

LECTURE, MARQUETTE, "THE
NAME SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNG'S PSYCHO-
LOGY FOR THE CULTURAL CRISIS OF
OUR TIME

NO. D-46

GRAND & TOY LIMITED PERMAX REVERSIBLE • F14-0331-22

D0079

Essential cultural concepts of Jung's thought:

1. Jung's understanding of the opposites. (Not Greek or Cartesian, but Hebraic)
 2. Meaning^{truth} and value repressed into the dark side
(essentially that the body is located within the self) - Jung's understanding of the ues.
 3. Jung's understanding of the dream: project and possibility
 4. Jung's understanding of the symbol: the unity
in-tension
of the possibilities & projects,
fate & history,
of the subject, his culture, the species
- Shadow,
contrasexuality,
archetypal-function

Ambiguities in Jung's thought:

1. An inadequate discrimination of intentionality - - tends toward, the never completely gives way to, romanticism.
2. Resultant: a problem with evil.
- not a union of opposites
but a transcending of the opposites
thru the conversion of evil into good
evil is unintegratable. This is what makes it evil. But it can be transcended, converted.
3. The notion of God: numinous n. of some psychic exp. → a problematic of religion: unavoidable
Jung is essentially Hegelian re: God (the ambiguous) - - can be interpreted this way.
What is coming to itself - - God or man?
Is there a sense in which God is being completed in history? Jung on Trinitarian symbolism.
4. Wholeness: not self-enclosure but self-transcendence. 5. immanence
6. psychological redemption

A myth for our time: Max Zeller's dream

but combined w. the awareness
of Mumford's post-historic man.

(g.v.)

Both are inevitable.

Jung's belief is that world-cultural
humanity will prevail.

Presuppositions:

1. Legitimate to approach any human-scientific construction from the standpoint of a philosopher/theologian concerned with what the construction says about the human subject
 - what implicit commitments does it make re: the human subject?
 - what can it contribute to my own interest in this topic as a philosopher/theologian?
2. Legitimate to interpret culture from this same standpoint: i. e., in terms of subjectivity
 - meanings & values → lifestyle
 - Cultural crisis = breakdown in lifestyles, ↓ breakdown in meanings & values
3. The contemporary breakdown in prevailing meanings & values may signal the end of a whole cultural epoch 2000 yrs old or better. Jung wd. agree
 - ↳ the condition for a new age
4. ↳ Subjectivity is dual, and the contemporary breakdown of meanings & values is due to an acute rift in subjectivity, the divorce of inner self & body, characteristic of a one-sided technological age. The new control of mg will be ecological r. th. technological.
 - ↳ mythic w. its bodily basis, & theoretical w. its basis in the spirit's drive for mg (↓ control)

Psi Chi Lecture, April 20, 1976 (also 143, April 21 + 23)

phenomenon:
people are or easily
become interested in
Jung... why?

Jung's work has now reached the point achieved, it seems,
by all greatness: it has begun
to give rise to different interpretations
& schools,
to contrary and even contradictory interpretations.

Multiplying
literature on Jung

What I offer, then,

is only one interpretation,

my own. Basis = last 15 yrs. or so, and esp.

And as with any interpretation,

Jung's seminar "On the
Nature of the Psyche" (1946)

it will be as much a reflection of the interpreter
as of the interpreted.

limits me to
speaking about
the cultural
significance
of his work.

→ more
w/ al

I will divide my presentation into 4 parts:

1. my presuppositions as an interpreter of Jung
2. the culturally pertinent aspects of Jung's thought
3. the ambiguities in Jung's thought
4. Jung's contribution to a myth for our time

1. I have at least six philosophical presuppositions
with which I come to the study and
interpretation of Jung:

a. Jung's psychology needs to be understood
from a meta-scientific standpoint.

That is, in Jung's thought, as in every human-scientific
construction that tends toward an over-arching
point of view that would offer an interpretation
of everything human,

there is implicit, and at times explicit,

an operative set of assumptions
that are philosophical in nature
and that deal with
the meaning of human existence,
the place of human existence in the total scheme of things,
the total point of view.

