AMERICAN HANDBOOK OF PSYCHIATRY

ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY

The Adlerian and Jungian Schools

JOSEPH L. HENDERSON

J. B. WHEELWRIGHT

THE ADLERIAN AND JUNGIAN SCHOOLS

B. Analytical Psychology

Joseph L. Henderson and J. B. Wheelwright

e-Book 2015 International Psychotherapy Institute

From *American Handbook of Psychiatry: Volume 1* edited by Silvano Arietti

Created in the United States of America

Table of Contents

THE ADLERIAN AND JUNGIAN SCHOOLS

B. Analytical Psychology

Joseph L. Henderson and J. B. Wheelwright

The Unconscious

Jung divides the concept of the unconscious in two parts, *the personal unconscious* and the *collective unconscious.*

We can distinguish a *personal unconscious,* comprising all the acquisitions of personal life, everything forgotten, repressed, subliminally perceived, thought, felt. But, in addition to these personal unconscious contents, there are other contents which do not originate in personal acquisitions but in the inherited possibility of psychic functioning in general, i.e., in the inherited structure of the brain. These are the mythological associations, the motifs and images that can spring up anew anytime anywhere, independently of historical tradition or migration, [p. 485]

In his explorations of the unconscious Jung was always very much concerned with the role of consciousness, which he frequently refers to as *the conscious.* Thus he maintains there is a relationship or a dissociation of the

conscious and the unconscious. The unconscious may, in the case of a relationship, appear to be complementary to the conscious, filling out or completing what is found lacking there. In the case of dissociation the unconscious is exaggeratedly opposed to the contents of the conscious (for example, the story of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde). But,

> The functional relation of the unconscious processes to consciousness may be described as *compensatory,* since experience shows that they bring to the surface the subliminal material that is constellated by the conscious situation, i.e., all those contents which could not be missing from the picture if everything were conscious. The compensatory function of the unconscious becomes more obvious the more one-sided the conscious attitude is; pathology furnishes numerous examples of this. [p. 485]

This compensatory function of the unconscious to the conscious is the cornerstone of Jung's psychology as a basis for psychotherapy. Unlike Freud's psychoanalysis, which seeks to retrieve repressions from the unconscious, Jung's empirical approach to the unconscious makes possible the inclusion by the conscious of many images and emotions that have never previously been experienced consciously.

> We know from experience, too, that sense perceptions which, either because of their slight intensity or because of the deflection of attention, do not reach conscious *apperception,* none the less become psychic contents through unconscious apperception, which again may be demonstrated by hypnosis, for example. Finally, experience also teaches that there are unconscious psychic associations—mythological *images*—which have never been the object of consciousness and must therefore be wholly the product of unconscious activity. [p. 840]

The Objective Psyche

These basic observations led Jung in later years to speak less of the unconscious versus the conscious and to refer to their potential for unity, for which he adopted the term "the objective psyche." Whitmont summarizes this development as follows:

> Jung has suggested the term *objective psyche* for that totality of the psyche which generates concepts and autonomous image symbols. Hence the ego-centered, subjective consciousness is a partial rather than a complete manifestation of the psyche. In the views of the psyche which were prevalent until Jung's studies became known, psychological functioning was a meaningful organization only in and through the activity of the ego. The drives themselves which constitute Freud's id were regarded as merely irrational, chaotic and senseless, not even related to a balance which keeps the organism alive but only striving to satisfy their own innate needs. Any meaning to be attached to the psychic organism could therefore be viewed solely in terms of ego rationality. The unconscious was quasi-attached to the ego as a general receptacle for that which the ego must repress because it is culturally or personally unacceptable. The psyche was thus "my" psyche, a part of my subjectiveness.
>
> The term *objective psyche* replaces and enlarges the earlier concept of the *collective unconscious* originally used by Jung to denote a dimension of the unconscious psyche that is of an *a priori,* general human character, rather than merely the precipitate of personal repressed material. Because this term gave rise to many confusions and misinterpretations—such as the seeeming advocacy of collectivity or of a mass psyche—he substituted the term *objective psyche* in later writings.
>
> The objective psyche exists independently of our subjective volition and intent. It operates independently of the ego, but can be experienced and comprehended to a limited extent by the ego. That which, lacking understanding, we would view as merely chaotic imaginations, urges and

impulses, can disclose meaning when we are capable of interpreting its image manifestations symbolically.

