

D0172

Oct. 25

Intro : In introducing
Part II of our course (Oct. 1),

I said that

our purpose in the 2nd part of the course
was to ~~inspect~~ ^{examine} Jung's interpretations

of certain data of human life (Jung's science)
in order to ascertain

whether these data

can be interpreted in such a way

as to support our vision

as contrasted with Jung's.

After a lengthy & ^{of} introduction,
this is what we are now about to do.

Outline

Part II

II. Jung's Science of the Psyche

A. Complexes

1. The association experiment and feeling-toned complexes.
2. The varieties of complexes
3. Jung and Freud: two differences
 - a. complex and trauma
 - b. complexes as unitary structures
4. The nuclear element
5. The ego as complex
6. Personification
7. Personal and impersonal complexes
8. Complexes as purposeful

Oct. 25,

1

Part II. Religious Experience and the Science of Depth Psychology. See p. 1 of Oct. 1.

II. What did Jung say? His Science of the Psyche

A. Complexes. The building-blocks of the psyche.

1. We have already made some mention
of Jung's notion of complexes,

when we spoke of the often disassociated fragments
of the psyche

that are split off when certain actual or potential
differentiations cannot be integrated
by the undertow of Personality No. 2.

2. The notion of complexes is more complicated
than this, however.

First, it is not a simply negative notion,

and second, Pers. No. 2 is not the only "place"

where complexes are to be found. The ego is also a complex.

3. Complexes were originally purely negative elements, however.

Jung developed the notion of complexes as a result
of his association experiments at the Burghölzli
Mental Hospital in Zürich,

where he joined the staff in 1900, upon the completion
of his medical studies. vs. facile clarifications,

4. What was the association experiment?

vs. facile clarifications,
wanted scientific way of really
getting to inner
exp. of psychotics.

Remember that Jung, from his own experience,
was quite persuaded of the existence of a
Pers. No. 2, which he termed "the ^{unintentional or} unconscious."

Start here:

"Complex
Psychology"

160,
Oct. 25,
2

But he wanted to find a way to ^{verify} investigate
the ucs in an objective and scientific way.

Jung was impressed by Freud's conclusions
on the ucs, but he found that even Freud's theories
lacked scientific verifications. They seemed to be
verified empirically, in Freud's practise of therapy,
but not experimentally, and so they did not satisfy
the scientific community.

The answer Jung found was the association experiment.

The concept of the a.e. is really quite simple:

The experimenter enunciates to a subject
a succession of carefully chosen words:
to each of the words the subject was to respond
with the first word that occurred to him.

The reaction time was exactly measured, & attention paid

Jung did not invent the association experiment.

It was invented by a man named Galton,
and was developed by H. H. Hurd, who used it
to establish the laws of the association of ideas.

For Hurd, the test should show a connection
between difficulties to associate and disturbance
of attention. Such phenomena as perseveration
(repetition of the stimulus word over and over again),
prolonged reaction time, absence of reaction, mistakes
in reproducing the stimulus word, showed disturbances
of attention. For Jung, however, these phenomena signaled

to other
circumstances
(repetition of
word, etc.)

160,
Oct. 25,
3

emotional disturbances. They indicated at times powerful affective influences -- the operation of an unconscious psychic factor, which Jung came to call feeling-toned complexes. They are what cause disturbances in the association process.

(2. The varieties of complexes) 5.

Jung quickly came to see, however, that not all complexes were associated with powerful emotions, or were disturbing. They were all connected with emotions,

but the emotions could be a state of low affectivity as well as extreme frenzy, and they could be very healthy and helpful emotions as well as emotions that disrupted conscious life.

Some complexes, then, were normal:

related to one's family and professional responsibilities.

Some were natural, and some "accidental," i.e., caused by or related to specific events ^{or continuous situations} that had happened in the life of the patient.

Some were transient -- i.e., they could be changed -- and others were permanent, as for instance in schizophrenics.

Some were quite conscious, some partly conscious, and some, Jung said, fully unconscious.

