

Shadow seminar

A four week on-line seminar on 'shadow' was arranged starting from Sunday 29st April to Monday 28th May 2012 by Stephani Stephens, Leslie Gardner and Liz Brodersen. The purpose of the seminar was to differentiate the multifaceted aspects of Jung's concept of 'shadow' from Jungian and post Jungian perspectives.

'Shadow' is one of Jung's most fertile depth- psychological terms, although it still remains rather maligned and relatively misunderstood as 'negative.' This seminar was an attempt to address that imbalance by opening up discussion from differing interdisciplinary perspectives in order to bring 'shadow' into the light!

The aim of the seminar was to expand consciousness about the 'shadow,' both in its collective and personal ramifications and to assess its potential for initiating socio- political change. As the IAJS- forum is interdisciplinary, the discussion brings together clinical as well as non-clinical perspectives.

I

The first Presenter is Helena Bassil-Morozow, academic and author. Her paper is about the collective and personal shadow.

Helena's paper emphasizes how 20th century political disasters prove that the confident urban individualism characteristic of European nation states is helpless in the face of dark 'collectivity.' For Jung, the individual's struggle against the binding forces of imitation and the desire to differentiate from the crowd are tied up with the problem of the collective 'shadow.' Helena approaches 'shadow' via postmodern applications of solutions such as political correctness and investigation into contemporary anthropology and mass media.

On the Reality of the Shadow

Having witnessed the two World Wars and horrific consequences of organised mass ideologies, Jung had no illusion as to the true nature of the shadow. He defined it primarily as 'a moral problem that challenges the whole ego-personality, for no one can become conscious of the shadow without considerable moral effort. To become conscious of it involves recognising the dark aspects of the personality as present and real' (CW 9/II: para. 14). This quotation identifies two central issues associated with this archetype: the moral aspect of the problem, and the shadow's reality, the actuality of its existence.

No one wants to be told that his or her integrity is fragile and can be upset by a dark force coming from the inside or the outside. We want to believe that we are personalities with wholesome identities; that we are people who can defend ourselves and define our choice when faced with envy, greed, lies, manipulation, cruelty, abuse, torture and murder. We want to think of the shadow as something we can control internally - and from which we can distance ourselves in real life. We want to believe that the ideal version of the Jungian ego, the conscious part of the personality, the complex of representations which constitutes 'the centre of the field of consciousness and possesses a high degree of continuity and identity', is strong and solid enough to expose and confront evil (Jacobi, 1973: 7). Accepting this part of yourself - and this part of human nature in general - is a morally challenging decision. It means shattering the ancient utopia of psychological completeness; it means losing hope in human perfection and human goodness. Jung wrote:

In reality, the acceptance of the shadow-side of human nature verges on the impossible. Consider for a moment what it means to grant the right of existence to what is unreasonable, senseless and evil! Yet it is just this that the modern man insists upon. He wants to live with every side of himself - to know what he is. This is why he casts history aside. He wants to break with the tradition and so that he can experiment with his life and determine what value and meaning things have in themselves, apart from traditional presuppositions (CW 11: 528).

The postmodern solution to the issue of evil has all been about casting history aside; forgetting its actuality and horror, trying to erase the memory of the trauma. Postmodern culture has been preoccupied with concealing the pain of realisation that the shadow is always inside, lurking and waiting for the right moment to attack the ego. Postmodernist vision of the world, which came after the emotional anaesthesia of existentialism - the PTSD philosophy of high modernity - attempted to sublimate evil into a myriad of other things, to dissipate the shadow, to bury it under a pile of masks, to overlook a major flaw in human nature by making up new worlds, assuming colourful identities.

By doing all this, postmodernism turned the shadow into the trickster. Evil has lost its intensity, it lost its edge. Horror was turned into a show, a Hollywood film; it transformed into empty and meaningless entertainment. The trickster does not have a core to its identity; it is a shapeshifter, eternally mercurial in its fragmentedness. It is completely, narcissistically unaware of its brokenness. By 'tricksterising' the shadow, by turning it into a blissfully malicious and playful child, postmodernism belittled it, seemingly diminished its dangers. Instead of being what it is - the terrible reality - evil became part of the combinatorial narrative game, and therefore playful, unreal, silly and even controllable and forgettable. Since we are masters of our own narratives (according to the postmodernist way of thinking), we can make up a story in which evil is just a silly puppet, and can therefore be easily dismissed or laughed at. Within the loose and endlessly variable structure of the postmodern world the shadow is but a game, a joker, harmless in its fluidity and its lack of the stable core, innocuously juggling guises, roles and faces.

However, the empty, broken postmodern trickster-shadow still stalks the ego, still wants to engulf it. The trickster-shadow lacks personality, and therefore may attempt to appropriate someone else's. Choosing to overlook this danger would be a mistake. We live in the age of sporadic terrorism when the cognitive dissonance dominating postmodernist thinking - its denial of reality, its habit of downplaying the dark aspect of human nature, its rationalisations in the face of the self-dissolution threat - no longer works. The shadow is neither a joke nor is it a zombie from a Hollywood film. It is a reality. It has a miraculous ability to break through the rules we have set up for ourselves. This is particularly alarming when a collective shadow of any size raises its ugly head. As Heinz Kohut writes in his analysis of narcissistic rage in national psychology,

Hitler exploited the readiness of civilized nations to shed the thin layer of its unspeakably civilized restraints, leading to the unspeakable events of the decade 1935 to 1945. But the truth is - it must be admitted with much sadness - that such events are not bestial, in the primary sense of the word, but are decidedly human. They are an intrinsic part of the human

condition, a strand in the web of the complex pattern that makes up the human situation. So long as we turn away from these phenomena in terror and disgust and indignantly declare them to be a reversal to barbarism, a regression to the primitive and animal-like, so long do we deprive ourselves of the chance of understanding of human aggressivity and of our mastery over it (Kohut, 2011: 635).

Application of psychoanalytic knowledge to national psychologies and historical analysis is therefore important because it might throw the light both on the nature of human aggression and on the methods of dealing with it: 'The psychoanalyst must not therefore shrink from the task of applying his knowledge about the individual to the field of history, particularly to the crucial role of human aggression as it shaped the history of man' (2011: 635).

The issue at stake here is the question of personal boundaries. The shadow, when it arrives in the form of an ideology, a cult or some less pernicious and menacing form (say, harassment and bullying), attempts to implant itself, or merge with its smaller version, its twin brother, within the individual. It obsessively seeks this moment of amalgamation; it feels a compulsive need to break through the defences, to destroy the boundaries. It is often very forceful in its intent to do so. But to break through 'the thin layer of civilization' is only the first step: the real aim is to infect the carrier with the dark contents; to fill their soul with envy, anger, aggression, inflated pride, murderous intentions. Mass ideologies aim to orchestrate a meeting between the two darknesses, the one coming from the outside the individual, and the one dwelling inside and waiting to be released and fulfilled.

The success of this hideous venture depends on the firmness of the person's (Jungian) ego as well as on the mutability and penetrability of personal boundaries. The ego is our vision of ourselves, and we often forget that this part of our personality does not 'embrace the totality of man, for this totality consists only partly of his conscious contents, and for the other and far greater part, of his unconscious, which is of indefinite extent with no assignable limits' (CW11: para. 390). The gravest mistake would be to overlook the fact that there is something underneath it all, and become over-confident in our ego's ability to sustain the abuse coming from the outside. As Jung warns, 'since everything living strives for wholeness, the inevitable one-sidedness of our conscious life is continually being corrected and compensated by the universal human being in us, whose goal is the ultimate integration of conscious and the unconscious, or better, the assimilation of the ego to a wider personality' (CW8: para. 557).

Striving for wholeness is often a misleading and dangerous thing. Projections, particularly in their mass variety, can be powerful, forceful - even beautiful and seductive in their repulsive ugliness. The ability to repel a malicious projection, to say 'I don't think so - it is your idea', 'I refuse to behave in this way', or to defend one's moral code is only something an individual who knows himself can do. Plato's Socrates in *Charmides* adds another slogan to the famous Delphic command - 'be temperate' (Plato, 1951: 21). Both tactics are useful when faced with the collective shadow: try to establish who you are as an individual and be able to control your impulses. Define yourself, defend your boundaries and keep hoping that the dark forces raging outside will not succeed in tainting you. But, to quote from Kohut again, 'in moments of despair and extreme danger men tend to be less rather than more rational; that in such

moments they will not turn to a rational leader, but will be swept toward the charisma of the Messiah. Yet, who can really predict how man will behave when he is face to face with ultimate disaster?' (Kohut, 2011: 535).

In the case of the collective projection, the real horror starts the moment when the individual's personal darkness answers the collective call. One can go on forever about the psycho-pathological, political, procedural and structural aspects of the encounter and merger between the two shadows - the internal and the external - but the facts remain unchanged. Evil is real. People do horrible things to each other. Psychological pyrotechnics and terminological complexities aside, how does one come to terms with something of the scale of the Holocaust or the Great Purge in the nineteen thirties in Stalinist Russia? How does one face the fact that this did actually happen? Smaller-scale instances of evil such as sporadic terrorist attacks may be less socially impactful - but they are no less real. The loss of life and the subsequent ambient intimidation experienced by the surviving members of the social group are oxymoronically authentic in their nightmarishness because the first is a terrible fact and the second a projective mechanism aimed at the distortion of the victim's reality; it therefore maims reality, abuses it, blights it, manipulates it - in short, it hijacks the real.

To define the mercilessly uncompromising reality of evil, I will borrow Lacan's concept of the Real (as one of the three orders, the Real, the Symbolic and the Imaginary). Unlike the Symbolic, which is constituted in terms of oppositions such as that between presence and absence, 'there is no absence in the Real' (Evans, 1996: 162). It cannot be ignored and will not evaporate in the cognitive dissonance of unwitting victimhood or being a proxy in the hands of an abusive regime. The Real is non-negotiable, 'absolutely without fissure' (1996: 162). One may lie to oneself forever, or attempt to blame others for one's actions - but facts and deeds remain facts and deeds. In the aftermath of a human tragedy one is always left to face the consequences, one will be judged by one's actions. Evil is physical, actual, factual - and people involved in it must be made accountable for their decisions.

Jung used a Biblical metaphor to render the reality and physicality of the shadow. A life-and death confrontation with it is always face-to-face, like Jacob's grapple with the Angel in the Old Testament. Jung wrote:

Without wishing it, we human beings are placed in situations in which the great 'principles' entangle us in something, and God leaves it to us to find a way out. Sometimes a clear path is opened with his help, but when it really comes to the point one has the feeling of having been abandoned by every good spirit. In critical situations the hero always mislays his weapon, and at such moments, as before death, we are confronted with the nakedness of this fact. And one does not know how one got there. A thousand twists of fate all of a sudden land you in such a situation. This is symbolically represented by Jacob's fight with the angel at the ford. Here a man can do nothing but stand his ground. It is a situation that challenges him to react as a whole man. It may turn out that he can no longer keep to the letter of the moral law. That is where his most personal ethics begin: in grim confrontation with the Absolute, in striking out on a path condemned by current morality and the guardians of the law. And yet one may feel that he has never been truer to his innermost nature and vocation, and hence nearer to the Absolute, because he alone and the

Omniscient have seen the actual situation as it were from inside, whereas the judges and condemners see it only from the outside (CW10: para. 869).

Jung's interpretation of the legend implies that, when faced with something inexplicably gruesome, one must fight to the end. It is, in fact, a hands-on solution to the problem. The physical proximity to the enemy embedded in the metaphor also implies psychological closeness to the shadow. It is all too easy to 'stay true to yourself' without any direct involvement in the events - but it is much harder to keep the boundaries intact when political and social storms are raging around your seemingly principled and stable 'centre of consciousness'. Jung knew to his own detriment that 'standing one's ground' without 'getting tainted' is not something everyone has the strength to do. Jung himself seriously marred his profile by failing to withstand the attraction of the Nazi ideology - even though he averted at the last moment the train wreck that his career was threatening to become.

There are different ways of bringing the Delphic command to life. The French existentialists, for instance, recommended to bullet proof one's identity from the influence of evil. This could be done by becoming an authentic individual whose (impossibly utopian) ideal is self-imposed isolation as a preventive measure aimed at minimizing contamination by the social, political or economic forces. Jung's solution to the problem was different: individuating, finding your path in life, learning about yourself in close proximity to society - and consequently, engaging with the collective shadow. This awareness of the shadow is the hallmark of Jungian philosophy. Knowing your enemy is the best way to prevent the disaster.

Bibliography:

Evans, Dylan (1996) An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis, London:

Routledge Jacobi, Jolande (1973; 1942) The Psychology of C.G.Jung (Eighth Edition), trans. Ralph Manheim, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Jung C.G. Except where a different publication was used, all references are to the hardback edition of C.G. Jung, The Collected Works (CW), edited by Sir Herbert Read, Dr. Michael Fordham and Dr. Gerhardt Adler, and translated by R.F.C. Hull, London: Routledge.

Kohut, Heinz (2011; 1978) The Search for the Self: Selected Writings of Heinz Kohut, 1950-1978, London: Karnac.

Plato (1951) Charmides, or Temperance, Forgotten Books.

I) Discussion. Some questions, comments and answers.

Robert Segal: (definition of the evil?) I have yet to come upon anyone who denies that human beings are capable of evil or that recognition of the possibility of evil is advantageous. What, then, are you claiming is distinctive of Jung?

What do you mean by an evil side? Where is it to be found? How does it operate?

Evil is not a neutral, scientific term but a moral one. Just how does one know that something qualifies as evil?

The hard part in any discussion of evil is (a) defining the phenomenon, (b) explaining the phenomenon, and (c) curbing the phenomenon. For my part, I don't see how Jung does any of these three.

Erik D Goodwyn: You said: "Evil is not a neutral, scientific term but a moral one. Just how does one know that something qualifies as evil?"

It can be a scientific term IF what is being investigated are *reports* of what is considered evil. An example would be evolutionary ethics (i.e., Krebs D, 2005, "The Evolution of Morality". In Buss (Ed.) The Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology: 747-771). For example, studies that pose moral dilemmas and record what typical responses to them are. An example would be if there was a runaway train and you could pull a lever that diverted the train from a trapped busload of children, but caused the train to thereby crash into a single man drunk on the track, would you pull the lever? Most people answer 'yes'. No it doesn't define "evil", per se, but it's a start.

