THE SELF AND THERAPY

# Carl Jung: The Self as Mandala

Jerome D. Levin Ph.D.

# Carl Jung:

## The Self as Mandala

**Jerome D. Levin Ph.D.**

e-Book 2016 International Psychotherapy Institute

From *The Self and Therapy* by Jerome D. Levin Ph.D.

## Carl Jung: The Self as Mandala

Fliess was the last of Freud's "fathers." Carl Jung was the first of his "sons." For Freud, the break with Fliess was traumatic. Fliess was more than a substitute or symbolic father, he was partly a brother, partly an idealized love object, partly a professional audience when Freud had none, and partly a companion in the adventure of creativity. His relationship with Fliess was the relationship that caused him more pain than any other. Briicke could not give him a patrimony; Charcot died; Breuer broke with him on the issue of sexuality; his own father died; and his relationship with Fliess ended in bitter acrimony. It was enough of fathers. From here on out, Freud would be the father, not the son. However, being a father worked no better for Freud than being a son. Freud's relationships with his "sons" were at least as conflicted and tormented as his relationships with his "fathers." Almost without exception, they ended in mutual recrimination and hurt. This was certainly true of his relationship with Jung.

Freud's legacy to self theory is rich, encompassing the not necessarily compatible notions that the self is not primordial but develops only slowly; that the self is only partly and not primarily conscious; that the self is built up through internalization of lost objects; that the self is originally and to a great extent remains a bodily self; that the self is suffused with narcissistic libido and love; that the self is prone to dynamic conflict between unconscious drives: sexuality and aggression and their repudiation by conscious and unconscious ideals; and that the self is prone to defensive splitting, the integration of which is a primary goal of therapy. Thus, Jung as "son" had much, perhaps too much, to accept, assimilate, and transmute into something of his own or to reject from his "father." This was the case for all of psychoanalytic theory, but particularly true when it comes to Jung's understanding of the self. As we shall see, the Jungian self is radically different from the multidimensional Freudian self.

Carl Jung (1875-1961) was born in a Swiss village where his father was the dissatisfied parson. The family had produced a long line of clergymen. Jung's father had wanted to become a classical scholar, a university professor, and regarded his actual career as a poor second choice. The relationship between father and son was never close or warm. Jung's mother, although capable of more warmth, was subject to depressions and was not reliably there for him. She also seems to have had ambivalent feelings toward

him. The parents did not get along, and there was much dissension in the house. Jung's later theory of the man getting in contact with the woman within (the *anima)* and the woman getting in touch with the man within (the *animus)* and achieving some sort of integration of masculine and feminine elements can be seen as a theoretical derivative of his intense boyhood desire to reconcile his parents. In life, he did not succeed in doing so. He grew up an introspective, socially isolated child prone to withdrawal, avoidance, and psychosomatic difficulties. Like Freud, he was strongly attracted to nature, especially to the Rhine, which had its source near his home, and to the lakes and mountains of Switzerland. Jung early realized that his tendencies to neurotic withdrawal could lead him into great difficulties, and he precociously, self-consciously fought against them, eventually becoming a "successful" schoolboy who enjoyed the respect of his fellows, although it is extremely doubtful that he really felt a part of things. Jung was always an egalitarian from above, and one has the sense of a separation and alienation from his fellows, although he denied this. At any rate, Jung did succeed in connecting with his peers at a manifest level, and this was important for him. It probably prevented him from regressing into the all-too-seductive realm of imagination and fantasy in a perhaps irreversible way. Even as a child, he was deeply engrossed in the inner world of his dreams. In his maturity. Jung emphasized the absolute necessity of the patient remaining in or becoming attached for the first time to the ordinary day-to-day social realities of familial and occupational responsibilities in order to have a secure enough base so that the "journey" into inwardness that Jungian therapy became could be safely undertaken. Jung cited Nietzsche, who strongly influenced him, as a tragic example of the consequences of pursuing inward reality at the cost of loosening one's bonds with external reality. It is too dangerous to enter the cave without someone to rappel for you. Nietzsche's madness was partially organic in etiology; Jung knew this, but he nevertheless believed that psychological factors had cost Nietzsche his sanity. Jung was determined not to suffer a similar fate, nor did he wish his patients to descend into the maelstrom of madness as a consequence of the pursuit of the world of fantasy, imagination, creativity, and solitary contemplation. Accordingly, Jung would not engage a patient in such work unless he or she had such an anchor. If the patient did not have such an anchor in day-to-day responsibilities and ordinary social reality, Jung's first therapeutic thrust was in establishing such connectedness with its concomitant network of validation. Those of my patients who have been most taken with Jung and most interested in "trips" and "journeys" have been those with the weakest ties to ordinary social reality; had they read their Jung more carefully, they would have seen that his therapy would not have encouraged this.

