JUNG AND HIS ARCHETYPES

AN EXTRAPOLATION ON POLARITY

John Hunt. B.App.Sc. (UTS)

Thesis submitted for Master of Science (Hons) Degree.
Social Ecology, Faculty of Social Inquiry.
University of Western Sydney Hawkesbury.
March 1999.
PLEASE NOTE

The greatest amount of care has been taken while scanning this thesis,

and the best possible result has been obtained.
To my son Matthew.

With thanks to Dr David Russell
for his time and advice.
NO PART OF THIS THESIS HAS BEEN SUBMITTED IN ANY FORM FOR THE AWARD OF ANY DEGREE AT THIS OR ANY OTHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.

JOHN HUNT
MARCH 1999.
CONTENTS

Preface 1
Abstract 2
Introduction 4
Individuation and Social Ecology 9
The Personal Origins of Motivation 15
The Archetypes 19
Legend, Fairy Tale, and Archetype 24
The Inherited Archetype 35
The Universality of Polarity 46
Psychic Polarity and the Archetypes 55
An Archaeology of Archetypes 61
The Dual Nature of the Archetype 74
The Centrality of the Ego / Shadow Polarity 80
Ego, Shadow, and Individuation 93
Review 102
Appendix 1 107
Appendix 2 109
Appendix 3 118
End Notes 119
Bibliography 123
PREFACE

It can perhaps be said that the personal side of a thesis has about four stages: the original motivation, the research and thought, the writing, and the editing and self imposed critique. These four are certainly not mutually exclusive, but overlap and interlock in a manner that becomes reflexive and reflective. At least that is my experience in the work for this thesis. And as the thesis approaches completion it becomes unclear what 'completion' means. Completion can't possibly mean producing the definitive statement on a topic, since the thesis process uncovers endless ramifications of what was originally thought to be a discrete and contained 'topic'.

As the written work increases and progresses it is found that the early 'front end' work requires more attention, and as a consequence of that ongoing thought and research, there is a shift in perspective for the latter part of the work, which in turn requires more thought and research. So the early part of the work pushes the latter part along, and the latter part pulls the early part along, caterpillar like, searching for understanding, and finding unexpected power hidden in its simple directive autonomy. And rather than finding the answer, to the original motivating question, the question is carefully unravelled, until at last, it seems the question itself is revealed in all its glory. The discipline of the research consists of the maintenance of a 'domain of thought and feeling', which is centred on the question insistently and refuses to be led too far away, or to become too diffuse by expansion. In that sense the research is found to be a kind of visual vignette.

If there was a clear straight path from the question to the answer, then there would be no need for the research, since the path and its end would be obvious. But the work proceeds by thinking and rethinking and in a half blind manner struggles to elucidate the question. With this ongoing feedback nature, the thesis becomes a living entity, and like all living things it has the ability to take its own mistakes into account, and to overcome problems by growth and continuity. A statement made by Jung about the individuation process, can be seen to be applicable to the thesis process:

"The right way to wholeness is made up of fateful detours and wrong turnings".
ABSTRACT

This thesis looks at the Jungian concept of the archetypes and the connection between the process of individuation and social ecology. An unnatural split between thinking and feeling is seen to be entrenched in society and to be a cause of conflict. It is argued that this split has its origins in the individual's unresolved inner conflict of ego and shadow. The thesis includes an outline of the personal experiences which formed the incentive for the pursuit of this study and how the study grew from those experiences.

The idea of the archetype is examined in the context of Jung's observations about psychic features, which he made throughout his lifetime. While it is true the psychic archetypes have an immense significance for a society in general, it is also true that archetypes are absolutely central in the life of the individual. The central part played by mythology and fairy tale in Jungian psychology is explored using a North American Indian myth as a vehicle for an exposition for some major concepts.

Inheritance of archetypes is perhaps the central feature of controversy surrounding the Jungian concept of psychic archetypes and a possible mechanism of inheritance based on the idea of the 'meme' and its relationship to the gene, is examined.

The concept of psychic polarity is seen to lead to the idea of polarity in general, since it can be observed that polarity is more than a consequence of phenomena, rather phenomena are found to be a consequence of polarity. In this way polarity is then given a universal setting. The significance of psychic polarity and archetypes is in turn found to be a consequence of the ego / shadow polarity, which occupies the central position in the observed dual nature of the archetypes. The ego / shadow polarity is itself seen to be a consequence of ego formation, in which the features excluded from ego are retained in the unconscious and coalesce to form the personification that Jung named the shadow.