These kinds of studies do not give us much to compare with the learned treatises of morality that have been passed to us by the various ethicists of history, but they do give us a firm idea of what our typically universal moral intuitions and reflexes are. They therefore allow us to better define such nebulous terms as "evil" by looking at their biological underpinnings--after all, morality evolved for some reason. Understanding why may help to inform more considered reflection on the matter. Even the most sophisticated analysis of morality is built on these basic intuitions.

You said: "What, then, are you claiming is distinctive of Jung?"

You're right that nobody denies the existence of evil in the abstract; coming to terms with it in oneself is another issue, however. Sure, somebody somewhere might do bad things, but not me! Jung's contribution is to state though I may try to deny it, there are parts of me that are cruel and vicious and greedy. I can't explain it away, blame other people for it, or philosophize it out of existence. The sooner I accept them and learn to live with them, the more whole of a person I can become.

Helena Bassil-Morozow: [Robert] strayed off from the question of the reality of evil deeds and into the realm of definitions. As I have already stated, I consider this approach counter-productive. Let me try to explain why.

Consider an example: a person projects his or her thoughts onto other people. Let's imagine that he or she does it quite forcibly – i.e., his actions are cathected with a degree of aggression. To use Jungian terminology, this person projects his or her own shadow onto others.

The choice of the individual on the receiving end of the projection is quite clear: to accept the projection, and with it the aggressor's internal reality (which in time, rather like an infection, may transform into the external reality), or to reject the unwanted opinions.

Now, regarding the owner of the projection: can we consider this person and/or his actions evil? In my opinion, not at this stage. To me, this person's behaviour looks like a sign of insecurity or a textbook deployment of immature defences. All is subjective, of course, and someone else may regard the owner of the projection evil or very aggressive (due to the presence of the cathected affect). However, strictly speaking, nothing truly bad happened and no one died.

Consider another example. Let's up the stakes and imagine someone who is truly and darkly charismatic. He or she successfully projects his shadow onto a group of people. The result is mass paranoia and mass murder. In this case, the choice of the individual who is trying to defend himself is far more complex because the projection is much more powerful and its consequences are REAL. This is no longer the psychological reality of the insecure abuser – this is mass murder.

The shadow has grown in size and became evil.

And here's the answer to your key question: the shadow is evil depending on the scale of the event as well as on the gravity of consequences. This is why I go back to the issue of the real.

- - -

Where evil resides exactly in human beings is a big question. There are a variety of theoretical possibilities, including, as [Matt] point[s] out, the soul, the collective unconscious, the instincts, etc. In trying to pinpoint the exact location or psychological birthplace of the shadow, we find ourselves in a murky forest of opinions and theories none of which have any tangible effect on the issue of evil. Jung does not necessarily locate the evil in the other. Consider, for instance, this quotation: 'whoever looks into the mirror of the water will see first of all his own face. Whoever goes to himself risks a confrontation with himself' (CW. 9/I: para. 43).

Jung views the shadow as something that primarily dwells in the psyche of the individual – but 'might be projected' onto the other. The shadow realises itself, comes alive in 'the other' via the mechanism of projection. Same goes for anima/animus/possessed.

Päivi Alho: (whether shadow is good or bad) Shadow always withholds a possibility for both good and bad. When not consciously realised in terms of analysis it is always bad in the long term, because the unconscious, projected, shadow distorts reality in that it refers to the subject and not the object. It attributes unrealistic traits to somebody else, which is stressful regardless whether these characteristics are idealised as good and desirable, or demonised as bad and avoidable. In an unconscious form the shadow is like an unintended but binding preconception. Introjection of the shadow is even worse...

The essence of the good and bad in this context - and every other context - "evaporates" into the mystery of life and death, in psychological as well as physical sense. If there is more evil than good in the world the human race will eventually die and become abolished from the earth.

Matt Koeske: My impression of Jung's position on evil is that he was acting not only as a psychologizer but also advocated an "absolute evil" or "archetypal evil" that had a very theological (rather than psychological or strictly scientific) quality.

I may be misunderstanding Erik, but I felt he was arguing for a biological basis or predisposition for human morality . . . a predisposition that necessitates the ideas of evil and good, which emerge within specific (but in many ways arbitrary and various) social contexts. I agree with Erik about this and feel that the human sense of morality is probably more biologically predisposed than consciously constructed or learned. The contexts and variations of expressing morality are likely learned/socialized, but the capacity for morality and the powerful emotions commonly attached to moral violations are probably largely innate. I think there are a number of sensible places to look for the "psychologic birthplace" of the shadow. It is, for instance easy to observe the unintentional construction of the shadow in any social group with an identity bond (f.e., a tribe). Where identity takes a specific form (as it always does), that form necessitates an otherness that does not conform. Moreover, all identity is significantly defined by what it is not, what it doesn't believe, what it doesn't do (or at least condemns doing). Therefore, as Jung claimed, any conscious attitude held has an opposite or other that the conscious attitude chooses not to be. As a result, the shadow is inevitable.

Another probably biologically rooted aspect of human sociality (and therefore human morality) is the dehumanization of what is considered other. One of the interesting (and frightening) characteristics of our morality is that moral laws (and "good" behavior) are reserved only for those others deemed fully human and significantly familiar. One individual might be exceedingly kind to his kin and tribe but have no qualms about harming other forms of like without remorse (animals, insects, plants, etc.). That individual may also feel it is perfectly acceptable to harm or kill other humans that do not satisfy his or her definition of familiar or "like me".

My point is that morality may be biologically rooted, but it is inextricably connected to the human sociality instinct, which drives constructions of self and other, us and them. The sociality instinct is also an identity constructing instinct. Both these instincts and their social expression determine that there will be a psychological construction of "Not-I" . . . an entity that we seem to instinctually fear and/or despise. The Not-I, by its very existence threatens the coherence of the I, because the coherence of the I is quite arbitrary. Any difference (in the realm of identity), therefore, is an argument for the invalidity of the I.

As for "evil" or a capacity for evil, we can look more closely at the way we are predisposed to construct and treat others who do not fall into our sense of kin. In these instances, even the most moral individuals can behave like psychopaths. But we (if we are of the same tribe) do not usually consider these actions or attitudes toward others psychopathic or evil. Where the other is dehumanized (and denuded of their "like-me-ness"), we typically allow ourselves to be or to perpetrate "evil".

I would consider "shadow work" to be a deep and generally painful investigation of this whole phenomenon as we have participated in it. The shadow worker asks, "How have I been constructing the other? How do I treat this other? Why have I allowed myself to be so cruel to and/or to relinquish any identification with this other?" This work demands increasing tolerance of and sympathy for the shadow. It is not a "redemption" of the shadow (as that would force me-ness onto the other in a colonizing fashion), but an acceptance that otherness is inevitable and that it does not have to destabilize (even as it must affect) the I.

George Hogenson: (a clinical example) I do think it is worth keeping in mind that at the personal level, at least, shadow is not always some massive sense of the evil side of a person's nature. Jung is pretty clear, I think, that shadow is really that aspect of our total life experience that is most difficult for us to accept. A small clinical example that I have permission to use and frequently bring up with analytic trainees illustrates the point. Some years back I had as a client a rather well regarded professor from one of the major universities here in Chicago. He was particularly well known as one of those lecturers who could pack an auditorium due to the brilliance of his lectures. But there was a considerable level of anxiety, which was the presenting issue. After we had been working for a while, he came in with a dream in which he had dreamt that he was a rather tacky used car salesman, wearing a garish yellow plaid sports coat. This was to my mind, a representation of the shadow. While he was unquestionably a fine scholar, at some level he realized that much of his popularity was based on showmanship, to the point of somewhat underhanded manipulation of his large student audiences. He was not evil, nor was he selling cars that would drop their engines as soon as they left the lot, but he was selling used material--same thing over and over--and he was relying increasingly on his stage technique to maintain his sales/reputation. Coming to terms with this aspect of his career was not easy but it was important for his development into later stages of his life.

Susan Rowland: I am interested in Helena's argument that "postmodernism" has diminished our sense of the reality of evil and given a trickster version of Jung's shadow without grip on body, nature etc. It would really help if you characterized this version of "postmodernism" as, even though its era seems to be largely exhausted, it still defeats simple categorization, in my view.

For example, rather than being obscured by some deflating "postmodern" force of theory, I might argue that Jung's sense of the way the reality of the unconscious undermines secure knowing gives him an *affinity* with later postmodern arguments. I am not saying that Jung IS postmodern; rather that he anticipates and in my view answers rather a lot of it!

This finally leads me to build on George Hogenson's invaluable clinical example of shadow and suggest that Jung's shadow is a marvellously powerful image for the challenges to the

stability of meaning in a complex culture and semiotics like ours. To pursue the Lacanian analogy, Jung's shadow is the Real dynamically animating the Symbolic Order.

II

The second Presenter is Erik D. Goodwyn, MD, Psychiatrist, academic and author. His paper is about the shadow and archetypes.

Erik's paper explores concepts from his book (2012) *The Neurobiology of the Gods*, chapter 10, 'The Shadow' in affective neuroscience and the creative production of mental imagery such as found in myth and dreams. Erik pays particular attention to non-dualistic cultural images of the Self which include the mercurial, 'shadow' archetypal elements expressed, for example, through Woden (Germanic myth), Merlin and Mercurius. Such personifications express both the emotionality imbued in 'shadow' as well as its integrative possibilities, if differentiated and made conscious.

Erik was born in Washington, D. C., and is a graduated scholar of the college with a B.S. in physics and mathematics at Western Kentucky University. He obtained a M.S. in anatomy and neurobiology at the University of Louisville where he co-authored several journal articles in cancer cell research. He graduated from the University of Cincinnati with an M.D. and went on to psychiatric residency training at Wright State University. He is an officer in the air force and has been involved in teaching as well as contributing to research in psychiatric imaging and genomics studies in addition to caring for a variety of patients from both civilian and military backgrounds, including soldiers who have been deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan. He received the Abe Heller Essay award in two consecutive years for essays on psychodynamic theory and neuroscience.

Erik has published several articles for *The Journal of Analytical Psychology*, which has generated a lively discussion among top theorists in analytical psychology (*Journal of Analytical Psychology*, Vol 55, no 4: pp. 502-555) from the United States, England and Australia. Erik has also written a book *The Neurobiology of the Gods: How the Brain Shapes the Recurrent Imagery of Myth and Dreams* (Routledge, 2012). The following paper draws its fascinating material of 'shadow' phenomena from his book as well as from new material not yet been published....

The Eye in the Well—Shadow and Self

Seldom do we find symbols of the goal whose dual nature is not immediately apparent.
(CW 16, para 398)

For Jung, the shadow represented:

a moral problem that challenges the whole ego-personality, for no one can become conscious of the shadow without considerable moral effort. To become conscious of it involves recognizing the dark aspects of the personality as present and real....Closer examination of the dark characteristics...reveals that they have an emotional nature.
(Jung, CW9ii, para 14-15)

From a biological perspective, the affective systems that fuel rage, fear, lust, resource seeking, etc., are morally neutral and evolved to serve the preservation of the organism. Humans, however, universally have biocultural mechanisms in place that aim toward maintenance of reputation, trustworthiness and harmonious social cooperation. But these patterns emerge over top the more primitive systems that fuel violent agonistic competition for resources. The guilt that these newer bio-social systems generate is therefore sometimes at odds with the more basic reflexive energy of rage, fear, or lust systems. So it seems the

human mind is born into conflict and a tendency to repress, dissociate or divide, particularly when challenged by trauma or extremely conflicting needs, a finding supported by therapy case study (Van der Hart et al, 2006) as well as neuroscientific investigations (Goodwyn, 2012, McNamara 2009). These aspects which are separated from consciousness (or have yet to surface) encompass the Shadow.

Refusal to accept the darker/Shadow aspects of the personality helps perpetuate conflicted and unhealthy patterns (Jung, CW 16, para 381). In fact, the approach of many styles of therapy involves accepting them and becoming conscious of them, while not allowing them to dominate behavior. Instead, the goal is to use them in more controlled, constructive, and flexible ways. Jung emphasizes in CW 16 that the process of individuation contains a continual interplay of opposites, and this interplay can be seen as the intermingling of shadow, often depicted in images of the Self, as the Self contains the totality of the human being.

Self and Shadow—Images from English Heritage

Though typical explorations of Self symbols traditionally explore our Classical inheritance in the West, the part of our cultural symbolism that is carried by the English language contains aspects that warrant further investigation, as language can be seen as a vessel of culture, which includes collective conscious and unconscious material. In CW 13 and 16, Jung describes the late Medieval image of the Self as Mercurius; we can supplement this analysis using the available Germanic material from which the English heritage originally derives, and into which the Classical material (such as the god Mercurius) was adopted (starting roughly in the 7th century with Christianization of the Anglo-Saxons and continuing after), in particular with regard to Shadow elements.

Among the Pan-Germanic traditions from which English derived, I argue that the pre-Christian image of the Self was Woden. Woden is the most well documented of the pagan gods of the Anglo-Saxons (Owen, 1985), and a god of many aspects. According to Germanic scholar E.O. Turville-Petre,

The English records suggest that, among the pagan English, Woden had filled a place similar to that which he filled in Scandinavia as late as the tenth century...he was a god of princes, victory, death and magic, perhaps also of runes, speech, poetry. It is not insignificant that the English come chiefly from north Germany and Denmark, where the cult of Odin seems to be old and particularly well established. (1964: 71).

Among the Scandinavians, Woden was known as Óðinn, which has been Anglicized to Odin in modern English^[1]. He is an ancient god: “Theologically speaking, Odin is related to the Indian god Varuna, who has sorcery, the gift of shape-changing and the directing of the fortunes of battle in common with the Germanic god...[which traces Odin] back to Indo-Germanic times.” (Simek, 1993: 244-5).

