

DD180

- III. Critique of Jung. A. Jung's contribution. B. Non-alienated humanity
C. Jung & alienation
D. Christ and the Psyche
- ~~B. Intentionality and Psyche~~
1. The need for a new control of meaning.
 2. The self-appropriation of the subject as the new control of meaning
 3. The subject as intentionality and psyche
 4. Psyche as intentional
 5. The key to authenticity: intentionality
- ~~C. B. The three orders of symbols~~
1. Personal symbols
 2. Archetypal symbols
 3. Anagogic symbols
- ~~D. Religious & Christian symbols as anagogic~~

A. Jung's Contributions
 Today we come to the final section of our course, a critique of Jung precisely as scientist. (Today & Monday: next Friday is review).
 In our last class, we saw how Jung's science led him directly into his myth, which he expresses in his later work by identifying it with his own peculiar interpretation of astrology.

His science, his careful observation of certain data, the data of synchronicity and of psychic events that had no causal explanation in the terms that would be accepted by the canons of empirical science, led him in his last years to a mythical vision of the world that takes on the aura of a religion -- and a religion that conflicts with Christianity over the treatment of evil

and over the meaning of Jesus Christ and of God
for our psychological and spiritual lives.

Christian theology cannot ignore

the existential-mythical implications of Jung's thought.

Not only do they challenge Christianity to give an account of itself in psychological terms,
but they also capitalize and summarize

a not inconsiderable cultural phenomenon of our time --

the fascination with the occult,

the different varieties of the human potential movement,

the re-sacralization of nature and sexuality,

the capitulation of intelligence and reason and value-orientation

to the rhythms of nature and the body

that seems to be the principal danger

in the contemporary flight from the spirit of technology and domination

that characterizes the post-Enlightenment mind with its conviction

of automatic progress and unlimited growth.

What seems to me to be

the lasting fruit of Jungian psychology,

the real contribution of Jung to our time,

is the critique that he delivers

of the modern ethos.

In our insistence on automatic progress

and unlimited ambition

and growth

in our personal, social, economic, and political lives,

we have lost contact with our deepest humanity,

and have constructed a society where alienation

is paramount,

Dec. 3, 3

where people who have lost contact with themselves
 have also lost contact with one another,
 where the life of feeling, aesthetics, and art
 as well as the life of religion
 have retired to a private enclave
 or to an ivory tower,
 and where community, the ideal basis of any well-functioning society,
 is non-existent.

We are people so much out of the move --

psychologically, professionally, geographically, economically, socially --
 that we have lost our roots.

Jung has recalled us to our roots,
 and that is his lasting merit and contribution
 to the cultural life of our times.

A second contribution

is that, in recalling us to our roots in nature, the psyche, & the body,
 he has provided us with a new range of data on ourselves
 that are very important for our self-understanding.

These are the data on what he calls the unconscious:

its collective or universally human basis,
 its creative and teleological orientation,
 its intention of an ever richer and more finely differentiated humanity,
 and its various components: shadow, contra-sexuality, mythical resonances.

Jung, almost alone among the pioneers of modern psychology,
 has been aware of these dimensions of our being,
 and has preserved the science of psychology
 from being the exclusive domain of positivists, behaviorists, reductionists,
 gross materialists.

160,
Dec. 3, 4

He has displayed,
through courageous and often quite solitary and lonely explorations and
investigations,
that a rigorous scientific outlook is possible
that will at the same time not empty human life
of the significance that pre-scientific humanity
found in human life,
but that even enhances our sense of an ultimate significance to our lives
by rooting this belief
in empirically verifiable data:
the data of our dreams, of our spontaneous symbols, of our orientations
to differentiated totality.

Such has been Jung's mammoth contribution to the cultural life of our times.
It is only against the background of this contribution that I will venture a
critique of Jung,
for I wish to include this contribution as an essential constituent
of a world-view appropriate for our modern cultural task.

B. My critique of Jung

begins by asking the question: what will overcome the alienation that
Jung so accurately accuses the modern age of perpetrating?
What is non-alienated humanity?

In my response, I take my main cues from Louergans and Gandhi.

Non-alienated living is a dynamic balance

between complexity and ~~limitation~~ integration,

between self-transcendence and limitation,

between forward movement and consolidation, between intentionality
and psyche!

Non-alienation in all spheres of life

is an ecological balance of forces. The principal forces to be balanced

160,
Dec. 3, 5

are the forward moving impulses that make for continual growth and progress,
and the conditions of limitation that make for continual consolidation
and integration of all growth and progress.

