

Note: this file is a work in progress: additions and alternatives are welcome

Jung's Life and Career

Jungian – or Analytical – Psychology is an integrative approach to psychology because it subsumes a number of other approaches. Thus, Jung provided one of the better approaches to trait theory. Jung also accepted, but went beyond, many of Freud's theories. The concept of ego consciousness and the personal unconscious, for example: the concept of unconscious defence mechanisms and fixation: the use of association techniques, transference and dream analysis: the belief that unconscious sexual and aggressive drives can (at least sometimes) cause lifelong mental disability. Jung also had much in common with the phenomenologists, particularly the humanists. For example, the concept that we have an innate inner nature that cannot be changed (as with Maslow): the idea that allowing one's inner nature to emerge is the key to healthy psychological development: the concept that the personality and life experiences of the therapist are actually an instrument in psychotherapy: and the concept that acceptance of, even love for a client is essential in the creation of a therapeutic relationship. But, before we get to all this, in other files, let's look at the man's life and career.

Early Life. Carl Gustav Jung was born in 1875, 19 years after Freud. He died in 1961. He was born in Kesswil and brought up at Laufen, above the Rhine falls, then went to Basle (university), but lived most of his life at Kusnacht, 8km south of Zurich. His old house at Kusnacht was until recently the C.G. Jung Institut and his consulting rooms/house in Zurich are still used for the same purpose. Jung, of course, was against the setting up of a Jung institute at all, as he didn't believe in creating schools of psychology that might slavishly adhere to the ideas of a 'great man'.

Jung's childhood appears to have been a generally happy one. His father (like five of his uncles) was a Lutheran pastor. Not a strong authority figure, though: rather, a man whose doubts of religion were such that Jung was not bound to religious belief or observance too strongly. As a result Jung, unlike Freud, did not have to be a rebel to reject religious aspects of his upbringing. In turn, he was always comfortable with religious ideas and found it easy to incorporate them into his psychological theories. Freud, by contrast, had to reject Judaism and religion in general in order to promote his theories and was anti-religious (albeit superstitious) throughout his life. Jung also had a mother who had a dark, powerful and mysterious 'other self'. She impressed her son greatly, taught him about Eastern religions and (by her behaviour) instilled in him the concept that we all contain a series of opposing tendencies – towards good and evil, the spiritual and the earthy, the masculine and the feminine and so on. His psychology, as a result, has often been termed the psychology of paradox.

Note the time and place of Jung's childhood, though. The last 25 years of the nineteenth century (the Victorian era), often in rural Switzerland. It was a place where relations between the sexes were chaperoned, where sexual practices were straightforward, but not mentioned and where the protestant

ethic (work, integrity and cleanliness) was paramount. Churchgoing, especially for the upper classes was almost universal, as was a belief in the truth of Christianity and the need for soul and a religious approach to life.

Jung's earliest memories were happy ones. Of gardens, blossoms and the beauty of nature in general "I am lying in a pram in the shadow of a tree. It is a fine warm summer day, the sky is blue, a golden sunlight darting through green leaves....and everything was wholly wonderful, colourful and splendid" (an early memory from *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*). I don't think there's any doubt that such a harmonious beginnings helped Jung to create a theory of psychology based on the idea of dynamic harmony and the possibility of progress – in contrast with the angst-ridden and conflicted vision of Freud (and, it must be said, many others of the early psychologists).

Jung was, of course, an outstanding pupil at school. Vincent Brome's biography is recommended for a description of this part of his life. On several occasions he was threatened with a beating by his teachers for outstanding essays ('if only they could find the source from which he had copied such excellent work'). From the age of six, and clearly seen by the age of sixteen, he came to regard himself as (at least) two people or personalities. The good, hard-working schoolboy and another mysterious and deeper being who was a stone in the universe. Certainly he was very complex – multi-faceted, serious, intellectual, gamin, humble, imperious, liable to furies, full of humour. As a therapist he was noted for changing his personality to reflect, or at least suit, the personalities of his clients.