Woden as Shadow-Inclusive Image of Self/Individuation

One of the clues to the pluripotency of the image of Woden is the sheer number of names attributed to this god. Over two hundred have survived^[2]. In the Eddas and sagas, Woden is often described as a tall, spear wielding one-eyed man with a long grey beard, a blue or grey cloak and a wide-brimmed hat. He appears as a complex character, great and terrifying, loving and cruel. Orchard (2002: 276), summarizes the account of Odin given in the *Ynglingasaga*:

Odin was the cleverest of all, and from him all the others learned their arts and skills. But he knew them first, and more than other folk....When he sat among his friends, his face was so fair and dignified, that the spirits of all were uplifted by it, but when he went into war he seemed fearsome to his foes. This was because he could change his skin and appearance in any fashion he so chose....Odin knew how to alter his shape: his body would lie as if dead or sleeping, while he would be in the form of a fish or snake or bird or beast. With only a word or two he knew how to put out fire, calm the stormy sea or change the wind to any direction he wanted...Odin was skilled in the art [of prophecy]. Through this he was able to know beforehand the fate of men and what had not yet come to pass... (Orchard, 2002: 276-277).

We can see here the ways in which Woden manifests as an organizing force, changing the fabric of the subjective world, and aware of the great turnings of events throughout all corners of it.

A number of animals are closely associated with Woden, including his two ravens Hugin and Munin ("thought" and "mind") and his two wolves Geri and Freki ("ravenous" and "greedy"), unifying the cerebral with the visceral, and occupying the 'fifth' within them. Elsewhere, Orchard has this to say:

...most notably the quest for wisdom and knowledge, together with an eager passion for using sex and deception in the pursuit of his aims...Odin is often found in the sources engaged in a battle of wits, whether with giants...with humans...and even with others of the Æsir....His close association with the dead is also apparently connected with this thirst for knowledge, which extends to speaking with the hanged and maimed, and raising the dead to seek wisdom. (2002: 274).

These comments link Woden not only with organization, origination, and "first" crafts and activities, but also with a powerful forward moving energy of seeking. Woden is therefore a unification of many energies and opposites. Woden is often seen in the myths as acquiring knowledge from extremely wise and ancient giants, notably learning powerful magic from his uncle (a giant). Woden is also the god of poetry and spoken magic, which to oral cultures such as the pre-Christian Germanic tribes, is nothing less than the preservation of culture.

The self-sacrifice of Woden on Yggdrasil, according to Simek,

is also well-known from initiation rites in archaic cultures, and has sufficient parallels in Indian (Prajāpati, Kṛṣṇa) and in Greek mythology (Dionysius) to warrant its acceptance as an Indo-Germanic motif. Consequently, the origin of Odin's self-sacrifice should be seen as one of the shamanistic initiation rites into the knowledge of poetry and magic connected with the knowledge of the runes [mysteries]. (1993: 249).

The comparisons between Woden's sacrifice, speared upon the tree, is of course similar to the independent symbolism of Christ's sacrifice on the cross:

The sacrifice of Odin to himself may thus be seen as the highest conceivable form of sacrifice, in fact so high that, like many a religious mystery, it surpasses our comprehension. It is the sacrifice, not of king to god, but of god to god, of such a kind as is related in Scripture of the sacrifice of Christ...although every one of these had its roots in pagan tradition. (Turville-Petre, 1964: 48-50).

Note also the connection between this sacrifice and the sacrificing of the primordial giant Ymir at the creation of the world. The force behind this act—Woden himself—is also the force that acts similarly upon itself, as if iterating a continual relentless process of differentiation. Through this act, Woden acquires the power of speech, runes (mysteries),

poetry, song, and magical incantations. In other words, he achieves the immense power of language/culture. He gains such insight only through his own painful involutions and expansions, which parallels the process of individuation *through* endless contact with Shadow *prima materia*.

A Complex of Images and Antimonies

Woden also embodies a union of masculine and feminine elements; he practices the “female” magic of prophecy, which he learned from Freya—the supremely beautiful goddess of magic, death, sexual passion, and fertility. Woden also has an army of ferocious female warriors known as valkyries who are variously depicted as enacting his will, teaching warriors battle magic, or sometimes falling in love with heroes—connecting fierce anima images to the Self. Even further blurring of boundaries comes from the observation that Loki, the morally ambiguous and gender-crossing trickster god who helps bring about Ragnarök and ends up siding against the gods, is Woden’s “blood brother”.

Woden therefore forges the link between creation and destruction and is a central player in the three great sacrifices of the mythology—first, he (tripled with his two brothers) sacrificed Ymir, his ancestor, to create the world. Second, he sacrificed himself to himself in order to achieve the magical power and wisdom to rule. Third, he is doomed to sacrifice himself willingly at Ragnarök for the sake of the new world to rise after. Woden straddles the boundaries of good and evil, god and giant, life and death, male and female, creation and destruction, reason and instinct, light and darkness.

Finally, the myths tell us Woden and his many children carve out Asgard and the mortal realms—the worlds of Self and ego, respectively—and create a space from the surrounding chaos of Jötunheimr and the underworlds, and this space is in a state of eternal change and cyclic evolution, where the powerful, wild, wise, beautiful, ugly, and lustful unconscious forces are constantly impinging upon the realms of gods and humans, and must be dealt with through means that range from placation and marriage to outright trickery and warfare. And on the other side of this, Woden’s blood-brother Loki, who is also both god and giant, is foretold to bring about the destruction of Asgard and Midgard, inverting creation. This cosmology appears to map well to the dynamics of psyche.

Transformations of Self images

In the West, it appears that as Christianity pressed northward and absorbed the heathen tribes, the older images of Self-ego dynamics became overshadowed by the newer religious images. There are significant differences, however, in that the narrative of Christ’s heroic journey of sacrifice involves a sharply defined moral dimension that was not present in the older tradition. Jung argued in CW 9ii and CW 13 (see also Jung and von Franz, 1970) that the absolute right and wrong that came to characterize Christianity quickly produced “anti-Christ” images in folklore and legend which cropped up constantly throughout the medieval period and were a necessary consequence of this splitting. The dynamics of the Self that we have explored thus far suggest that there is always a movement in mythic expression towards characters who are more unified and ambiguous in their nature, even after characters like Woden were forgotten.

One such character that emerged post-conversion that seems to fit this description is the strange character of Merlin. Legends about Merlin were, and are, remarkably resilient across the generations, originally spreading rapidly and fascinating generations not long after the conversion in the British Isles. Merlin grew in popularity in the context of Christianity, and it

was not long until Merlin was even placed on the same level as biblical prophets (Ashe, 2006). Like Woden, Merlin is of ambiguous origins (being born from the mating of a demon and a morally pure Christian woman), has powers of prophecy and magic, and is said to have died by hanging and impaling (drowning is added to Merlin's "three deaths"), but yet he lives on. Both characters shape change and prophesy and are associated with holy vessels: Merlin with the Grail, and Woden with the Holy Mead of Poetry. Both characters are also morally ambiguous and are given to fits of madness, and are paired with equally magical wives, Merlin with the fairy Viviane or Nimue, and Woden with the magical Frigga or Freya. Merlin is also attached to a great tree described as being in "the center", the Priory Oak in some legends, as Woden is linked to Yggdrasil.

Merlin, like Woden, is part giant/demon, enemy and friend, dangerous and benevolent. Ashe goes on to link Merlin's stories with older Celtic myths, such as the Welsh god Mabon, and links Britian with Merlin as possibly originally an ancestral deity (Ashe, 2003: 113), much like Woden was taken as ancient ancestor to the Anglo-Saxons. Ashe says of Merlin:

In his mythic fullness he is an unclassifiable being with unique powers and knowledge, neither divine nor demonic, yet with something of both—human despite his profound strangeness, and supportive of the good, in ways that are no one else's. (Ashe, 2003: 215-216).

This could easily apply to Woden's characterization.

Woden and Mercurius

Emma Jung and M.-L. von Franz argue in *The Grail Legend* (1970) that Merlin represents the missing element, Shadow, that Medieval Christianity split off and that Merlin's legend grew so quickly because of the psychological void he filled. If we follow this reasoning, it becomes evident that such a void was created when widespread tales of Woden faded from popular memory. Though not focusing on Woden per se, Jung and von Franz do notice a firm resemblance between Merlin and Wotan, another name for Woden. They also argue the numerous connections between Merlin and the figure spoken of in later alchemical texts, the god/spirit Mercurius:

The efflorescence of the Merlin literature coincided in time with that of Occidental alchemy, and in the latter we find a personification of the arcane substance, which bears a striking resemblance to Merlin, namely the alchemical Mercurius....It is remarkable how many features Merlin and the Mercurius of the alchemists have in common...Moreover we are entitled to compare Merlin with the alchemical Mercurius since the alchemists themselves did so. (1970: 368-371, emphasis in original).

We are furthermore encouraged to compare Mercurius with Woden because historians as far back as the 1st century CE did so, as will be evident. Jung and von Franz further note that Mercurius and Merlin are both material and spiritual beings, and represent the process by which "the lower and material is transformed into the higher and spiritual, and vice versa" (1970, 372). Furthermore they both are devilish yet redeeming psychopomps, as well as evasive tricksters:

It is amazing how such a figure of the Self emerges almost simultaneously as Mercurius in Occidental alchemy and as Merlin in the Grail legend. This indicates how profound the psychic need must already have been at that time for some such undivided personification of the incarnated Godhead that should heal the opposites

of Christ-Antichrist...in Merlin the older image of God is probably resuscitated, an image in which aspects of Wotan are mingled....(1970, 372-375).

More than mingled, I argue, but repeated. Jung said of Mercurius:

...he represents on the one hand the self and on the other the individuation process and, because of the limitless number of his names [another trait shared with Woden], also the collective unconscious” (CW13, para 284).

Jung psychologizes the god as an image of individuation and transformation, and theorizes that Mercurius “personifies the unconscious [and is] essentially ‘duplex,’ paradoxically dualistic by nature, fiend, monster, beast, and at the same time panacea....” (CW 16, para 389). Elsewhere:

“The alchemists aptly personified it as the wily god of revelation, Hermes or Mercurius; and though they lament over the way he hoodwinks them, they still give him the highest names, which bring him very near to deity.” (CW 16, para 384).

Mercurius, like Woden, is a triple-god: in the Norse creation story, Woden is tripled to include two brothers whose names alliterate in Proto-Germanic *Wōdinaz*, *Wiljon*, *Wēhaz*: “inspiration/fury”, “thought/will”, “numen/spirit”, a structure found in many mythologies of triple-gods. Both Woden and Mercurius are ambivalent, healers and destroyers, wily and dangerous, killers and lovers, teachers and deceivers. Together they are associated with the great tree (such as the great Oak of Mercurius described in CW 13, para 239-243[3]), are vengeful, and have boundless riches. Mercurius and Woden dwell in the roots of the great tree[4], are gods of revelation/inspiration, transformation, have myths in which they are burned but unharmed, are called good *and* evil[5], are originators of magical scripts[6], are tied to a hermaphroditic god/giant, are lascivious, and connect above and below through their actions.

Developments Across Time

Jung argued that “the introspective brooding of the centuries gradually put together the figure of Mercurius and created a symbol which, according to all the psychological rules, stands in a compensatory relation to Christ.” (CW 13, para 295). But as we have seen, from the perspective of the Germanic-English language-complex, such an image was already extant before Christianity arrived—he was apparently “rediscovered” by the alchemists. The Christ image is, according to Jung, the archetype of consciousness—it is a differentiation in which Shadow is entirely transcended, leaving the moral perfection of the Christ. But if we follow Jung and von Franz’s speculations here, it appears that a more unifying and antimonial, and perhaps foundational figure re-formed not long after in Merlin, and even in the same location (England) where the previously Woden-worshipping Anglo-Saxons settled, connecting a sequence of highly persistent images across the millennia; starting with the archaic Proto-Germanic god **Wōđanaz* (West, 2007)[7]. We can piece together, then, that the transition of the Proto-Germanic-Germanic-English tradition carried a resilient image of the Self:

**Wōđanaz* à Woden à Merlin à Mercurius

While the conscious attitude, popularity and worship toward these figures changed, the imagery itself returned continually to the same complex after the introduction of the Christ figure, with Mercurius returning nearly full circle to Woden: even as early as the 1st Century CE, Tacitus, interpreting foreign gods as Roman, labels the pagan Germanic chief god Woden as “Mercurius” in his *Germania*. Notably, Jung combines these images similarly as “the pagan god Hermes-Mercurius-Wotan” in CW 13, though he does not discuss the

Germanic/Norse/Anglo-Saxon material as deeply as I have here. The Shadow-mingled images of the Self stubbornly resisted eradication, drifting back to the same complex over the centuries, despite various efforts at eradication, returning always to the image variously labeled as **Wōðanaz*-Woden-Merlin-Mercurius. As mentioned, Jung argues (CW 13) that Christ was the archetype of fully differentiated consciousness and Mercurius the unconscious. Interestingly, the pagan myths actually presage this differentiation, keeping it contained within the image of Woden: Woden sacrificed an eye to the well of creation/fate/magic, and therefore sees both the conscious worlds and the primordial unconscious underworlds. His gaze spans both realms.

In whatever guise, these resilient image complexes have at their core the essential element of Shadow. Replacing Woden with Christ—who is completely free of Shadow—only led to another complex of images to accrete around the older type of Self image which demanded Shadow inclusion. And even this transformation, too, is also pictured in the myths, such that Woden is depicted as capable of resurrecting himself^[8], Shadow and all.

The Self, as an archetype, cannot be observed directly, but must be viewed through its effect on imagery. Through the foregoing analysis, we can see how the archetype of the Self has drawn imagery to it across scores of generations, giving us a better look at its inner workings—the results appear to demand Shadow as critical element that resists the most powerful moral imperatives to exclude it. This may be due to the extensive biological underpinnings of what normally lies in the Shadow: lust and rage, but sometimes repressed play and seeking action plans—morally neutral behavior systems that evolved for our survival, but sometimes need the coordinating and integrating action of individuation to interact smoothly and flexibly.