Complexes and Archetypes

The term "complex" was initially used to describe certain emotionally toned reactions to typical happenings or persons, which were causally conditioned by early childhood experiences (traumatic or otherwise). However, it came to be seen, even during the period of Jung's association with Freud, that complexes not only are personal, ego-centered reactions but also conform to certain collective representations (for example, the Oedipus complex). This fact led Jung to postulate a nonpersonal factor in the formation of complexes. Quite early Jung states:

> The work of the Zurich school gives careful and detailed records of the individual material. There we find countless typical formations which show obvious analogies with mythological formations. These parallels have proved to be a new and exceedingly valuable source for the comparative study of delusional systems. It is not easy to accept the possibility of such a comparison, but the only question is whether the materials to be compared are really alike or not. It may also be objected that pathological and mythological formations are not directly comparable. This objection cannot be raised *a priori,* since only careful comparison can show whether a real parallelism exists. At present all we know is that both are fantasy-structures which, like all such products, are based essentially on the activity of the unconscious. Experience must show whether the comparison is valid. The results so far obtained are so encouraging that further research along these lines seems to me very well worth while. [Pp. 187-188]

Further research did prove that the comparison was valid, and the use of the words “type” and “typical” in this early passage shows that Jung was reaching for a term that could embrace specific observations. The term he finally adopted conveys a sense of the inevitability of all new discoveries. At first he favored a term already in circulation, *primordial image* (borrowed from Burkhart), which had the advantage of suggesting something ancient, eternal, and creative. This did justice to the mythological formations, but it failed to account for some element that seemed to come from all plants or animals to repeat identical patterns of behavior as part of a development process. The word *“archetype”* was accordingly adopted, which was observed to combine patterns of both image and behavior in its configuration.

Therefore, Whitmont rightly observes:

> The term *complex* denotes the basic structural element of the objective psyche, and the central element of the complex is the *archetype.* We shall see more clearly how complexes manifest themselves if we again turn to an actual case.
>
> Complexes therefore operate not only as sets of inner tendencies and drives, but also as expectations, hopes and fears concerning the outward behavior of people and objects. Philosophically speaking, since all our perceiving occurs in terms of our psychological predispositions we may regard all perceptions as projections upon the object, the “thing in itself,” but in our clinical usage we limit the term to those situations in which the reality perception is distorted by the compelling power of a constellated complex or archetype. [P. 57]

Whitmont further tells us:

> Jung saw in every complex two aspects. The first he called a *shell* of the complex, the other *the core.* The shell is that surface which immediately presents itself as the peculiar reaction pattern dependent upon a network of associations grouped around a central emotion and individually acquired, hence of a personal nature.

The *core* of the complex is represented by its archetypal content, which frequently suggests a mythological theme, and "Apparently the energic charge of the complex which accounts for its disturbing field effect originates, not in the personal layer . . ." but in the mythological core.

The Archetypal Image

Jung describes the archetypal image as: "having the psychological character of a fantasy idea and never the quasi-real character of an hallucination, i.e., it never takes the place of reality, and can always be distinguished from sensuous reality by the fact that it is an 'inner image' " (p. 442).