6. Jung thought that the greatest value of the a.e. lay in these latter, was that it provided objectively valid evidence for an unconscious dimension of the psyche.

As such, it helped to get at the emotional determinants of psychic disturbances, whether in neurotics and psychotics, or in relatively normal psyches.

160,
Oct. 25,
4

In this sense, the essence of Jung's original complex theory can be stated in three points:

- 1) there is an intrinsic connection between disturbances of association and psychopathology (whether serious or "normal")
- 2) the cause of the disturbances is an unconscious, feeling-toned complex which affects consciousness
- 3) the complex is ^{often} the result of certain events in one's life which had become unconscious -- esp. true of complexes which caused disturbances in conscious life.

↓
(3. Jung
+ Freud)

7. The complex theory thus became for Jung a scientific way of measuring the degree and the quality of affectivity in Personality No. 2. In part, complexes -- those which are the result of certain events in one's life and that have a disturbing effect upon us -- are playing a function similar to that which Freud assigns to the trauma. But this is true only of these complexes. Complexes in general are more inclusive than Freud's trauma. They are not limited to acute states of abnormal emotion. In fact, some complexes, e.g. those related to and caused by religious experiences, can lead to long-lasting affective stability (CW 3, p. 43).

8. Thus Jung from the beginning has a different & more expansive notion of affectivity than Freud, where affectivity is a function of the excitation of sexual drives. For Jung, the content of an experience and of an emotion would always be more significant

160,
Oct. 25,
5

than it was for Freud. The total emotional situation of the subject was a function of many other factors, autonomous in their own right. For Freud, a sexually related trauma always was responsible for emotional disturbance, whereas for Jung,

a person's psychic predisposition, wh. was a function of many factors, and was responsible even for the way a person would respond to a sexually related trauma.

Thus the actual present of the patient was always granted a genuine significance by Jung,

a significance not accorded it by Freud.

9. A further difference from Freud is that for Jung every complex, even when it is split off from the rest of the psyche, is internally cohesive and stable.

It is a unitary structure, where feeling-tone and idea are strictly coupled together.

For Freud, the affect and the idea could split apart from one another.

For Jung, this happened only in schizophrenia.

A consequence of this for Jung

160,
Oct. 25,
6

is that every minute part
of the complex
would call into action the entire complex
(e.g., the stimulus word would activate the whole complex).

Complexes, then,

gradually came to be understood by Jung
as structural units of the psyche as a whole --
the entire psyche is composed of complexes.

(4. The 10. nuclear element
In 1928, in his paper "On Psychic Energy,"
Jung formulated the notion
of a nuclear element to each complex.

The nuclear element or nucleus

was the focus of the energy and content of the complex.

It consisted of two factors:

one was innate,

the other determined by experience.

Thus, e.g., the mother-complex (the sum of images, affects, and ideas
connected with mother)

is partly determined by nature, where the mother is both beneficial
and partly and destructive

by one's own experience of "mother."

11. The complex also differs
from Freud's idea of trauma

in that some complexes are or can be conscious, including the ego,
whereas ^{the effects of} traumas were always ucs for Freud.

Further more,

even with those that are ucs,

(5. The ego
as complex

160,
Oct. 25,
7

not all are caused by repression.

Complexes can be conscious in two ways, ^{✓ always was}
either because the complex in question is in the ego,
or because one has allowed a complex that was ues
to become conscious, to enter into the constitution of the ego.
For Freud, trauma was healed by dissolving it.

For Jung, disturbing complexes can be robbed
of their disturbing quality
by coming into es,
where they are not dissolved

but lived with honestly and forthrightly. Some complexes, at least, remain.

12. Not all complexes of the ues do become conscious, though,
but retain an autonomy of their own.

This is especially true of the "complexes of the collective unconscious,"
which are never to be associated with the ego, ✓ wh. we will see
later on.
When they are, one has become psychotic.

→ 13. The ego-complex is the union of all conscious complexes.
It must remain in contact, ^{✓ harmony} with its unconscious background, (d. v. i.)
or ues complexes will split off, start living a life of their own, ✓ begin
to disturb one's conscious life.