Jung says of Mercurius: “as an ancient pagan god he possesses a natural undividedness which is impervious to logical and moral contradictions. This gives him invulnerability and incorruptibility, the very qualities we so urgently need to heal the split in ourselves.” (CW 13, para 295). Thus it appears that, in the story of the English cultural-linguistic tradition, the many Christ symbols emerged as a differentiation from the Shadow-inclusive image of the Self, but this should be thought of as not as a *replacement* of the pagan images, but as developing alongside, or perhaps out of the more primordial process, with Shadow content being the primary element of difference: even in the context of conscious efforts to eradicate them, Shadow-mingled Self images recur, reinforcing their importance in the individuation process, existing as a potential in every human psyche.

Bibliography

Ashe G. 2006. *Merlin*. Sutton.

Faulkes A (trans.). 1995. *Edda*. Everyman.

Goodwyn E. 2012. *The Neurobiology of the Gods*. Routledge.

Jung CG. 1959 [1979]. Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler and W. McGuire (Eds.), trans. R.F.C. Hull. *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Vol 9ii*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Jung CG. 1966 [1985]. The Practice of Psychotherapy. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler and W. McGuire (Eds.), trans. R.F.C. Hull. *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung Vol 16*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Jung CG. 1967. Alchemical Studies. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler and W. McGuire (eds.), trans. R. F. C. Hull, *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, vol 13. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Jung E and von Franz M-L. 1970. *The Grail Legend*. Mythos.
 Larrington C (trans.). 1996. *The Poetic Edda*. Oxford University.
 McNamara P. 2009. *The Neuroscience of Religious Experience*. Cambridge University Press.
 Orchard A. 2002. *Cassell's Dictionary of Norse Myth and Legend*. Cassell
 Russell JC. 1994. *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity*. Oxford University Press.
 Simek R. 1993 [2007]. *Dictionary of Northern Mythology*. D.S. Brewer.
 Turville-Petre, EOG. 1964. *Myth and Religion of the North*. Greenwood.
 Van der Hart O, Nijenhuis ERS, Steele K. 2006. *The Haunted Self*. Norton.
 West ML. 2006. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford.

[1] Other variations include Wodan, Wotan, Godan, and Oden.

[2] Among his many names are Aldaföðr “father of the world”, Baleyg “Flaming Eye”, Bölverkr “Bale-worker”, Draugadróttinn “Lord of the Undead”, Faðr galdrs “Father of magical songs”, Fjölfnir “the Wise Concealer”, Gangari “Wanderer, Traveler”, Gizurr “Riddler”, Grímnir “Hooded One”, Hangatyr “Hanged God”, Herfodr “Father of Hosts”, Hrafnagud “Raven God”, Hropt “Groaner, Wise One”, Jölföðr “Yule-Father”, Oski “God of Wishes”, Rúnatýr “Rune God”, Sigtyr “God of Victory”, Svidur “Wise One”, Svipall “Changing”, Thrasarr “Quarreler”, Ud “Loved”, Valdr Vagnbrautar “Ruler of Heaven”, and Ygg “Terrible One” (Faulkes, 1995).

[3] “The mighty old oak is proverbially the king of the forest. Hence it represents a central figure among the contents of the unconscious, possessing personality in the most marked degree. It is the prototype of the *self*, a symbol of the source and goal of the individuation process.” (CW 13, para 241). Jung further remarks that Mercurius “was considered identical with the German national god, Wotan” (para 245) but does not mention details explored here.

[4] One of Woden’s names is Sváfnir (“Sleep-bringer”), also a name of one of the serpents gnawing at the roots of Yggdrasil (Turville-Petre, 1964: 63).

[5] As in Woden’s names Ud “Loved” and Bolverk “Evil-Doer”.

[6] Hieroglyphs in the case of Mercurius (CW 13, para 225), runes in the case of Woden.

[7] In linguistics, reconstructed words are preceded by an asterisk.

[8] Described in the *Hávamál*, or “sayings of the High One”, meaning Woden/Odin (Larrington, 1996).

II) Discussion. Comments, questions and answers.

Elizabeth Brodersen: (dream example) As I understand it, Mercurius, as spirit, can transform disassociated 'shadow' qualities into acceptable, co-operative ones for the ego. The 'shadow' in these cases must have enough attractive traits to bridge, balance and overcome 'shadow' revulsion and the 'taboo' emotions attached to 'shadow,' otherwise such emotions have not really been accepted and integrated. They remain pretty 'ugly.'

I'd like to offer a dream example from an analysand of Mercurius working in the modern day psyche which reminds me in certain aspects of the dream George posted last week at the beginning of the seminar, although the two clinical cases are obviously different. The analysand in question is an upright, well-educated, rational, conservative banker, lover of classical music and refined tradition. Anything frivolous or reflecting popular culture he dismisses as uncultivated and uncouth from which he consciously disassociates himself to keep his cultured, cautious persona in tact. I would say he is an introverted, intuitive thinker, who presents a picture of 'normalcy' but suffers from bouts of depression and loneliness which sometimes manifest themselves in alarming physical symptoms. He has given me permission to use his dream to show how working with 'shadow' has helped to ameliorate his physical symptoms as he cautiously integrates his 'shadow' as 'positive' not always 'negative' into ego consciousness...

' I am standing alone in prison. There are grey walls all around and I feel hopeless and isolated. Suddenly, a bright yellow, open sports car drives through the prison door with Elvis Presley sitting at the wheel wearing glitzy 'rock and roll' clothes. His black hair is slicked

back from his forehead. He opens the car door and I get in quickly and we drive off. I feel intensely liberated.'

Since that dream, the analysand has incorporated Elvis as a co-operative 'shadow' mercurial personification of his own lost 'sensation' function which he had repressed as 'taboo' and 'inferior.' Through contact with Elvis as his same sex 'shadow' personification, even listening to rock music, he says he experiences more joy, spontaneity and freedom in relationship with others on a direct, dynamic, emotional level. He calls them 'his Elvis Presley moments...!' In this particular case, I would interpret the 'shadow' as performing an important compensatory and liberating function. Elvis in his own lifetime was trapped as a 'shadow' projection of some pretty hefty, undifferentiated, collective 'sensation' himself, amongst other aspects, so the intra-psychic personifications of Elvis and the banker, in the dream, combine and work well together (unconscious/shadow; ego/persona) in a creative, symbolic relationship which I think benefits both aspects in new ways....

The individuation process is difficult, frightening work, more particularly for those attached to a too- safe, collective persona out of fear of doing or thinking about anything 'risky.' They need a 'mercurial' dream that helps them neutralise, bridge and integrate 'shadow/self' aspects to move forward into life. In clinical dream work, I look to see who or what is strong and irresistible enough to break through and make that connection between 'shadow' and ego possible. In this case of the banker I mentioned, the spirit Mercurius takes the compensatory image of Elvis Presley and performs that transformation...

Pam O'Connel: I am a visual artist and have a particular interest in the shadow as I discovered that unbeknownst to me it was present in my strongest work. I wrote my thesis on "The Shadow in Art" and in it I investigated the Jungian concept of shadow and its manifestation in art. Whilst doing my Masters in Fine Art I found that as I became more creative my work was becoming darker. I did not want to go down this dark route and yet I wanted to progress as an artist. This led to the question of the relationship between creativity and shadow. Roseanne Bane in "Dancing in the Dragons Den" wrote "Carl Jung said that creativity comes from the least preferred function, this is, our creativity comes from our shadow!"

Jung viewed the shadow as part of the psyche that if acknowledged could lead to positive growth. He believed that in order to realize one's potential as an individual, personally and creatively, it is necessary to encounter one's shadow. He recognized the positive aspects of shadow as he felt it contained many positive influences. In fact, he considered it 90% golden as it contains creative impulses, normal instincts and insights. I identify with this positive attitude to shadow.

The American writer and educator Erica Jong said, "Everyone has talent. What is rare is the courage to follow the talent to the dark place where it leads." I believe it is this dark place that the artist has to visit on their creative journey.

Evangeline Rand: I found your use of the word 'language' in your first contribution a little bit disconcerting since you went on to talk more generally about mythologies in a more general sense. So when you came back to 'word' discussion, in your second letter, I found the rest of your writing fall into place. (Ah yes, language... "a vessel of culture".) With much interest.

I'm not sure about the English tradition coming, primarily, from Germany and Denmark...

Then there were the Celtic missionaries who went into 'german lands' so long ago...

I think the English spiritual tradition is rooted in deeply pagan and ancient traditions rooted in earth forms and so on. I think recent DNA work shows all of the people British Isles and others in Europe originating at the end of the ice age in Spain. And I'm not a historian... But

your point remains...we dwell in land, cultures and mythologies. Unfortunately many of our 'mother tongues', around the world, are disappearing at an astonishing rate.

III

The third Presenter is Christopher Hauke, Jungian analyst, academic and author. The paper is about shadow and film.

Christopher's paper maintains that any struggle with the rejected and despised in the end brings more self-understanding. He proposes that a similar struggle with popular film with its stirring of emotion and its more violent genres as the rejected 'shadow' of film-as-art is worthwhile. The dark liminality of cinema space also offers an opportunity to allow 'shadow' emotions normally kept away from consciousness to emerge, be experienced and yet stay in that dark space of the viewing theatre itself. His paper on 'Film and The Shadow' is in part a chapter in his upcoming book, *Visible Mind, Filmmaker, Spectator, Psyche*, to be published in 2013 by Routledge. This paper offers us a wonderful opportunity to move to the venue of 'shadow' as encountered in film and film going.

Chris is a Jungian analyst and Senior Lecturer at Goldsmiths, University of London, UK, and a filmmaker. He is the author of *Human Being Human, Culture and the Soul* and *Jung and the Postmodern: The Interpretation of Realities*. He has co-edited two volumes of Jungian writing on film: *Jung and Film. Post-Jungian Takes on the Moving Image* (2001) and the new collection, *Jung and Film II – The Return* published in London and New York in 2011. His films include the documentaries *One Colour Red* and *Green Ray*. The psychological short *Again* was premiered in Montreal in 2010. His website is <http://christopherhauke.com/?cat=98>

Film and The Shadow

Film and its gaps - emptiness as shadow to substance.

Jung links his idea of the shadow to Freud's concept of the personal unconscious and its repressed contents, "it is well known that Freudian psychoanalysis limits itself to the task of making conscious the shadow-side and the evil within us." (Jung, 1932. CW 11 para.531) but Jung finds it contains far more creative potential, "If the repressed tendencies, the shadow as I call them, were obviously evil, there would be no problem whatever. But the shadow is merely somewhat inferior, primitive, unadapted, and awkward, not wholly bad. It contains childish or primitive qualities which would in a way vitalize and embellish human existence, but - convention forbids". (Jung, 1938. CW 11 para.134).

There is a way in which modernity in its struggle with fragmentation and identity, being and shadow, has given rise to procedures or innovations (we might call them) that both encompass and attempt to heal these very things with which they struggle. One example could certainly be the particular form of conversation innovated by Freud and Jung known as psychoanalytic psychotherapy where there is an assumption that the unconscious precedes and limits the discourse, while attention to what is said can help reveal what is otherwise in the shadows and unknown. In this way a new narrative of the self is brought to light and a coherence over the fragmentary nature of mind is achieved by

giving attention to addressing the unconscious which is otherwise experienced as gaps in consciousness.

Film might well be a further example. When it is projected, film appears as a semblance of the real world and in fact seems to have a convincing power over the senses to offer an experience which - more than any other art or simulation or representation - produces an equivalent of subjective reality in terms of emotions felt and identifications made. Yet film itself is full of gaps. We can only see moving pictures because of the non-film, the spaces on the film Eastman invented. He decided to make small, regular square holes either side of the celluloid film-strip so it might be dragged regularly past the film-gate to let in light and expose each frame in succession. Between each celluloid frame of film, or between each refreshing of the digital image sixty cycles per second, there is again a momentary gap which makes the whole illusion possible. It makes the moving image as opposed to the still picture. When projected, second after second the same sprocket holes are used to drag twenty-four separate still photographs past a bright light giving the impression of a moving picture on the opposite wall of a darkened room. Film seems to re-fragment reality so it then may make it whole again. A technique to turn fragmentariness - the shadow of a desired coherent 'whole' reality - back into the whole we need. In this way, in our viewing of the projection of light and shadow, we derive a less fragmented sense of ourselves, a coherence of identity projected into what we see.

The Red Book - Jung's encounter with the shadow of the civilised

In Jungian psychology the shadow archetype is the obverse to self-identity – it is the Other to all we think we are. Shadow may be defined as that with which we do not identify, that which is rejected as 'not me'. To struggle with the shadow and to confront the abject, is one of the tasks of individuation - Jung's term for the fulfilment of one's potential as a unique human being. Throughout *The Red Book* (Jung, 2009), the record of Jung's self-exploration through fantasies and paintings started around 1913, Jung reports his struggle with many opposed and rejected parts of his nature such as the feminine in himself, the banal, the popularised, the irrational and magic – all that Jung consciously rejected but now finds he has to include in his being.

At several moments, we find Jung suggesting there may be a place in Hell for the shadow aspects of psyche which he detects in himself and may be found in many of us. One Hell - believe it or not - is for those who reject an affinity with cinema, another is populated by those who reject any identity with the imprisoned and a third for people who so hang on to conscious life they never consider death. While these levels of Hell seem quite different – some apparently banal, some profound – what they have in common is they are all about rejection. Such acts of exclusion and rejection initiate the struggle with the Shadow archetype.

Ever since the Lumiere Brothers first screened their films in Paris in 1895, popular cinema has met with rejection and disdainfully valued lower than theatre and other performance arts. Just as the popular novel cannot compare to 'literature', both are accused of being purely commercial and banal. But as any struggle with what we reject and despise in the end brings us more self-understanding, I propose that a similar struggle with popular film - the rejected shadow of film-as-art - is worthwhile. *The Red Book* is Jung's record of

his struggle with the opposing parts of himself and the contemporary psyche in general – which includes encounters with popular cinema and the banal. In this period of his thinking and fantasising, Jung is at the start of an individuation crisis where everything he once believed and valued is getting turned upon its head; an agonising crisis brought on by rifts between Jung and the psychoanalytic community, and his sensitivity to the turmoil of Europe at that time. In many ways, Jung’s encounter with aspects of himself that he had previously been rejecting was as much an individual encounter as it was to be typical of millions in the coming era. "Jung’s personal identity as a founder of a new psychology....was threefold:

psychologist (originator of a new theory and critic of Freud), social critic and moralist (commentator on the predicament of modern man), and prophet (critic of traditional Christianity). Insofar as his core process was a synthesis of all three - a ‘new way of seeing things’ - Jung’s identity must be understood as a synthesis of these three self-images.” (Homans, 1979: 91) For the following twentieth century, a ‘new way of seeing things’ was to be the project of all.

