object relations," anyone? - and don't necessarily invalidate the phenomena which they address. I think this is the case with projections.

Recently, I heard a wonderful rabbinical saying: "We don't see things the way *they* are. We see things the way *we* are." Blake put it even more succinctly: "As a man is, so he sees." These wise statements seem much more psychologically apt. We see things the way *we* are. Thus, the work of say, object relations therapy to gradually remove the cloud of a suboptimal history from one's life and relationships. This has, to my mind, clear parallels with various Eastern spiritual disciplines the goal of which is to enable a true seeing of the world. It is, broadly speaking, the work of "withdrawing projections."

This begs the question: what happens when all the projections are withdrawn or all the harmful object relations healed? (For the purposes of teasing of the theory, we can ask this question even if such enlightened states rarely, if ever, occur.) Of course, the world always *must remain enchanted to the extent humans are spiritual beings*. Who knows, and who cares, what a landscape is in and of itself? A landscape always presupposes a "see-er" and if we see things the way we are, and if we are spiritual beings, then no amount of withdrawn projections will erase *our* spirituality, *our* soulfulness and the world we inhabit will remain animated by this. Because humans are inherently soulful, so must be our world.

Best wishes,
Dan

Dear Roger;

I can't get that issue of JAP until next month, when it's available on-line. I did read the abstract. So it could very well be that you answer my questions within your piece. For example: How do we distinguish mental representations (I almost wrote projections) from "the psychological world in which we live our lives."? (It reminds me of soul/Soul. Or, in Buddhism, mind/Mind.)

Also, doesn't phenomenology seek to erase the mind/psyche dichotomy as you state it by soaking up the atmosphere?

Best,
Joel

Dear Roger and Joel,

Excellent points here. I had suspected a difference between the use of mind and psyche, but had not brought it into my field of thought or enquiry. This might be an important element in clarifying the "muddiness", as I have called it. Please, Roger, give more specific details about your JAP piece on this topic, and I will look it up immediately.

Joel, yes, I tend to agree that phenomenology seems to erase this distinction between mind and psyche, although that could merely be my impression as an outsider, as I am not trained or highly skilled in philosophy. But yes, maybe we need to introduce soul/Soul into our discourse, or mind/Mind. That would be one way through - and a very helpful suggestion, I might add.

Roger, was your detailed checking in English or in German. That is, were you differentiating between Jung's use of Seele and Psyche? His essay on the influence of earth on psyche is Seele und Erde in German, which ends up as Mind and Earth in the English Collected Works. But I am not sure that this is the correct translation of Jung's German. He seems, in

this (in)famous essay (where he refers to measurements of the skull in Americans), to be discussing psyche rather than mind.

best wishes

David

Brisbane, Queensland.

Dear Matt,

I never mean to misconstrue discussants, so sorry that I have done so in your case.

I appreciate your agreeing with me that terms need to be defined precisely. I myself have never said that Tylor's definition of ANIMISM or Otto's of NUMINOSITY is definitive. I have said only that those who want to offer new meanings of terms should at least get straight on the old meanings. Otherwise we get into the state that Kuhn calls incommensurability: same terms, different meanings.

For the last time may I explain to the assembled that the "old" understanding of animism, which goes back to Tylor, is NOT the animation of the world.

Therefore the rejection of animism by science, as David Tacey and others state like a litany, is a false characterization of both animism and science. I quote below two statements from Tacey, who responds to me only in responding to others. I scarcely object to his calling for a NEW ANIMISM. I ask only that the OLD ANIMISM be properly characterized.

Put summarily, Tylor, whose PRIMITIVE CULTURE is the locus classicus of old animism, maintains the following:

(a) religion and science alike observe animation in the physical world--that is, observe motion, which gets associated with life.

(b) religion and science alike seek to account for that animation.

(c) religion hypothesizes, not observes, personified entities; science hypothesizes impersonal processes.

(d) the personified entities, or "spiritual beings," or gods, need not reside in the world, so that there need not be "spirits in nature."

(e) gods are not immaterial, so that there is no dualism; there is no dualism UNTIL science.

(f) gods do not contravene natural laws but instead pre-empt them, so that there is no supernaturalism.

I have no idea what "a fluid and metaphorical awareness about soul in the world" means. But it gets contrasted to "the archaic literalism about spirits," which we are told "are a secondary, not a primary, phenomenon."

My response: Tylor's animism, far from downplaying the animation of nature, attempts to account for it. And so does science. Therefore let us not, in the name of anything new, proclaim MISSION ACCOMPLISHED prematurely.