Of several extraordinary events in his childhood, one of the most impressive occurred at the age of 11. He fell and hit his head on a kerbstone and became unconscious. After this incident he developed fainting fits that, among other things, often prevented him from studying. Then one night he overheard his parents expressing their anxiety as to what would happen to the family if the son was unable to earn a living. He resolved to 'cure' his fainting fits. He went to his father's study and read a German grammar. After a few minutes – a fainting fit. He got up and started again. After 15 minutes a fainting fit. He got up and started again. And so on. Eventually he didn't have a fainting fit and never did again. He had cured his neurosis and, at this point, remembered that when he initially hit his head he had thought 'oh good, now I won't have to go to school'. 11-year-olds stand amazed!

Jung went to Basel University. He had intended to study archaeology (trying to get down to the origins of knowledge), but found there were no courses at Basel. So he studied medicine. He became president of the student union (of course) and was apparently supported by all the theology students, but opposed by many of his fellow medical students. Had he studied theology it is a fair guess that he would have been supported by the medical students but opposed by his fellow theology students. On graduation he had intended perhaps to specialise in internal medicine, but read an early text on sexual pathology and decided upon psychiatry – a specialisation that hardly existed at that time (see also elsewhere under the history of psychiatry). He thought that here was an empirical field common to biology and spirituality. This was the beginning of his emphasis on the need for a psychology that included soul.

In December 1900 Jung arrived at the Burgholzli mental hospital in Zurich, to work under Eugene Bleuler (the originator of the term schizophrenia) – see also elsewhere on the web site. Bleuler was a sort of psychiatric saint, or at least a father-figure. Discipline at the Burgholzli was strict. Daily staff meetings were held at 8.30 a.m., before which all resident psychiatrists were to have

made their ward rounds. Work was relentless and at 10pm the doors were locked on all but the most senior psychiatrists.

Jung had a fluctuating relationship with Bleuler – he tried for a long time to persuade him to become a psychoanalyst. However he liked the rough and tumble of the ward and attempting therapy with deeply psychotic patients. He developed and used the Word Association Test (see the file under therapy) – an early forerunner really of the lie-detector test – and gained an international reputation as a researcher from his publication of his findings. He used the test to winkle out complexes (which he defined) and other areas of psychic disturbance. Note that Jung often described his approach to psychology as complex psychology at this time. He also researched the curative properties of abreaction or catharsis.

Meantime, Jung had met and married Emma Jung who, it is said he had first met when she was only fifteen and decided that she would be his wife. Emma was a wealthy woman but, on marriage, her wealth passed to her husband (as was usual at the time). The marriage took place in 1903 and there were five children by 1914. The marriage seems to have been essentially happy and easily so for some years although, by all accounts, Jung was not an attentive father. In later years, when Jung worked and wrote at Kusnacht, no one was allowed to interrupt him!

Jung and Freud.

The relationship between Jung and Freud is described in a little more detail in the area of the web site with that title and only briefly here.

Jung and Freud began a correspondence in 1906 and developed a relationship that lasted until 1913. Freud, as the older man and as was his habit, took on the role of father, Jung that of a son. But there was more to it than that. Thus, Jung never really accepted Freud's contention that sexuality was all-important in the generation of mental illness (and in mythology): this is apparent from a reading of the first letters that they exchanged. Freud also saw Jung as especially valuable to the psychoanalytic movement, both because he was a noted psychiatrist and because he was not Jewish (as were most of the Vienna psychoanalysts). Anti-Semitism was always a handicap for Freud and his followers. Jung was made the first president of the International Psychoanalytic Movement, but disagreements soon followed and a break became inevitable.