‘Bewitched by the banal’ - popular cinema and Jung’s epiphany

Jung begins from a position of despising popular fiction and its banal emotions in one fantasy reported in *The Red Book* (Jung, 2009: 262) where he writes of a fantasy character being “bewitched by the banal” (ibid.) The idea of being “bewitched by the banal” is an example of being caught up in shadow projection and being mesmerised into achieving a sense of identity through this particular version of ‘not-me’. Calling it ‘bewitching’ draws attention to how difficult it is to manage a core engagement with what we reject and despise so that we may stand back and re-assess it on the way to a reconsideration of our self-identity as a whole.

Later Jung is equally negative about popular cinema. A further fantasy in *The Red Book* helps us track Jung as he questions his own impulse to reject this popular mass entertainment, but later has an epiphany in realising its human significance and value. In this fantasy he calls ‘One of the Lowly’, (Jung, 2009: 265-67) Jung is joined by a dirtily-clothed man with scars on his face and only one eye – a tramp “who does not look trustworthy.” (ibid.: 265) Jung and the man strike up a conversation. The man says he is looking for work but does not want to work for a farmer in the countryside because, he says, “there is no mental stimulation, the farmers are clods.” (ibid.) Jung is surprised and wonders how this working dolt can prioritise his ‘mental stimulation’ before he has even secured his work. He asks the man what kind of stimulation there is in the city and gets the answer:

“He: ‘You can go to the cinema in the evenings. That’s great and it’s cheap. You get to see everything that happens in the world’. [...]

[Jung] I: ‘What interested you most about the cinema?’

He: ‘One sees all sorts of stunning feats. There was one man who ran up houses.

Another carried his head under his arm. Another stood in the middle of a fire and wasn’t burnt. Yes, it’s really remarkable, the things that people can do.’” (ibid.)

At first we find Jung sneering: “And that’s what this fellow calls mental stimulation!.”

(ibid.) In this, Jung shares an elitist attitude that has prevailed since movies began. But struggling with his disdain towards cinema – this mere entertainment for the masses –

Jung reflects on his biased view and on the fate to which all the anti-cinema snobs may be condemned:

“I have to think of Hell, where there are also cinemas for those who despised this institution on earth and did not go there because everyone else found it to their taste”. (ibid.)

Jung then thinks again about the wonders the indigent man says he looks forward to witnessing in the cinema and finds he appreciates the fellow’s views even more. Jung compares the cinematic depictions of wonderful feats to the appeal of tales of the Saints and asks himself,

“Isn’t it a blasphemous idea to consider the Acta Sanctorum as historical cinema? Oh, today’s miracles are somewhat less mythical than technical. I regard my companion with feeling – he lives the history of the world – and I?” (ibid.)

Jung struggles with his fantasy of the cinema as rejected and cast into the shadow back in 1913 as part of his ongoing journey toward self-knowledge and acceptance. By 1928-1930 in his seminars on Dream Analysis, Jung is happy to state, “The movies are far more efficient than the theatre: they are less restricted, they are able to produce amazing symbols to show the collective unconscious, since their methods of presentation are so unlimited.” (Jung, 1984: 12)

Shadow and emotions - why do we cry at the movies more than at life?

Popular stories and narrative films often provoke powerful emotions and moving experiences that leave the reader or viewer quite out of control. For many, especially for men in Western industrial societies, being surprised by emotions can be exposing. There tends to be a sense of shame in revealing a vulnerability to being moved especially when the emotion is in reaction to events and people with whom there is no personal connection - as with a movie. Thus, for some, the emotions are managed and kept from being shown. They are banished to the shadow where they will still seek some form of expression, usually in projection as strong feelings about another’s behavior.

It strikes me that part of what Jung is trying to keep under control and apart from his self-identity when he dismisses the banal is the experience of strong emotions that popular stories and films so often evoke. Powerful feelings that overcome the rational mind can be shaming for many especially for those with a more intellectual or pragmatic approach to life.

The cinema seems to be a place where the emotions evoked by film grip us and move us deeply - overriding all our apparent objectivity and knowledge that we are watching a fiction. The dark liminality of the cinema space offers an opportunity to allow emotions normally kept away from consciousness to emerge, be experienced and yet stay in the shadows of the cinema itself. Emerging into the daylight, wiping our eyes, is where the shame and embarrassment begin - unless, that is, we have resolved to accept this shadow side of our being: an emotionality that is always present and part of us, ready to be triggered by surprise through the images we watch in film.

Over and above this general tendency for the cinema to provide a place for us all to experience the shadow of the rational - our emotional life - many are surprised by the individual emotions certain film images evoke. Madelon Sprengnether in her book *Crying*

at the Movies (2002) tells how at twenty-six she first discovered a part of herself that had been cut-off from full consciousness since her father's drowning when she was a child of nine. She was watching the film *Pather Panchali* (Satyajit Ray, 1955). "I wasn't merely tearful, I was convulsed....Why this story, in particular, and why now?" she asked herself (Sprenghether, 2002: 6). In the following years Madelon says how she cried at the movies but, "When bad things happened to me in real life, I didn't react. I seemed cool or indifferent. Yet in the dark and relative safety of the movie theatre, I would weep over fictional tragedies, over someone else's suffering." (ibid.) The force of her reaction to *Pather Panchali* reemerged in her fifties when she saw Peter Weir's film *Fearless* (1993) about a man (played by Jeff Bridges) who survives an air crash.

"Crying at the movies, I have come to understand, was a way for me to begin to feel the

pain of my father's death....It was as though the sadness I had buried when I was nine years old lay deep within my psyche, waiting for its shadow image to appear in the dreamlike space of the movie theater." (Sprenghether, 2002: 11)

Powerful emotions remain in the shadow and denied to the rest of the personality, initially out of fear that otherwise we may not survive and disintegrate completely. Sometimes film - and the special setting of the cinema space - can be so powerful that it confronts the shadow emotions in a direct way, by-passing all rationality and offering a re-discovery of abandoned parts of the self. These are found both on the screen itself and simultaneously in the emotions evoked. As Madelon says, "The loss I could not acknowledge in my own life I could recognise and react to onscreen." (ibid.)

Shadow and society - gangsters and outsiders

Just like individuals, whole societies have their shadow side too. Compulsive emotion, eroticism, violence and criminality - the shadow of civilised life - all get caught up in the naturalistic shadows of several film genres - especially those of the gangster and the vampire. One genre long seen as carrying the collective shadow - and incorporating it in to a visual style - is film noir. Anyone might readily include American films of the 1940s like *Double Indemnity* (Wilder, 1944) *Laura* (Otto Preminger, 1944) and *Farewell My Lovely* (Edward Dmytryk, 1944) as prime examples of film noir but others as far apart as *The Third Man* (Carol Reed, 1949) - British and set in Vienna - and *Taxi Driver* (Scorsese, 1976) from the mid-1970s also express the genre sharing dark themes and night-time settings. But I would also make a case for the noir tone of *American Gigolo* (Paul Schrader, 1980), where the darkness of the central character's life is made more stark by inverting it and setting the action, not in the dark, but in its opposite: the 'noir' of bright Californian sunshine.

Paul Schrader wrote *Taxi Driver* and also directed *American Gigolo* as the first two films of a trilogy depicting an existential character, (the third, called *Light Sleeper*, stars Willem Dafoe) the man existing for his own being and consequently cut off from all authentic relationships with the community of wider society. Although both films involve forms of criminal activity and eventually murder, these are not the films' main themes. However, for Schrader the theme of the outsider - the shadow-man already familiar from literature - led the way to films which reveal the shadow of society through the outsider's eyes.

In *Taxi Driver*, Travis Bickle (Robert de Niro) is the outsider taxi driver in New York who

simultaneously both participates in and condemns the shadow of society he sees all around him. Cox comments on Martin Scorsese's choices of shots where our own, and, apparently, the director's, uncomfortable emotion is left in the shadow by moving the camera away from the subject. In a squeamishly uncomfortable scene, Travis Bickle is on the phone trying to ask out a girl who is never likely to say 'yes'. The camera tracks away from Bickle to the hallway leading out to the open doors to the street so all we see is an empty space. That, and Bickle's voice. This is another example of how the space or gap in film acts as shadow - the shadow that 'reveals' the substance which is kept missing from the frame.

The Third Man (Carol Reed, 1949) is set in post-war Vienna where the city has been divided into four by the victorious powers - Russia, Britain, France and America. It is filmed mostly at night with the last scenes shot in the further dark shadows of the sewers that run beneath the city - the unseen, unconscious labyrinth that carries away the city's waste which no one on the surface wishes to be conscious of. Harry Lime (Orsen Welles) has staged his own death to avoid being caught for a criminal scam that is highly cynical in its disregard of its victims and he has profited from their suffering in a condemnable, socially-offensive way. In one key speech, Lime points out that we all have the tendency to minimize the significance of others for our own profit. Talking to his friend Holly Martins in a carriage of the Great Wheel high above the city, Lime looks down at the people appearing as tiny dots way down below and asks,

“Would you really feel any pity if one of those dots stopped moving for ever? If I offered

you twenty-thousand pounds for every dot that stops, would you really, old man, tell me to keep my money - or would you calculate how many dots you could afford to spend?” (The Third Man, 1949. Screenplay by Graham Green).

Harry Lime's character confronts the shadow of humanity that can sacrifice its own kind not just for profit, but also for politics in the devastation of warfare. Lime represents not only the particular criminal profiteering that war can engender but also the even more persistent disregard of human life that accompanies the waging of war. Death is another aspect of our humanity which gets cast into the shadow by our modern consciousness and in the Red Book (Jung, 2009: 266) Jung imagines how it may produce its own Hell for those who have not taken the fact of death on board.

Finally

Jung, in summarising his struggle with his own shadow as projected onto characters in his fantasies, points out how, “The devil as the adversary is your own other standpoint; he tempts you and sets a stone in your path where you least want it.” (Jung, 2009: 261) Gaps in the flow of reality, emotions we hide, the death and violence we would rather not face, being drawn to what is popular, are all part of the shadow - “our own other standpoint” - which the experience of film may bring out. Shadow is far more ordinary and present than the struggle with evil it represents for some. For Jung, evil is just one aspect of shadow. Alongside evil, and equally as important, is everything else we may hold in the shadow - such as the need to accept our contra-gender self, or to accept our irrational, lowly self, or our emotional, irrational and banal selves that some find in popular cinema. We should

watch out for the shadow in all its forms.

References

- Homans, Peter, 1979 Jung in Contexts. Modernity and the Making of a Psychology
London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Jung, 1932 Psychotherapists or the Clergy in Coll. Works Vol. 11
- Jung, 1938 Psychology and Religion in Coll. Works Vol. 11
- Jung, 1984, Seminar Papers, Vol. 1, Dream Analysis: Notes of the Seminar given in 1928-1930, ed. W. McGuire. London: Routledge, p.12
- Jung, C.G., 2009. ed. Shamdasani, S. (trans. Kyburz, Peck, Shamdasani) The Red Book, Liber Novus New York and London: Philemon Series, Norton & Co. pp.265-267
- Sprengnether, Madelon (2002) Crying at the Movies. A Film Memoir St. Paul, Minnesota: Graywolf Press
- The Story of Film (2011). Documentary in nine parts written and directed by Mark Cousins. Channel 4, U.K. First broadcast September - November 2011.

Films

- American Gigolo (Paul Shrader, 1980)
- Double Indemnity (Wilder, 1944)
- Farewell My Lovely (Edward Dmytryk, 1944)
- Fearless (Peter Wier, 1993)
- Laura (Otto Preminger, 1944)
- Light Sleeper (Shrader, 1992)
- Pather Panchali (Satyajit Ray, 1955)
- The Third Man (Carol Reed, 1949)
- Taxi Driver (Scorsese, 1976)

III) Discussion. Comments, questions and answers.

Helena Bassil-Morozow: I entirely agree with your observations about the nature of the shadow, its link to creativity (via sublimation) and its contents (shame, fear of exposure, the acceptance-rejection dynamic).

Indeed, the shadow is important for Jungian Film Studies because it helps us understand the effect of films on people. As you write, 'For many, especially for men in Western industrial societies, being surprised by emotions can be exposing. There tends to be a sense of shame in revealing a vulnerability to being moved especially when the emotion is in reaction to events and people with whom there is no personal connection – as with a movie'.

Films offer ways of sublimating of the shadow – both to the people who make them and to the audience. In the liminal darkness of the movie theatre boundaries get broken, conscious mind gets flooded with images, the projective-introjective dynamic is set in motion and emotions – even the darkest ones – are released. Left without our defences, we feel vulnerable and exposed.

And yet – film is a narrative, it has an ending, and cinematic meeting with the shadow always entails closure. As you write, 'film seems to re-fragment reality so it then may make it whole again'. It fragments reality during the active phase of the viewing process but, after the movie ends, the viewer is capable of rebuilding this reality from pieces in his or her own way, to derive 'a less fragmented sense of ourselves, a coherence of identity projected into what we see'.

Even though movie watching is a collective experience, each member of the audience customises the shadow projections to suit his or her psychological needs. The process is both

collective and personal, and, as you rightfully note, entails exposure of personal emotions in a collective space, and therefore evokes shame and embarrassment in the individual. It entails a certain loss of privacy – something that is perceived as embarrassing in industrialised and post-industrial societies. Is not then film viewing a post-industrial individual's way of reuniting with the communal/collective?

- - -

I have been thinking about this metaphor: cinema as a form of psychological projection (it's about literal projection as well, of course!). As viewers, we are receptors of someone else's psychological contents (fantasies, ideas, etc) - including the shadow with its shame, embarrassment and fear of rejection. In a way, in dealing with someone else's shadow, we are also dealing with ours because the shadow has the collective aspect to it. And yet - the viewer might feel the need to set up boundaries to protect himself from the personal aspect of the filmmaker's shadow (such as in violent films).

