

The Jung-James Nexus

by: Douglas Lockhart

We have conquered the East politically. Do you know what happened, when Rome subjugated the near East politically? The spirit of the East entered Rome. Mithras became the Roman military god . . . Would it be unthinkable that the same thing happened today and we would be just as blind as the cultured Romans, who marvelled at the superstitions of the Christians? . . . I know that the unconscious is crammed with Eastern symbolism. The spirit of the East is really ante portas.

Carl Jung
Collected Works vol. 15.

[W]ordsmiths . . . are always devoted to obscurity. They castrate the public imagination by subjecting language to a complexity which renders it private. Elitism is always their aim. The undoubted sign of a society well under control or in decline is that language has ceased to be a means of communication and has become instead a shield for those who master it.

John Ralston Saul
Voltaire's Bastards: The Dictatorship of Reason in the West (p. 7.)

C. G. Jung, William James and J. B. Watson

Some people light up at the mention of C. G. Jung, others are not so enamoured. Whatever the reaction, this Swiss psychologist from Basle has left an indelible mark on the psychology of our time, and on our use of language. And to our benefit, it should be added, for without Jung and others like him, psychology, as a discipline, would have succumbed to premature attempts at neural reductionism and remained at the shallow end of what it means to be a human being. William James steadily resisted the attempts of reductionist thinkers to change his "person-centred" psychology into "scientific psychology", but by the end of his life the hard science school had gained ascendancy in the form of J. B. Watson's radical behaviourism - mental life had been swapped for the science of behaviour.¹

All was not lost, however; the inner life of the individual was still in play for European researchers such as Janet, Freud, and Jung, their schools of "depth

psychology" combating Watson's much narrower "stimuli-response" approach to research. But for the next fifty years this hard-edged approach would take hold of American psychology, James' careful balancing act between mental life and behaviour discarded for a psychology that refused to use terms such as "consciousness", "mental states", "mind", "content", "introspectively", "verifiable", "imagery", etc. It would be up to the European contingent to hold the faith on mental states and develop a mind-centred psychology ("dynamic psychiatry") that defended the human mind against the reductionist onslaught.² But in America, and in Britain, the damage had been done, and it would continue, what remained of Jamesian psychology coming under the influence of "mutually antagonistic professional sub-specialities"³ intent on its destruction. In the wake of this, squabbling behaviourism itself all but foundered, its limitations becoming too obvious to ignore - the reign of neuroscience and the philosophy of mind was underway.

So what was it about behaviourism that went so terribly wrong? Basically, it was its reliance on processes of conditioning and reinforcement to explain all forms of human behaviour. In the behaviourist scheme of things pain was the behaviour of "crying out"; it had nothing to do with "mind". Pain and pain behaviour were one and the same thing.⁴ As can be imagined, this kind of thinking soon showed itself to be inadequate; the mind and its astonishingly complex interactions with self, other and world could not so easily be dismissed.

But what of Jung and his theories? Hasn't he too been debunked? Hasn't his theory of the "archetypes" been shown to be imaginary, his dealings with the Nazis none too clear? And what of his overall theory of mind? Does anyone with a knowledge of modern psychology continue to consider it viable? Such questions are commonplace; they are almost always to be expected when Jung's name is mentioned. In fact there is a sense in which he has become so rejected by the intelligentsia that it is considered a *fau paux* to even mention his name. For myself, I am not so squeamish; in my mid-thirties it was Jung's take on life and living that made me realise there was the possibility of something beyond a tab of LSD - there was, in other words, more to maturity than getting a year older. So declared his theory of "individuation", a theory that proposed a meaning to life beyond that of Christianity's faith claims. I already knew from experiments

in meditation that psyche was more than mind; what I did not know was that it was psyche all the way down, and that there was little chance of bottoming out.

Only Professionals May Venture Here.