There is a myth, a world-view,
contained in every human-scientific construction.

This is true of Freud, of Skinner, of Maslow, of Lévi-Strauss,
and it is true of Jung.

A meta-scientific standpoint will disengage that myth,
that total view of things,
and will evaluate it

in terms of its adequacy
to the judgmental commitments of a philosophy
re: human subjectivity, reality, and
the relation between subjectivity and reality
that we call objectivity.

It is from a particular metascientific standpoint
that I attempt to interpret Jung.

- §. 6. Human-scientific constructions
such as Jung's psychology
can also contribute to a meta-scientific standpoint.
I. e., to the extent that any meta-scientific standpoint
is informed by judgmental commitments
regarding human subjectivity,
and to the extent that a human-scientific construction

arrive at such commitments from its own perspective
and on the basis of the data it studies,
this construction can contribute to the philosophy
that constitutes one's interpretative scheme
or hermeneutic framework
or meta-scientific point of view.

Perhaps no one has shown this better than Paul Ricoeur
in his work on Freud and his debates with Claude Lévi-Strauss.

Ricoeur seems to realize that, as a philosopher
intent on self-reflection as the heart of
the philosophical enterprise,

his work is incomplete without the critical monitoring
and careful appropriation

of the scientific discoveries

of such investigators,

even if he rejects their meta-scientific
standpoints as too narrow,

constricting,

falsifying,

mystifying.

So too, I wish to discover the contribution

Jung can make to my philosophy

of self-reflection,

my meta-scientific standpoint.

c. The basis of my own interpretative scheme
is provided by the thought of Bernard Lonergan.
There is no way I can even begin to detail Lonergan's thought
in this context.

Let me simply indicate that Lonergan presents us with a
philosophy of the human subject as human subject,
and discovers that we do perform
basically two kinds of operations as subjects:
cognitive (concerned w. ng and truth)
✓ evaluative, concerned w. value or the good.

Essential to Lonergan's thought is the judgment that
a position on reality
✓ on objectivity
are dependent upon a position on the subject,
that the key to understanding any philosophy
lies in disengaging its implicit or explicit
position on the human subject.

d. Intrinsic to Lonergan's point of view
is that culture is to be understood in terms of subjectivity.

Lonergan defines culture as an operative set of assumptions
regarding meaning and value
that inform the life-style of a given group of people.

A cultural crisis, then, which is what we are discussing tonight
(as soon as I finish my presuppositions!)

is a breakdown in lifestyles, consequent upon and based on
a breakdown of previously cherished or at least implicitly
operative assumptions regarding meaning and value.

e. Lonergan also assumes that we may be heading into a new cultural epoch in the history of humankind,
 an epoch based on a new control of meaning
 in terms of the self-appropriation of the human subject as human
 subject.

f. Which brings me to what is at the heart
 of our current cultural crisis.

The transition between the epochs, I believe,
 depends on whether we successfully heal
 the rift in subjectivity,
 the divorce of the inner self from the body,
 that has been present for 2000 yrs of Western history
 but that has become schizoid in our time.

Ernest Becker: every noteworthy psychology
 will take this duality as its principal concern.

The question then becomes:

→ What does Jung offer to our understanding of subjectivity,
 and how does he ~~words~~ help us to negotiate this epochal
 cultural crisis -- what does he contribute to the
 transcending of the schizoid condition of alienated
 Western humanity? To ecological ethos?

2. There are four aspects of Jung's thought that I wish to emphasize as valuable for this transition between cultural epochs:

- a. his understanding of the opposites in human subjectivity
- b. his understanding of the unconscious
- c. his understanding of the dream
- d. his understanding of symbols.

a. The opposites. ^(my own vocabulary) There are certain conceptions of human subjectivity that preclude from the outset any possible attainment of a position beyond the opposites, precisely because of the way they conceive the opposites in the first place.