The ancient story of Aladdin and the Lamp, is found to contain inherent psychic features or artefacts, which elucidate the concept of the ego / shadow polarity, and so can be seen to constitute an example of an 'archaeology' of archetypes. In Jungian psychology, fairy tale and legend are typically observed to be able to be clarified and understood by applying the concepts of the archetypes, but in the Aladdin story the reverse is found to be possible, as an analysis of the story reveals unexpected aspects of the nature of archetypes.
The apparent dual nature of the archetype is further explored by comparing and contrasting the archetypes of the 'wise old man' and the 'wicked magician', and this dual nature exploration is seen to be in essence an examination of the ego / shadow *equilibrium*, which exerts its influence on all archetype manifestations at the moment of expression. This unexpected influence on the archetype, despite the archetype's collective nature, explains the positive and negative faces of the archetypes and seems to resolve some questions about their moral, amoral and/or polar nature. The resolution of psychic conflict in the context of Jungian individuation and how the individuation process may influence the expression of *collective* features, is also found to have the ego / shadow equilibrium as the central psychic structure.
INTRODUCTION.

A social ecology thesis has a dual nature, while it chronicles the progress in the researched topic, it also chronicles the progress in the growth of the researcher. That is, a research thesis identifies itself as a social ecology thesis, when the researcher is revealed in the research. A social ecological study then, doesn't attempt to pretend that the researcher can be aloof from the study, like some disembodied mind. Nor does it reluctantly admit the subjective aspect of the supposedly objective study, but rather it encourages the inward and outward looking nature of experience and consciously fosters the integration of that dichotomy as a vehicle for understanding and growth.

The foregoing paragraph has connotations of what Jung called the individuation process, so a connection is made here between Jung and social ecology.

In Jungian analysis the individuation process refers to the growth of the analysand by the gradual integration of aspects of the conscious and unconscious to manifest the Self, to a greater or lesser extent. Jung describes the individuation process:

"In general, it is the process by which individual beings are formed and differentiated, in particular, it is the development of the psychological individual ... as being distinct from the general, collective psychology. Individuation, therefore, is a process of differentiation ... having for its goal the development of the individual personality."1

The individuation process is essentially a process of becoming conscious and is a central concept in Jung's work. In a discussion of psychopathology and archetypes, Jung makes the following more concise comment:

"In all cases of dissociation it is therefore necessary to integrate the unconsciousness into consciousness. This is a synthetic process which I have termed the 'individuation process'."2

Social ecology is an approach to finding solutions to environmental and social problems. This social ecological approach takes a holistic view which depends on co-operation and action at all levels, individual, community, national and international. In the publication 'Renewing The Earth' the Editor John Clark has this to say:
"Social Ecology is a comprehensive holistic conception of the self, society, and nature. It is, indeed, the first ecological philosophy to present a developed approach to all the central issues of theory and practice. It sets out from the basic ecological principle of organic unity in diversity, affirming that the good of the whole can be realized only through the rich individuality and complex interrelationship of the parts. And it applies this fundamental insight to all realms of experience.

In affirming such a holistic approach, Social Ecology rejects the dualism that has plagued Western civilization since its beginnings. A dualism that sets spirit against matter, soul against body, humanity against nature, subjectivity against objectivity, and reason against feelings."

In the first sentence of the above quote the words self, society and nature, are the words which suggest the connection between social ecology and Jungian psychology. And in the last sentence of that quote, the dualism spoken of, is exactly what the social ecological study attempts to avoid. That last sentence is also strongly suggestive of a psychological context, since psychological dualism is at the core of the individuation concept. Social ecology then, is the opportunity for research and expression in a whole manner.

It would seem that although a research involves a careful rational method, the motivation behind that rationality is a feeling aspect, more to do with the heart or the soul, than with intellectualising, and it could be asked - why was it we chose that topic in the first place, if not from our feelings? It also seems that rationality without the foundations and guidance of the feelings, very quickly loses its directive charter and is in danger of becoming hijacked by the mere analysis of ideas. Jung:

"The discrepancy between intellect and feeling, which get in each other's way at the best of times, is a particularly painful chapter in the history of the human psyche."

Rather than the feelings being an obstacle or hindrance to the rationality, it is the feelings (heart or soul) which direct and use the mind like a tool, provided the feelings are mature. To say it another way, it seems the mind is at its best when it runs ahead and clears a path for the feet of the soul.

From the foregoing discussion it becomes clear that the ramifications of social ecology and Jungian psychology are intimately intertwined. Self; an end to dualism; social action based on individual action.

It is common in public discussions on environmental issues to hear defenders of the environment accused of being emotional. 'You're just being
emotional', is the usual expression, and the normal response is to deny the accusation, as though that is not the case and the accusation is seen as an insult. The tendency to justify defence of the natural environment for reasons which are not emotional, is absurd. It would be difficult to find a better example of the dualism which Clark refers to in the previous quote.

In this case the dualism is feelings opposed to reason as though it is unreasonable to want to maintain large areas of intact nature as opposed to preserving small sections of ecosystems as examples of nature. (Perhaps to show our children's children what the earth was once like). This attitude again indicates the 'separate from nature' view of humanity, and in this case human beings become curators of the last remnants of nature, presiding over a sad, ecologically attenuated, and disorganized collection of environmental taxidermic curiosities; naively believing that ecosystems don't have an 'eco-physiology' of which human beings are an organ. And to be emotional about this is considered to be inappropriate.

