

D0156

Sept. 15

1) The logic of what we are doing:

What is emerging in our discussion of Jung's autobiography is an interpretation of his own personality development in its religious significance.

Issues are raised,

matters opened for our discussion, that intimately concern the topic of Christian personality development.

I have found that no book in modern times

-- and perhaps only Augustine's confessions in all of history -- raises these issues so dramatically,

and as we go through

I am trying to point out the issues or questions that occur to me.

When we get to the material on Jung's science,

we will try to see whether these issues

can be interpreted differently from the way Jung interpreted them, whether Jung's genuine discoveries about dreams, the unconscious, the self,

can be incorporated within a framework that is consonant with Christianity.

At the present time,

I am assembling materials

for an argument,

and you will have to be patient

until the materials are assembled.

For a number of classes,

we will be raising more questions

than we answer,

but not for the sake of confusion,

but to get the issues & problems out on the table,

160,
Sept. 15, 2

before trying to work out a theory of
Christian personality development.

We are studying a personality development
that is obviously related to questions

of paramount concern for the Christian,
so our reading of Jung's autobiography
is establishing the questions

that we will be able to answer or attempt to answer
only in the latter part of our course.

2) With that said,

I want to turn to the issues
that are raised in Cc. 2 + 3.

Chapter Two

A. The first is that of Personality No. 1 and Personality No. 2.

Qstn: What is the difference?

(Elements of answer: Ego and ues, ("instinct")

Jung's relations of closeness to ues, where he felt peace,
where the secret abides,

the natural mind, uncontrolled by reflexive
techniques such as logic,
intellectual argument, etc.

lives in the
centuries.
connected w past.
When we are born, we are
old).

guided by imagination and affect,
association,
symbol,
multiple meaning, etc.)

Is Personality No. 2 absurd? No.

untimely? No.

dangerous? Yes.

all children are close to No. 2.

No. 1 emerges clearly
when one moves from

33

"Previously I had been willed to do this or that"
to
"now I willed." Moving into youth,
where the difference betw. the two systems
becomes pronounced.

But for Jung, the reality of No. 2
was not to fade away
or be split off from the other. (p. 45)

But its thoughts,
which were about such topics
as religion, evil, & the devil,
led him more & more to depressions (63),
for "everywhere in the realm of religious questions
I encountered only locked doors,
and if ever one door should chance to open
I was disappointed by what lay behind it."

No. 1 was
depressed
when he
remembered
No. 2 (80).

No. 1 for Jung emerges more clearly
between his 16th & his 19th years,
"I began systematically pursuing questions
I had consciously framed" (68).

He began pursuing questions of his career,
and was moving more & more
in the direction of science, mature study, concrete things
(all No. 1).

Helped by 2 dreams (p. 85) -- notice how
dreams sometimes can answer impl.
questions.

160
Sept. 15, 4

But the most imp. emergence of No. 1
came as the result of the important dream
related on p. 87 f.

The dream itself, tho it comes from the depths,
is supporting the life of consciousness.

→ mg of
individuation

Jung began, too, at this time
to conjecture about dreams,
about where they came from,
whether there is some superior intelligence at work in them, etc.

No. 2 had something to do w. the creation of dreams,
yet here he was sending a dream
that was to help No. 1.

No. 1 is "ego"
and during this stage of life in particular,
ego is all-important.

vs. Nietzsche,
whose No. 2 over-whelmed him,
and drove him mad.

B. Second,

the further comments made on God in these two chapters.

God is connected by Jung with No. 2. Jung liked God, but not Jesus.
He was a mysterious being,

and so bore a certain analogy to "the secret." (27)

Perhaps the most significant event in the early development
of Jung's notion of God

was the fantasy of God defecating on the cathedral (36 ff.).

Jung experienced this fantasy
as though it were a terrible sin

to think such thoughts,

the sin agst. the Holy Spirit, which cannot be forgiven.

How did
Jung interpret
this phenomenon?

He was tormented by the thought
that he was being forced to think a terrible thing,
something inconceivably wicked.

And he began to think that God himself
had forced people, including Adam and Eve,
to sin.

38: "It was God's intention that they should sin."

So God had placed Jung in this situation,
God was compelling him to sin,
and after he thought the terrible thought,
he experienced, not damnation & shame,
but bliss, happiness, grace.

Jung interpreted all of this
as the will of God,
this impulse to think a thought he did not want to think.
God demanded that he think it,
rewarded him for thinking it.