Thus, even Ernest Becker,

whose book, The Denial of Death, I regard as the potential source of a very new chapter in the history of depth psychology, remains hopelessly dualistic in his portrait of man by insisting on speaking of the opposites as self and body. Unecological

Jung never does this.

For him the opposites are spirit and matter or body or instinct.

Self is the totality, and thus the body is not excluded from the self but is a constituent part of it.

This is a radical reversal of the Cartesian ^{radical departure from 300-400 yrs. of thought.} "take" on subjectivity that is so

prominent a feature of the Western schizoid condition.

More precisely, for Jung the human subject is not a duality at all,
but a threefold being:

we are matter or body or instinct
and spirit or intentionality or archetype
and psyche or soul or imagination.

Spirit and matter, intentionality and body, are the opposites,
but the operator of their cumulative integration
is the psyche.

The psyche or soul or imagination
shares in both of the opposites,
in spirit in that she -- for psyche is anima --
is an operator of meaning + value,
in body in that her meanings + values
are always concrete, specific, here + now.

The reconciliation of the opposites,

or more precisely,

the attainment of a position beyond the opposites,
is through psyche, then.

She is the gateway to an asymptotically approached wholeness
or unification
or integration of subjectivity,
to the healing of the rift in modern Western subjectivity.

Jung's psychology, then,

is appropriately referred to by James Hillman
as a matter of "soul-making."

Cultivation of psyche or soul is the key to transcending
the schizoid split of the opposites.

6. The unconscious.

From Freud we inherit a notion of the unconscious as "id,"

(the even in 7. the matter is far more complicated),

and we tend to think of "id" as nothing but

pleasure-bent

or aggression instinct,

as sheer animality,

untutored by civilization, and then properly repressed

by civilized humanity.

For Freud, the unconscious can only be deciphered

by a peculiar hermeneutic of demystification

that regards all phenomena of consciousness,

even dreams,

as deceptions,

as covert manifestations of primal instinctual gratification-wishes.

Not even dreams are honest. All of consciousness, except of course the es that has been tutored by Freudian psychology, is mendacious.

For Jung, on the other hand,

the unconscious

is the key to a far more profound desire

of the human subject than gratification:

the desire for meaning.

Faithful attention to dreams

is a primary source of illumination

as to the meaning and direction of one's life;

perhaps the principal indicator

of the factors that must be negotiated

along the path to self-actualization

and self-transcendence.

Furthermore, the modern unconscious

for Jung

is the repository of peculiar meanings & values

that have been repressed as a result of the program
set for modern consciousness by the Enlightenment's
commit to demystification and secularization--
moral and religious values

previously affirmed by consciousness
and granted a position of centrality
in the conscious direction of life.

Jung's call to attention to the manifestations of the unconscious
sets for modern man a program of remythologization
of consciousness,

but not in the naive sense of pre-critical,
pre-Enlightenment

Western man,

but in the sense of a second, post-critical naïveté,
an immediacy tutored by the critical achievements
of the last 200 years
and thus healed or cured

of the idolatrous superstitions
that are the constant temptation
of pre-critical naïve consciousness.

The unconscious for Jung is the whole of the dark side
of human subjectivity,
and the dark side is not only the residue of primitive animal
instinct,

but also the whole realm of the mysterious,
the numinous,
indeed the redemptive.

It must be said quite openly
that Jung was and remained
through his life a profoundly religious spirit,
and that the unconscious is the locus
to which the divine had been relegated
by the hypertrophy and inflation of the ego of modern Western
consciousness.

God for Jung is the underground God,
a God repressed into the opaqueness of matter, memory, & the
by scientific and enlightened hubris, fact,
a God seeking to be set free from the confine
of the prison of darkness into which he had
been forced by an ego that tried the
experiment of making itself the measure of all things.

Perhaps this point may be understood more clearly
if we examine Jung's notion of ^(what is innate) ~~instinct~~ in man.

From the beginning, Jung presents a very different notion of
instinct from Freud.

For Freud, as we said,

instinct is sexual

and aggressive,

and aggressivity is in the interests of sexuality.