Jung himself emphasized the internal life in his 1961 autobiography *Memories, Dreams, and Reflections*, in which he said, "My life is a story of the self-realization of the unconscious" (p. 1). Accordingly, his autobiography concentrates on dreams. As every analyst knows, what isn't discussed is what is most conflictual, and Jung's waking activities included sleeping with his female patients and playing footsie with Herman Göring. Jung's relationship with the Nazis has been variously interpreted, and his supporters, including many Jewish ones, have vigorously denied that he ever had sympathy for or with the Nazis or that he was an anti-Semite. It is also true that Jung undoubtedly did help many Jewish analysts escape from Germany when the Hitlerian night was growing ever darker. However, he did accept the presidency of the German Psychotherapeutic Society after Göring took it over, although he said he did so to protect Jews. Even if this was true, it is impossible to defend the article he wrote distinguishing an "Aryan" from a "Jewish" science of psychology, just as the Nazis were persecuting Jewish psychoanalysts, and which clearly gave support to Nazi ideology, although it was written by a man who claimed to have discovered the universality of the archetypes that structure and determine all human experience. Whatever the equivocation and ambiguity of Jung's relationship to Fascism, it is unsavory. I do not like the man and see his emphasis on "spirituality" as hypocritical and self-serving, but it is not only that. Having put my bias on the table, I will try and do justice to the things he said about self and about the emotional life. Even if mistaken, Jung's theoretical constructs and insights into self and psyche have been and are widely influential, are frequently original, and throw new light on our tortuous topic.

To return to Jung's earlier life, by the time he reached adolescence, his family had moved to Basel, where he grew up. Brilliant and brooding and a voracious reader, he was strongly attracted to Goethe, to the German Romantics, and to Schopenhauer's and Nietzsche's philosophical psychologies of the irrational, of blind striving of the will, of the drive for power, and of the unconscious nature of those primordial forces within. Jung would have had no trouble understanding George Groddeck's (1923/1930) statement that "the It [id) lives us." (Freud borrowed the term *id* from Groddeck.)

Jung's intellectual interests were not restricted to the German Romantic poets and philosophers. Classical literature had an almost equal appeal for him, and he was far from immune to the allure of the new Darwinian biology. Additionally, theology fascinated him. The diverse pulls of literature, philosophy, theology, and science never left him. His life and works are an attempt to integrate them.

Jung first decided to become a classical philologist, perhaps in an ambivalent attempt at an Oedipal victory over his father and a wish to enact for that father the desire that he himself had not been able to fulfill, but he turned away from classical studies to study medicine. He saw in psychiatry a field uniquely integrating the scientific and the humanistic. He had also considered and rejected a clerical career, but his view of psychiatric healing was a pastoral one, so in a sense he did become a sort of clergyman. He has been called "the doctor of the soul," which would have pleased him; it would not have pleased Freud.

Jung was early fascinated with the occult, and would continue to be throughout his life. Though I find aspects of his preoccupation with alchemy, the occult, and the *I Ching* obscurantistic and pseudoprofound, it is also true that his interest in these matters made them accessible to scientific scrutiny and rendered the study of a vast stretch of human experience academically respectable. My tastes apart, Jung took the occult seriously (as Freud did parapsychology), and that interest became a second source of his interest in the unconscious and its manifestations, the first being literary and philosophical. While in medical school, he became involved in spiritualist experiments with his cousin, Helen Preiswerk, who was a medium. He wrote his dissertation on those experiments.

After graduating (in 1900), Jung joined the staff of the Burgholzi, the Swiss state mental hospital, as what we would call a resident. His chief there was Eugene Bleuer, a remarkable man who was totally devoted to his lower-class, psychotic patients. Bleuer, a teetotaler who insisted on total abstinence from alcohol by his patients and staff, is chiefly known for his classic description of schizophrenia, a term that he coined, and his origination of the concept of ambivalence. Bleuer listened to his psychotic patients and took what they said seriously, just as Freud had listened to his neurotic patients and taken what they said seriously. The Burgholzi was a unique institution, pioneering modern psychiatry. The celebrated Forel had preceded Bleuer as director, so a psychologically minded psychiatrist like Jung couldn't have found a better appointment.