The same feeling/ reason split is seen across the spectrum of human activities including social and ethical concerns. For example it was recently proposed by the prominent philosopher Professor Peter Singer, that new-born infants perhaps shouldn't be admitted to the community (and consequently citizenship) until a month or so after birth and only from that time would the infant have citizen rights. This kind of conclusion is the result of a totally intellectualised approach to human problems and highlights the dangers of the split off intellect making decisions about the human or world future.

The reason for the recently increasing action by governments and commerce on environmental issues is not because it has been discovered that the emotional concern is justified but because non action is now seen to cost dollars or political ascendancy. The question of the earth not being able to sustain human life has only recently been taken seriously, since the feared doomsday may not occur for a few generations. Captains of commerce have a charter also but it doesn't extend to environmental issues beyond their present contract.

One of the most dangerous outcomes of the collision of commerce and widespread environmental awareness is the idea that since environmental impact statements must be completed prior to commercial developments, then perhaps specific ecosystems, habitats and areas should be evaluated financially and reduced to, and defined by, dollar equivalents. This concept does allow a cost for a service or manufacture to have a built-in environmental levy to finance pollution reduced manufacturing methods, but has a dangerous side to
it. Putting a dollar value on aspects of the environment opens the door further, for taking the least financially costly path in each proposed commercial project, and closes the door further on the acceptance of the intrinsic value of the environment and on the long range viability of the earth as human habitat. It is a capitulation of the concept of human beings as feeling creatures and furthers the split, of rationality and feelings, walking the path of a kind of collective, cultural neurosis in which people are led to believe their feelings are inferior components of the total psyche.

This fundamentally limited view of human nature can also be seen in some areas of psychology, where assessments and conclusions are made using invalid criteria. Periodically in the general media, there is debate and criticism of psychological analysis as a therapeutic process. Analysis being referred to, in a derogatory way, as the talking therapies, with at least one prominent psychologist, Professor Forgas, saying these approaches don't help people. The stated or assumed criterion in this case is the concept of happiness.

In assessing the efficacy of consultative therapy, the common, seemingly reasonable question is often 'is the person happier after the process than they were before'? If the answer is no, then we might say the process has failed. But is happiness the single criterion? Compare this situation with the normal process of a person's academic education; after sixteen years or so of school and university, is the person happier? If the answer is no, then we might say the process has failed. In fact if we presented that educational history (with all the struggle and effort implied) to a person living a very simple life, totally unexposed to education, and then admitted it didn't bring happiness, that person would probably consider it the most hilarious, or tragic thing he ever heard. But the person with the education would view it differently, and apart from the vocational aspect, would know that there was something else achieved, call it growth, or a wider horizon, or a less parochial view.

When a child grows to maturity, that also doesn't necessarily bring greater happiness, sadly often less, but adult maturity is absolutely essential to cope with life. In the consultative therapeutic process there is an aspect of this same educational theme, but a psychic education this time, a maturing of the person, and a consequent increase in the ability to cope with the inevitable problems of life. Some people, sometimes, need help towards that maturity, and to attempt to discredit that process using naive criteria, is the equivalent to attempting to discredit education, based on a narrow and limited view of human nature, and is further evidence of the separation of the intellect and the feelings.
Social ecology then, like the individuation process, is about wholeness. But also, the wholeness of the individual is intimately connected to the maturity of a culture, and it seems that if the social and environmental problems facing the world are to be solved at all, a prerequisite is the recognition of a broader view of human nature; an acceptance of mature human feelings as legitimate sources of action, and hopefully an end to dualism.

Acceptance of this broader view needs to include also the fact and reality of the unconscious mind as part of the normal human psyche; an unconscious mind with all its potential for destructive as well as constructive action. And just as the conscious mind includes various capacities such as for example rational thought, so the unconscious includes various capacities, for example the phenomenon of dreams. Dreams have been studied by analysts and psychologists to gain understanding of the mechanisms of the psyche, and also to gain insights into individuals undergoing analysis or counselling, so that the nature and content of dreams may contribute to the therapeutic process. Many people consider dreams as having no psychic significance and therefore do not consider them to be of any consequence and do not take them seriously. This view would seem naive when it is considered dreams are produced by the psyche, and therefore it would be strange if they didn't relate to inner processes, in the same way that obvious physiological phenomena, such as heart rate and blood pressure relate to inner physiological processes.

Jung considered that dream material and content may be drawn from the individual unconscious and from a collective unconscious. That is, from the individual's personal experience and from the racial experience.

In this study which is centred on Jung and maintains the significance of both feelings and thought in that study, it would not be consistent with such a voluntary charter to ignore dreams and personal landmark experiences, whether as material which can contribute to the general discussion or as influential in my own life.
INDIVIDUATION AND SOCIAL ECOLOGY

The individuation process promotes the psychic growth of an individual by the development of a personal, realistic understanding, acceptance and integration of the conditions of his/her life, individual and collective, external and internal - the realization of the Self. This process of becoming conscious implies a freedom to pursue further realisation of potential without psychic blockages due to acquired and limited concepts in the person's self view.