(Freud's post-1920 writings contain also the notion of
the instinct for death).

For Jung, the instinctual realm is far richer and
more complicated.

There are five areas of instinct: bodily sustenance, sexuality,
self-defense (aggressivity), reflections (the human
variant of flight), and creativity.

Now instinct is the realm of need, of biological need.

And so, for Jung, human need is a far more complex thing than it is represented to be by Freud, where gratification is the determinant of need, and where even the secondary process or reality principle operates in the service of gratification or pleasure (all of which is basically sexual).

The instincts of reflection and creativity, built into human biology (as instincts),

indicate life needs that refer to fulfilment and meaning.

The body is intrinsically related to spirit for Jung.

Both are "the unconscious"

If instincts represent the threshold of matter into consciousness, archetypes represent that of spirit.

Archetypes are meaningful patterns of response to the data of experience,

meaningful principles for the organization of experience, meaningful determinants or constituents of human life as a story.

Archetypes and instincts, spirit and matter, stand in a relationship of intimate correspondence to one another.

The correspondences become conscious by the joining of the two psychoid dimensions in the archetypal images of dreams.

Dream images relate a story, and it is the story of the subject's ongoing drama of individuation,

of the unity of spirit and matter in the concrete and limited human subject that I am.

This is the meaning of dreams:

they are the cipher of where I stand, of how it is going forward,
in the drama of becoming the individual that I am.

They are the indicators

either of the relative harmony
or relative disharmony

of intentionality and body,
of spirit and matter.

They tell the story of my journey to or away from authenticity,
by presenting the manifestation of what I must deal with,
or of what I am dealing with,
at the present juncture
in my completion of my own individual destiny.

They can only do this,

if in fact the realm of the unconscious,
from which they originate,

is itself intrinsically tuned, as it were,

to respond to more than stimuli for gratification,

only if the unconscious is the place where the treasure of meaning
and value resides,

the home of significance,

the abiding place, even, of the divine,

the temple of the Holy Spirit. Rejected by the hypertrophied
ego, like the cornerstone which the
builders rejected.

c. Let me say more about dreams.

The dream is the principal and most treasured
manifestation of psyche,

and thus the primary integrator of the opposites,

the key to a position beyond the opposites.

We can understand what takes place in the dream
if we approach the question from the standpoint of energy.

(my
interpretation)

From an evolutionary perspective,
we can say that the world's energy
becomes present to itself in consciousness.

Consciousness is energy that is transparent to itself
and potentially intelligible to itself in self-knowledge.

If this is the case, then the unconscious
is energy that is not present to itself, opaque energy,
energy in the dark.

If this is the case, then all energy in the universe
save that which becomes present to itself in cs,
is the unconscious. (The term "the ucs" is relative to us)

Proximately, ~~Remotely~~, the ucs
is neural-physiological process in the human organism.

Remotely, the ucs
is the world.

From this perspective,
the ucs in itself, as all energy that is not cs,
is what is known by physics,
chemistry,
v biology.

But the ucs as known by depth psychology
is not a matter of physics,
chemistry,
v biology,

but is this same reality as pertinent for human living.

The pertinence of the world's energy for human living
discloses itself in the most rudimentary form of cs,
the dream.

The dream is the cosmos yearning for cs and
for redemption.

In the dream,

the universe known by physics,
chemistry,
& biology,

matter,

reveals an ulterior finality, an interest in human consciousness.
It enters into subjectivity.

It becomes for-itself, not simply in-itself, le pour soi
and not just l'en soi (Sartre).

The dream,

the place of the most rudimentary form of es,
is also where the universal energy of the cosmos
first becomes present to itself.

The psyche, Jung said,
is at bottom world.

But as psyche, it is world for itself,

energy transparent to itself,

the universe posing a question to the human subject
who is endowed w. the capacity of being
not merely present to himself,

but of being so intelligently, reasonably,
in responsibility,

in erotic and agapic love.