While there, Jung read *The Interpretation of Dreams;* it changed his life. He wrote to Freud and quickly became an adherent of psychoanalysis. Reading the two men's correspondence (Freud & Jung, 1974), it is immediately clear that their collaboration was doomed to failure. From the beginning, they lived in different worlds and operated on a different set of conscious and unconscious assumptions. Freud was desperately anxious to recruit Jung. He needed him. Jung was brilliant, Swiss, a psychiatrist,

Gentile, and on the staff of the best mental hospital in Europe. He was in a position to make psychoanalysis acceptable to the medical establishment. Jung, on the other hand, was longing for a theory that would help him understand his desperately ill patients, and he was looking for a father. As the logic of transference would have predicted, he had ambivalence toward his new father from the beginning, and ended by enacting an Oedipal revolt against him. (This is not to judge the merits of the substantive differences between the two.) Freud was skeptical, empirical, extremely leery of philosophical speculation, and, most important, adamantly atheistic, viewing religion as a neurosis, while Jung was open to all kinds of investigational techniques, believed that speculative thought could be a source of truth, and, most important, believed that religious experience was meaningful and that it could contribute to mental health. Jung believed in God, although he was never, as an adult, a member of a church. There was no chance that the two could work together for any length of time. To grossly oversimplify, Freud believed that neurosis was caused by repressed sexuality, while Jung believed that it was caused by repressed spirituality. However, 1900 was not 1913, the year of their break, and Jung started out by courting Freud. He went on to become Freud's "crown prince" (Freud's phrase) and president of the International Psychoanalytic Association.

Jung quickly applied psychoanalytic methods to the treatment and understanding of psychotics. He was the first to do so. He soon discovered that psychotic delusions and hallucinations had the same structure as dreams; that wasn't surprising, since Freud regarded both as compromise formations expressing in disguised and distorted form a repressed, forbidden wish; what is more surprising was Jung's discovery that the contents of dreams, hallucinations, and delusions were strikingly similar. Jung, with his religious, metaphysical, and philosophical interests, had become fascinated with mythology. He discovered that myths from disparate cultures, dreams, and psychotic symptoms dealt with the same themes, that they all reflected universal aspects of human nature that were transcultural. Jung was on his way to his formulation of the *collective unconscious* and its *archetypes.*

While at the Burgholzi, Jung also engaged in empirical psychological research, using the word association test. He published his psychological account of dementia praecox (schizophrenia) (Jung, 1907/1909) and rapidly acquired an international reputation. At the same time, he became romantically involved with Sabina Spielrein, a Jewish patient from Russia whom he had treated in the hospital. She did well in therapy, left the hospital, and entered medical school. When her mother

protested that Jung as her physician should not be sleeping with her, he replied that since he had received no fee, he was under no obligation to refrain, but if she wished to pay his usual fee, he would stop having intercourse with her daughter. That is sort of prostitution in reverse, and is Jung at his most outrageous. Of course he was not entitled to or even permitted a fee because Sabina was a hospital patient and Jung was on the hospital payroll. Ethics aside, he did "cure" her, and this brilliant woman became an analyst herself. She returned to her native Russia, married a man who later became psychotic, and had a child with him, but always remained in love with Jung. She was shot by the Germans when they invaded Russia. She was apparently the inspiration for Jung's concept of the anima.

In 1909, Freud and Jung journeyed together to America to receive honorary doctorates from Clark University. Before boarding ship, Freud fainted. On awakening, he said that his fainting was a reaction to Jung's death wishes toward him. Not long after, their dissension became overt. In 1911, Jung delivered a series of lectures at Fordham University in which he redefined libido as psychic energy in general, or as a life force rather than as sexual energy per se, and in the same series of lectures denied the universality of the Oedipus complex. Although Freud tried to placate him, the two were theoretically and temperamentally poles apart. Their relationship ended with Jung's resignation as president of the International Psychoanalytic Association in 1913.

After World War I, Jung developed a treatment technique and a system of theory he called analytic psychology. It still has many advocates and practitioners. During the same period, Jung experienced some sort of crisis that he understood as a descent into the underworld. This was a prolonged episode of serious emotional illness, lasting for a decade. During it, Jung resigned his official and university posts and isolated himself as he descended deeper and deeper into the unconscious levels of his personality. It was a period in which psychic reality—dreams, myths, and perhaps hallucinations—were predominant in his life. These experiences have been variously interpreted as a "creative illness" and as a psychotic break. Jung successfully maintained his ties to reality by continuing to see patients and by meeting family obligations. He emerged from his decade-long creative illness with a fully developed theory of personality, including a theory of self. Jung universalized this experience and taught that the second half of life is a time to turn from the mastering of external reality to a journey within. The outcome of that shift in orientation is the emergence of the self. The rest of Jung's long life was spent elaborating his theory of the self and in teaching and practicing psychotherapy. Jung continued to have liaisons with his female

patients and students, most of whom remained devoted to him, as did his wife Emma, who herself became a Jungian analyst. He died full of honors, having received honorary degrees from both Harvard and Oxford.