The term "counterculture" seems odd now; almost an anachronism - the days of beards and long hair, of kaftans and ponchos, are over. Well, almost; there are still a few of the old hippies in California's Height Ashbury, but they are now "old" in the proper sense of that word. During a visit to California I marvelled at them as they slunk by in their once brightly coloured clothes, their faces lined with old memories, their shoulder-length grey hair thin and wispy. And every so often shops selling hippy-type clothing and incense sticks to style-conscious youngsters. On the one hand a time warp replete with vintage hippies; on the other the baubles of hippydom offered with a sincerity generally reserved for fake antiques. All of it quite sad, the truth being told; another time with its hopes and aspirations reduced to no more than the vagaries of fashion.

Nothing vague or fake about Carl Jung, however; an admired adventurer of the mind whose theories galvanised the thinking of the whole New Age movement. Yet I've read little of Jung since; the need to do so faded along with the revolution. But I am indebted to him nonetheless, for it was his extraordinary efforts that helped stabilise me in a time of personal and collective instability. Alas, the counterculture in which Jungian thought flourished is no more; it has been replaced with a different mentality, a different set of questions and a different set of answers. It is no longer personal experience in the depths of consciousness that matters; the interaction is now much more abstract, much more to do with neuronal processing and difficult to understand philosophies of mind. Unlearning, as a discipline, as an art form, as a means of exploring and comprehending psyche, has been swapped for secular humanism's harder-edged interpretation of self, other and world. The sign now reads: *Only professionals may venture here.*

Strange as it may sound, Jung did not encourage "descent experiences" as taught in the Eastern disciplines of yoga and meditation. In quite forthright terms he cautioned against westerners getting involved with these practices, and

even suggested the possibility of their going mad if they did so.⁵ Westerners did not know what they were doing when they took up yoga; the inner processes experienced were without doubt universal, but the yogic methodologies employed were culturally specific.⁶ Yoga was now a highly evolved discipline of mind and body, but it had started out as a natural process of introversion, and had to be treated as such.⁷ This was the slant that interested Jung; it afforded him a rich vein of symbolism in relation to his theory of the collective unconscious, and added to the development of “a cross-cultural comparative psychology of inner experience.”⁸ The West’s dabbling in yoga and meditation was dangerous because the Western mind was culturally at odds with the Indian mind; it was a mistake to “carry Eastern ideas and methods over unexamined into our occidental mentality”.⁹

Jung’s purpose in constructing a comparative psychology of East and West, therefore, was not, as some may still believe, to sell the West Indian methodologies of mental development; it was to create a depth psychology tailored for the Western mind in alignment with Western religious tradition. Christianity was the religion of the West, not Hinduism or Buddhism, and it was through the religious symbols of Christianity cross-referenced with Eastern symbolism that the Western mind would reach spiritual maturity. The culturally specific aspects of Christian symbolism would necessarily undergo modification, there was no doubting that, but that would in turn allow its deeper psychic elements to surface in the form of cross-cultural correspondences. Constructing his depth psychology on what he believed to be indisputable proof of cross-cultural symbolism, Jung laid out “an account of the developmental phases of higher consciousness” that contrasted strongly with J. B. Watson’s behavioural psychology, and with Freudian psychoanalysis - a necessary corrective was in the air.¹⁰ For Jung, “the unconscious [was] crammed with Eastern symbolism”;¹¹ (my italics) it was not, as the philosopher Stephen Katz claims, grounded in culturally specific symbols of strictly local variety.

Arguing Jung’s case for cross-cultural correspondences with a Cupitt or a Katz in the face of bold statements to the contrary is not easy; they are after all modern researchers backed by a seeming consensus on this very point. But as

fellow philosopher Bruce Mangan points out, the reasoning being applied is far too narrow; it is a lifeless form of analytic/linguistic philosophy which, in relation to mysticism, or descent experience, is simply inadequate. I concur. Speaking from personal experience, I can confirm Jung's assessment of unconscious symbolism - at depth it is neither parochial nor datable, and it clearly signals deep-structure interactions between levels of the self that challenge psychological theory on many levels. This of course does not mean that Jung was correct in all of his theoretical pronouncements (who ever has been?), but it does mean he should not be so cavalierly dismissed. Whatever his mistakes or miscalculations, he was clearly at the cutting edge of psychological theory during his life time, and along with William James, and others yet to be considered, his contribution is well overdue for reassessment.