Of Otto's use of NUMINOSITY, I say, similarly, that no one is obliged to defer to him. But at least recognize his usage--if only to dismiss it. In saying that he is writing from a Protestant point of view, you are repeating my point, which is that his term has been rejected by the field of religious studies because of its "ethnocentricity." Jung does not break with Otto but follows him: Jung loves Otto's view of religion as God versus the world because it fits so snugly Jung's view of unconscious versus ordinary consciousness.

Robert

FROM TACEY:

Postmodern science will lead us into a new kind of animism. This seems ironic because it was science that debunked animism and asked us to see it as a form of error. But postmodern science is preparing the way, albeit unwittingly, for a re-enchantment of the world. Perhaps we can plot the development of human thought in three stages. The first stage is ancient enchantment through animism and pantheism. The second is modern disenchantment through rationality and reason.

A key element of a post-rational enchantment involves replacing with a fluid and metaphorical awareness about soul in the world. The animating factor would not be seen as supernatural, but as deeply natural. The new understanding is that spirit is inherent in nature, and does not have to be put there by forces from above. Spirit does not intervene in the natural order in an artificial way because it is always already part of that order. Thus the new understanding of an animated universe is neither dualistic nor supernatural.

What is animism? If it is "the attribution of motion in the world to personified beings", as Robert Segal mentioned in a recent Oct 6 email (his response to Matt), then it may not be the right term. When I do "field work" on Aboriginal native lands, I almost never feel that their worldview is "animated by personified beings". Again, I think Hillman is right when he says that animism tells us less about indigenous cultures than about the minds

of 19th C anthropologists and writers.

It seems to me that "animism" is how the European mind characterizes, quite wrongly and inappropriately, the cosmos of indigenous cultures. It is the European consciousness placing a literal-minded lens on what goes on in the cultures of tribal peoples. Their "personified beings" are a secondary, not a primary, phenomenon.

Dear Robert,

Thank you. Sorry for the delay of my response. Your apology is accepted.

I appreciate your efforts to examine these definitions, because taking some of these terms for granted seems to have become increasingly problematic in this discussion. We may even be facing something muddier than incommensurability. Namely, a hiding of general value statements behind vague terms. Essentially, David is saying: "There is a good thing, a better way of being and of relating to nature . . . and this can be called 'New Animism'". It is hard to disagree. It is fairly clear to most people today that our species has created numerous natural crises and that these crises could have been avoided if we had simply adopted a different, more valuative attitude toward nature, environment, and other.

My initial response to David's essay was to say, "Let's finish bringing this intuitive value statement into focus by contextualizing it culturally, psychologically, and scientifically, as well as spiritually and mythopoetically." By invoking "postmodern science", I thought David had meant for us to keep imagining a more robust science, not one limited to 19th century positivism* in which nature and matter were stripped of their innate complexity and therefore their value to us (as we tend to associate dynamic complexity with animation, agency, and intelligence). I felt that in order to proceed in making this fantasy of a "new animism" viable and languagable in modern terms, we (i.e., Jungians and discussants on this list in general) would have to face any fallacious and prejudicial attitudes we might have about science. We can hardly re-imagine science as useful to the process of valuing nature if we radically misunderstand and scapegoat science. What stands between Jungians and the imagination of a nature-valuing "postmodern science" is our own romantic prejudice and cultural complex. "Postmodern science", we might see if we chose to look at science today instead of in the 19th century (where we last paid attention to it?), is of course already moving toward the valuation of natural ecosystems and complexity . . . and has been doing so more productively than mythopoetic Jungianism.

*[By the way, it is unfair to blame even post-Enlightenment science for devaluing nature. This devaluation was central to early Christianities and neoplatonism and rooted in philosophical and religious ideas. See medieval alchemy for a pre-Enlightenment effort to imagine a "new animism" with a complex and even "intelligent" nature.]

My other contention was that this "new animism" would be a "shamanic" proje=

ct. By which I meant that it would require those of us interested in pursuing it to pass through a kind of identity-dissolution and -reconstitution and also find a functional way of channeling mature "heroism". Acting ethically and with social and environmental responsibility is "heroic". That is, it couples ego-sacrifice and empathy for "otherness" into an initiatory passage to a new, more responsible attitude. In other words, as writers sometimes say, we must "kill our darlings", our precious but outmoded and dysfunctional identity habits, in order to actually proceed in any valuative (and creative) project. Without this shamanic/heroic attitude, we are left with (as Jungians might say) "puer fantasy" that boils over with abstract valuation, but never actualizes or has a relationship or effect on the object of supposed value.

That said (and I merely repeat it, because no one has taken up a counterargument . . . and David has even remarked that "most of the issues you raise = in this long email have been responded to in the ensuing discussion, and therefore do not need special attention" (10/7), which is certainly not true) = , I agree with you, Robert, that it is time we start insisting on more precise definitions in this discussion. Otherwise, whatever meaning we might be spinning here will fall out of orbit.