Jung's thoughts on personality and self are complex and difficult to summarize. Although Jung disliked Hegel and regarded his language and style as contaminated by primary process thinking, there is a Hegelian quality to much of Jung's writing, insofar as it is dialectical; there are reciprocal relations between entities and concepts in all of Jungian theory, and nothing can be understood in isolation from the whole. Like Hegel, Jung believed the truth is the whole. Jung sees two explanatory principles as having equal validity: causality and teleology. Human behavior is determined both by the past as actuality and by the future as potentiality. Individual and racial (here meaning the human race) history are causal, while aims and aspirations are teleological. Action is shaped by both; that is, we live by aims and by causes. This allows for a chink in an otherwise deterministic system. Jung here is somewhat Kantian, with the self being both part of the causal chain and free, depending on whether we are viewing the phenomenal self or the noumenal self. He is also echoing Aristotle's analysis of causality with its efficient and final causes.

For Jung, human life is characterized by constant and creative development and by the search for wholeness and rebirth. It is that drive for growth and integration rather than solely the satisfaction of biological drives or compulsive repetition that moves human behavior. Jung here is clearly anticipating the self-actualization theorists like Kurt Goldstein and Abraham Maslow.

Jung's term for the mental self in the everyday sense of self is the *personality.* The personality is everything about a person except his or her body, although the body finds expression in the personality. Jung would deny the body-mind split. For Jung, the personality is archaic, primitive, innate, unconscious, and both universal and racial. That is, everyone's personality has the same structural elements, which are inborn, and phylogenetic inheritance of the experience of the human race determines, at least in part, both structure and content of that personality.

The personality is constituted by the ego; the personal unconscious and its complexes; the collective unconscious and its archetypes, the most important of which are the persona, the anima and

animus, and the shadow; the attitudes of introversion and extraversion; and the self. The *ego* is the conscious mind. Its functions include perception, memory, thought, and feeling. It is what gives us feelings of identity and continuity. Jung's ego is the structure responsible for consciousness and is itself conscious. It differs from Freud's structural ego in important ways. Freud's ego is partially unconscious; one of its principal functions, defense, is out of awareness. Not so Jung's ego. Furthermore, Freud's ego is a mediator seeking to balance the demands of instinctual needs, internalized prohibitions, and external reality. Although the Jungian ego is concerned with reality testing and action, it is not a mediator in Freud's sense. Perception and memory are functions shared by the Freudian and Jungian egos. Jung's ego is closer to the realm of consciousness in Freud's topographical model than to Freud's structural ego. There is no question that we have a conscious mind, and there is no reason that Jung should not denote it the ego and make it one constituent of the totality that is the personality.

The *personal unconscious* is like Freud's descriptive unconscious. It is not exclusively the product of repression. It contains repressed, forgotten, unnoticed, and ignored material. Some of this material is retrievable by an act of attention; some of it is not, unless a way can be found to derepress it. The content of the personal unconscious is both those things I ignore and those things I cannot deal with and must keep from awareness: memories of events, feelings, or drive—derivatives that threaten me. They are historical, that is, part of my personal history that was in some way traumatic. So far there is nothing new here, but Jung includes under the personal unconscious its *complexes.* A complex is an unconscious nucleus that organizes experience. For example, if I have a father complex, then I will react to all "fathers" in a rigid, stereotyped way, with submission, defiance, fear, or whatever my unconscious father experience dictates, regardless of the actual behavior of the current father figure with whom I am engaged. My experience of any father figure will be organized and strongly biased by the father complex in my personal unconscious. We all have complexes; however, in pathological instances, the complex may dominate the whole personality. In such a case, we would speak of a *pathological introject*, an internalized father, or whatever, who is experienced as a foreign body and who "takes over," or dominates, important segments of personality and determines the way we think and feel. A pathologically introjected father become a complex could lead to avoidance of all authority figures, crippling a patient's vocational and educational behavior.

The *collective unconscious,* also called the transpersonal consciousness, is a uniquely Jungian

concept. The collective unconscious is a repository of the experience of the species—of the human race. Although there are some gender differences, the collective unconscious and its contents are essentially the same for all human beings. Jung is a Lamarckian, one who believes in the heritability of experience, of acquired characteristics, as did the French naturalist, Jean Baptiste Lamarck (1744-1829).

The theory of evolution—with its doctrines of the struggle for existence, of the survival of the fittest, and of "natural" selection and its corollary, the descent from and continuity of man with the animals—was part of the intellectual climate in which psychoanalytic theory was formulated. Darwin did not believe in the inheritance of acquired characteristics. On the contrary, he thought that certain traits were "selected" because they had survival value, and their possessors lived to reproduce and transmit those characteristics to future generations. Few biological scientists then or now have sided with Lamarck against Darwin on this issue. Freud did, an aspect of his teaching accepted by few analysts. Trying to account for the universality, regardless of individual history or of the particulars of early childhood experience, of such manifestations of the darker side of human nature as primordial guilt, the need for and self-destructive enactment of self-punishment, and the Oedipus complex, Freud postulated that the *anlage*, or template, for such experiences and behaviors was inborn and an inheritance from the experience of the (human) race. It was a viewpoint with which Jung agreed. Jung did not, however, agree with Freud on what was inherited. To restate, Freud came to believe in the inheritance of certain psychic predispositions that overrode individual experience and hence appeared universally in human beings regardless of families, cultures, or historical eras. Freud theorized that certain experiences, such as the murder of the primal father by the horde of primal brothers, was the source (or, to be more accurate, the guilt over those acts was the source) of religion and morality. Furthermore, that experience was stamped in and passed down through the generations so that all of the conflicts around the desire to murder the father were inborn. Freud was convinced of the necessity for such a theory to account for the irrational elements in human behavior. Why else do people behave so totally contrary to the pleasure principle and detrimentally to their own welfare?