The Psychoid Pole

In his later work Jung seems to have recognized that he had overemphasized the importance of the archetypal image at the expense of the equally important archetypal behavior pattern. In a paper "On the Nature of

the Psyche," he recapitulated, and for the first time, gave full value to the correspondence or complementarity existing between the archetypal image and the pattern of behavior. In this paper Jung uses the visual image of the spectrum to illustrate how human consciousness, in any individual sense, mediates between the instinct, or the "psychoid" pole of experience, and the archetypal image at the opposite pole. Instinct is likened to the infrared area of the spectrum, the archetypal image to the ultraviolet area. The intermediate yellow area is then the meeting place, or place of blending, where the archetype is subjectively experienced as a whole. Instinct gives reality to the image; the image gives meaning to the instinct.

Thus, in harmony with the most advanced biological research, we begin to see more clearly as time goes on how environment is to be regarded as a function of the organism, just as much as the organism is to be regarded as a function of its environment. Man's capacity for bringing about certain basic changes in the archetypal patterns presented to his imagination, over and above the instinctually predetermined psychoid area of his being, becomes a challenge of unlimited ethical and spiritual consequences.

The Symbol

The archetypes have sometimes been called "organs of the unconscious," and as such they maintain some kind of psychic metabolism

that is seen in symbolic activity, usually of a visual nature:

> . . . the symbol provides the mode of manifestation by which the archetype becomes discernible. . . . Consequently one can *never* encounter the "archetype as such" *directly* but only indirectly in a symbol, or in a *complex* or a *symptom*. . . . Hence any statement about the archetype is an "inference."

A thorough, well-documented study of symbol formation may be found in G. Adler's case presentation of a woman patient in *The Living Symbol.*

Ego, Persona, Shadow

Jung wrote: "By ego I understand a complex of ideas which constitutes the center of my field of consciousness and appears to possess a high degree of continuity and identity. Hence I also speak of an *ego-complex"* (p. 425). The ego in a mature person stands between and must mediate between the external (objective) and the internal (subjective) worlds. In order to adapt to the external world, the person has to play one or more roles without his personality becoming dissociated: "He puts on a *mask,* which he knows is in keeping with his conscious intentions, while it also meets the requirements and fits the opinions of society. . . . This mask ... I have called the *persona* which is the name for the masks worn by actors in antiquity. . ." (p. 42s).

In relation to the subjective inner world the ego encounters its shadow aspect, its own weakness and self-doubt, and so it usually has an unpleasing,

at times unacceptable, appearance, often carrying repressed emotions or thoughts. But it is not always so negative; in fact, it may appear to contain just those characteristics that the persona lacks and that the ego needs to bring into consciousness to balance the one-sidedness of the persona. This accounts for the personal aspect of the shadow, but, since the shadow stands at the doorway leading to the collective unconscious, it has an archetypal aspect as well, as represented in Satan or other demonic figures.

Anima and Animus

In contrast to the shadow, the anima-animus has no personal connections with the ego. It is always purely archetypal in character, providing a "soul image."

> Just as the *persona* (v. Soul), or outer attitude, is represented in dreams by images of definite persons who possess the outstanding qualities of the persona in especially marked form, so in a man the soul, i.e., anima or inner attitude, is represented in the unconscious by definite persons with the corresponding qualities. Such an image is called a "soul-image." Sometimes these images are of quite unknown or mythological figures. With men the anima is usually personified by the unconscious as a woman; with women the animus is personified as a man.
>
> For a man, a woman is best fitted to be the real bearer of his soul-image because of the feminine quality of his soul; for a woman it will be a man. Wherever an impassioned, almost magical, relationship exists between the sexes, it is invariably a question of a projected soul-image. Since these relationships are very common, the soul must be unconscious just as frequently—that is, vast numbers of people must be quite unaware of the way they are related to their inner psychic process. Because this

> unconsciousness is always coupled with complete identification with the persona, it follows that this identification must be very frequent too. [Pp. 470-471]

The Self

Jung describes the self as an archetype that stands in the greatest contrast with the ego. The ego is small, partial, personal; the self is infinitely and indefinably larger, all-encompassing or central, and impersonal. He says:

> I therefore distinguish between the ego and the self since the ego is only the subject of my consciousness, while the self is the subject of my total psyche, which also includes the unconscious. In this sense the self would be an ideal entity which embraces the ego. In unconscious *fantasies* the self often appears as supraordinate or ideal personality, having somewhat the relationship of Faust to Goethe or Zarathustra to Nietzsche.
>
> As an empirical concept, the self designates the whole range of psychic phenomena in man. It expresses the unity of the personality as a whole. [pp. 425, 460]

This concept caused some controversy in Jungian circles. In one sense Jung seems to imply that the self is the totality that encompasses all psychic activity, at other times that it is simply the central archetype.

Neumann, Edinger, and Fordham have elaborated Jung's concept of the self. In differing ways their concepts stress the primary nature of the self as an archetypal container for the child-mother pair in the first year of life. Rising out of this unconscious matrix by a process of deintegration, the ego

develops by stages. In later life, beginning in adolescence, the ego learns again to relate to the self progressively by establishing an ego-self axis that allows the ego to relate to this numinous content at the same time maintaining a polite distance from it. Without this axis the ego would be in danger of succumbing to an identification with the self (megalomania), or becoming alienated and nihilistic, or falsely protected by an unyielding atheism.

Jung maintains that in the second half of life the ego necessarily must relinquish its exclusive dominion over the psyche and give precedence to the fateful direction of life in accordance with the self. This frequently leads to some form of religious conviction wherein the evil power inherent in the archetypal shadow may be redeemed through growth of individual consciousness and faith (pistis).

Individuation

This type of growth invariably leads to symbol formation as previously mentioned, and this means learning to balance opposite tendencies hitherto unreconciled, as, for instance, allegiance to the individual versus allegiance to society.

> Individuation is a natural necessity inasmuch as its prevention by a levelling down to collective standards is injurious to the vital activity of the individual. Since *individuality* is a prior psychological and physiological datum, it also expresses itself in psychological ways. Any serious check to individuality, therefore, is an artificial stunting. It is obvious that a social

> group consisting of stunted individuals cannot be a healthy and viable institution; only a society that can preserve its internal cohesion and collective values, while at the same time granting the individual the greatest possible freedom, has any prospect of enduring vitality. As the individual is not just a single, separate being, but by his very existence presupposes a collective relationship, it follows that the process of individuation must lead to more intense and broader collective relationships and not to isolation. [Pp. 448-449]

Psychological Types

It is enormously helpful to the therapist to be able to estimate the abilities and limitations of his patients, in terms of their possible behavior and adaptation. And it is essential that he speaks to them in a language that they understand. To talk intuitively to a factual man, or intellectually to a woman who lives through feeling, is a waste of breath.

Many vexed marriage situations revolve around this business of types. Our research shows that in a series of over a thousand subjects, the overwhelming majority have married their polar opposites, although for friends they tend to pick similar types. It is a little startling to think of most of us marrying people that we would never pick as friends.

Jung's idea of individuation is closely related to types. As long as we are content to let somebody else carry our introverted side or our feeling, we remain relatively unconscious and undeveloped. And he believes that growth involves a constant increase of consciousness—that is, the incorporation into

our conscious personalities of aspects of our psyche that have hitherto lain in the unconscious. This shift is usually carried out by projections that are identified and consciously reclaimed, as in the analysis of the transference.

Jung's function types represent the four principal ways of adapting to people, things, and situations. These functions work under the aegis of the habitual attitude type—that is, introversion or extroversion. They are especially useful because they are derived from normal individuals and apply to any class of person—high or low, educated or uneducated, complicated or simple—and to either sex.

Extroversion and introversion are attitudes and represent specific direction in which psychic energy, or libido, can flow. Extroversion is a flowing of energy toward the outer world; introversion is a flow of energy toward the inner world. The extrovert tends to explain things from the point of view of environment, seeing a fact produced in a person as coming from without. An unconscious extrovert values the outer object and fears his own inner self.