In relation to Eastern spirituality, Jung saw his theoretical task as offering psychological interpretations of classics such as the *Upanishads* and the *Rig Veda*, and in similar vein, comparisons with yogic experience and the practice of analysis.¹² To others, his intention was to displace the Western spiritual tradition with an Eastern model, his psychological system perceived as derived from an alien culture. Jung's patients were digging deep, however, and the deeper they dug the more it seemed that the essence of yoga as depth experience resided in the Western breast as well as in the Eastern. Fundamentally, however, his psychological scheme was not an attempt to displace West with East, it was about a natural inclination towards psychological wholeness. Above all else it was this seemingly natural drive towards integration that Jung saw as important, and he believed it to be deeply entangled with an individual's ability to be creative.

The American literary critic Harold Bloom came to same conclusion. In 2002 he wrote that a compulsion towards "consciousness expansion" lies at the heart of all creative endeavour, William Shakespeare being a prime example of that fact. Art, argued Bloom, augments consciousness;¹³ it is psyche's way of doing work on itself. This returns us to the polymath Wolfgang von Goethe, who admitted in a letter to von Humboldt, that he worked always towards a synthesis where "consciousness and unconsciousness [interacted] like warp and weft ... a uniting [of] the human faculties."¹⁴ Freud, alas, was preoccupied with the "rubbish

heap" interpretation of unconscious processes, whereas Jung saw the same processes as a treasure house.¹⁵ That, I think, pretty well sums up the problem we're dealing with here.

Inspiration, Imagination and the Unimaginable

At its best, creative expression is potentially a life-transforming experience; at its worst, potentially destructive. I say "destructive" in the sense of not communicating anything of substance to the encounter. For that is what good art is; it is an "encounter" with the self of another. What one puts in to a work of art is what others get out of it as an experience. Little in, little out; a simple, but telling formula. But with an inbuilt contradiction as I'm sure you've already noticed: what if the viewer, the reader, the interpreter of the experience, is without substance? Which is to say without maturity, and subsequently without the ability to appreciate what is before them. What a dreadful moment. What does one do with an uninspired painter or writer, or an uninspirable viewer or reader? For that is what it comes down to, the ability to inspire, or be inspired. So the question is this: what exactly is "inspiration" as an experience, and what does it mean to be "encountered" by the self of another?

For Freud, art was an escape from reality, artistic appreciation a disguised form of pleasure in the unconscious (forbidden) fantasies of another.¹⁶ For Jung, artistic appreciation was the ability to participate in, and be affected by, the artists own level of psychological integration.¹⁷ In this sense art was "edifying"; it augmented the consciousness of the other; even "heal" according to the philosopher John Stuart Mill, whose reading of Wordsworth's poetry had a profound effect on his health. There is, it seems, a direct correlation between inspiration and art's transformative effect. But there is an added twist in this. It is not just "good art" that results from inspiration; it is the "best possible" art that surfaces. Inspired moments not only inspire, they move us deeply because it is depth communicating with depth.¹⁸ Something way down deep in us is responding to something way down deep in the artist's inspired moments of creation, and it stops us in our psychic tracks.

A prime example of this curious sense of connection between artist and other was captured by Emerson (1837-1983) when he wrote, "in going down into the secrets of his own mind, he [the artist] has descended into the secrets of all minds". But there is again a twist, for this descent into mind is also, according to Emerson, a descent into "nature" - we are not only mind, we are also matter.¹⁹ This deepens the question of what is taking place in psyche during moments of inspired insight and expression, for if the deepest stratum of psyche is matter, then our relationship to the basic building blocks of physical existence has, along with creativity in general, been profoundly underestimated.