Jung, as I have said, was an adherent of this theory of the inheritance of acquired characteristics or, in his case, of acquired thought patterns, attitudes, and preconceptions, although he did not agree with Freud on the prominence of the self-destructive and aggressive in that inheritance. His notion of the collective unconscious is his account of such inherited predisposition. The collective unconscious is, in a

sense, a modem incarnation of the doctrine of innate ideas. What is innate is a predisposition to certain forms of thought, to certain ways of organizing and construing experience. This innateness is more Kantian than Cartesian; it is more structural than specific, more like Kant's categories of the understanding than like Descartes's innate ideas of God and immortality. Jung's collective unconscious is actually somewhere between an innate idea and a category of the understanding, but much closer to the latter. Speaking of the infant, Jung says, "The form of the world into which he is born is already inborn in him in a virtual image."

Freud's topographic (dynamic) unconscious and structural id are repositories of seething biological energy: primitive, archaic, timeless, beyond the restraints of logic and the laws of contradiction, and pressing for discharge regardless of the requirements of external reality. Jung's collective unconscious has this aspect, but is not only, or even primarily, so characterized. Rather, it is the heir of our racial experience, demonic and archaic, as well as sublime and wise. It is not primarily biological; rather, it is primarily object-relational, a repository of self- and object representations or, better, the anlagen for them. What it shares with Freud's id (it) is its impersonality; it is collective, not individual, racial not personal. The collective unconscious holds the potentiality for a multiplicity of experiences and actions, all of which are locked away from the conscious mind. It has at its disposal as subliminal content the forgotten and overlooked wisdom and experience of uncounted generations. The danger of coming into contact with this collective unconscious is the loss of individuality, the engulfment by the universal and transpersonal of the individual, the personal, and the unique. In Jung's view, that is what happens in psychosis. On the other hand, not to come into contact with the collective unconscious is to be impoverished, to be cut off from the wisdom and experience of those countless (not quite) past generations. Individualization involves both differentiation from the collective unconscious and integration of part of its infinite richness.

The structural components of the collective unconscious are the *archetypes*, universal thought forms that "contain" a large element of emotion. They are sort of a die that stamps a given type of experience or, to change the metaphor, a lens through which a given type of experience is refracted. For example, our experience of our own mothers is shaped by, or refracted through, the innate archetype of Mother, derived from the experience of the race with mothers. An archetype is a schema with both emotional and cognitive aspects. Their parallel to Kant's categories of the understanding is obvious. There is, however,

an important difference: Jung's archetypes are patterns of self- and object perception and representation; Kant's categories are logical constructs that pattern relationships between objects; they are purely cognitive, lacking affectivity.

Just as Freud came to believe that certain modes of thought were innate because they were universal and cut across cultures and individual experiences, Jung came to believe that certain modes of perception and experience were innate because they too were universal and appeared in every human culture and in every individual human life. He found the evidence for the existence of archetypes, the structural elements of the collective unconscious, in myths, dreams, rituals, symptoms, and art. What he saw was that the same themes, the same characters, the same relationships, and the same narratives found embodiment in the most disparate materials. Jung studied the mythologies of many different peoples and found the same heroes, the same heroines, and the same interactions between them in Greco-Roman, Norse, Hindu, Chinese, and primitive peoples' myths. They reappeared in his own and in his patients' dreams, in neurotic symptoms, in psychotic hallucinations and delusions, and in works of art. Their appearance may be in the manifest or in the latent levels of human experience, but they are always found. (The distinction between *manifest* and *latent* goes back to Freud's dream theory, in which he distinguishes between what the dreamer dreams, the manifest dream, and the underlying meaning of the dream to be unraveled by following the dreamer's associations to each of the elements of the manifest dream.)

Among the archetypes that Jung described are birth, rebirth, death, power, unity, the Hero, the Child, God, the Demon, the Old Wise Man, the Earth Mother, and the Animal. The archetypes are prototypes within us through which we process our experiences of their objective correlatives, but they are also available for projection and realizable in symptoms, religious myths, and art. They are within, yet we largely experience them as external. Once again, "the world is half created and half perceived."