The extrovert is at ease in the outer world— with objects, people, and situations. His attitude toward the object is romantic and adventurous. He is likely to look on any subjective activity as morbidly introspective. When he deals with his unconscious material he is ill at ease, as an introvert is in the

outside world— feeling his way with caution, reserve, and fear, as though dealing with an uncanny power.

He has “a constant tendency to appeal for interest and to produce impressions upon his milieu.” Or he has an exaggerated intimacy with those around him and a tendency to adjust to his surroundings through imitation. The more neglected the subjective, introverted side, the more primitive and infantile it becomes. When the extrovert talks about himself, he seems naive or superficial to the introvert.

In the introvert the energy flows away from the object to the subject. Unlike the extrovert the introvert’s subjective reaction to the outer stimulus is the most important thing. He abstracts from his environment whatever he needs to satisfy his inner processes. He may be shy, taciturn, impenetrable.

Subordinate to introversion or extroversion are the four methods of adaptation. These are sides of the personality that Jung called functions. Most of us have one or two developed functions, and the other two or three are relatively unavailable and lie in the unconscious. In assessing the developed functions it is easiest to find how an individual works out of an impasse— does he think his way out, does he wait for a hunch or intuition, does he use his observation or sensation to find a loophole, or does he try to solve the problem with feeling, that is, through relationship.

The superior and inferior functions are equally potent in any individual. But he can run the superior one, whereas the inferior one runs him. For example, a thinking type can direct his thinking, but he is very vulnerable on the feeling side. His feelings are easily hurt and may come up volcanically and take him over.

According to Jung, people gather data with their perceptive functions—sensation or its opposite, intuition. He calls these functions irrational. The data is then processed by the rational, assessing (judging) functions. These are thinking and feeling.

Sensation

Sensation is a perceptive function. The extroverted types are realists. They can retain a great many objective, unrelated facts. They are constantly experiencing the concrete world, and the more extroverted they are, the less they assimilate these experiences. Their thinking is factual, and entering the unconscious is often hard for them, as they tend to be object-bound.

When it is differentiated introverted sensation is highly tuned and spiritual, not being limited to the actual physical sensation. It is perhaps the most inarticulate function of all and is best expressed in color or form. Jung says, “Introverted sensation has a preferential, objective determination, and those objects which release the strongest sensation are decisive for the

individual's psychology."

An introverted sensation woman said to me, "I go into the outside world as long as I get subjective reactions to it. When they cease to come, I go away by myself and boil these past reactions down to abstractions. Once set down on paper, or in paint, and put away, I feel satisfied and am ready to meet the world again."

Intuition

Intuition is perception via the unconscious. For the extrovert it is directed toward outer objects and for the introvert toward inner ones. It appears to be an attitude of expectation as it is concerned with seeing possibilities and having hunches. It works best when there is nothing to go on and is an excellent function for a pioneer. It works when there are no facts, no moral support, no proved theories—only possibilities. The intuitive is transiently interested in objects and facts, and then only as stepping stones.

Extroverted intuitives are particularly able to ferret out the potential in people and to foster its growth. For that reason they do well as stage and movie directors and as educators. Their thinking is speculative.

The introverted intuitive draws from the deepest layer of his unconscious, which is common to humanity. It is a particularly useful function

in psychology as this is pioneering work and deals with intangibles. Having vision, he avoids the pitfall of the sensation type, which is to get bogged down in a welter of facts and details. This is the predominant type among Jungian analysts.

Thinking

There are two kinds of thinking—the kind that derives from objective data and the kind that may be traced to a subjective source. This stamps the latter type with a subjective inner direction. It is the development of a vague inner image or idea, which has a mythological quality. It has little to do with objective fact, and is only accepted by the extroverted world when it is adjusted to outer facts.