The break with Freud came about, in the end, when Jung wrote a book entitled **Symbols of Transformation**, in which he stated - to put it simplistically - that incestuous needs need not have been universal in primitive societies. The book was returned by Freud, pages uncut with 'Resistance To The Father' written across it. Jung stated (to Joe Wheelwright) that he felt as if he had been thrown out of his father's house. Jung then had a two-to-three-year 'nervous breakdown' and retired to the bank of the Zurich See, where he recreated the village of his childhood (and accompanying psychic problems) from stones and other materials. Emerging, eventually, with his own theory of psychology. Essentially the break was caused by the ways in which they differed – in this case on symbolic *vs.* concrete thinking, and the importance of the literal truth of Freud's sexual theory. But also let's look at a listing of the ways in which Jung and Freud differed, as personalities and as theorists.

Freud and Jung:

A Comparison of Personalities.

| Freud | Jung |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Concrete Thinker | Symbolic Thinker |
| Judaic Tradition | Christian Tradition |
| Rebellious Outsider | Would-be Insider |
| Radical | Conservative |
| ESFJ | INTP |
| Verbaliser | Visualiser |
| Driven by Sex and Aggression | Driven by Spiritual Needs |
| Strong Power Drive | Weak Power drive |
| Gregarious | Rather Solitary |
| 'Nothing but' Thinking | 'This and Many More' |
| Conflict the Norm | Harmony the Norm |

Jung's Orientation, theory development and post-Freud career. After the break with Freud, Jung found his professional feet and began to develop his own theories in detail. These are based, in part, on premises that are very different from Freud's.

First, Jung was very much a follower of Kant, where Freud was influenced by Darwin and perhaps Nietzsche. Kant believed that our innate mental structures always intervene between outer 'reality' and our perception of the world. He was an important influence on Jung's development of his theory of the archetypes.

Second, Jung had a major career as a hospital psychiatrist. Where most of Freud's theories were based on his observations of middle-class, neurotic women, Jung's ideas stemmed far more from working with deeply psychotic patients of all ages, sexes and classes. As a result, Jung's theories are much more concerned with the deeper layers of the psyche; with the archetypal structures that underlie the more superficial behaviours and neuroses that Freud described.

Third, Jung had a much happier, more even-handed childhood than Freud. His mother was not seen in a sexual light, his father not powerful enough to be an Oedipal rival. Where Freud was in the patristic tradition and wrote monographs about penis envy and the prophet Moses, Jung's theories give equal validity to the masculine and feminine and have acted as a major conduit for the entry into the world of analysts. Where Freud always wrote in terms of anxiety and conflict, Jung always seem to think of balanced, dynamic harmony as a natural state.

Fourth, and following from the last item, Jung was much more comfortable with both his sexuality and his need for religious experience than Freud. He was also able to accept religious needs and experiences as a universal human phenomenon,

None of which prevented Jung from a psychological meltdown in 1913-16. In Jungian terms perhaps better called a plunge into the unconscious. A meltdown that, while dangerous, allowed Jung his independence as a theorist and one of the great original minds of the 20th century

A couple of dreams, or dream series, are worth describing. In one of these series Jung had dreams in which he stood with a small, native 'shadow figure' who shot down a figure of Siegfried with great bloodshed. Many explanations have been given of these dreams, including the concept that Siegfried (the great but doomed Nordic hero figure) represented Jung's own internal hero figure: a figure that was no longer needed perhaps, as Jung moved towards middle age and maturity. The other dream series was one that included the prophet Elijah and Salome (who was blind). Jung never really interprets these dreams (and, according to Laurence van der Post, he had plenty of them) but Elijah surely represents Jung's developing role as a prophet or seer, while Salome is a likely anima figure. Jung seems to be dreaming that his anima is a blind tart who cuts the head off prophets.