Interestingly, Jung also speculated about the mind's relationship to matter. This is thought by some to have been a move beyond his special competence as a psychologist, but it can also be seen as a natural extension of his research into the mind's depths. Which is to again ask: is it "psyche all the way down", and if so, what does *all the way down* actually mean? For Jung, it meant the possibility of psyche being the unrecognised element that completed, complimented or even paralleled, Einstein's theory of Relativity - a claim of some magnitude not rejected out of hand by Einstein. They discussed such a possibility, but Jung found communication on such an abstract level difficult to handle,²⁰ and put his difficulties down to Einstein being too analytical. In his private papers, however, Einstein talks of dreams and images as lying at the root of his discoveries, and that suggests a capacity for descent that would have surprised Jung had he known about it. In the end it was Einstein who influenced Jung into developing his own highly abstract theory of *Synchronicity*, a conception of mind and matter where "a subjective element attaches to the physicist's world picture", an element that connects psyche to the space-time continuum.²¹

Einstein's influence on Jung's theoretical ideas is seldom referred to, so it may come as a surprise to learn that Relativity theory also underpins Jung's theory of Archetypes, a theory he progressively reformulated in an attempt to prove that as the physical world is given order and meaning through mathematics, so psyche is given order and meaning through a comparable psychic structure. In Jung's psychological scheme, archetypes were an organising principle in psyche that arranged images and ideas beyond conscious awareness; they were, in other words, "unconscious", and as such only detectable after the

event.²²

The temptation to reject a subjective element in Relativity theory should be resisted given that it was Einstein, not Jung, who built the observing consciousness into that theory as a primary factor.²³ There is no escaping this uncomfortable fact; it stands even more solidly today than it did when Einstein first introduced it, and it should be taken into consideration when dealing with some of Jung's more difficult to grasp concepts dealing with the undifferentiated level of being. There is, in Jungian theory, a point where "the psychological has become deeper than the psyche [where it] has become nonpsychic, and therefore no longer separated from the physical aspect of nature."²⁴ Not an easy concept to take on board, but a necessary adjunct to our thinking if we are to dig beyond the more prosaic offerings of psychology on the creative process - a process of descent *by* mind into psyche used by Einstein himself.

Einstein's theory of the observer's role in relativity theory is deeply challenging, but Jung's theory of the same pushes the mind to the very limits of comprehension. For what is one to do with the notion that mind and matter are at some level one and the same thing, that mind penetrates matter to the point where it itself ceases to be psychic and becomes nonpsychic? Jung's theoretical capacities faltered at this point, but such a condition of mind is not inconceivable given that scientific psychology supposes mental phenomena to be on an equal footing with physical phenomena, and that consciousness will inevitably be measured in physical dimensions.²⁵ That sounds a bit like what Jung was trying to say about mind and physicality, but it isn't; it is a reductionist argument that leaves mind as no more than an epiphenomenon of the physical brain, a quite different proposition, and a dangerous one given that it presents human sentience as no more than a stimulus/response mechanism. Yet tantalisingly close in that mind is perceived as directly linked to the physical.

Jung's contrasting argument was that consciousness extends all the way down to an undifferentiated level of awareness where mind and matter interpenetrated one another (see my essay *The Nagel-Pinker Divide*) and symbols replaced conscious mentation. And so thinking stops and is replaced by a wholly other form of knowing where meaning becomes "archetypal", that is, deeply

unconscious yet capable of creative reorganisation. This was Jung's revolutionary contribution: meaning could be experienced at the so-called unconscious level of being. Individuation, as an "inclination towards wholeness", was in the very cells of our body as intimations of depth, and that suggested an integrated structure.

Bottom up or Top Down?

There are those to whom such an argument is fundamentally flawed. We are, according to many specialists, nothing more than conscious automata, "part of a deterministic chain of events in which one event is the direct antecedent of, and gives rise to, the next event".²⁶ Volition is not involved. What we think of as personal volitions do not cause anything; they are but symbols in the physical brain caused by chains of events culminating in a necessary response. In this context "necessary" means *predetermined*. Everything is dependent on the physical; matter is primary, mind is a secondary by-product of matter.²⁷ Mind is itself "solely the product of a nervous system shaped over the course of evolution in response to the demands of the environment".²⁸ In this approach "materialistic determinism constitutes the essence of science"²⁹ - the door is closed to all argument to the contrary.