Extroverted thinking is an intellectual reconstruction of concrete actuality or generally accepted ideas, and is concerned with promoting them. The gauge by which thinking can be considered extroverted or introverted is this: Where does it lead back to? Does it go back to generally established ideas, external facts (as with an engineer), or does it remain an abstraction and return to the subject—as with many philosophers? Actually both points of view are essential for balanced thinking. Introverted abstractions save extroverted thought from a materialistic or repetitious fate. Equally extroverted thought saves the introvert thinker from an abstraction that has

no relation to the accepted traditional world.

The introverted thinker is often inarticulate because he is forever trying to present the image that comes to him from the unconscious, which usually does not tally with objective facts.

When the introverted thinker is exposed to an objective situation he becomes timid and anxious or aggressive. When he presents his ideas he makes no transitions, but throws them out as they are with little realization of his audience's reactions. lie is not aware that because his ideas are clear to him they are not necessarily clear to others. However, this type may have the power to create ideas that do not yet exist, although certain apparently unrelated facts may be known. Mendeleev achieved this in his construction of the table of atomic weights. He left blank spaces for substances that have since been discovered and been found to fit, as he predicted.

Feeling

As I see it this type chooses its friends on the basis of character rather than interest. According to Jung, the type is commonest among women, where it is generally considered normal. It occurs less often in men; when it does it is often a problem. This is because such men do not conform to the stereotyped notion that all men are thinkers.

This is the type that makes value judgments at their best. Extroverted feeling values are traditional and generally valid, being determined by social standards. To quote Jung: “The function is designed not to upset the general feeling situation.” But when feeling becomes overexaggerated, the subjective, unrealized egotistical attitude creeps in and makes it untrustworthy, cold, and material. At its worst it becomes vicious, putting other people in a bad light, while appearing blameless and even worthy itself.

The feeling type has very definite likes and dislikes—an appraising quality that cuts like a knife and is orderly and consistent. This is what makes feeling a rational function.

The extroverted feeling man is often found in the ministry, in psychology, and in society, but in most other walks of life he is under a severe handicap. A man in our society is supposed to be a thinking creature, and it is difficult for him to maintain his masculinity against this social prejudice. He may be able to think, but only when it supports his feeling.

The introverted feeling type is very unlike the extrovert. His feeling works from an inner premise—he is almost hostile to the object; he may be inaccessible and silent. He must protect himself from the outside world, and in order to do so, sometimes belittles it or depreciates it. His feeling is more intensive than extensive, because it is not drained off by an easy adjustment

to the outside world.

His premise is a vague inner image. It resembles the concept of the introverted thinking type. In order to get his image across, an artistic talent is helpful. This type tends to break with traditional values, as its premise is very original, literally original, deriving from the basic historical patterns of the mind.

J. B. W.

Jungian Therapy

Jungian concepts cover so wide a field of psychic experience that their use in therapy becomes considerably complicated. Their value lies in the flexibility of any therapy inspired by them. Jung himself used to say he had no method of psychotherapy and that each analyst had to create his own method. However, there are certain guidelines that may tell us how a Jungian analysis may proceed. From the beginning Jungian therapy presupposed the inclusion of the relevant techniques used in Freud's psychoanalysis or Adler's Individual Psychology. Gerhard Adler, a follower of Jung, quotes Jung's own point of view. According to this:

> ... he distinguishes four different stages of analysis, each requiring a special technical approach; the first stage of "confession" (or the cathartic method); the second stage of "elucidation" or "interpretation" (in particular the interpretation of the transference, thus being very near to

> the "Freudian" approach); the third stage of "education" (the adaptation to social demands and needs, thus most nearly expressing the standpoint of Alfred Adler); and finally what he calls the stage of "transformation" (or "individuation"), in which the patient discovers and develops his unique individual pattern, the stage of "Jungian" analysis proper.
>
> These stages are not meant to represent either consecutive or mutually exclusive stages of treatment, but different aspects of it, which interpenetrate and vary according to the needs of the particular patient and the therapeutic situation. Thus, treatment has to be undogmatic, flexible, and adjusted to the needs of the individual patient, and this specification is one of the main tenets of analytical psychology, [p. 338]

In addition to this schematic conception, Jung's "constructive" method makes possible a subjective approach to the material presented that allows both therapist and patient (analysand) to work together, including their subjective response to the dream or other fantasy material at hand. This establishes the basis for a method of exploring the archetypal unconscious as well as the personal unconscious. This is the method of amplification used together with personal free associations.