At about this time Antonia (Tony) Wolff appeared on the scene. She had come to Zurich as a patient in 1910, progressed rapidly (becoming one of the most noted Jungian analysts in time) and became Jung's mistress and (as Joe Wheelwright put it) his 'right hand'. While there clearly was a love relationship, Tony Wolff appears to have done things psychologically for Jung that Emma Jung could not. She, in a way, embodied the anima for him and was important in his development of the concepts of anima and animus. The situation, which has been written about quite enough was obviously very difficult for both Emma Jung and Tony Wolff, but they appear to have worked out a bearable relationship. In the end they both became analysts and lectured at the Jung Institut in Zurich. Each morning, first Emma then Tony would lecture. Many years later, when Jung became interested by the psychological meaning of alchemy, Tony was somewhat left aside as Jung collaborated more and more with Marie-Louise von Franz.

So the years 1913-16 represented a change from hero to prophet and the concept of the anima/animus. But much more besides. In the years that followed Jung both developed and published his theories. His theory of psychological types was published as a paper in 1913, as a book in 1921. In 1928-30 he gave a series of seminars on dream analysis. In 1923 he published *On The Psychology of Individuation* and on the relationship of analytical psychology to poetry. In 1925 he published *The Seven Sermons to the Dead*. And so on.

In the 1920s and 1930s Jung became one of the most celebrated psychotherapists in the world, with innumerable publications and honorary degrees and awards. Patients, many of them rich and/or powerful came from all over the world to be analysed by Jung. Jung's clinical techniques were very different from Freud's. No couch, but face to face, or any other arrangement that suited Jung and the client. Often in his garden, even sometimes on his boat. Transference and counter-transference was seen, not as a parent-child bonding, but as a collaborative process between client/patient and analyst. 'Beginning' dreams (the first dream in an analysis) were often regarded as representing aspects of the psyche rejected by the client. Understanding and assimilating the shadow was often important. And so on. Jung also had a number of psychotic patients whom he was able to lead back 'into the world' and who could function in everyday life so long as they kept their connection to Jung.

Jung's theories may be briefly compared to those of Freud and outlined in brief as follows:

A Comparison of Theories.

Psychoanalysis

Analytical Psychology

Importance of
Conflicts often 'resolved'
Dream analysis used as

unconscious emphasized
via unconscious defences
major therapeutic tool

Psyche consists of conscious, preconscious and unconscious. Unconscious contains repressed experiences. Id, ego and superego.

Psyche consists of conscious, personal unconscious and collective unconscious. Collective unconscious composed of archetypes.

Two major drives: sex and aggression.

Many innate drives and abilities. As many archetypes as there are universal human situations.

Religion and culture represent no more than repressed sexual and aggressive urges and memories.

Instinctive needs for religious, cultural, social and other experiences.

Conflict between psychic structures the normal state.

Balanced, dynamic harmony and progression the normal psychic state.

Concentration upon the neurotic personality.

Concentration upon the healthy personality.

Personality described in terms of stage of neurotic fixation, perhaps of predominant defence mechanisms.

Personality described in terms of
a. Preferences for different attitudes and functions (traits)
b. Spiritual development, preferred archetypal or mythological *motifs*.

Development occurs via a few psychosexual stages that everyone goes through. Development finished very early in life and controlled by the individual's experiences.

Development a lifelong process of natural growth termed **individuation**. Involves living out as much as possible of your potential. The second half of life as important as the first.

Many ideas derived from experience of neurotic, wealthy women in private practice.

Many ideas derived from psychotic patients from all walks of life, from hospital practice.

Jung's Theories

A. Personality Theory.

A modified trait/temperament theory called **type theory**, based on the concept of attitude and, function choice as measured (more-or-less) using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and some other measures.

After Jung's recovery from the break with Freud, and as a part of his attempt to understand the nature of his friendship with Freud -and its ending- (not to mention to do justice to the theories of both Freud and Adler) he devised his theory of psychological types: Jung realised, first of all, that he was an **Introvert**, whereas Freud was an **Extravert**. Terms that he coined.