We return again to our model of differentiation & integration
(again: not Jung's, but mine)

but we extend this model beyond purely personal development
to all other systems in human living: social, economic, political.

It was Gandhi's insight
that every system,
beginning with the personal system of our own individuality
but extending to social, economic, and political systems --

every system

will give rise to alienation

unless it maintains a delicate and tense balance -- there will
always be a tension --

between complexity and integration or consolidation.

It is Lounsbury's insight
that genuineness

is also a delicate and tense balance between self-transcendence
and limitation.

Let's develop these insights

and see where they lead us in attempting to evaluate and critique
Jung.

Many people think of Gandhi as the political liberator of India
from the domination of the British Empire -- and such he was.

But Gandhi always insisted that political liberation is always a consequence of spiritual liberation.

His primary concern, he said, was not a political revolution but a spiritual revolution, not political freedom but spiritual freedom.

Without spiritual freedom, political freedom is a sham. (cf. America)

What, then, is freedom? Freedom from what? Freedom for what?

Gandhi's insight is that all of human life is a complex of systems:

each of us is a personal system, a network of relationships, internal and external.

Each of us lives in a political system and in an economic system.

These were the three main systems Gandhi emphasized: personal, political, and economic. They are inter-related w/ one larger system of human ecology.

In all of these systems, as well as in the more embracing ecological system, there obtains a law,

and the law is as follows:

if the system ever becomes more complex there is needed for a sustained balance of the system,

alienation will begin to dominate the system:

if the system is personal, the alienation will be a psychological and a spiritual alienation from oneself;

if the system is political, the alienation will be an alienation of the powerful from the powerless;

if the system is economic, the alienation will be an alienation of the rich from the poor.

Dec. 3, 7

In each instance,

the result is oppression of an infrastructure by a superstructure:
in the personal system,

the superstructure of the ego will oppress the infrastructure of
nature, body, psyche, unconscious;

in the political system,

the superstructure of government will oppress the infrastructure of
the masses;

in the economic system,

the superstructure of industry and finance will oppress the
infrastructure of labor and the non-laboring classes.

In every case,

the oppression is a result of the superstructure becoming
larger and more complex than is necessary to maintain
a balance or harmony.

The ego becomes larger and more complex than ^{what} the psyche can integrate;
the government becomes larger and more complex than what the people
can humanly find compatible w. their need for representation
and input;

the economy becomes larger and more complex than what will
sustain a continuous and ordered satisfaction of the basic
needs of all the people.

In each case,

the infrastructure will do one of two things,
neither of which will restore the balance.

The infrastructure will either give up and collapse
or declare a revolution against the superstructure.

In the personal systems,

if the ~~ego~~ infrastructure gives up,
you have depression, drifting, nervous break down;

if the infrastructure revolts,
you have mania, inflation, psychosis.

In the political system,

if the infrastructure gives up,
you have political cynicisms, hopelessness, a withdrawal
of the people from civic responsibility;

if the infrastructure revolts,
you have a violent overthrow of the old superstructure
and the beginning of a new but still oppressive superstructure
(cf. Russia).

In the economic system,

if the infrastructure gives up,
you have a loss of the sense of economic responsibility,
abuses of social welfare,
refusals to work, etc.

and if the infrastructure revolts,
you have labor becoming as much of an alienating giant
as industry,
you have ever spiralling wages and prices,
you have the monopoly of the Teamsters & the United Auto
Workers.

160,
Dec. 3, 9

In all instances,

the root of the problem is that the superstructure became too large and too complex for the infrastructure to sustain in a balanced fashion.

When the infrastructure gives up,

the imbalance is just perpetuated.

When the infrastructure revolts,

it is insisting on becoming just as large & complex as the superstructure, and both of them grow out of proportion.

To guard against alienation, then, and all its consequences

it is necessary for the superstructure -- personal, political, economic -- to acknowledge the finitude of the system,

and to keep itself from the over-complexification that throws the whole system off balance.

There is increasing complexification that is needed,

but only to the extent that the infrastructure can consolidate and integrate.

To fail to move on to new complexity

when the infrastructure is ready is to stagnate.

But to insist on moving on to new complexity

when the infrastructure is not ready is to alienate, to divide, to split.

160,
Dec. 3, 10

C. Jung and Alienation

Jung's concern is with the personal system,
even though what he says has ramifications
for the political and economic systems.

Using the model of complexity and integration,
what are we to say about Jung,
and especially about the transformation of his science
into a modern form of astrology and myth,
and about his critique of Christianity?

My basic thesis is the following:

Jung has combined an extraordinary knowledge of the
infrastructure of the human personality
with a less than adequate understanding of its
superstructure.