Sorry, the door is not closed, in fact it is firmly wedged open on questions to do with mind, consciousness and such like - conscious awareness is shaping up as much, much more than a product of physiological sensations or processes. Undeniably useful as secular humanism's founding of all concepts on the human has been in its fight against superstition and irrationality, rationalistic modes of thought such as the above are observably undermining its methodological strengths. Which is to suggest that "top down" arguments are bedevilling our capacity to plumb our "bottom up" natures - we are in danger of believing only what the discursive intellect arrives at via the inbuilt limitations of language. Language is all we have at the level of surface consciousness, but we are not predominantly surface beings, we are also beings of unimaginable depth. This leaves us with a difficult question to answer: Whence cometh the inclination towards wholeness?

Let's tackle this question by way of creative experience. Advanced creativity suggests psychic integration, an adjunct of maturity that progressively carries an individual down into the self's depths. There is no avoiding this descent; it goes with the territory of meaningful, substantial creation and its demands can be considerable, even life threatening. Engage with one's creative processes in any meaningful way and the result can be sickness if the process is discontinued for any length of time. To be in the grip of the "Muse" is to be at the mercy of incredibly strong psychological forces against which it is difficult to struggle. Not that one generally wants to, but there are difficult moments, moments when the process of penetrating to what one senses to lie beyond language, education and training, becomes such that escape would be welcomed. This is perhaps because two psychological processes are overlapping, one to do with the creation of a work of art (painting, poem, novel, sculpture, ceramic, etc), the other to do with the creator's integration as a personality, a consciousness, a mind, a self. Two processes, each embedded in the other, each with its own demands folded into the other as an overall tension in psyche without which the work of art could not form, or psychological integration be possible. This is art as an archetypal *hammer blow from within*, an ongoing series of intimations sensed more in the diaphragm than in the head that something transformative is happening in one's life. In this sense creativity is itself an inclination towards wholeness; it heralds insight into the deepest, most difficult aspects of self, other and world.

It was the psychologist Fredrich Myers, a close friend and major influence on the thinking of William James, who suggested that genius and madness reflected disturbances in psyche that masked an evolving dynamic interplay between different levels of comprehension. He meant by this that genius allows for greater communication between the submerged, subliminal self and the surface, supraliminal or emergent self, and that madness, or breakdown, sometimes affords us a glimpse of this difficult to detect mental territory. This suggested that genius expressed a drive towards psychic wholeness, and that this drive or striving was fundamental to human nature. In terms of evolutionary theory, Myers saw genius as an eruption of latent faculties at the subliminal level leading to a greater concentration of will and thought as active imagination.³⁰ Genius was imagination unleashed; it was the poet Coleridge's concept of

imagination as an inner capacity to fuse, synthesise and unify raw materials into works of art let loose through inspiration.³¹ And not just in the sense of genius being a quirk of nature, a kind of fortunate mistake, but as a foretaste of what humanity would one day be capable of: genius, as an evolving condition of psyche, was perhaps our collective destiny.

This is of course to push the whole idea of human evolution towards an ultimate, utopian perfection where human beings become gods in their own right, a hope not all that different to the Christian notion of mankind perfected through St Paul's renewing of the mind. In fact it may just be that that holy vision is rooted in psychological truths not yet fully appreciated. Now whether perfection in Myers' sense of humanity's future is possible, or not possible, I cannot say, but the evolutionary basics as described by Myers, hinted at by James, and elaborately theorised by Jung, may not be wholly without foundation. It is however regrettable that much of the proof for this underlying capacity of individuals to communicate with their own psychic depths does not come from healthy individuals, but from the realm of psychopathology where "art" just happens to play a vital role in the healing process. Mental illness opens the door to what is going on at the deeper levels of psyche, and it was those deeper levels as revealed in hospitals and asylums that first alerted Jung to the possibility of psychic wholeness. Freud the hard-headed scientist read the same clues as indications of subterranean horror, a bogeyland of suppressed desire upon which a lid had to be firmly placed, whereas Jung saw it, eventually, as a privileged glimpse into the Ground of Being.