Jung's final theory suggested that personality typology was based on two things: **chance** and **choice**. Or nature and nurture. That one is born with a certain temperamental disposition and with perhaps a greater natural ability in some areas of personality than in others. And that, as one grows up, one **chooses** (whether consciously or unconsciously) to develop some attributes and neglect, or repress others; these choices may be made on the basis of what seems to work for the individual, or be no more than a matter of availability of opportunity. In either case, as time goes on, one's true personality type emerges (usually by early adulthood) in terms of **attitudes** towards the world, and **functional preferences** about how to **perceive** the world and how to make **judgments** about it. Jung always maintained that personality was nothing constant, but rather varied always: but also that most individuals tended to show the same preferences – more or less – in most situations and at most times.

Attitudes. There are two basic attitudes, **Extraversion** and **Introversion**. An extravert believes that the 'real' world -the important world- is **outside** himself/herself. The introvert thinks that the 'real' world is within. Attitude preferences should be regarded as habitual preferences for where (and with how many) one likes to be and from where one gets one's energy.

Four functions were proposed: two of these are ways of **perceiving** the world, the other two ways of **judging** the world (making decisions). The perceiving functions are sensing and intuition. A **sensing type** takes in the world (inner or outer) through the five senses: through facts, data and the proven. An **intuitive** lives in the world of ideas, of possibilities and is likely to regard facts as mere instruments in the service of ideas. To these two types, the basic structure of reality is different. Note that it is extremely difficult to use the sensing and intuitive functions at the same time. Jung himself was very much an intuitive. He regarded Freud as a sensing type who 'only had about three ideas in his lifetime'.

The two ways of judging are **thinking** and **feeling**. Thinking types tend to make decisions on the basis of logic, fairness and rationality. Feeling types make decisions on the basis of human values, sympathy and ethical correctness. Again, it is difficult to use both of these functions at once. Jung was a thinking type (a preference he shared with B.F. Skinner). Carl Rogers would have been a feeling type.

And this was about as far as Jung went. He regarded himself as having preference for (and skills in using) introversion, intuition and thinking. Possibly thinking most of all: he would have said he was a thinking type, with

auxiliary intuition and an introverted attitude. Since Jung's death, however, a number of American psychologists have extended his theory and created questionnaires (the most important being the MBTI) to measure the individual's typological preference. They have added another dimension – **perceiving-judging**: this purports to measure whether the individual prefers to utilise their perceiving preference **or** their judging preference **when dealing with the outer world**. Jung was probably an INTP, using his all-important thinking for his internal world and his auxiliary intuition when dealing with the (less important) external world.

B. Structural Theory.

Conscious, personal unconscious, collective unconscious. To Jung, the psyche contained both an ego-consciousness (very much as described by Freud) and a (much larger and more powerful) unconscious mind. The unconscious contains both material from personal experiences (again, as described by Freud) -for example, childhood traumas - and a great variety of **inherited** structures - drives, abilities, potential ways of being, and so on. Jung termed this level of the mind the **Collective Unconscious** and his description of it sharply delineates his theories from those of Freud. To accept the presence of a collective unconscious means to put emphasis upon inherited structures as well as environmental influences and to accept that humans are **innately** more complex and more varied in nature than anything envisaged by Freud. Jungians always tend to stress **individual uniqueness** and **complexity**.

The **Collective Unconscious** contains what Jung termed **Archetypes**. (lit: *Implanted from the beginning*). Inherited abilities or patterns that are present in everyone and are expressed in lifestyles, relationships and in literature, myth, religious ideas and other creations of the human mind. Jung noticed that myths, fairy tales, dramas and religious ideas in all societies seem to contain the same basic stories and motifs: his explanation was that the motifs must reflect universal patterns within the psyche. And hence, universal human experiences. We write the stories, take part in the dramas because they mean something to us at an unconscious level. The most important archetypes include the Shadow, the Anima or Animus, the Self, the Persona (or mask), the Great Mother, the Great Father, the Child and, of course, the Ego.