Social ecology describes the development of a collective / cultural 'self' view, which takes into account the conditions of global, national and communal society, and actively promotes the acceptance of human beings as a part of, and totally dependent on, the natural environment. This cultural self view implies the integration of the humanist, economic and environmental spheres of human activity, leading to actions and responses which are consistent with sustainable use of resources and which 'tread lightly upon the earth'; this last an essential aspect as the human population approaches several billion.

In both the individuation process and social ecology, the starting point for an improvement in the situation is an acceptance of the initial conditions. Denial of present conditions by the individual or by a society is an impediment to change. In 'Catalina', Sumeret Maugham makes this simple, and here pertinent, comment:

"But a wise person takes things as they are, and knowing the conditions proceeds to deal with them in such a manner as to achieve the desired result."

This statement makes good sense in the psychological context and also in the social context. In the social context there is still much denial about the precarious situation which exists between the environment and human activity, and in the individual context, denial is an impediment to growth.

Marie von Franz, in describing the Jungian individuation process, places dreams and their symbolic content, and dream interpretation, as central to the process:

"Thus our dream life creates a meandering pattern in which individual strands or tendencies become visible, then vanish, then return again. If one watches this meandering design over a long period of time, one can observe a sort of hidden regulating or directing tendency at work, creating a slow, imperceptible process of psychic growth - the process of individuation."
Marie von Franz goes on to speak of the gradual emergence of a wider and more mature personality, which is not brought about by a conscious effort of will, but happens voluntarily and naturally. This growth is not directed by the conscious ego but is rather suggested and inferred, and as it were, offered to the conscious mind through the medium of symbol, as an opportunity which the ego may or not accept.

Since this opportunity for growth is offered to the conscious mind, not initiated by it, then an initiator or source is implied. For this implied source to be able to direct or suggest opportunity for growth, then that source must in some way be in touch with the individual's potential. One question which perhaps would be the first to spring to mind is; why all the apparent coyness of this source in the subtle suggestions and hints? And why wouldn't the individual be born blessed with the wiser identity if that is such a better way to be? These questions are at least partly answered by two considerations. The first is that the conscious mind by its nature and function needs an 'operational' autonomy in order to be a centre for immediate action, in the same way that a business manager needs his / her operational autonomy, but needs also to listen to the advice of and heed the collective wisdom of the rest of the organisation to avoid naive actions.

The second consideration is to remember that the human species has, like all organisms, evolved. The evolution of an organism doesn't proceed by following some predestined plan, but rather exploits opportunity by a change in its present form, which fits it slightly better to its environment. This idea is supported for instance by phylogenetic convergence, in which two evolving species from different evolutionary origins and trajectories, exploit the same ecological niche by coming to similar morphological or behavioural conclusions. "But a wise person takes things as they are ..."

In the case of psychic growth, the opportunities are either taken up or not taken up, according to the vastly complex interaction between the conscious and unconscious mind. The vast majority of researchers and writers in this field of psychology agree, the source referred to, is immensely wise; some primitive peoples referring to this, as the Great Man within. (eg. the Naskapi Indians of north America). This guiding source is in some way the person's potential itself, but a potential with the capacity to grow towards manifestation. This manifestation is the slow growth of that potential; no short cuts, no by-passing experience, because the realised potential is experience! A tree becomes a tree by growth, not by hunger nor desire. An organism's
evolution and change is not with reference to some ideal original concept, but rather the present is always the origin for what follows.

In this discussion of the individuation process, the inner being gradually coming into consciousness and manifestation, was referred to by Jung as the Self. Judith Hubback speaks of the Self:

"In clinical work evidences of the activities and dynamism of the self occur in many ways: in dreams, in fantasies, in paintings, and in the handling of events in daily life..."9

This Self is a centre in the total psyche, and has access to unconscious and conscious contents; a centre of psychic organization which is far broader than the exclusive consciousness. Marie von Franz describes the Self:

"...an inner guiding factor that is different from the conscious personality and that can be grasped only through the investigation of one's own dreams. These show it to be the regulating centre that brings about a constant extension and maturing of the personality. But this larger, more nearly total aspect of the psyche appears first as merely an inborn possibility. It may emerge very slightly, or it may develop relatively completely during one's lifetime. How far it develops depends on whether or not the ego is willing to listen to the messages of the Self."10

My own time in Jungian analysis reminds me of how difficult it can be to let go of an attitude or personal perspective, when a different or broader view is encountered, and how slowly these processes may proceed.