Jung refers to call the superstructure the ego. But what builds the
I suggest, following Lomorgau, that we call its ^{operator} intentionality. ^{ego keeps it} in line?

We have said something already about what intentionality
is,

when we spoke of character.

Now we must return to it, by way of wrapping things up for
our course.

Jung's psychology is a psychology of personality.

There is Personality No. 1, the ego,

and Personality No. 2, the ucs or the infrastructure.

Dec. 3, 11

Jung is intent on establishing a balance between them,
but what he misses in all of this
is the nature of what keeps development going.

For Jung, this is psychic energy.

But: psychic energy is neutral.

It can be invested in any of a number of different systems.

The question remains:

in what systems,

and with what balance among these systems,

am I to invest my energies?

Psychic energy doesn't answer these questions.

The answers come from intentionality or character,
which is responsible for the free disposal of the
surplus energy whose investment leads to personal
development.

The orientation of intentionality is to self-transcendence.

The orientation of the infrastructure is to consolidation,
integration.

The task of intentionality is to keep the dynamic balance
between self-transcendence and integration,
between complexity & limitations.

Dec. 3, 12

What do I mean when I say that Jung's understanding of intentionality is inadequate?

I mean that, in the last analysis, Jung does not know that it is intentionality that contains the ~~the~~ criteria for authentic humanity:

Bernard Lonergan has shown very forcefully & persuasively that intentionality unfolds on four levels, each w. its own immanent law:

experience	-	be attentive
understanding	-	be intelligent
judgment	-	be reasonable
decision	-	be responsible.

Each level is self-transcending,
each in a different way,
each later level is more ~~more~~ self-transcending than the previous.

The relationship of intentionality and psyche is reciprocal, it is the relationship of a suprastructural operator with an infrastructure. It can be understood in a serious fashion.

Psyche is the lower blade, the data.

Intentionality & its questions are the upper blade?

What does it mean?

Is this really so?

What am I to do about it?

Dec. 3, 13

Authentic & non-eliminated humanity, personality,
results from the interaction of the two blades of the scissors.

By neglecting the upper blade,

by neglecting self-transcendence,
Jung in the final analysis,

despite his enormous contribution,
does not provide the complete set of operators for authentic human
development,

for he does not formally acknowledge how important
are the questions of the upper blade,

nor how inevitable are the consequences of neglecting them.

By this failure,

Jung falls victim to the romantic agony,
the capitulation of intentionality to psyche.

The final stage of pure romantic myth

is symbolized, says Northrop Frye,

in "the old man in the tower,

the lonely hermit absorbed in occult or magical studies."

Such was Jung in his last years,

the living symbol of pure romance,

of psyche without intentionality,

engaged in the psychological counterpart of alchemy,

while ignoring that alchemy.

Dec. 3, 14

is one of the most conspicuous failures in the history of human inquiry, and that its psychological counterpart,

if it includes good & evil among the opposites to be reconciled, will share in this failure --

for it is the failure of a task that was impossible from the beginning.

Psyche alone, infrastructure alone, will not arrive at genuine humanity.

Only the interlocking, the dynamic balance,

of the self-transcending question

for meaning, truth, & value

with the symbolic expressions of the infrastructure

will bring the modern mind beyond

the alienation produced by the splitting of the opposites of spirit & matter.

D. Christ and the Psyche

From this perspective,

what happens to Jung's critique of the symbolic significance of Christ?

Can Christ function for the psyche as symbolic of the

end-point, the goal,
of personal development?

160,
Dec. 3, 15

The question reduces to a prior question:

Can Christ function as a symbol of the dynamic balance of
intentionality and psyche
that is authentic, non-abstracted humanity?

The answer, it seems to me, is yes,

but in order to substantiate this answer,

I must distinguish three,

and not two,

orders of symbols: the personal,

the archetypal,

and the ~~symbolic~~ anagogic (leading beyond).

Personal symbols

Archetypal -- taken from nature, symbolize humanity in so far as it is
emergent w/ nature. Mandala, flame, stone, flower.

Anagogic -- symbolize humanity in so far as its destiny transcends
the great mandala of nature.

Christ is a symbol of the Self, not in an archetypal fashion,
but in an anagogic fashion.

The Crucified: the life, truth, love that are crucified & victimized
by intentionality's refusal to face the questions that
dynamically & harmoniously move to self-transcendence

The Living One: the self I will be when I reach my trans-natural
destiny

Satan: the self I will be if I continue in my refusal. The two can't be
integrated. ^{final is} ^{the word is} ^{free} ^{from}