Archetypes are conceived of as existing at every level from simple reflexes, through the ability for emotive and simple cognitive responses to specific stimuli to the stories and figures that have been the basis for the great myths, religious ideas and so on that are universal to human societies. Note that many other psychologists have been, or are, interested in the presence of innate (inherited) psychological structures in humans. Bowlby, for example (attachment theory), or the evolutionary psychologists (human mate choice etc.). The difference is that, where most psychologists take an 'outside' and scientific look at innate structures in our species, Jung attempted essentially to describe them through human experience of them: from the inside. In the case of a 'mother complex', for example, where evolutionary scientists might quantify the behaviour of orphans and non-orphans, Jung would talk of the manifestations of mother-deprivation in the works of Michelangelo and the dreams of his clients. If Jung was right, the great archetypes will find their way into all major works of every culture. Religious stories, fairy tales, novels, advertisement series, poems, films, documentaries etc. etc.

The Shadow. The concept of the shadow illustrates Jung's approach to the mind very well. The concept here is that we are all born **multipotential**: we each could develop in a huge variety of ways, depending upon **choice** (the decisions we make about our lives) and **chance** (our opportunities and balance of natural abilities). As you grow up, you make a large number of decisions (consciously or unconsciously) about the sort of person you want to become: eventually you become that person (more or less). But at each step, as you decide to take on a characteristic (say, the trait of caring), you decide **not** to be its opposite (say, selfishness or cruelty). But the opposite of your chosen ego personality does not simply evaporate. It remains a part of your potential. Your ability for cruelty, for example, rather than ceasing to exist, becomes **unconscious** through **repression**. It becomes a part of your **shadow**. The very act of creating a conscious ego personality, therefore, also creates an unconscious shadow personality that contains the opposite characteristics to those found in the ego. The shadow, then, will contain all those things we have decided **not** to be, including all the feelings and motivations that we despise, or which are forbidden to us, as well as those aspects of our overall potential that we have never had the chance to develop. The shadow will be both good and bad. It contains abilities that we don't use and aspects of ourselves that we have rejected for good reasons. Typically, Jung saw it as a necessary counterbalance to the one-sidedness of the modern ego. We usually see our shadow projections **via projection** onto others (usually of the same sex as ourselves). We meet someone that we immediately hate or admire to a degree that is not justified by anything in **them**.

There are several further things to note. **First**, the shadow can be either individual or **collective**. Just as every individual has a personal shadow, so nations and other groups will have a collective shadow: for a long time, of course, the Soviets functioned as a shadow for the U.S. collective. **Second**, we are very afraid of our shadows in our society - we don't know our unconscious processes any more, but also we are more conscious, ego-directed and deliberately 'good' than in the past. **Third**, the shadow can be seen as a part of all the other archetypes as well as an entity in its own right.

The Anima/Animus. The **Anima** is the image of the female within a male. The **Animus** is the image of the male within the female. As you develop, you will reject some aspects of yourself (at least as ego characteristics) because they 'belong' to the opposite sex: these repressed, unconscious contra-sexual characteristics become the animus/anima. The woman or man within. Of course, if your development is rigidly and narrowly sexist, your anima/us will become **alarmingly** contra-sexual: the violent ocker, by definition, **should** possess a passive, frilly, over-feminised anima. This is all quite natural, and a matter of psychological balance.

We normally see our animus/a when we project it upon a member of the **opposite** sex. This, in fact, is the basis of falling in love. You pick upon someone who, for some reason, has a resemblance to your inner contra-sexual image, and project the anima or animus. What you fall in love with is an inner image not a real, independent human. Try not to do it (at least, after the first few times): it is not a good basis for a long-term relationship! If you are in a long-term relationship, look at the difference between your present, reality-based opinion of your partner and the view you had when you were in love with them. The difference will tell you something about the nature of your animus or anima.