An interesting aside to all of this is Coleridge's clear distinction between "imagination" and "fancy", a distinction of value when dealing with the discursive intellect's "top down" evaluations of self, other and world. For Coleridge, imagination was magical; it was a radical power of the mind superior to fancy in every way. But what did he mean by "fancy"? Well, he was apparently alluding to low-grade products where "association" and not much else seemed to be operative. Mechanically and passively produced, these products exhibited little more than an ability to collate, aggregate, juxtapose, transpose or rearrange. In contrast to this, the products of inspired imagination were organic and alive; they assimilated, dissolved, recreated, fused, synthesised and unified. Which made

them, according to my source, "alembic" in quality. They had, in other words, the power to refine and transmute.³² And that, in essence, is what creativity is in itself - it is a process whereby fancy or, as I prefer to call it, "fabrication" (making things up) is replaced by the ability to *reveal*. This is what Coleridge detected in the poetry of his friend Wordsworth, and it pushed him down into himself in search of the same space.

The Falling of the Barriers

William James talked of "The falling of the barriers", and meant by that that he had detected processes of mind whereby the self was either partitioned off through the act of "selfing" (the self as a localised phenomenon), or released from selfing through the experience of existence as a whole (the self as a non-local phenomenon). This gives us a "condition of mind" to deal with, but it is what happens in this special, non-local condition of mind that concern us here. James's own experience of heightened, drug-induced creativity is of interest.

The mode of consciousness was perceptual, not conceptual - the field expanding so fast that there seemed no time for conception or identification to get in its work. There was a strongly exciting sense that my knowledge of past (or present?) reality was enlarging pulse by pulse, but so rapidly that my intellectual processes could not keep up the pace. The content was thus entirely lost to retrospection - it sank into the limbo into which dreams vanish as we gradually awake. The feeling - I won't call it belief - that I had a sudden opening, had seen through a window as it were, distant realities that incomprehensibly belonged with my own life, was so acute that I can not shake it off today.³³

The philosopher Don Cupitt would have fun with this quote (see my essay *Cupitt's Unlearning Self*); it appears to confirm his belief that nothing at all is rescuable from a mystical state of mind, and that they are therefore without

significance. But that is not the case. This strange experience, in conjunction with others of a similar type, radically changed William James' thinking on a number of questions, and that in itself opens out into the question of what a mystical experience actually does to the experiencer. One thing is sure, however, a form of comprehension beyond propositional reasoning was at play. It isn't that nothing was communicated to James; it is that what was communicated was assimilated by a self that had undergone radical change in how information was being processed. On this score there is a wealth of information in this quote, information that explains not what was comprehended, but how it was comprehended, and what resulted from the experience.

First thing to spot is that the mode of consciousness was "perceptual", not "conceptual" - that clearly identifies the process as *insightful*. It was also a rapidly expanding process of insightfulness that his conscious mind could not cope with, hence his inability to consciously register details later. But not altogether non-propositional, for there was a sense of having glimpsed "distant realities that incomprehensibly belonged with my own life", and this feeling did not diminish with time. So not only was the experience had at another level of comprehension and assimilation, it was also an encounter with his own depths that radically shifted his opinions about self, other and world. This leaves us with a quite detailed tripartite encounter: (1) a new mode of comprehension and assimilation that substantially altered his perception of reality; (2) a sense of distant realities perceives through a kind of aperture in time and space that poses questions of its own; and (3) the suspicion that these plural realities were somehow connected with his own existence in some intrinsic fashion. And James did not leave the matter there; he went on to liken his experience to an "uncovering of tracks of consciousness", and compared that with how we track "objects" through the process of *instant perceptual expansion*.³⁴ (my italics) So not at all a waste of time this so-called mystical experience, and not without serious repercussions in terms of the kind of psychology James eventually developed.

In his paper 'Consciousness Already There', J. Bricklin comments on this particular experience had by James, draws our attention to the rapid expansion of James' perceptual field during the experience, and suggests that such a field

could theoretically convert “vast temporal successions into space-like simultaneities” not unlike those reported in near death experiences.³⁵ Similarly, James homed in on the idea of perceptual simultaneities in the *Principles*³⁶ when he drew attention to Mozart’s ability to compose, not by way of successive creative moves in time, but *all at once* “as in a beautiful strong dream”. All at once? By what process of mind could Mozart have composed a whole sonata all at once? In trying to describe mystical experience, James inches his way into this phenomenon when he suggests that perhaps “[e]very bit of us at every moment is part and parcel of ... some more really central self which is co-conscious with the whole of us”.³⁷