> Amplification gives the widest context for interpretation because it opens the way for a confrontation between the historical remnants (the archaic heritage) and the immediate needs of the personal psyche. The archetypal symbols can then be accepted or rejected by the individual's own choice; this is of the greatest importance in depth psychology, for no one can experience the archetypal images without being temporarily fascinated, terrified, or possessed by them. The free associations and the amplifications, when properly handled by analyst and patient, gradually reduce the undesirable power of these images and render them accessible to consciousness as organs of healing. What can be integrated remains; what is dangerous or unacceptable falls back into the unconscious, whence it may reappear later, when ego-consciousness is ready to receive and

integrate it. [p. 6]

This method goes hand in hand with a conscious recognition and continual reassessment of the transference and countertransference between analyst and analysand.

> Among such prospective unconscious material the primordial archetypal images are of particular significance, and it is on this that the specific approach of analytical psychology is focused. Applied to the interpretation of transference phenomena this means that underneath what appears as a merely personal transference relationship, archetypal, transpersonal images are active. Every intense experience of a personal nature will also actualize the corresponding archetypal image. In other words, every actual experience of, say, father or mother consists of a complex blend of two components; the parents as such and the archetypal image projected onto them. The personal experience acts as the evoking factor for the archetypal image (Neumann), and the two together in their interpenetration for the image. The archetypal aspect must never be overlooked in interpreting the unconscious processes in general (Adler, G.), and in the transference relationship in particular.
>
> Thus the transference, as well as dealing with repressed infantile conflicts, also aims at raising into consciousness the archetypal, transpersonal substratum of personal experience.
>
> Regarding the attitude to countertransference we come to a fundamental point in the theory and practice of analytical psychology. Here I must make it quite clear from the start that I shall use the term "countertransference" in a positive sense, as indicating the analyst's constructive subjective reaction arising from his own unconscious activated in the analytical relationship (which would perhaps be better described as the "analytic field"). As such it is an inevitable, necessary and indeed desirable instrument of treatment. This constructive countertransference has, of course, to be most decisively distinguished from such undesirable countertransference manifestations as unconscious identifications and

> projections due to the analyst's unanalyzed neurotic complexes and leading to harmful unconscious involvements—in which case further analysis of the analyst is clearly indicated, [p. 340]

A Jungian analysis is conducted by establishing a vis-a-vis, conversational situation between therapist and analysand. This insures that the therapist will remain alert and participate humanly in the analysand's experience. The therapist may then be in a position to observe significant nonverbal forms of communication, and may even implement this by making available colored pencils or clay with which to form images of nonverbal experiences. Some therapists have a separate room in which they keep a sand table, in which figures and designs may be placed. This may be used as a projective technique, or as a device to help overcome a resistance, or simply as an experience for its own sake. It was originally used by Margaret Lowenfeld in London and adapted by Dora Kalff (Zurich). It is especially useful in child therapy, but has been extended in recent years to adolescent and adult communications.

The Jungian School

J. B. Wheelwright, the retiring president of the International Association of Analytical Psychologists, states:

> I think it is important to say, at the outset, that Jung did not intend or want to compete with Freud. It was his conviction that an analyst could not transcend himself. He said, "Philosophical criticism has helped me to see

that every psychology—my own included—has the character of a subjective confession ... it is only by accepting this as inevitable that I can serve the cause of man's knowledge to man." In short, he attempted to abstract and generalize his truth—not the truth.