For an understanding of the ego-animus / anima relationship, Robert Johnson's books *He, She* and *We (The Psychology of Romantic Love)* can be recommended. In the last book, in particular, Johnson traces the evolution of the concept of romantic love from the Cathar heresy and uses the myth of Tristan and Iseult to illustrate negative aspects of the ego-anima relationship.

The Self. The Self was, to Jung, the central guiding archetype. He envisaged it as being at the 'centre' of the collective unconscious, giving a sense of direction and of purpose to our development. It may be envisaged as containing, or having some conception of, all that we are and may become. As a perception, in Rogerian terms, of 'that self which one truly is at heart'. Jung considered that encounters with the self occur in dreams and in visionary and religious experiences: when one is suddenly confronted with an overwhelming inner reality 'to which one must listen with humility'. He rather inclined to the view that religious experiences were a type of psychological experience and that the search for religious experience was a symbol of the ego's search for union with the self. Note that there is no way for us to know whether this is true or not. In religious experiences and related dream and visionary experiences, at the least the ego is confronted with overwhelming forces that it can't withstand, control or comprehend. Perhaps the self, perhaps merely other powerful archetypes, perhaps God, perhaps a god or gods. We can tell what the experience **feels** like and we (often) know how to react to the experience, but we have **no** way of knowing what it is that confronts 'us' (i.e. the ego).

The Persona. Is perhaps best understood as the Jungian equivalent of the social self. A largely unconscious ability and tendency to present an acceptable outward face to the world and hence play effective social roles. Often the 'ally' of the ego and intertwined with it. Note, though, that too-strong an association between ego and persona is said to create a 'false personality' that may be out of touch with inner reality and the self. This, in turn, can lead to a shallow, affectless life.

The Child. The child archetype is said to represent the inner child in everyone. When we are very young, we identify with, or 'live' this archetype. When we become parents, we project the inner child upon our children and love and adore them far more than they merit! Comparison *Calvin* and the *Little Prince* (or *Charlie Brown*). The inner child in dreams and visions is also said to represent inner potential for growth, creativity and renewal. Its state reflects our inner state (develop). Jung said that, in neurosis, the inner child characteristically splits into two halves – that the two manifestations are always present together. The abandoned, hopeless, ill-used, persecuted and perhaps dying child. And the all-important, strangely heavy golden child of the Saint Christopher legend. Freud would perhaps have called all this fixation at the stage of identification with the child.

The Great Mother and the Great Father

The great mother and the great father are the major subjects of fairy tales. They are images, of course, derived – at least at the level of the personal unconscious – from our experiences of our real-life parents. They are also important inherited archetypes.

Every human is biologically designed to interact with parent figures. Of both sexes, but most crucially, when very young, with mother figures. Relating to parent figures in an appropriate way is an important factor in biological survival. You have to behave in certain ways towards them (e.g. being cute, or obedient, or determinedly hungry) and you have to see/perceive them in appropriate ways. When you are young they are god-like figures to be listened to and obeyed with awe (?). You see them as the great good mother and the great good father –familiar to everyone as the beginning parents of every fairy tale you care to mention. You, inevitably, have strong – even overwhelming parent complexes. The parents will simultaneously be seeing their children through the rose-coloured glasses of the inner child archetypes. This makes them very susceptible to manoeuvring by their children.

At a certain stage of development – a few years before puberty perhaps – the developing child will need to resolve, or overcome, or move beyond, their parent complexes, in order to progress to adulthood and independence. Typically, at that stage, the projection of the good parent complex or archetype onto the actual parent will be switched off. If the complex was never overwhelmingly strong, you would think that this would be enough. The path to progress would be cleared. All the evidence (especially of world literature) however says that this is often **not** enough. In order to break free, it seems that many children find it necessary to reverse the polarity of their projections upon their parents. To project a terribly negative image of the great mother or father onto the parents. To see them as wicked witches or destructive ogres for a while: to hate them. Only when this negative projection passes is the child really free of parental complexes.