One could argue that these themes and characters appear and reappear in myths, dreams, art, and symptoms because they are universal human experiences that appear in and are lived by each and every generation. Each and all have a mother, is or was and knows a child, and so forth, so of course we write, sculpt, paint, and dream about them, and there is no need to posit an innate mother pattern antecedent to experience of mother. Universality does not necessarily entail innateness. The archetypes, like Plato's

forms, double the world—there is the world as experienced and the world as eternal pattern—in the collective unconscious, or in the Platonic Heaven, or in the mind of God. Is this doubling necessary? Does it really explain anything? I have my doubts, although I do not espouse a naive empiricism or a radical nominalism. Aristotle and the conceptualists had it right; we do shape as well as are shaped by experience, and we do that by processing input through conceptual categories, including and perhaps predominantly linguistic ones. But these categories have no existence apart from the objects that embody them. I find Kantian innateness more compelling because it is more structural than Jungian innateness, which is more specifically contential. Be that as it may, Jung's notion of a collective unconscious with its structural analogs, the archetypes, does offer an esthetically appealing way of organizing an enormous amount of seemingly disparate data. It is more compelling as an explanatory hypothesis than as a set of entities to be taken concretely, as Jung apparently intended. Such doubling moves away from concrete human experience and easily contributes to obfuscation and mystification. Instead of looking at my relationship with my mother, with all of its love and hate, sexuality and aggression, fusion and separation, I can get lost in the "mother experience," as exemplified by the Mother archetype. This is not to say that what myths, dreams, and art have to say about mothers may not be useful to me in exploring and understanding my relationship with my mother, but this can all too easily become an intellectual exercise. My objection is both theoretical and clinical. Jungian analysts ask their patients to amplify by evoking mythological conceptions when they are talking about personal matters, and this can easily lead to intellectualization, and away from feelings.

Jung delineated five special archetypes that are the best known of his theoretical entities. They are the *persona*, the *anima,* the *animus,* the *shadow,* and the *Self.*

The persona is a mask; it is "the face I put on to meet the faces that I meet." It is not quite a social role, but the internal representation of social roles. Its nucleus is an archetype, an archetype that has arisen out of the race's experience that social convention and stereotypical roles and representations are essential to smooth social interaction. Community life would be impossible without them. We need easily recognizable cues; we need defenses—a certain distance and formality—to interact with others in other than intimate ways, in the workplace, in the marketplace, and in organizations of all sorts. The particular persona I wear is a product of my personal characteristics, my culture, and my historical situation, but the fact that I easily develop a persona, or personae, is made possible by its preformation in my collective

unconscious. I fill in the details, the particulars, but the mask was already there. Thus, the persona as archetype is something within, and the masks I wear that are its derivatives are the outward manifestations of that inner preformation.

More central to Jungian psychology are the anima and the animus. The anima is the female archetype within the man, while the animus is the male archetype within the woman. The anima and the animus are Jung's version of bisexuality.

They are also Jung's version of androgyny. They are derived from the racial experience of man with woman and of woman with man, respectively. The germ of femininity within the man and of masculinity within the woman call to mind the Chinese symbol of the Yin and Yang, ☯, which represents the dialectical unity of the paired opposites, including gender opposites. The black dot in the white half and the white dot in the black half of the circle are anima and animus, as well as the seed of all the other contrarieties embedded in their respective antinomies. Jung was familiar with the Yin and Yang and saw it as an artistic artifact of the archetypical relationships he was describing. It is said that Jung discovered the anima in his relationship with Sabina Spielrein, when he realized that his infatuation with her was partly driven by his projection of his woman within, his anima, onto her. Archetypes are prone to such projection and externalization. Lack of insight into that process makes for all kinds of difficulties in interpersonal relationships, when we treat people as if they were the archetypes rather than themselves. Jungian analysis is importantly concerned with making that unconscious process conscious. Midlife is a time in which men realize their feminine potential and women their male potential, as both sexes move toward androgyny. Individualization requires such an assimilation of the latent other. Some have alleged that the concept of the anima-animus was Sabina Spielrein's and that Jung appropriated it without giving her credit. It is difficult to sort out creative collaborations, and how true this is is up for grabs.

The *shadow* is the archetype most prone to projection. It is the "animal" side of human nature (one wonders if a psychologist who was him- or herself the member of a nonhuman species would come up with the *people* as an archetype of primitive aggression to be projected onto other nonhumans). The shadow is all that is instinctual, biological, sexual, aggressive, and "evil." The shadow is usually projected outward as the Devil or the enemy; it is the source of the doctrine of original sin. Jung's notion of the

shadow and its projections is a compelling explanation of prejudice and of intergroup hatred. The enemy (the Jews, the Blacks, etc.), are beastly (cruel, sadistic, inhuman, perverse, immoral, etc.) not me or mine. However, one wonders what is gained by concretizing the projection of that which is unacceptable to us, within us, as the shadow. Why make process substance? Again, why the doubling? According to Jung, the shadow must be integrated, owned, and made a conscious part of me. This too is a goal of Jungian analysis.