Evangeline Rand: I have found your entry into film and its shadow most helpful to get me into this field a little bit.

Firstly to be reminded, in framing the study of film, of the importance of unfettering childish and primitive qualities that can, if enabled, embellish and vitalize human existence...and then the possible emergence of a new self narrative and coherence...rather than there being only a 'gap' in consciousness – a gap that otherwise only tends to bleed into coherence, and prevents us from seeing what is in fact left out of the gap.

I appreciated your example of Jung (Red Book) in the process of changing his ATTITUDE towards film ...moving beyond 'being bewitched by the banal' towards an 'ordinary' appreciation of 'film' being great, cheap and getting everything that happens in the world.

(This is the sort of phenomenological 'attitudinal change detail' that is missing in the 1916 essay on The Transcendent Function.) (I must say I used to like the old 'news' reels that one could see before a movie. Many of us didn't have TV for the news and so this was an added bonus!) I like Jung's new descriptions of 'hell' you elucidate...

A man who ran up a wall, another carrying his head under his arm (like St. Denis, I am thinking) and one who could stand in the middle of fire (like Daniel I am thinking) can be seen as blasphemous Acta Sanctorum...and film a wonderful way to present symbols of the collective unconscious. Your writing has prompted many creative ideas...

Your insights into The Third Man – where the dark shadows run under **post war Vienna** divided into four - is an important image to cut away any naïve sense we might have of the perfection of 'fourness'. ...the loss of pity and the loss of being with death.

I would have to say that certain films have been epochal for me...films that I have had to watch again and again because they elucidate something of myself in a broader history. And there have been films of the devastation of war that have mirrored the devastation of deep illness. Somehow engaging the horror is even comforting. As an accurate mirror always is – eventually!

Leslie Gardner: Thanks for this really stimulating paper. It links well with what I have been thinking about in relation to dream being a shadow of scholarship; and here, dream as artifice and shadow too – a controlled and communal way to experience and grasp shadow.

Does reaction to cinema, - and I suppose it has to buy into popular culture, mass culture to be affordable after all – inform the critical apparatus in a more coherent way than personal dreams do in scholarly discussion? The reactions you refer to – a woman crying convulsively at a film you and I might watch calmly is experiencing a deeply personal response. What is this evidence of? Does it turn us back to her; she does actually think so because she recounts

deaths in her family etc. she reacted to differently – so the focus is on her personal reaction in this case. in what way does it open the door to critical analysis?and does it?

The citations from Jung's work are terrific – many thanks for bringing them up – but he too seems bemused by reaction first in an elitist way, and then, upon reflection, he takes it on board. Shadow is part unconscious, and the mores and scary images of culture, must be deeply embedded in us to arouse the reaction cinematic producers want. so shadow is manipulated and controlled, in a way.

I recall shakespear and Jacobean literary scholar, Gary Taylor in his book entitled 'Cultural Selection' pointed out that the sheer achievement of arousing emotion in people was a mark of the genius of a piece of writing or theatre etc at one time. critical discussion centered on its success in that regard, We wonder if that's the case now – and I really like your image of the gaps in the fragmented image – as viewers we are not really aware of this but it is a symbol of the artifice.

How much, in conclusion, is affect important in critical discussion of cinema – fitting into my wondering whether dreams, which are as personal as affect is, are shadows of scholarship. ?

Elizabeth Brodersen: I am particularly interested in your view that 'shadow' emotions constellate in the darkness of the cinema, where in that darkness, itself, such emotions can be assimilated and accepted... One aspect that you mention in your paper but did not elaborate on further is the film characterisation of the vampire. I'd like to develop that here, if I may, as a 'shadow' personification of unacceptable, 'inferior,' unredeemed emotions such as anger, betrayal and abandonment, hidden away in the darkness, out of sight. One could say that the vampire has no mirror image and personifies non-ego aspects which have become soul-less, disassociated and 'taboo.' I was wondering whether the current intense interest in the vampire in various film and television series reveals a more pressing individual and collective need, hunger even, to address such 'unacceptable' soul-less, 'taboo' emotions than for example, fifty years ago, and have them accepted? I have noticed that the vampire image and narrative history for both sexes have become more complex and sympathetic, for example, as shown in Coppola's marvellous film version of Bran Stoker's Dracula, where Dracula, as a romantic sufferer, openly challenges a too narrow concept of Christian salvation and is prepared to suffer 'damnation' for earthly love rather than submit to a too narrow definition of absolution. Could this reflect our own changing attitudes towards questioning authority which is becoming more acceptable on an individual level but still carries a 'shadow' taint of collective damnation? I feel this dilemma is becoming more conscious and differentiated through the vampire as 'shadow' projection in film.

I have also noticed a connection between the vampire in individual dreams and film. In the case of individual dreams, analysts who are prepared to dialogue with the vampire as a unconscious image of their own intense, ambivalent emotions, dream that a vampire is entering into their house at night through a half open window. This opening of attitude seems to be reflected in the recent popular portrayal of the vampire as projection in recent films such as the Twilight films featuring the books of Stephani Meyers.

Luke Hockley: To play with metaphors for the psychological aspects of cinematic apparatus alongside projection I want to introduce 'screen'. I am writing about this in my next book (Somatic Cinema). There I go into this in some deal but in summary in the cinema the screen makes something visible (the results of projection) but to screen also means to protect from something - as in sunscreen, fire screen or screening for a disease. So cinema both offers the possibility of encounter and also protects against it. It doesn't necessarily make it safe, or positive as it is possible to screen on racial, political and socioeconomic factors - screening can mean discrimination - plenty of examples of that in cinema. The origins of the word

screen are in scrim - a shield that protects from heat, or fire. A sight screen in cricket is something that brings the play into relief - it brings greater clarity to what is going on for the players. Finally a screen is also something that divides a space (what lies beyond the cinema screen?). So a screen both displays and hides, and it reveals and protects.

Helena Bassil-Morozow: I agree that screen is a really good metaphor for the boundary against unwanted projections. One still feels protected even though some of the images projected onto the screen (and onto the audience) can be violent and powerful = really shadowy. One feels protected if one bears in mind the division between fantasy and reality - i.e., between what is happening on screen and outside the cinema, in real life. In this way one can also discern the difference between the collective and the personal elements of the projection. The presence of the screen guarantees that the crossing of the liminal boundary into the unconscious remains imaginary. Great idea, Luke.

- - -

Yes, I agree that close-ups of the face is a powerful device precisely because it enhances projection and ensures its immediacy. In fact, it is a form of synecdochic projection - influencing the viewer by emphasizing the most expressive part of the body. And, as Chris points out, this goes back to the idea of psychological fragmentation (because the face IS a visual synecdoche). Yet, this device in cinematic narratives also conveys the idea of wholeness because the face is emotional, expressive and alive. It is, as Chris says, 'a revelation of the inner person'.

Mark Saban: But 'seriously', I only want to suggest that every medium brings with it its own shadow, within which the worst examples of its form perform their worst crimes against taste and, more importantly, feeling. I love a shoot-em-up gore-fest as much as the next man, and salting my popcorn with tears has often enabled a welcome discharge of pent-up angst, but cinema which offers nice manageable emotional release, can very easily become a kind of sentimental pornography enabling a kind of masturbation of the passions (and best of all on my own in the dark!). In such cases we are never out of control, and never surprised by our emotions, because everybody knows that this is exactly what film is supposed to do, and has been doing very successfully for a hundred years.

Christopher Hauke: Yes that Screen metaphor is very handy - it reminds me of what I am saying about the Face in movies and in life in another chapter of the book. The face and the close-up have been a hallmark of what cinema brought to our gaze from the silent era onward. The face can fill the screen and obliterate all context which was baffling for the early viewers of cinema. It could appear disembodied and terrifying - just like any body part in close up in the first days of watching silent film. Now we are used to this dismemberment of the body on the screen, but stories were not told like this before film - drawing our attention so vividly to parts to weave a whole.

But the main point I wanted to flag about the face is that - as you say of the screen - the face can both reveal and conceal too. You could say the internal thought is the shadow of the facial expression as much as the face is a revelation of the inner person. Actors in film have taken advantage of this in both directions. The smallest movement of a facial muscle speaks in film where it could not in theatre. But the trick is to exclude all the other clues. Like Mark writes, the shadow of the technique of film is what it does not express, what is not in focus (maybe hence everyone's love of the shallow depth of field as the signifier of the 'film look'). What it 'chooses' not to express - whether it is aware of that choice or not. Some unawareness of the choice of exclusion can arise simply out of genre - what fits and what doesn't. Other choices are far more political and at worst amount to propaganda. Thanks for enjoying the paper.

Stephani Stephens: I just wanted to make a brief comment regarding the explosive popularity of the Twilight films and most recently The Hunger Games, both having been adapted from books, which were originally written for the Young Adult market. The emergence of such films, and what could be considered a burgeoning market of dystopian literature, calls into question the perceived need that adolescents have for themes of competition, loss, despair and triumph. Does the popularity of the genre indicate that adolescents can be seen, in light of our discussion here, as 'shadowing' the older generation and encountering dystopia anticipates coming to terms with the adult roles that they will eventually assume?

Recently, when teaching gifted youth, I was amazed at the prevalence if not obsessive consumption of such books and films. When I asked a colleague 'what is it about these types of books and films that has gripped these kids?' he answered, 'This is where the moral issues of our day are being played out, for them.' This stuck me as important, and a place to keep a watchful eye in terms of what youth are learning about themselves and their world through such content. Just a thought.

IV

The fourth presenter is Phil Goss, Jungian analyst, academic and author. His paper is about the shadow in education.

Phil's paper shows how 'shadow' in education carries with it the whiff of failure: students who fail, teachers who fail to teach successfully and schools which fail to meet the superlative standards set by governments. Within this dynamic of inadequacy lies subcultures of 'shadow' often associated with learning difficulties and the assignation of what is 'special' and sometimes intolerable behaviours. It is in the realm of the archetypal ascriptions of failure in education that 'shadow' at least offers us different narratives of what it means to be 'outside' the norm. Phil's presentation explores how this disassociated 'shadow' phenomena can be read in relation to and have a bearing on our own failings, academic and otherwise.

Phil is a Jungian Analyst (AJA, London) with a private practice in the Lancaster area (Northern England) and Senior Lecturer for Counselling and Psychotherapy at the University of Central Lancashire. Previously, Phil taught and managed in special schools in London where he developed a strong interest in the emotional dimension of learning for children and young people with learning difficulties and their families. This interest is reflected in his publications, such as his chapter in the edited collection *Education and Imagination: Jungian Approaches* (Routledge, 2008) and *Meaning-led Learning for pupils with severe and profound and multiple learning difficulties* (British Journal for Special Education, 2006). Gender is his other strong interest, reflected in the focus for his book: *Men, Women and Relationships, A Post-Jungian Approach: Gender Electrics and Magic Beans* (Routledge, 2010) and other publications such as *Discontinuities in the male psyche: waiting, deadness and disembodiment, Archetypal and clinical approaches* (Journal for Analytical Psychology, 2006) and a chapter on the presence of gendered influences in the psyche in *Dreaming the Myth Onwards* (Routledge 2008). The following paper is a brief working up of ideas presented in Phil's chapter 'Learning Difficulties: Shadow of the Education System?' (2008) and from his paper (unpublished) given at the IAJS conference in Cardiff (2009) 'More than we can bear: Schools and the archetype of failure.'

Learning and Shadow: Failure awaits us

by Phil Goss

'We refuse to fail'

Shadow in education carries with it the whiff of failure - students who fail, teachers who fail to teach successfully, and schools and colleges which fail to meet the superlative standards set by governments. Within this dynamic of inadequacy there lie subcultures of *shadow*, often associated with learning difficulties, the assignation of what is 'special', and sometimes 'intolerable' behaviours. It is in the archetypal ascriptions of failure in education that *shadow* at least offers different narratives of what it means to be 'outside' the norm. The Jungian emphasis on *shadow* offers routes into self-awareness and individuation which can bring a different flavour to the possibilities opened up by 'learning through failing' and I will explore how this can be read in relation to bearing our own failings, academic and otherwise.

How might *shadow* influence our experiences of, and attitudes towards, learning? To approach this question I want initially to delineate what we might include within the notion of 'learning'. First this must inevitably include learning as offered and experienced in schools and other teaching institutions such as colleges and universities. Jung bluntly captures the apparently unavoidable nature of learning in its collective form when he wrote: 'Collective learning is indeed a necessity and cannot be replaced by anything else.' (Jung, 1925, *CW* 17: Para. 256). Although here Jung is referring more to imparting 'rules, principles and methods' (op cit: Para 254), I would argue that it is formal educational settings where these get transmitted as part of a *collective* learning experience more than anywhere else.

More broadly - while parents who are passionate about the virtues of home-schooling might take issue with this - the reality is that social convention and cohesion would seem to require at least a degree of commonality in educational experience, transmitting knowledge, skills and values via a relatively homogenous curriculum, as a standard requirement for all children, however diversely this can be offered. But, this very commonality of expectation and experience seems to be a powerful contributory factor to the activation of *shadow* in schools and other formal learning environments, as it sets up a dynamic of comparison and even competitiveness between learners which plays into our individual vulnerabilities with learning of a more academic, or vocational, and nature.

However, learning can also refer, in its wider applications, to the 'learning journey' of the individual person through life, as she / he gets to know and understand themselves and the world around them. This provides a perspective on learning as driver and function of individuation, which in turn '...involves the achievement of an optimum synthesis of one's conscious and unconscious processes..' (Gordon, 1993: 379). It thus provides a wider definition of learning as a way of 'becoming' compared to more didactic and target-driven educational notions of learning as having specific goals of academic attainment or vocational skills competency (<http://www.education.gov.uk/vocabularies/educationtermsandtags/1643>). It also fits more conventionally into a Jungian framework where learning is part and parcel of the multi-faceted work in progress of human 'being', including *shadow* work which helps us accept lessons in life which are painful and hard won.