The logic of this is that the parental archetypes must therefore contain equally important positive and negative imagery. And be symbolised in literature, in dreams, wherever, by a host of experiences and images. Jung himself said that the great mother archetype could be symbolised, on the one hand, by everything that is fertile, nourishing and encouraging to growth – the Virgin Mary, a ploughed field, a cornucopia, a cow, the fairy godmother, a field of wheat and so on – and, on the other hand everything that is consuming, destructive, stifling and growth-represent – Scylla and Charbydis, a python, a bottomless pit, a wicked witch, the grave and so on. You can compose your own imagery for the positive and destructive aspects of the father image.

C. Developmental Theory.

The development of the personality (or psychic development) was termed **individuation** by Jung. The process, as he described it, is very similar to the self-actualisation of the humanists. There is an understanding by many Jungians that the process is an instinctive drive to wholeness and to becoming 'everything that one can be'. This feels right, but is unproven.

One can think of development of the psyche as a matter of balanced development of the archetypes in turn, while maintaining a good relationship between the ego (itself an archetype) and the self - **the ego-self axis**. One of the problems in modern western society was, to Jung, the way that we need to develop a very strong, logical and relatively unemotional ego in order to deal with the world: if the ego becomes too powerful, the ego-self axis will be weakened or lost and the person will be cut off from their inner core. The result will be a loss of contact with feelings, with a sense of meaning in life, with the ability for spiritual experience and so on. In mid-life this may become unbearable and result in a **mid-life crisis (or a series of crises)**, during which

the individual will seek to rediscover their 'other half' -the part of themselves they lost contact with at 18-20. Jungian therapy is very often a matter of dealing with mid-life crises.

So, in the original Jungian description of individuation, there were two stages to life. First, the years of growth and extraverted mastery of the world. Then, from the mid-point, a natural decline the object of which is (eventually) death. During this period there is a need to regain connection to the self and obtain a religious attitude (broadly defined) to live – to have purpose (see also Erik Erikson).

However, one can take this a little further.

When one is very young it is proper to identify with the archetype of the child and to **project** the archetypal great mother and father onto one's parents. And behave in a manner to promote your survival. Later, when independence from parents becomes appropriate, these bonds will be broken: at, say, 6-8. The anima/us will be projected just before puberty at around the time that hero myths are lived out. After the establishing of hero/ego mastery comes parenting, identification with inner parents and projection of the inner child onto one's own (but not necessarily other people's) children. Read Shakespeare. Later comes identification with the crone(?), the wise old man or – alternatively – the silly old fool (see Jung and the Post-Jungians: Adolf Guggenbuhl-Craig)

The Later Years of Jung

In 1944, aged 69 and following bed rest after a broken ankle, Jung suffered a heart attack. Thereafter his health declined and he suffered from a variety of old-age maladies, including distressing tachycardia. In 1952 Tony Wolff died, apparently of an unexpected heart problem. Then, in the next year, Emma Jung became ill with cancer, resulting in a stroke: her death left her book on the grail legend unfinished. A little later (1955), Jung finally invited Ruth Bailey to be his companion-housekeeper and 'see him out' at Bollingen. A continuous flow of famous, noted and ordinary people came to see him.

Jung died in May 1961 after another stroke and a prolonged coma, during which he 'smiled often' according to Ruth Bailey. Two hours after his death a great thunderstorm struck Kusnacht and lightning struck a poplar tree by the lake under which he had often sat. An Adelaide friend of mine (Paul) was actually in Kusnacht that day, while studying at the Jung Institut. It was known that Jung was very ill. Paul was standing on a bridge over the Limmat river (that flows out of the Zurichsee) and saw an extremely localised thunderstorm, complete with lightning flashes, taking place over Kusnacht (and nowhere else). He immediately intuited that Jung was dead.