As with Carl Jung, Einstein suddenly enters the picture as someone who agreed with James’ view that “time” is no more than an artifice. For Einstein, everything was *en block* in space-time; temporality was an illusion. As Bricklin points out, James had lost what Einstein called the reference body around which “successive, linear perspective is constructed”,³⁸ and in this sense it was diffusion of the self that allowed this special state of consciousness to arise. A “transmarginal panorama” of experience was available to those who lost the “narrow field of consciousness-arrayed-around-a-reference-body-self”.³⁹ This appears to resonate with John Paul Sartre’s notion of “pure reflection” in which everything is given at once,⁴⁰ but that would be to draw the wrong conclusion. Sartre contended that in pure reflection nothing is ever learned or discovered, and that drops the whole issue back into Cupitt’s court where only the discursive intellect can deal in meaning. Problem is, we’re not actually dealing with “meaning” here; we’re dealing with *experience*. It is the experience of “consciousness as a whole” that delivers “everything at once”, and that requires a very different kind of observer. Bergson captures what is going on when he says:

[O]nly to a superficial inspection does consciousness consist of a sequence of distinct conscious states. To a more profound investigation, consciousness reveals itself as a continuity of mutually permeating states that form an organic whole ... the true life of consciousness cannot be caught in our conceptual

network. It will always overflow our artificial demarcations and distinctions.⁴¹

Consciousness is not “me” or “you” thinking thoughts in language; consciousness is what we are in our entirety, and what we are in our entirety is a continuity of mutually permeating states that form an organic whole, and that includes the body. To be intercepted by such a self is an experience that indelibly marks the conscious ego, for the self as organic whole, as *psyche*, is an altogether different self from the ego-self. This is what William James is getting at when he refers to “some more really central self” that is co-conscious with the ordinary self. We are much more than we seem, but much less than we consciously presume.

References and Notes

- 1) Kelly, Edward, and Emily Williams Kelly, *Irreducible Mind. Towards a Psychology for the 21st Century*, Rowman & Littlefield, Inc, UK., 2007. Introduction, xvii.
- 2) Ibid, Introduction, xviii. According to Rami Gabriel (assistant professor of psychology in the Dept. of Humanities, History, and Social Sciences at Columbia College, Chicago) “psychology is the de facto study of human “nature” which is best biologized bottom-up. In his paper “Modularity in Cognitive Psychology and Affective Neuroscience”, Gabriel states that the deeper theme of his paper is situating affective neuroscience as a biologically-based monist description of human nature. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 3-4, 2012.
- 3) Ibid.
- 4) Ibid, p. 5,
- 5) Shamdassani, Sonu, (ed.) *The Psychology of Kundalini Yoga: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1932 by C. G. Jung*, Introduction, p. xxx.
- 6) Ibid, xxix.
- 7) Ibid.
- 8) Ibid.
- 9) Ibid, xxi.
- 10) Ibid, xxiii-xxiv. A personal note in the next paragraph states that I (the author) agree with Jung’s statement that the unconscious is “crammed with Eastern symbolism”. This claim is based on the symbolic forms I encountered in meditation. These symbolic forms were almost purely Eastern in origin, and confirmed experientially that descriptions of at least some of the chakras were as other yogic meditators claimed. I have to add that this was not because I was well versed in what to expect, but even if I had been, the experiences themselves were so visually rich, so overpowering as to eclipse any expectation I might have had. Also, these Eastern type visual experiences were augmented by dream images of equal intensity that did not bear an Eastern stamp. These were more in the form of strangely illuminated scenes within which I sometimes encountered beings who challenged me in some fashion. One such encounter was in a strange, deserted underground city, where I found myself wrestling with a physically powerful, hooded man. At the end of the bout, which I appeared to win, he handed me what looked like a

dice with symbols on each surface, and said, "Learn". Some of these experiences are described in my first novel, *Song of the Man Who Came Through*, but have to be carefully differentiated from creatively generated experiences while conscious. These experiences are in alignment with the 6th chapter of Jung's autobiographical work *Memories, Dreams and Reflections*, at the end of which he says: "The years when I was pursuing my inner images were the most important of my life - in them everything essential was decided. It all began then; the later details are only supplements and clarifications of the material that burst forth from the unconscious, and at first swamped me, it was the *prima materia* for a lifetime's work."