Robert lists Tylor's ideas on animism, and they offer us an excellent place to start (the first three are easier to parse, so I'll limit my response to these for now):

(a) religion and science alike observe animation in the physical world--that is, observe motion, which gets associated with life.

(b) religion and science alike seek to account for that animation.

(c) religion hypothesizes, not observes, personified entities; science hypothesizes impersonal processes.

Regarding these first three points, I think we can add that the "impersonal processes" science hypothesizes, in previous post-Enlightenment eras, were hypothesized as relatively simple systems. The difference with today's science is that these systems are being understood as increasingly complex. = With this new language for talking about (and observing) complexity, we are beginning to see structural parallels in all complex systems, not only those we had always assumed were more complex, especially human intelligence. = The brain is structured like a complex system (i.e., it develops its complexity through the massive interrelationship of relatively simple structural elements like cells and chemical neurotransmitters; these elements are organized into subsystems, and the subsystems are then organized into larger interrelated systems, etc.). Naturally emergent ecosystems show parallel organization with the human brain. In fact, all complex dynamic systems have substantial structural similarities. Both the human brain and ecosystems =

evolved or emerged through self-organizing principles (in the case of the brain, through natural selection).

This observation (which comes from the sciences and is not a religious idea per se) demands that we rethink our definitions of life itself. Here, perhaps, is some foundation for a "new animism" which will derive from "postmodern science". But this "postmodern science" is still science. It still hypothesizes impersonal processes (complex dynamic and adaptive systems). It rejects (since it does not require) "personified entities". It is, essentially, naturalistic.

Best Regards,
Matt

Dear Matt and All,

You say below that the new animism and postmodern science is "naturalistic". I understand why you would say this, but I strongly disagree.

It is not naturalistic, but something quite different, which could probably be described best by the word "emergentist". There are quite a few contemporary Jungian scholars working on emergence today, including Jean Knox and John Clarke, in the London area.

In the USA, I would recommend Joseph Cambray's new book, *Synchronicity: Nature and Psyche in an Interconnected Universe* (Texas A&M, 2009), as the most cogent and up to date account of what Jungian Psychology can make of the new sciences and their opening to mystery and connectedness.

For those on this list asking about postmodern science, what it is, who the key authors are, etc, please see Cambray's book, which provides a full list of this field. This book can be purchased at all good bookshops, and it can also be downloaded for free from the TAMU website, on the address I supplied to this list last year.

We have to stop thinking in terms of this binary: natural / supernatural. Contemporary postmodern thought has left this far behind, and all the assumptions that both of them have. A good exploration of this is found in Jung's essay, "The Real and the Surreal" (1933), found in CW Vol. 8. In this essay he does something similar, which is to take up, and reject, both realism and surrealism as adequate terms/paradigms for exploring psychic reality. Of course, Jung was writing before postmodern science came up with the idea of emergence as a hypothesis in physics, chemistry, biology. One could say he was writing on emergence before the term was invented - hence some anomalies in his science.

Here I can do not better than quote back to you what John Dourley wrote on this list on 4 October:

"I so much agree with your undermining of the natural/supernatural distinction that still prevails in monotheistic psychology and in cultures shaped by them. Jung's discussion with Buber and White demonstrate in box car letters that Jungian psychology simply does not reduce to a

natural/supernatural paradigm and so to Jewish, Christian or Islamic orthodox main stream imagination. I've heard the response that this is less true of their mystical traditions but if so it is only because the mystics themselves are closer to the unconscious as the sole source of religious experience. You are quite right in affirming that we cannot go home to any of these options after Jung."

Let's move on from naturalistic / super naturalistic and explore the new options offered by science. It's not good enough just to say we have not read this science; we have to find time to read it, as it is the way forward in my view.

regards,

David

Dear Colleagues,

By inviting David to do the inaugural launch of Issues in Jungian Psychology (Dan should also take a bow for this), I wanted to bring our scholarly discussions back to Jung with a scholar, who though not a clinician, is one of the most highly respected scholars with senior members of the International Association of Analytical Psychologists. A return to the roots and well-spring of the IAJS with one of its' founders.

David, who is on and off airplanes of late and nursing a cold, has asked me to "thank those who have made useful and insightful contributions." Where would I start? I would start with the EC of course! Dan and Mark have made tremendous contributions, as have Leslie and Joel. There is also Judith, Evangeline, Matt, Byron, Peter, Paivi, Guy, Steven, Raya and Robert. Particular thanks to Jerome, Roger, and John D.

If I've left anyone out, please accept my apology for any inaccuracy.

A big metaphorical bottle of champagne and bouquet to all and to David Tacey.
Onward,
Maryann