When the dialogue between the analyst and the analysand begins, it is critical that it doesn't deteriorate into debate. In debate or argument, a position or point of view is assumed and as the debate proceeds the original position is seen as something to be defended. This defence, no matter how logical, is an impediment to growth and understanding. This is due to the fact that defence requires battlements to be placed around the original belief, and those battlements constitute psychic structures which prevent the belief being reviewed or re-examined, and it becomes fixed, and growth is inhibited. Polar debate implies the possibility of a winner, and no one relishes the prospect of losing. A non polar discussion on the other hand provides a safe place for an open interchange of ideas, where no one person attempts to change another and so no battlements are placed, and growth and development remain possible.

It may be that when a viewpoint is re-examined in the context of new ideas, the viewpoint is altered or possibly subsumed by a wider understanding. In this open discussion and interplay of ideas between the analyst and
analysand, the position of the analysand must first be accepted by the analyst and the analysand, his/herself, because if a challenge to the status quo is initiated, the battlements are certain to be placed. But in the ethos of acceptance the analysand can review and examine his/her viewpoint or attitude, in a wider context of ideas being generated by the interaction with the analyst. This wider context is partly generated by the analysand and therefore allows the development of trust in the inner process of growth.

In the polarised argument it would require a great act of generosity to accept a new idea, which is perceived to be sound, when it is being forced upon us; no matter how logical the argument. In open discussion new ideas can be more readily accepted by us, since we half own them already, by sharing in the safe place in which they were generated. The possibility of acceptance of new ideas and perspectives coming from this safe place, doesn't in this case require an act of generosity towards another person, but rather an act of honesty towards ourselves. The formation of this self honesty constitutes a crucial stone on the individuation pathway, and perhaps the first upon which the analysand sets his foot. As the analysis proceeds the interface between the analyst and the analysand becomes a mirror, like the interface between water and air, in which the analysand, and possibly the analyst, can be self reflective. This willingness to be self reflective, may, and very often does, involve painful and frightening confrontations.

Mirror, mirror, on the wall,
what's my greatest fear of all?
You are, said the mirror,
you're your greatest fear of all.

Mirror, mirror, on the wall,
what's my greatest hope of all?
You are, said the mirror,
you're your greatest hope of all.

Mirror, mirror, in the sky,
what is deeper, that my sigh?
You are, said the mirror,
it's you who lie beyond your sigh.
Mirror, mirror, in the sky,
who made life become a lie?
You did, said the mirror,
to live a lie makes life a lie.

Mirror, mirror, in my mind,
what will break these lies that bind?
The truth will, said the mirror,
an honest mind can break the bind.

Mirror, mirror, in my heart,
what will cause this truth to start?
Your heart will, said the mirror,
It's in your heart the truth must start.

Mirror, mirror, in my soul,
what will make my life whole?
It all will, said the mirror,
Your whole truth will make you whole.

So this ongoing individuation process develops and reveals the Self, by and in its own efforts. Self is self made and therefore self defined! But in the self defining process, interaction with others is both essential and unavoidable. As Henry Ware observes:

"The shaping of our own life is our own work. It is a thing of beauty or a thing of shame, as we ourselves make it. We lay the corner and add joint to joint, we give the proportion, we set the finish."\textsuperscript{11}

Much of this description of the individuation process has implications for the social, ecological and cultural perspectives, since the social polarity of thinking opposing feeling, is a reflection, or rather projection, of an inner polarity. Previously it was stated that a thesis reveals itself as a social ecology thesis, when the researcher is revealed in the research. It could also be said that the social ecology thesis reveals itself as an individuation opportunity, due to the self reflective nature of social ecology.

The individuation process relates to social ecology in various ways. For example, the growth of the individual is generally seen as being fundamental to social ecology, since it would seem to be a prerequisite to be able to be
sensitive to social and ecological problems. John Clark, in the publication Renewing The Earth, discusses the prospects of the world emerging from its self destructive path, and states that it, the world, must become a universal community, and if human beings cannot develop a deep sense of community, then the gulfs between people can never be bridged. Clark continues:

"Such a possibility depends on a renewal at the most personal level: that of the self. ... Social Ecology sees the self as a harmonious synthesis of reason, passion and imagination."\(^{12}\)

There are other aspects of Jungian psychology applicable to society, and to human beings collectively, and which offer opportunities for cultural insights. Perhaps the most prominent of these is the concept of the archetypes. The archetypes are central to Jung's psychology, and profoundly influential in social events. Jung, in speaking of the *collective* unconscious, states:

"Its contents, the archetypes, are as it were the hidden foundations of the conscious mind, or, to use another comparison, the roots which the psyche has sunk not only in the earth in the narrower sense but in the world in general. Archetypes are systems of readiness for action, and at the same time images and emotions. They are inherited with the brain structure - indeed they are its psychic aspect ... that portion through which the psyche is attached to nature, or in which its link with the earth and the world appears at its most tangible."\(^{13}\)
THE PERSONAL ORIGINS OF MOTIVATION

I first became interested in the concept of the psychic archetypes during Jungian analysis about seventeen years ago. For me that concept was a watershed; almost instantly there was a psychic crystallisation at a personal level. From that point, many seemingly separate and disconnected ideas, experiences, facts, thoughts, urges and feelings all came tumbling into place, integrated by the single unifying concept of the archetypes.