The universe can become love

in human es,

and that it enters into,

in deed even issues in,

human es, wd indicate that this is its finality.

Love, then,

is harmony with the rest of the universe.

But the dream

is the entrance of the universe
into its own capacity to become love.

In the dream,

the universe places itself
at the mercy of the human subject,
for everything depends on what the subject does with the dream.

The subject can be completely oblivious of the dream,
as most white Westerners have been,
thus giving rise to the breakdowns
of meaning & value

that qualifies us for a cultural crisis.

The dream can be regarded as insignificant,
as without value.

But the dream can also be lived forward

attentively, intelligently,

reasonably, truthfully,

responsibly, erotically, agapically.

Then the universe itself is advanced in its urge toward
more being, more life.

And if the dream is forgotten or rejected,
ridiculed or denied,

an evolutionary blind alley

or false start

or even complete breakdown & collapse
has been suffered.

Now that the universal energy,

in this one insignificant aspect of my es,

has issued in transparency to itself,

its future depends on humans,
wh. is responsible for determining its direction,
for defining its finality,
for executing its desire.

The universe, then,

becomes intentionality through psyche.

In psyche, body and intentionality become unified beyond the
opposites.

in soul-
making,

April 26 --
14/3,
Sept. 2

Such a perspective helps us understand

the insistence of Jung

on the depths of the unconscious:

it is not purely personal, as with Freud,
telling the story of my body in the world,
but also racial or cultural,

and cross-culturally collective, ^{telling through psyche} the story of matter in its
containing evolution or
breakdown in human
consciousness.

It is this ^{almost} infinite extension
of the ucs, if indeed the
universe is almost infinite,

that allows Jung to speak of the self as a permanently
borderline concept, expressing a reality to which no limits
can be set.

At the same time, though,

the self is a totality revealed through
symbols of roundness,

reflecting perhaps

that the universe is a curved universe;

for the psyche. Jung says, is at bottom world.

April 26th d. Finally I must say something about symbols.

Symbols are the language the universe speaks when it enters at first into us thru dreams.

A symbol, in its elemental form in dreams, is the place of the meeting of past and future in human conscious experience.

In the symbol, the future beckons the past, what has been, into the present, where time speaks.

In symbols, nature (the "having been") & freedom (the future), matter & spirit, commingle into a tense unity.

In symbols, project
possibility
unite.

The dream symbol creates the unity of the projects of intentionality and the limits of possibility set by matter.

Symbols, then, are profoundly ecological.

Project is future & spirit, possibility is set by past and matter.

Project is consciousness, possibility the unconscious. The dream makes of the possible a project.

No other project than one that is possible,
no other future than one that can ^{transform} ~~take~~ the past into the present,
no other ^{intentionality} spirit than that which is coincident with ^{energy} matter,

"goes,"

i.e.,

is harmonious with universal energy.

All the rest is folly, abomination, destructiveness, the mutual destruction
of the environment by the subject and of the subject by the
environment. The dream comments on the projects of es, indicates

Symbols -- the elemental symbols of our dreams --
are the key to our ecological responsibility.

whether they are possible, and whether they reflect the fullness of the possibilities set by energy.

The Intentionality of our projects

is intrinsically dependent upon psyche,
for it is psyche that manifests what it is possible for intentionality
to project.

It is the symbolic process of psyche's dream
that represents, indeed is,

the unifying element

drawing the subject beyond the opposites

- of future & past into the present,
- of intentionality & body into humanity,
- of spirit & matter into incarnation,
- of consciousness and the unconscious into the subjectivity

of the I am, I am just this.

3. The ambiguities of Jung's thought.

I said that what I was offering
is an interpretation of Jung,
and thus would contain as much a reflection
of my own interpretative scheme
as it does of Jung himself.

That reflection will become more obvious
as I try to indicate my reservations about Jung's work.

There is one primary reservation
and ~~the~~ consequent reservations.

a. The primary reservation

is that there is not present in Jung, implicitly or explicitly,
an adequate discrimination of intentionality or spirit.