This brings me back to our topic, the self. Jung's notion of the self is unique. He sees it in a completely different light from our earlier authors. It is central to his understanding of human life and its purpose.

The *Self is* Jung's master archetype. As such, it is an innate racial inheritance that is an indwelling organization and organizer of experience. Although Jung intended his account of the Self to be descriptive, an account of something that is and has just as much reality as a rock or a mountain, his conception of Self is clearly normative. It is an injunction to engage in a spiritual journey of self-discovery into centeredness. According to Jung, the Self in the first half of life is the total personality, but in the second half of life, the period of introversion, it becomes an archetype representing man's striving for unity and centeredness. The Self is a holistic integration. From Jung's description, it appears that the Self moves from, almost literally emerges from, being a sort of outward envelope encompassing the personality to being an inward locus of balance and harmony.

This change in the nature of the Self parallels Jung's change in his theoretical understanding of the Self. He himself moved from the Self of early adulthood to the Self of maturity, and then expressed this change theoretically. Jung's psychology of the Self is a psychology of total unity, or at least the striving for it. Jung (1945, p. 219) described the relocation of the Self in this way:

> If we picture the conscious mind with the ego as its center as being opposed to the unconscious, and if we now add to our mental picture the process of assimilating the unconscious, we can think of this assimilation as a kind of approximation of conscious and unconscious, where the center of the personality no longer coincides with the ego, but with a point midway between the conscious and the unconscious.

The Self is this new centering of the personality, made possible by a preformed propensity derived from the experience of all the human beings who preceded us. When Jung says "midway between the

conscious and the unconscious," *unconscious* means both the personal and the collective unconscious.

The Self is life's goal: the search for wholeness, sometimes, but not necessarily, through religion. True religious experience is as close to Selfhood as men come. Christ and Buddha are highly differentiated expressions of the Self archetype.

Jung "discovered" the Self in his studies of the religions of the Orient, in such symbolizations as the Yin and Yang and the Mandala and in the striving for unity and centeredness in such ritualized disciplines as Yoga and Zen.

According to Jung, before the Self can emerge, the various components of the personality must be fully developed and individuated. Human development is a process of differentiation of an undifferentiated mass and the subsequent integration of that which has been differentiated. (Shades of Hegel—this is the cosmic dialectic personalized.) Because the Self cannot come into being antecedent to that differentiation and integration, the archetype of the Self doesn't emerge until middle life, which is, or should be, a time of serious effort to change the center of the personality in the conscious ego to a midpoint between the conscious and unconscious. This midway region is the province of the Self. Failure to do so results in psychopathology—the midlife crisis as illness instead of creative opportunity. Is Jung here confusing *is* with *ought*, description with prescription? He thinks not. but I am not so sure.

The Jungian Self in various manifestations has great currency. The many notions of self-actualization are essentially Jungian in origin. Each urges the realization of an innate potentiality. Such personality theorists as Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers are not consciously Jungians, and would reject a good deal of what Jung says, yet their notions of self-realization in the second half of life, their confusion of *is* and *ought* and of description and prescription, are strikingly reminiscent of Jung. Their theories lack the complexity of his—they are simpler, more pragmatic, and less "spiritual"—yet they share the Jungian notion of the Self as something that gains realization through development and intensive striving.

Alfred Adler (1870-1937) was another early associate of Freud's who broke with him to found his own school. Adler developed a notion of the *creative self.* The creative self is the unique constellation that each person constructs out of his or her goals, values, style of life, constitutional givens, and experience. It

is the principle that organizes experience and stamps it ours. It is essentially teleological—pulled by the future in our projections more than propelled by the past or by the biological. Adler's creative self owes something to Jung and something to William James, but the creative self itself is uniquely his. It too has a hortatory quality and is difficult to evaluate philosophically or scientifically.

Jung contributed several other illuminating ideas to our understanding of our inner world. We owe him the notions of extraversion and introversion. At any given moment, we are either extraverts or introverts, with the nondominant trait latent in our unconscious. Midlife is normally a time of turning inward, of becoming more introverted. The complementarity and dialectical relationship between the two attitudes is quintessentially Jungian. Even if we were to take a non-Jungian view of the self, the notion that that which is not manifest in consciousness is latent in the unconscious and potentially realizable would enrich our concept of self. Jung cited the evidence of dreams to demonstrate that the nonmanifest is nonetheless present.