He began to think ^{could}
that "God _{could} be something terrible,"
"a dark and terrible secret."

He became even more solitary:

"I know things and must hint at things
which other people do not know,
and usually do not even want to know." (42)

What did he know? That "God wants to force me to do wrong,
that He forces me to think abominations
in order to experience His grace." (42)

God would thus become for Jung
the cause of evil
as well as of good.

Sept. 15, 6

This secret

Jung wished to share with his father,
but could not.

And p. 43

shows the real point of cleavage, difference,
between Jung and his father.

It was No. 2,

the dark side,

that knew God directly, immediately, immediately.

Whatever happened in No. 2, Jung thought,
was done directly by God.

No. 2's secret knowledge,

connected w. dreams & the night & intimate participation
in nature,

was divine knowledge. (p. 45)

Jung didn't know it articulately

in this manner then,

but that is what he says

when looking back on it from old age.

This means, of course,

that one's knowledge of God

is direct, first-hand knowledge,

and not through faith.

Cf. p. 46 - in Church, people were "exhorted to believe
that secret which I know to be the deepest,
innermost certainty."

Only Jung knew this,

and he was convinced

that faith was the wrong way
to reach God.

One could reach God

Sept. 15, 7

only by doing His will w/o reservation,
and doing God's will was
doing whatever No. 2 said.

Jung was convinced
that God's will had to be explored daily,
and that this meant exploring No. 2 -- something
he didn't do himself, but thought he should do.

The will of God
was sometimes terrible, wch. for Jung means
causing people to commit evil,
or bringing evil upon people,
as in the Book of Job.

So God is to be feared
as well as loved,
for he is angry, dark, wrathful, foreboding,
as well as loving, good, benevolent.

The dark side of God, his wrath, his strangeness,
is actually interpreted by Jung
in such a way that God has a shadow,
an evil and unconscious side,
& even in such a way that the human being
reaching for greater es
has something to teach God. (Answer to Job)

Finally, Jung had to face the question
whether the devil had not done the things
he was attributing to God,
and realized he had to answer this question.

This answer eventually would be, as we will see later,
that the dark side of God is the devil,
and that the answer is that both God & the devil had acted in his life.

Sept. 15, 8

Combined w. these thoughts
 is the unfortunate fact
 that Jung found no life at all
 in the Church,
 no experience of grace
 in the people he knew there,
 no connection at all between the Christian religious
 and God as he had experienced Him.

What would have happened
 if Jung's experience of the Christian religious
 had been ~~an~~ an experience of truly joyful people,
 whose faith was alive, related to experience,
 who were in living contact with God,
 but who nonetheless were committed to
 a genuine Christian conception of God,
 who knew the experience
 of both God's grace
 and of evil,
 but who knew there was not the same thing?

Jung challenges the Christians to face the question:
 "All right, where is your God?
 You say you disagree with my interpretation,
 but is your faith not lifeless,
 w/o experience,
 w/o conviction,
 w/o joy?"

Show me that you know God, the God of Christians,
 and perhaps I will believe."

Sept. 15, 9

We cannot read Jung,

↳ especially we cannot enter upon
the experiment of individuation
he proposes to us, the inner journey,
w/o facing this question,
the question of our own personal contact with,
and personal discovery of,
God in our lives.

The answer of living Christian faith, I am convinced,
will be different from Jung's answer;

but our faith will be living
only if we accept the challenge Jung offers --
where is God in my life?

what experiences tell me of God?

what is He doing in my life,

and where can I point for evidence of this claim?

Religion must be personal,

for a faith that proclaims
that God cares for each of us personally
will also maintain

that God deals with each of us individually.

The result will not be a secret,

as for Jung,

but a community of love and service,

But as long as Christianity is the lifeless thing he found it to be,

Sept. 15, 10

the kind of thing Jung proposes as an alternative
will seem to be plausible.

Despite the fact that Christian faith
will disagree with Jung's interpretation,
it will also say

that Jung forces us

to face the problem of an experiential religion,
grounded in personal religious experience,

and even

that Jung

has done a great deal, as we will see later in the course,
to open the way to this religion, to personal religious
experience.

With a few major strokes of reinterpretation,
as I hope to show in the course,

Jung becomes

a guide to personal religious

✓ Christian experience.

But the reinterpretation is necessary,

for w/o it,

we end up with a God

who is other than the God of Christian faith

-- i.e., with an idol.