Later when I first decided to begin research in the School of Social Ecology at the University of Western Sydney, I was uncertain about choice of a research topic. This uncertainty was resolved in the following dramatic way. (dramatic for me at least). I was reading the book 'Iron John' by Robert Bly, (Jungian psychologist / poet) and at one point the author was speaking of the self knowledge of the unconscious. As I read my eyes fell on the line "...the inner King knows what we want to do for the rest of our lives, or the rest of the month, or the rest of the day".14 At that point I closed the book and knew beyond any doubt that my study was in the area of the archetypes.

For the next few hours I experienced a most amazing 'connecting up', between my interest in Jungian psychology, and the idea of research and investigation. During this time there was an inrush of ideas and cross connections, between many areas of knowledge and learning, and the realisation of the ramifications of the concept of the archetypes. This intense experience was reinforced a few days later by an extremely vivid dream concerning archetypes. In the dream:

I am at the house where I lived as a child (but now adult) and I look up at the night sky and see that the whole sky is patterned with the most beautiful mosaic of square or rectangular 'tiles', each of different design and colour. Some have writing on them, but which can't be read, and only the central several are in clear focus, giving the effect of a vignette. Those tiles closer to the horizon are different and a bit rounded.

I stand staring at them all, totally amazed and captivated by their beauty and significance, and know beyond doubt they are the archetypes. It is clear to me (in the dream) that the lower rounded ones are the holy and ancient and profoundly spiritual archetypes; They are Egyptian in feeling and have some hieroglyph type markings. I then excitedly call to my mother, who is in the house, to come out quickly to see the sky.
The most significant aspect of this dream, for me, is the motivating, emotional impact it had on focusing me in the archetypal study. It put my whole relationship with the study on a personal basis. The dream contains many revealing aspects. The vignette type view, with clarity in one region, suggests that only some archetypes are known and have been studied, while most remain in the twilight between conscious and unconscious or shelve away into the unconscious completely. The night sky lacks the sun of consciousness. The childhood house makes connections to my own childhood; always a powerful connection to feelings. The whole display took place in the sky, which envelops the earth and life, and under whose eye human beings live. No matter how subtle or rational or conscious our deliberations, we live and act with reference to the psychic infrastructure of the archetypes.

The combined impact of the Bly book experience and the dream, resulted in a feeling of deep personal connection to the study of Jung and the archetypes.

It is common that such systemic, psychic motivations, or deeply emotional insights, are presaged by years, or decades, of inner preparation and work, and so it was in my case. For me the archetype concept reorganised things at several levels of life. At the cognitive level, the archetypes indicated another approach to how I and others learn and develop thinking processes. At the feeling level, the archetypes made much clearer the drives, often conflicting, that we all experience. At the spiritual level, the archetypes offered a foundation of connection with others, connecting people with the world and existence, and connecting existence with the origins. For me the archetypes are the wheels of the machinery of human existence, not in an exclusively materialistic sense, but also including the pragmatic sense.

At an intellectual level archetypal psychology offers an approach to study in many disciplines, for example, literary criticism, mythology, psychology and psychotherapy, anthropology and sociology, archaeology, education, and religion. The archetypal approach to study in all these areas is well advanced and a mountain of literature has accumulated. Jung has written extensively on most of these areas and it is available in the Collected Works.

From the time of my first exposure to the concept of the archetypes, I was often able to identify their action and presence in my dreams and experiences. One powerful experience of the influence of an archetype was the following:
I was attending a camp on the south coast of NSW, for people interested in Aboriginal matters. During the stay there I did a walking hike to the nearby Dithol mountain (Pigeon house mountain) which an aboriginal man at the camp said was a sacred female place. The walk to the top takes about two hours and from the top there is a spectacular three hundred and sixty degree view of the surrounding country. I was impressed and I returned and that was the end of it; or so I thought!

Several months later I was having dinner with friends, when suddenly I had a most compelling urge to visit the mountain again. It was night, and a most inconvenient time in my life to be setting off on the long journey, so I didn't go. I put it out of my mind and tried to forget about it, as I went about the commitments of life. For about two years the urge to visit the mountain lingered around the edges of my awareness, until it became imperative that I not only go, but that I stay a night at the top.

*P*arking my motorvan at the camping area at the base of the mountain, I began the two hours walk to the top, with my two sons, who were to return to the camping area before night, and I would stay alone at the top. As I hiked towards the top I gradually became immersed in a contemplative frame of mind, and that slowly gave way to a deeply emotional state, with a sense that at the top I would be facing some kind of profound catharsis.

Swinging a hammock between two trees at the top, alone, I then went to the highest rock on the top and began a quiet meditation while the sun set. Alone at the top I felt extremely peaceful and secure. I remembered the aboriginal man had said this was a female place, but by this time it was an inner conviction. I was responding to the mountain from that personal perspective, and at that moment; it was nurturing. I felt that some unknown, unstated, wordless trouble had left me. Quietly in the dark after sunset I found my way back to the hammock, and lay there in a half wakeful state for several hours.