They will become a second authority
thwarting the life of consciousness.

In 1936 (CW 8, "Psych'el Factors Determining Human Behavior"),
Jung wrote that such complexes
will interfere with the intentions of the will
and disturb conscious performance,

160,
Oct. 25,
8

by producing disturbances of memory
blockages in association
obsessions
slips of the tongue
mistakes in action.

"In a word, complexes behave like independent beings,
a fact especially evident in abnormal states of mind."

14. The mes complex is a part of the personality,

but it will display a definite personality of its own.

Cf. ^{Györfi} ~~Carte~~: the complex systematizes ideas, images, and feelings around a stable nucleus and thus forms a personality center with particular feelings or ideas of its own.

1928, "On Psychic Energy": the complex is "a miniature, self-contained psyche," a "dissociated personality."

Thus the psyche is split into self-contained fragments of personality. This is not always abnormal, not always a matter of personality disintegration.

But it calls into question the assumption that we are from the ^{beginning} unified persons, with the ego as our center.

There is an image of personal unity, the archetype of the self, buried in the psyche,

but the actual unity of the multi-faceted personality is a goal toward which development is headed,

not something given from the outset of life, in a differentiated fashion.

Part of the process of moving toward this goal consists in integrating

6.
Personification

those still unconscious contents
that are capable of being admitted into consciousness.

15. Ucs complexes

(7. Personal and impersonal complexes

can be either personal or impersonal.

Personal complexes

either belonged at one time
or could belong to the ego-complex.

Impersonal complexes

originate in a timeless and primordial base of the psyche,
which is completely independent of the ego.

Jung calls it the collective ucs. Its contents have a meaning
common to all men. They "arise from that realm
of creative psychic life out of which the ephemeral
mind of the single human being grows like a plant
that blossoms, bears fruit and seed, and then withers
and dies," out of something greater than the personal
human being. They express:

- 1) problems which concern the human race
as such, and not just this individual
- and 2) the fertile ground of all creativity.

16. For Jung, complexes have not only emotional
but also purposeful aspects.

(8. Complexes as purposeful

There is almost no complex

which could not be used to good advantage
as an occasion for deepening one's insight,
becoming more conscious,
expanding the personality.

160,
Oct. 25,
10

Everything depends on what consciousness does with it.
Complexes, in a sense, keep conscious life on the move,
in that they can be an incentive to greater effort
and to new possibilities of achievement.

While they frequently represent our points of greatest
weakness,

they can prove to be the stimulus to victory.

More precisely,

complexes are often caused by conflict:
between ethics and instinct,
mind and nature,
society and individual.

Conflict, while it sometimes leads to neurosis,
^{is} ~~can also~~ an inevitable aspect of life
and development
and is not necessarily negative.

Conflict reveals the polarity of the psyche,
or what Jung calls (CW 8, p. 97)

"the apparent impossibility of affirming
the whole of one's nature."

For Freud,

the conflict that gave rise to neurosis
was always a clash between cultural standards
and instinctual desire,

and, until the 1930's,

the mes side was always coordinated
with the immoral side, the pleasure principle.

160,

Oct. 25,

"

For Jung, on the contrary,

the ucs focus could be either moral or immoral.

frequently it is the moral tendencies that have been ucs, overlooked, needing release.

Also the creative tendencies.

For Freud, the ego was always the seat of moral evaluation, or reality principle.

For Jung, the ego was frequently what was debased and immoral,

and the ucs was ^{sometimes} a sure guide to the moral tendencies.

This had to do with the difference in their notion of energy and instinct:

for Freud all energy was libido, sexual energy, and if it took other forms it was because it had been displaced;

for Jung all energy was ultimately neutral; it gave rise to five different instincts, none of which could be reduced to the others: hunger, sex, activity, reflection, and creativity. Energy could be at least partly transferred from one domain to the other, without being purely "nothing but" displaced energy, whose proper domain was elsewhere. [More on this next time. I want to finish with Jung's final definition of the complex.]