In the broadest terms, Freud focused on sexuality, Adler focused on power, and Jung focused on growth, which he called individuation. With these central concerns went attitudes and values that many people have found ego-syntonic. It is a matter of different, not better or worse approaches. As time goes on, the barriers between the schools seem to be dissolving. Frieda Fromm- Reichmann said, "The goal of analysis is self- realization." Few Jungians would quarrel with that statement.

It is worth remembering that Jung saw the dangers in organization. He was well aware that rigidity in institutions is a constant danger and that a man who is identified with an orthodoxy is inaccessible. One cannot communicate with an institution. He once told me that he supposed an organization was necessary, but that he thought it should be as disorganized as possible.

Jung addressed himself to two previously neglected aspects of life. With his concepts of the animus and the anima, he placed women on an equal footing with men—no better, no worse. The other aspect was aging and the second half of life. He was primarily always interested in whatever age he happened to be. As he lived to be a very old man, he learned and formulated a lot about old age. And, unlike many geriatric specialists, he did not regard it as a combination of illness and an economic liability to society.

There has been no basic change in Jungian theory coming from any member or group of the Jungian School. Modifications have been suggested by Neumann, Fordham, Edinger, but there remains a basic conformity to the basic concepts. There has been considerable borrowing and learning from other schools— from the ego psychologists, such as Erikson, and the neo-

Freudian, Melanie Klein, chiefly represented by Fairbairn and Winnicott in England. A friendly relationship exists between Jungians and certain members of the school of existential analysis *(daseinsAnalyse),* for example, Medard Boss and Rollo May. Adler sees the Jungian School as comprising three different Jungian approaches to therapy: "The 'orthodox' approach tends to keep Jung's concepts 'pure' and virtually unchanged, with the accent of its practical work on archetypal interpretation (the 'synthetic-constructive' method)." An unorthodox approach is seen in those analysts, chiefly in London, who have tended to revive the old Freudian reductive method of interpretation in their practical work. Finally there is ". . . a solid center group firmly linked to Jung's teachings . . . but accepting modifications in the light of further experience and using in their work a combination of reductive and constructive interpretation." Jungians differ among themselves concerning the value of group therapy and the use of multiple analysis (that is, analysis with more than one analyst), especially in training analyses. The Zurich Institute requires multiple analysis; the London group discourages it; the New York and San Francisco groups have no formal requirements, but are friendly to multiple analysis when it seems indicated.

Bibliography

Adler, G., *The Living Symbol,* Bollingen Series 63, Princeton, 1961.

____, "Methods of Treatment in Analytical Psychology," in Wolman, B. B. (Ed.), *Psychoanalytic*

Techniques, Basic Books, New York, 1967.

Bradway, K., "Jung's Psychological Types," *J. Analyt. Psychol.,* 9, no. 2: pp. 129-137, 1964.

Fordham, M., *Children as Individuals,* C. G. Jung Foundation, New York, 1970.

Henderson, J. L., *Thresholds of Initiation,* Wesleyan University Press, Middletown, Conn., 1947.

Jacobi, J., *Complex, Archetype and Symbol,* Bollingen Series 56, Princeton, 1959.

Jung, C. G., "Psychogenesis of Mental Disease," in *Collected Works,* pp. 187-188, Bollingen Series 3, Princeton, 1960.

_____, *Psychological Types,* Bollingen Series 20, Princeton, 1971.

_____, "The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche," in *Collected Works,* pp. 159–234, Bollingen Series 6, Princeton, 1947.

Perry, J. W., "Reconstitutive Process in Psychopathology of the Self," *Ann. N.Y. Acad.* Sc., 96:853-876, 1962.

Wheelwright, J. B., 1963.

Whitmont, E. C., *The Symbolic Quest: Concepts of Analytical Psychology,* Basic Books, New York, 1970.

[1] Translation modified from the original.