At about three o'clock in the morning there was thunder in the distance, and I knew I must not be there through a lightning storm; the mountain is a solitary pinnacle and the top has evidence of repeated lightning strikes. The pinnacle is such a small area that if lightning strikes, there is a high risk of being killed. As the lightning came closer, it was obvious it was time to leave.

All packed up, I made my way down the dangerous steel ladders and tracks in the dark and drizzle, rejoining my two sons a few hours later, exhausted from the walk, yet feeling I had achieved what I set out to do.
The mountain will always be a special place for me, and always offer the opportunity for healing.

Over the years since the mountain experience, it became clear to me that it had been a powerful example of an archetype activation, which would be recognised in Jungian psychology and by cultures living close to nature, as the Earth Mother. Some of my feelings about the mountain and the experience, are that the experience itself was ancient and healing. That I had gone home, to the mountain; that I knew what to do there, and that I would be welcome again. On the journey to the top there was a feeling of apprehension, as well as a sense of approaching catharsis, and this combination was a definite experience of the numinous. At the top, it was like the top of the earth, and made many cares seem only passing; 'we are only passing, but earth abides'.
THE ARCHETYPES

Though the concept of the archetypes is ancient, it was Jung who explored and gave the first extensive exposition of the psychic archetypes. The Macquarie Dictionary offers this for archetype: "A model or first form; the original pattern or model after which a thing is made". The Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought gives an exclusively Jungian meaning: "A Jungian term for any of a number of prototypic phenomena (e.g. the wise old man, the great mother) which form the content of the COLLECTIVE UNCONSCIOUS (and therefore of any individual's unconscious)".

The roots of the archetype concept can be found at least as far back as Pythagoras, when he founded a school of philosophy based on the premise that 'all is number'. Robin Robertson discusses that fact in the publication 'Jungian Archetypes' and goes on to say:

"... the Greek mathematician and philosopher Plato ... argued that behind the appearances of outer reality lies a deeper, truer world: the world of ideas ..."

Although this concept of archetypes is about the idea of possibility 'existing' before the physical form, with the physical form being the filling of the pre-existing possibility, and isn't exactly the Jungian concept, it nevertheless is significant to the Jungian concept because the psychic archetypes are reflections of the outer world and its workings.

Jung speaks of the archetype:

"The archetype - let us never forget this - is a psychic organ present in all of us...For the archetype is an element of our psychic structure and thus a vital and necessary component in our psychic economy. It represents or personifies certain instinctive data of the dark, primitive psyche, the real but invisible roots of consciousness."

Jung goes on to say that in any explanation of an archetype, the functional significance must remain unimpaired, so that a meaningful connection between conscious mind and archetype is maintained.

Jung considered the unconscious to be comprised of two major parts. The personal part based on the individual's own experience, and unique to them, and another deeper common part, inherited like the instincts and shared by all people. This common part Jung called the collective unconscious and referred to its contents as the archetypes. These archetypes are the inherited
attributes of the psyche, and have been subject to evolution as much as the physical body has been subjected to evolution. A consequence of the idea of the collective unconscious, is that the contents, being an innate - 'readiness for action', have the property of goal seeking, in a similar way to the instincts, which influence behaviour towards gratification, and in this the unconscious is not seen merely as a passive receptacle of unwanted experience.

Since the collective unconscious comprises the archetypes, which have a diverse and complex nature, it would be expected that goal seeking would always produce opposition and conflict in ordinary life, and most certainly in the individuation process. Ordinary life does produce conflict, and if the process of individuation is to occur and resolve this conflict, it must be mediated by a centre which has access to the collective unconscious, the personal unconscious and the conscious, and this is to some extent definitive of the Self. The Self then, is an archetype. The goal seeking nature of the psyche, also implies the ability to heal itself, in a similar manner to the capacity of the body to self heal. Individuation is a process of becoming conscious of, and finding solutions to, conflict. This mediation of the unconscious and conscious aspects of the psyche, is similar to the way in which the instincts are mediated in the normal person, not by repression, nor by having unrestrained expression.

Since the archetypes fit us for our environment, and are as Jung put it 'systems of readiness for action', then for the psyche to have evolved its structures, implies its, the psyche's, interaction with the environment over the aeons of human evolution. So the inner world is built to match and deal with the outer world, and any permanent feature or process in the outer world must be represented internally by some corresponding, mostly unconscious feature, which sometimes unexpectedly whispers symbolically to the conscious mind; "before you were born I knew this".

Rosemary Gordon in a discussion of Jung's description of the archetypes makes the following observation:

"Thus when he wrestled with the concept of the archetypes he described them as psychosomatic entities whose physical expression is instinctual action, reaction and behaviour, while their mental expression is in the form of images."19

Permanent external objects such as the sky, the sun and the moon, will have internal counterparts. These internal counterparts will not be simple reproductions of the external, but will include the significance of the external object to the psyche. The analogy in the physical body, is to say that hands
exist because there are objects in the environment to be touched, and ears exist because there are sounds to be heard. (This is not said in a phenomenological context but in the context of biological evolution).