In the last analysis,

there is no grasping the truth about man
proposed by Lonergan;
namely, that the authentic human being
is the one who transcends himself or herself
in understanding, in truth, and in responsible
and loving commitment,

the one who, in Becher's terms,

develops one's own unique gift with all the
energy and passion at one's disposal,
and then simply gives it over

w/o claiming control over what happens to it.

Jung seems to me to be forever caught
between this ideal of self-transcendence
and a romanticism where intentionality
would simply submit to the rhythms and
processes of the psyche and of nature.

Authenticity -- indeed, wholeness itself -- is ec-centric.

According to the perspective from which I am working,
intentionality or consciousness is not only to achieve
harmony with universal process,
but is to transform the world's energy
into meaning, truth, and love.

If this were not the case,
the issuance of the world's energy
in a being capable of meaning, truth, and love
would be absurd.

And I am committed to the proposition
that human existence is absurd
only when it makes itself absurd, and that it only makes
itself absurd
by refusing
to reach for meaning, truth, responsibility, and love.

6. The first reservation consequent upon this primary one
is Jung's ambiguity regarding the notion of evil.
Good and evil do not stand in the same kind
of relationship to one another as spirit & matter.

Spirit and instinct can both be both good and evil.

Jung states this quite clearly in one of his major papers,
"On the Nature of the Psyche" (vol. 8),
but fudges on the question elsewhere.

What is at issue here is understood
only by the Christian doctrine of redemption,
where the issue is not that of the union of opposites
but of the transcendence of evil by good,
of nothingness by being,
the creation of something out of nothing,
the conversion of evil into good.

Jung never understood,
and so could never accept,
the traditional Augustinian - Thomist
position on evil as privatio boni.

One can only speak of a union of opposites
where there is a question of a synthesis of
two contradictory spheres of being,
such as spirit and matter.

But evil is not a sphere of being,
it is the absence of intelligibility, meaning,
reality, truth,
and value.

Evil is irretrievably unintegratable.

In our time, no one has argued this more forcefully
than Paul Ricoeur.

It is precisely its incapacity for integration
that makes it evil.

c. Another qualification concerns Jung's notion of God,
particularly as this appears in Answer to Job
and in his paper on Trinitarian symbolism.

The numinous quality of archetypal experience
led Jung inescapably into a discussion
of the problematic of religion & God.

But Answer to Job is essentially Hegelian (romantic & immanentist)
in its understanding of God,
and Jung's tortured queries regarding Trinitarian symbolism,
his attempt to "quaternize" the being of God
by bringing evil into God's being,
reflects again Jung's counterposition on the "nature" of evil.

In response to Answere to Job, (and Hegel)

one must simply raise the question:
what is coming to itself: God or man?

And in response to Jung's perhaps legitimate desire
to conceive of a fourth in God,
thus conveying to the Godhead a wholeness
not possible in Trinitarian symbolism,
David Burrell has suggested

that the believing community
can be considered God's 4th,
just as God's gift of himself to us in grace
is what completes the otherwise
threefold being compound
of spirit, psyche, and matter
that is the human subject.

d. Fourthly, Jung's immanentist notion of wholeness
does not easily allow for the position that
authenticity consists in self-transcendence.

Again, the problem lies in
an inadequate notion of intentionality
in Jung's writings.

The notion of subjectivity
that results from the
structure of the self
attained by complementing
Lonegan with Jung

allows for a conception of wholeness as self-transcendence,
a paradoxical conception reminiscent of "He who would save
his life will lose it, but he who loses his life for my sake will find it."

e. Finally, E. Becker has pointed
to the claims Jung seems to offer
for the possibility of the psychological redemption
of psychological man.

Such claims, Becker has argued beyond dispute,
are a fraud.

As wholeness is equivalent to self-transcendence,
so ^{the} redemption of psychological man is
attained when he is brought beyond psychology
by rebirth, conversion.

Cf. the mystics -- beyond the images
thru the night of faith
to the "just-so" person,
the condition of complete simplicity.