- 11) Jung, Carl G., *Collected Works* vol. 15. See also Richard Noll's *The Jung Cult/Origins of a Charismatic Movement* in which he attempts to link Jung with the often mad-cap notions of the pre-war German *Volkisch* movement, yet time and again has to admit that this is more an inferred association than an actual connection. This is particularly evident when he suggests that Jung's folk-psychology is a disguised Volk-psychology with anti-Semitic/Nazi underpinnings, so making Jung, by association, a disguised exponent of anti-Semitic ideas. But it is a case of one step forward and one step backwards for Noll, for in the next breath he says: "The claimed evidence of the active, open espousal of anti-Semitism or Nazism by Jung is, in my opinion, less directly compelling (hence the greater controversy over it), and is perhaps more fruitfully framed – from the historian's point of view – in its deeper *volkisch* context. As historians such as Mosse have continually stressed, anti-Semitism and National Socialism, while derivatives of this *volkisch* tradition, are not to be regarded as completely identical with it and its multiple off-shoots, of which Jung and his analytical psychology is only one of many." What this "deeper" *volkisch* tradition was in itself we are not told, and it is on this singular fact that Noll's argument against Jung stumbles. Why so? Because the deeper *volkisch* tradition referred to carried within it profound insights and intuitions stemming from Plotinian, Neoplatonic and Hermetic thought at its best. Yes, Jung's ideas were dangerous, but only because they represented a challenge to the hardening, reductionist, dehumanising humanist perspective already evolving.
- 12) Shamdasani, Sonu, (ed.) *The Psychology of Kundalini Yoga: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1932 by C. G. Jung*, (see above) Introduction, p. xix.
- 13) Bloom, Harold, *100 Geniuses*, 2002, p. 12, as referred to by Edward Kelly and Michael Grosso in *Irreducible Mind, Towards a Psychology for the 21st Century*, (see above) pp. 478-479.
- 14) Murray, P., (ed), *Genius: The History of an Idea*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, pp. 166-180.
- 15) Kelly, Edward, and Emily Williams Kelly, *Irreducible Mind: Towards a Psychology for the 21st Century*, (see above) p., 479.
- 16) *Ibid*, p. 481.
- 17) *Ibid*.
- 18) *Ibid*.
- 19) *Ibid*, p. 482.
- 20) Progoff, Ira, Jung, *Synchronicity, and Human Destiny: Noncausal Dimensions of Human Experience*, A Delta Book, New York 1973. p. 151.
- 21) *Ibid*, pp., 152-153.
- 22) *Ibid*, p. 155.
- 23) *Ibid*, p. 153.
- 24) *Ibid*, p. 157.
- 25) Kelly, Edward, and Emily Williams Kelly, *Irreducible Mind: Towards a Psychology for the 21st Century*, (see above) p. 51.
- 26) *Ibid*, p. 53.
- 27) *Ibid*.
- 28) *Ibid*, p. 52.
- 29) *Ibid*.
- 30) *Ibid*, pp. 476-477.

- 31) Ibid, p. 455.
- 32) Ibid.
- 33) James, William, 'A Suggestion About Mystics' pp. 1274-1275 in *Writings: 1902-1910*, New York, Library of America.
- 34) Bricklin, J., 'Consciousness Already There Waiting to be Discovered: William's James's Mystical Suggestion as Corroborated by Himself and his Contemporaries', p. 70. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 11-12, 2010.
- 35) Ibid.
- 36) James, William., *The Principles of Psychology*, p. 255. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1890.
- 37) Bricklin, J., a footnote in 'Consciousness Already There Waiting to be Discovered: William's James's Mystical Suggestion as Corroborated by Himself and his Contemporaries,' *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 11-12, 2010. p. 71.
- 38) Ibid. p. 74.
- 39) Ibid.
- 40) Sartre, John Paul, *L'être et le néant*, p. 195.
- 41) Zahavi, D., 'Varieties of Reflection', p. 13. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 1, 2011.