Jung delineated four psychological functions: *thinking*, whose function is comprehension of self and world; *feeling*, whose function is evaluation of pain and pleasure; *sensing,* whose function is to provide us with concrete facts, perceptions, and representations of the world; and *intuiting,* whose function is perception by way of the unconscious and which is the source of mystical experience. Sensing is phylogenetically and ontogenetically prior; thinking and feeling differentiate out of it. The four psychological functions are not equally developed. We each have superior functions that dominate and inferior functions with which we are much less in contact. The superior functions are conscious; the inferior ones are unconscious and find expression in dreams and fantasies. There are interactions between the functions: one function may *compensate* for the weakness of another; one function may *oppose* another; or one function may *unite* with another to form systems. The complete *actualization of the Self* requires an ideal synthesis in which the four psychological functions acquire equal strength, that is, are equally developed. Jung represented that state of affairs by a circle in which the four functions and the two attitudes of introversion and extraversion are equidistant. The dialectical unity of opposites is brought about by the *transcendent function.* This full actualization of Self is a goal toward which we strive, not a place where we arrive. It is an ideal, not an actuality.

The work of realization of the Self, as well as all other psychological work of the personality, is done

by *psychic energy.* Jung's notion of psychic energy is that of a life force or life energy, and although he sometimes calls it libido, it is not exclusively sexual like Freud's libido. Psychic energy is a hypothetical construct, not an empirical observable. Psychic energy fuels biological survival, sex, and the cultural and spiritual by a process similar to Freud's sublimation.

Jung developed a dynamic of personality that is essentially a dynamic of psychic energy in which that energy is subject to laws parallel to the laws of physical energy. The first law is the *principle of equivalence,* which states in parallel to the first law of thermodynamics in physics that psychic energy can neither be created nor destroyed, only transformed. It is a conservation principle. Of more interest is Jung's *principle of entropy,* which parallels the second law of thermodynamics and which states that there is a tendency for a personality to go toward equal values in all of its components. The endpoint of this process is an ideal state in which total energy is evenly distributed throughout the various highly developed systems in the Self. The ego, the personal unconscious and its complexes, the collective unconscious and its archetypes, the attitudes, and the psychological functions all move toward a state of equilibrium and equi-energy. This is what happens in a closed physical system: energy is conserved, but the uniformity of energy states makes further change impossible, and the system is "dead." Self-actualization means that the dynamics of personality move toward a perfect, albeit then static, equilibrium. This is Jung's version of the Nirvana principle or, if you prefer, the death instinct: life moves toward perfect equilibrium that is stasis, pure being and no longer process. That is a state of affairs both wished for and dreaded. Illness is one-sidedness.

Another Jungian notion that has had widespread reverberations in the self-actualization movement is the *principle of synchronicity*, which is the acausal correspondence between manifestations that is neither causality nor teleology. It is reminiscent of Liebniz's "windowless monads," who share states of being because of their preestablished harmony. Jung's synchronicity makes coincidence meaningful.

We are now in a position to see the Jungian Self whole. Essentially, it is the endpoint of the individualization process: that is, the developmental unfolding of the original, global, undifferentiated wholeness into the differentiated aspects of personality described above, followed by their integration into a balanced, dynamic whole whose components are equidistant, equi-potent and equi-energized and

whose goal is the realization of the Self. The Self is both that realization and the quest for it. Full development requires the differentiation and expression of all aspects of the personality. That comes about through a complex process of progression and regression. Regression is sometimes necessary for growth and can be creative. The transcendent function unites the fully differentiated parts of the personality into the Self, leading to "the realization, in all of its aspects, of the personality originally hidden away in the embryonic germ plasm; the production and unfolding of the original, potential wholeness." A mandala (the Sanskrit word for circle) is a perfect symbolization of the Self.

The movement toward the realization of the Self is innate, driven by the psychic law of entropy. The fully actualized Self would cease striving, being in a Nirvanalike state of equi-potentiality and stasis that would be a kind of psychic death. But not to worry—nobody gets there.

Do we strive for wholeness, integration, and the realization of all of our potential? It would be nice to think so, but I don't see much evidence for it. Jung thought otherwise, and believed that he saw such evidence in myths, religions, and Mandalas, as well as in his own life and the life of his patients. Is there anything to be gained by calling this process and its product the Self and giving it archetypal status? I don't think so, although the Jungian Self makes more sense as an explanatory hypothesis than as a substantive entity. If the Jungian Self lacks evidential support and is more of an ought than an is, more of an injunction than a scientific description, is it then of value? Should the goal of life be balance and integration? Is the movement of self from an identification with the conscious ego with all of its willfulness to a full comprehension of that which is unconscious concomitant with the relinquishing of some of our conscious control desirable? You might sell me on that, but that is a value judgment rather than an objective elucidation of the self experience. Has Jung convinced you that his style of self-actualization is worthwhile—in fact, the highest good?