Finally there is also something about our capacity to 'learn together' which I think needs to be included here. This refers to how we derive shared, collective understandings and insights from common experience, or from the revelatory discoveries of inspired individuals (or innovatory groups of people) whose ideas gain a wide consensus of acceptance and appreciation. This shared dimension to learning straddles both the first and second versions of learning above in that this tends to be learning via osmosis: we often pick up on big ideas like evolution, psychoanalysis or quantum physics because they are deemed as being generally 'important' by the cultural context in which we grow up, reinforcing the ways we are taught about such ideas in school and higher education: a kind of silent oracle in the collective which winks at us to get our attention and then points out what we need to know (or what we need to google a quick definition of..?), if we are to take our place effectively enough in the world.

For the purposes of this discussion I want to argue that learning in the first, formally educational sense is a kind of magnet for *shadow*, in that institutionalised learning has a rigorously established hierarchy in which success (good exam results, good marks, good reports, good feedback from teacher) is always better than failure (poor exam results and marks, disappointing reports, critical feedback from teacher). At least, success is always better on paper; the ubiquitous belief that we learn more from our mistakes and failures abounds in western culture, although telling ourselves or others this is true can also serve as a way of ameliorating the discomfort and disappointment arising from not making the grade.

What remains clear is that the established ways of teaching and assessing learners - schooling for example - is often fiercely reliant on the presence of the spectre of failure in order to sustain the drive towards 'success'. Pupil achievement is the *raison d'être* behind schooling systems across of the world, and one could say that those who fail to hit the targets set for them, fall behind in their learning to a significant degree, or who do not get the grades required to progress on to college or university fall into the realm of *shadow* where they will experience 'the thing a person has no wish to be...' (Jung, 1946: Para. 470) - after all who wants to be labelled as having failed, or to experience the feelings associated with having failed?

My interest in this obvious - but troubling because it *is* obvious - question extends beyond the way we seem to need the *shadow* of failure and low achievement in our educational system in order to experience the warm glow of success when we achieve well. The field of

'special educational needs' as termed in the UK (Frederickson N & Cline T., 2009) in itself can sometimes seem to represent a psychological attempt to cover up, or even eliminate the *shadow* of low attainment and failure which we secretly seem to need to maintain the equation described above. This can feel disturbing in the same way that Jung writes about how one generation may keep messy truths from the next, so that: 'The repressed problems, and the suffering . . . fraudulently avoided, secrete an insidious poison which seeps into the soul . . . through the thickest wall of silence and through the whited sepulchres of deceit, complacency, and evasion.' (Jung 1954: Para. 154). Such shadow contamination, passed on, could be said to happen within commonly held attitudes to learning and failure, when we cannot see and own our hang ups about low educational attainment.

On the other hand the 'special-ness' intimated here may allude to the presence of something real. Here one of Jung's formulations for *shadow* is helpful, where he notes that: '...the shadow is merely somewhat inferior, primitive, unadapted, and awkward, not wholly bad. It contains childish or primitive qualities which would in a way vitalize and embellish human existence, but - convention forbids'. (Jung, 1938. CW 11 para.134). This awareness that there may be something 'primitive' but which has the potential to enrich 'mainstream' learning and reality which operates through *shadow* also seems to lie underneath the tendency described to call children with learning difficulties 'special'.

But, by making learning difficulties in the UK educational system 'special', there is a sense in which we want to have our cake and eat it: we want those who *really* struggle to learn, and have a 'good reason' for this, i.e. those with the more severe learning difficulties which relate to constitutional neurological or other obstacles, to be seen as 'special' (Goss, 2008). On the other hand, we prefer to see inadequacies in more mainstream educational attainment as 'failure' and as something which should not be tolerated. This latter attitude has deepened into an embedded philosophy in the UK. The schools inspection body, the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) has a long established brief to root out 'school failure'. It has a reputation for 'naming and shaming' schools which are not good enough and generally taking no prisoners; a recent survey confirmed that the clear majority of head teachers in England fear for their jobs when the inspectors come to call (TES, 2012), something I found in my own earlier research (Goss, 2008).

Here, the schools, their Headteachers and teachers can fall into the taboo *shadow* of school failure, an uncanny parallel to the taboo of pupil failure, where there also seems to be a shadowy wish to 'punish teacher'. Teachers of course are the receptacles for all sorts of projections and identifications from pupils, parents and the public at large. These can take the form of being blamed for educational failure, standards of respect and discipline, and even the cohesiveness of society at large. As children, at least initially, we both fear and idealise teachers, as they come to represent aspects of our parents or primary carers that we say goodbye to when they drop us off in the playground.

Inevitably, teachers - however skilled and caring - let us down from time to time, like our parents do, what Hillman (1975: 1-2) refers to as the betrayal of: '...primal trust, presented as the archetypal image of Eden,...(and)...repeated in individual lives of child and parent'. As we move from childhood to adulthood we unconsciously retain these feelings of disappointment, or sometimes of bitterness, depending on how well we were taught and treated by them. Here *shadow* projection can kick in as we unconsciously project our own feelings of failure or even victimisation, by 'kicking teacher', or even the headteacher who is supposed to embody an idealised parental capacity to both look after a huge 'family' of children and young people as well as provide their route to achievement.

[Note: I think that whereas in some other countries there seems to be a respectful, sometimes grateful attitude towards the teaching profession, in the UK this seems much less the case due, perhaps, to a hierarchical, somewhat intolerant, streak in British culture and its institutions which cannot bear failure, failure which is fed by our own confused feelings about teachers. I would be interested to hear about how this plays out in other countries, and how those with learning difficulties are regarded and the terminology applied to them).

So, *shadow* hovers strongly in the background to schooling where the tendency to split between success and failure has a familiar and uncomfortably primitive feel to it (Klein, 1946): we get paranoid about our own failure, or feeling responsible for that of those in our care, so we'd rather not think about it. Arriving at a realistic, or depressive, position would involve accepting the *shadow* of our failings in school, even embracing our learning difficulties as being part of who we are. To bring this point home I suggest those engaged in this discussion reflect on some aspect of their learning or skills which is weak and consider (though with no obligation to share on the list obviously) how they have dealt with the presence of this.

An example I can share is my own difficulty with practical learning tasks and with which require fine motor skills and hand to eye coordination. I now recognise I have a mild form of dyspraxia, as my ability to manipulate tools, say, or coordinate my arms and legs (I never got past a forward roll in P.E.!) can be faulty and awkward. This was a glaring source of anxiety for me as a pupil, e.g. making a mess of building a simple electrical circuit in a technology lesson at school – something I remember trying to cover up by deliberately breaking a component so I could blame that, or getting a sympathetic class mate to complete the circuit for me. This example is a reminder that *shadow* in education can often be about shame – i.e. being seen by others: teachers, peers, parents, to have failed becomes more important than the failure itself. The influence of this formula is often why it is so difficult to accept, or even embrace, the *shadow* of failings and learning difficulties in our own experience of organised learning, whether at school or in adult education. If *shadow* becomes the repository for failure, where failure is 'what we are' but we would prefer not to acknowledge it, or for it to be exposed to the gaze of others, then it can be argued that *shadow* provides access to the archetype of failure. This is important as it exposes us to a choice – either to try to deny or hide our failures, or to consciously do something productive with failure.

As Andrew Samuels puts it: 'Failure is a core element of good-enough—ness' (2001: 79). Failure is an archetypal human experience and it sits at one end of a continuum across from success/achievement at the other. Being 'good enough' is located somewhere on this continuum, probably just to one side of the mid-point, nearer success than failure, like a student who just does enough in an exam to get the pass mark only: the point where *shadow* has nearly had the student in its grasp, but not quite.

Andrew also writes that 'Disappointment is difficult too, for sure. But it too, has to be managed' (2001: 5). Alongside success and achievement in schools and colleges, the management of failure, and the disappointment and other feelings which can be evoked by this, need to be acknowledged and worked through, or they will fester in *shadow*, with the significant risk that there will be difficult consequences via undigested feelings of disappointment, shame, anger and betrayal, for those who are struggling to bear their failings, or those of others.

The line between success and failure in formal education is often a thin one, a percentage here and there either side of the pass mark, and yet psychologically it can represent so much: the line between 'good enough' or 'not good enough, between acceptance and rejection, and between belonging or being cast out. This parting of the ways encapsulates the disorientating power of our relationship with *shadow* at its most potent - the terror of being outside the gates of the heavenly city of the academically and socially valued. In this sense the archetype of failure seems to be fed by the baser instincts of *shadow* – the primitive fear of being judged as unacceptable and of no use to the family, tribe or wider community. Again this seems to operate via a fear of being *seen* as those things, so the intimations of shame engendered by this possibility sometimes may drive us to do all we can to avoid failure.

To conclude: How we deal with the *shadow* sting of 'failure'

To counterbalance this problem generated by the challenges of formal learning and the binaries generated by it (success-failure / acceptance – rejection and so on) I suggest we tend to do two things. One I have already touched upon: to identify individuals and groups whose failure becomes a virtue with which we can identify. Children, young people and indeed adults with severe learning difficulties provide a version of failure which ameliorates our *shadow* terror of it because their failure cannot be their fault, having often been born with the congenital factors which have generated the learning difficulties in the first place. Here, learning difficulty acts as a soulful balm which both makes us feel better about our own *shadow* inadequacies in learning and reminds us that our success and failure is never completely in our own hands. Hence the way those working with children and young people with special needs in schools can find themselves identifying with both the plight and the 'specialness' of these pupils' situations (Youell, 2006: 97), or the way there can even seem to be a kind of veneration for the most learning disabled and those who support them, or those who work with pupils who display the most challenging behaviours (Goss, 2008a: 43). Secondly, and linked to this, we construct our own narratives about the learning journeys we have been on in life in order to both remind ourselves that a lot of our most important experiences of learning have been outside formal educational contexts, as well as to ameliorate the problem of personal failure which we all experience in some form or other as we go through life. Here Jung's model for individuation in-part addresses the problem of *shadow*'s grip on us when we experience 'failure' in a learning task. By suggesting that this is actually part of a necessary process in which our inferior functions and what I would term as our 'learning vulnerabilities' are encountered, and sometimes painfully exposed in front of others, this formulation portrays failure as a potential growthful step towards both psychic integration and self-acceptance.

The problem I suggest we are still left with seems to be embedded at a collective level – why, when grouped together as learners in formal learning environments, particularly as

children at school but also in our relationship to school as parents and carers, as well as teachers and politicians, do we get gripped by the fear of failure, and the fear of being *seen* to have failed? (in higher education this also operates, but I would say to a less pervasive degree, considering the achievement of getting there in the first place..?). I would say this is because, in the rapid move towards the great achievement of the (almost) universal offer of education to our children in western societies over the last 150 years or so - fuelled at times by a kind of *hubris* (Zoja, 1995) - we have struggled to accept the possibility that we might, individually, fail at any given moment in any given task. Here, our individual *shadow* grips us whenever the collective demand to succeed constellates in our schools, which at the moment is pretty much every day of the week.

'*The shadow* contains, besides the personal shadow, the shadow of society ... fed by the neglected and repressed collective values' (Fordham, 1978: 5).

References

- Fordham M. (1978): *Jungian Psychotherapy* (Avon)
- Frederickson N & Cline T. (2009): *Special Educational Needs: Inclusion and Diversity* (Bucks.OUPress)
- Goss P. (2008): Learning Difficulties: shadow in our education system? in Jones R., Clarkson A., Congram S. and Stratton N. (2008): *Education and Imagination; Post-Jungian Perspectives* (London, Routledge)
- Goss P. (2008): *An investigation into the possible pressures on Headteachers - particularly the current school inspection arrangements in England and Wales - and the potential impact on recruitment.* (National Association of Headteachers / UCLan, unpublished)
- Hillman J. (1975): 'Betrayal' in *Loose Ends* (Spring)
- Jung C.G. (1924): *Analytical Psychology and Education* in CW Vol.17
- Jung C.G. (1925): *The Significance of the Unconscious in Individual Education* in CW Vol.17
- Jung C.G. (1938): *Psychology and Religion* in CW Vol. 11
- Klein, M. (1946): Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms. *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 27:99-110.
- Samuels A. (2009): Transforming Aggressive Conflict in Political and Personal Contexts *Int. J. Applied Psychoanalytic Studies* 6(0):000-000 (2009) www.interscience.wiley.com
- Times Educational Supplement/ASLC (2012): Headteacher Survey 2010 results (London, News International Papers) 30/3/12
- Youell B. (2006): *The Learning relationship: Psychoanalytic Thinking in Education* (London, Tavistock)
- Zoja L. (1995): *Growth and Guilt: Psychology and the limits of development* (London, Routledge)

IV) Discussion. Comments, questions and answers.

Elizabeth Brodersen: I was wondering whether you think that school performance in terms of success or failure is influenced by the open-ness of teachers towards the fear of risk-taking that could play a role as to whether children succeed or fail? I'm thinking of John Holt's book *How Children Fail* (1964/1990: 263) where he suggests that no child starts off in life as 'stupid' but that school, itself, promotes stupidity and a sense of failure. He argues that most children come to school curious, but that fear of failure itself which is inculcated by school standards of 'right' and 'wrong' soon blunts their curiosity and this experience plays a major role in dampening their intellectual and creative curiosity. Holt also suggests that by standardising and homogenising the academic results expected of children, we make them frightened of mistakes and exploring unknown territory. Instead children are given dull, repetitive tasks which simultaneously scare, confuse and bore them(*Ibid*: 275-76).

Obviously, children have to be educated, but I think how learning is transmitted, whether it is successful or not, rests with the constructive enthusiasm that the teacher her/himself has towards knowledge, whether it is open or closed. Holt maintains that he would have been frightened of teaching and probably imparted that relational quality about knowledge on to his pupils, had he not travelled, taken risks, experienced and overcome some of life's real challenges first, before standing in front of a classroom. Jung (1939, CW 17, The Development of Personality. paras: 284-288) maintains that the personality of the teacher is crucial; children are not stupid but can tell the difference between what is genuine and what is not (para: 286).

I'm sure not sure whether it is 'fear of failure' that is the 'shadow' of education but rather the fear of 'risk-taking' which breeds more fear and dampens intellectual curiosity by packaging knowledge into safe, pedagogic structures that are not always suited to developing the child's natural vitality. That some children refuse to fail despite such disenchantment, one could argue, shows both courage and stubbornness- both good qualities!- in the face of adversity.

Phil M Goss: Thank you for posing such an interesting question as to whether *shadow* in schools is more about a fear of risk - taking, than a fear of failure. One could characterise your suggestion as portraying an avoidance of the opportunity to fully live, and instead to place *eros* in cold storage, in order to avoid a supposedly worse fate, which may well be a fantasy (eg of being labelled as 'stupid', or of losing any chance of attaining one's goals in the future), but also may have some reality to it. Yet, as you imply, is this fate about the child or the teacher? If children are not seen to be doing well then their teacher can expect to have their knowledge, their skills, even their character brought into question. I encountered this a number of times when in positions of responsibility in schools - parents coming to me and questioning the capability, even the integrity, of their child's teacher when things were not going well for their child. However, as you suggest, teachers have to be prepared to take risks sometimes to open up possibilities for their pupils, including the risk of trusting in an intuition that a pupil will 'come good', in the midst of otherwise dire predictions about the latter's future.

As far as *shadow* is concerned in the individual learning relationships a teacher and pupil strike up, I would agree with you that the spark of self-belief and tenacity which characterises the individuated capacity to make something good happen in the face of negative feedback or disillusion is crucial. It means that the experience of falling into a kind of *shadowy* uncertainty about whether 'I am good enough' after failing an exam or getting critical feedback from a teacher can be used as a basis for confronting that which 'a person has no wish to be' (Jung 1946). Failing a piece of work at school or college can, within the context of a strong relationship with a good teacher, act as a turning point where what may be hidden by *shadow* in the individual learner gets released, via a breakthrough in awareness and determination. This is all good stuff, grist to the mill for the individuation process, a template for the challenge to integrate *shadow* , one could say...

Nevertheless I am left with the point I pondered in my paper: why is it that collectively, education - particularly in schools - seems to rely on such a visceral focus on the success vs failure equation? The perception seems to be that this is the only way of maintaining and improving standards, and yet it is not unreasonable to suggest that this rather unconscious reliance on upholding this split can lead to swathes of young people ending up outside the mainstream of educational progress, even of society. There are, after all, many who do not stand up again easily after experiencing being labelled as 'not good enough' academically. When *shadow* emerges through the constellation of the archetype of failure in the individual schooling experience of a child, and the right support is not available from the adults around her or him, then my sense is that the collective fear of failure, generated by a consonant

collective constellation of the archetype ('our children must not fail') can infect the struggle of the individual learner. Then, the *shadow* fear of risk-taking you allude to, which in turn is about the fear of failure if the risk backfires, can take over.

My argument suggests that there is a gravitational pull in schools towards failure because unconsciously we may be seeking it out. This could be because the idealisation of 'achievement for all', via universal target setting, is unhelpfully unrealistic and does not allow for enough diversity of experiences of 'success' and 'failure'. This, as I suggested in my paper is why *shadow* has a field day in schools - the more monolithic the definition of success and achievement, the more charged is the scramble to escape failure and to avoid becoming who we do not want to be. It is teachers as much as pupils who are scrambling to avoid this. Holt's model for teachers - to do what they need to do to free up their risk-taking capacity before they stand in front of a class and model a pro-active approach to life and learning- is a strong recipe for countering this. However, I suggest there is something in the conscious allure of success for schools which cannot avoid but generate a compensatory unconscious draw towards failure, and this can make the challenge for the creative teacher, and the determined child, all the more stark.

Leslie Gardner: You associate *shadow* (and failure) with collectivity – and yet we are more often focused on *shadow* as it relates to individual interconnections. There is *shadow* on individual level operating in schools too, as you suggest – some teachers and students just don't get on, is that about their dark sides projecting and rubbing up against each other somehow? And failures between individuals involve this aspect, but in the collectivity, they involve universal criteria reaching into society's expectations (which you suggest).

In some ways a critique of Jungian psychology is its emphasis on the therapeutic qualities of adaptation – and here you are proposing a solution – do I get this right?

It's a critique because we instinctively object to children's (or adult's) being required to fit in. we think this is stifling.

But maybe education is just about fitting in to society – and we make our conclusions as students whether and how either to fit in or not in our societies. So I see that

We accept *shadow* on individual level as a part of learning process, but, in collective institutions we sort of compartmentalise *shadow* since it's about failure of education into 'special needs' classes. So we undermine failure's goal (in your construction) as a teaching device – it is undermined because it is not a 'failure' any longer, it is a given, i.e. wholly acceptable human physical or mental attributes – so just who we are.

Elizabeth Brodersen: Coming back to your [Phil] question about why education, particularly in schools, seems to rely on such a visceral focus on the success and failure equation, I would like to suggest that education, itself, has its own in-built structural dilemma because it incorporates, at least, two conflicting functions: although education gives an individual access to the acquisition of knowledge, this access is also regulated through collective selection processes that govern social mobility and the type of knowledge that is distributed. To illustrate what I mean, I think parents, perhaps more than teachers, influence the educational outcome of their children by not addressing their own unconscious, shadow complexes of success or failure. Jung (CW 17, paras. 85-87) points to the role undifferentiated, unconscious parental complexes play intergenerationally within the psyche of the child which may well contribute to learning problems and children with special needs. In my experience, modern teachers in the main want to support children, but parents may give mixed messages to their children about success influenced by their own negative experiences despite the encouragement and promotion from the teacher about the potential of their own children. Class, gender and race barriers all play their

conscious/unconscious role: learning at higher educational levels for some parents still somehow smacks of the fear of hubris, getting above one's station in life, a throwback from 18th and 19th century middle and upper class fears about working class ambition and questioning whether reading and writing is really necessary or even appropriate for the 'masses.' Gender expectation also plays a role in dampening enthusiasm for learning. Until the recent past, women were deemed 'passive feelers' rather than 'active thinkers,' better privatised at home than publicised in the outside world. Both such class and gender fears can still affect the ability of poorer children and girls to realise their ambitions. Added to these factors is the use of corporal punishment at schools- now mainly prohibited- but still deep in the collective memory of schooling. One of the main functions of schools historically was to teach children obedience to authority and promote religious piety. Failure to learn was often equated with laziness, disobedience and sinfulness and punished accordingly. This was hardly a conducive environment to enjoy learning and build self-confidence. Punishment is guaranteed to generate intense anxiety about performance, linked to a fear of social *and* spiritual ostracism. Perhaps the concept of special needs children has developed out of a need to atone for such abuse which may not be practiced at schools anymore but is certainly still prevalent within the home for some children. So learning and punishment have a strong history, guaranteed to constellate an intense 'shadow' attached to failure.

I'm suggesting that such complex historical factors, taken together, without isolating one particular factor, could feed 'shadow' fears about performance (success/failure) which now concentrates on vulnerable children as 'special.' For the rest of 'normal' school children, such fears are prayed upon by the promotion of an 'easy' alternative: 'performativity' as so well described by educational critic Lyotard (1984). Lyotard suggests that computer age learning is reconceived as data banks and manipulated as 'input /output' under a centralised control by experts who determine what counts as 'knowledge.' I think this is another interesting 'shadow' perspective to look at: the mechanisation of knowledge to avoid 'stupidity.' It appears to give the individual pupil/student an easy access to knowledge but simultaneously streamlines, collectivises and controls thinking about that knowledge at the same time...!

- - -

The purpose of this seminar has been to widen ego consciousness about 'shadow,' however uncomfortable and complex this undertaking may be. 'Shadow,' itself, is generally hidden, so there is all the more reason to applaud each of our courageous presenters for entering into 'shadow' territory and casting a light on and reporting about the phenomena they find there. Their revelations also reveal their personal engagement with 'shadow' which has influenced their presentation. Helena discusses 'evil' under collective totalitarian systems which ignore the individual; Erik looks at the pagan father and his roots concentrating on creative aspects of Mercurius as 'self.' Chris enters the shadowy world of film and describes that twilight, hidden emotional domain. Lastly, Phil enters the classroom and draws our attention to special needs children, those shadowing figures standing in the corner of the classroom or outside the classroom door.

James G Johnston: A number of aphorisms come to mind related to your message. Neil Postman once commented that we begin our education as question marks and end as periods. One of Churchill's quips has stayed with me: "Success is going from failure to failure without losing enthusiasm." Finally, the motto of a highly successful industrial design firm, IDEO: "Fail early to succeed sooner."

Failure, in terms of innovation or personal growth, may be more valuable than success because it is packed with so many rich learning opportunities. But failure in schools is often laden with blame and shame. No wonder we might begin as question marks and end as

periods; we are afraid to fail in a "red pencil" educational culture. Innovation—the merger of imagination and unconventional thinking—is in some ways the shadow of formal education. Perhaps that helps to explain why some of the most innovative people here in the U.S. have also been those who exited the culture of formal education early: Bill Gates, Steve Jobs, Frank Lloyd Wright et al. Andrew Carnegie, one of the most successful entrepreneurs of all time, left school at age 13.

Innovation, learning from trial and error, imagination, creative collaboration—many of the attributes that can make for success in work and in personal growth, are often repressed in schools. Imagination looks for many "right answers" and adventurous trial and error requires mistakes in order to learn; a system oriented to one right answer implicitly promotes an orientation to avoiding mistakes.

Like many self-perpetuating institutions, the educational institution tends to attract people with psychological type dispositions that are congruent with the culture. The attraction tends to generate a cultural one-sidedness, suppressing the opposing shadow side. Jung noted that if the inferior type and its allies are overly repressed, they take on a role hostile to the dominant type of consciousness. The "dumbling" inferior type becomes a demon. In Jung's model, the shadow and inferior type are very closely connected. "I should only like to point out that the inferior function is practically identical with the dark side of the human personality" (CW 9i, par. 222).

If overly suppressed, the inferior shadow type and its allies may rise up to create havoc for the individual. We could likely say the same about one-sided educational cultures. An overly intellectual culture, for example, like those that might prevail in higher education, would be disrupted by suppressed primitive feeling: people might become petty, vindictive, and surly. "The outside influences he has brusquely fended off attack him from within, from the unconscious, and in his efforts to defend himself he attacks things that to outsiders seem utterly unimportant" (CW 6 par. 636). A culture overly oriented to social norms, facts, and "right answers," like the ones often found in early education, would tend to be disrupted by primitive, opinionated, negative thinking: "The unconscious thinking reaches the surface in the form of obsessive ideas which are invariably of a negative and depreciatory character" (CW 6, par. 600).

Daniel Burston: You are right to surmise that rational and irrational authority apply across the board to styles of parenting, teaching and political leadership. That is exactly what Fromm intended to convey. And yes, I think you are absolutely right to bring up the issues of boredom, attachment and humor. When they are not engaged with the teacher is a personal way, or when a teacher, to keep his or her job, must implement a manualized or heavily standardized curriculum - i.e. "teach to the test", which is increasingly prevalent on this side of the Atlantic - there can be no real mutuality or dialogue, only superficial banter, pep talks and scolding.

Also, in the absence of secure attachments, children (and teens) find it much more difficult - though not impossible - to learn. That Canadian film I mentioned, *Monsieur Lazar*, addresses the way in which teachers who embrace rational authority need to acknowledge issues of absence, trauma and loss in children's lives, and to create an (I/Thou) atmosphere of hopefulness and mutual respect in the classroom to contain them, but despite their own instincts and expertise, are prevented from doing so by prevailing cultural norms and expectations. As to humor - well, it can be a little risky sometimes, but it really helps to break the ice, and mitigates the sense of distance and potential estrangement that comes with any socially agreed disparity in status or power. (Gentle irony and self-mockery seem to work best for me . . . especially with older students.)

- - -

I agree, authenticity is key, and hasten to add - in keeping with your [Phil] reflections, and some earlier remarks of Tony's - that no matter how it is experienced, interpreted or exercised, authority always casts a shadow. Nevertheless, the usefulness of this distinction lies in enabling us to differentiate between 1) modes of authority that encourage (or at least permit) reciprocity, dialogue and genuine mutuality, and those that promote mechanical or superficial contact between teacher and pupil, and/or 2) modes of authority have a (liberating) formative influence on those who are subject to it, as opposed to those who are somehow harmed or "deformed" in the process. It also enables us to answer that age-old question, whether authority is a "good thing" or a "bad thing." Obviously, it is both and neither. It all depends of what *kind* of authority we are talking about.

While intuitively obvious to many people, I supposed, this heuristic distinction is very hard to grasp for any one who thinks of authority as invariably being oppressive, self-interested and/or duplicitous - i.e. many, if not most, of my graduate students, for example. As a result, many people who describe themselves as "anti-authoritarian" invariably approach things in this way, with a "hermeneutics of suspicion." They can't imagine a context where acquiring knowledge and discipline makes them more competent, more complete and ultimately, more creative and expressive people. Or if they can, they'll only grant very grudgingly that the teacher's competence and authority had anything to do with it.

The idea that the exercise of rational authority may be "liberating", and a product of competence and concern, runs directly contrary to the theories of Max Weber and Michel Foucault, for example. Weber believed that rational authority - which he equated with bureaucratic authority, or what you call the "hyper-rational" approach, with its reliance on quantification, uniformity, abstract goals and standards, etc. - ends up slamming us in an "iron cage." If you choose to define rational authority in this way, I quite agree. For Foucault, I think, authority can be creative, but is always self-interested at the end of day. Its ostensible rationality always masks a hidden agenda of social control. The idea that "rational authority" might actually have an emancipatory feeling or function seems laughable to any Foucauldian I've ever talked to.

In any case, the "hyper-rational" approach to education you've described would fall under the heading of what Fromm called "schizoid rationality", i.e. a detached, cerebral rationality that is devoid of empathy, intuition, and an ethical compass, and which has little tolerance or appreciation for individuality and creativity. Schizoid rationality is extremely dangerous to human welfare - at least in Fromm's estimation.

Another way in which your "hyper-rational" approach might be interpreted is in terms of what Fromm calls anonymous authority, where abstract standards, manualized curricula and "teaching to the test" supply the content and shape the tone and tempo of instruction. This undermines the judgement and skill of professional teachers, effectively making them little more than technical support staff charged with keeping customers happy - these customers being the students, the parents and the administrators who answer to them. I don't know what things are like in the UK, but we've gone a long way down that road in North America, with truly disastrous results. Our public schools are in shocking shape, with no real solutions in sight.