In addition to the internalisation of outer phenomena, the psyche has its internal mediating features such as the Self. Jung discovered other permanent attributes of the psyche, also inherited and hence archetypes. Some of these he named the shadow: the anima: the animus and the persona. These are personifications of aspects of the psyche. The anima is a female personification of the unconscious, or part of the unconscious, of a man, and is considered to be a kind of mediator between the unconscious and the conscious mind. The animus is the inner male aspect of a woman and is equivalent to the anima of a man. The persona is that aspect of the personality, which can be thought of as the facade or groomed presentation of the individual, it plays a part in facilitating the interaction between people. The shadow is the personification of suppressed psychic material and may appear in dreams as an image of the same sex as the individual, and manifests some of the disowned thoughts and feelings. (CW. many references).

The collective unconscious and its contents, the archetypes, are the collective wisdom of the race, and prepare us for life, by storing working templates of situations, interactions of the inner with the outer world, encountered by the psyche in its evolution.

Jung discovered that the archetypes are associated with symbols which represent the archetype but do not define it. Though the archetype is 'eternal', its representations may be different depending on the circumstance, culture or historical period. The archetype is expressed through the available material of the time and place. Commenting on this relationship between the archetype and its manifestation Jung says:

"The archetype is essentially an unconscious content that is altered by becoming conscious and by being perceived, and it takes its colour from the individual consciousness in which it happens to appear."\(^{20}\)

Jung goes on to say:

"The archetype in itself is empty and purely formal, ... a possibility of representation which is given a priori. The representations themselves are not inherited, only the forms, and in that respect they correspond in every way to the instincts, which are also determined in form only. ... In principle, it can be named and has an invariable nucleus of meaning- but always only in principle, never as regards its concrete manifestation."\(^{21}\)
The archetypes then, form the innate structure of the psyche, and this structure prepares the individual for life's encounters, by constituting a pre-knowledge or forewarning of what can be expected to be encountered in the environment, and also provides a mechanism of interaction with that environment. But the archetypes must also interact within each individual, especially during infancy when psychic structures such as ego are being formed. H.M. Solomon in an article on object relations theory applied to the discussion of the formation of the development of an infant's ego, speaks of the internal collision between opposites, and the achievement of internal synthesis, by the resolution of an inner / outer tension:

"These potentials are manifested through the processes of deintegration and reintegration as they emerge from the original unconscious integrate, the self, and to a greater or lesser extent find correspondences in the external world."^22

It would seem that some degree of mismatch between the archetypes and the environment would be normal in the development of the individual and would be accommodated by psychic adjustment. However gross mismatch would be expected to have catastrophic results on the individual's development. In the well publicised research of Harlow, infant monkeys were deprived of normal mother contact, and consequently developed gross deformities of behaviour.^23 (And suffered greatly for it). Since the mother archetype is so fundamental and pervading, the absence of the external counterpart would be the psychic equivalent in a physical situation, of being born with normal arms and legs, only to find a world with no surface to walk on and no objects to touch. This raises the question about relatively minor archetype / environment mismatch in any individual (or in a culture), and the mismatch's relationship to the health of that individual or culture.

Archetypal imagery occurs and can be observed in several ways. In an individual's dreams; in legend and mythology; in fairy tales; and in mass actions of populations and societies.

An individual's dreams, are manifestations of the unconscious, but Jung identified dream images which did not come from the person's personal unconscious, but from the collective unconscious. Dream images therefore, may be from either the person's own history or from the race psychic history, and not necessarily discretely separate, since the individual personal image may be superimposed on the underlying archetypal image. In my own dream, previously outlined, I called to my mother to witness the amazing phenomenon of the sky, but the mother reference is at first glance incidental to, and not
relevant, to the main dream content. However, the presence of the powerful mother archetype image, is equivalent to saying - 'before the very earth and life I witness this event'.

Jung, in speaking of archetypal images in dreams and mythology, and in the context of the images not being dead or fossilized, says:

"...mythologems are still fresh and living - for instance, in dreams and visions - in the hidden recesses of our most personal life..."24

Dreams, are one of the windows open to us to study these elusive archetypes, but we don't look out of these windows; we look in to ourselves, into the foundations of our psychic nature, and therefore cannot pretend to be objective. And in a psychic and very real sense - this is holy ground.
LEGEND, FAIRY TALE, AND ARCHETYPE.

In the introduction to the book 'The World's Best Fairy Tales', the editor Becker Sideman has this to say:

"Fairy Tales and other folk tales are among the oldest works of man. ... every people adapted the tales to their own life, shifting the details to fit local customs. Worn smooth by ages of telling, the stories acquired that distinctive conciseness of form and rapidity of movement which are among their principal charms."25

Jung, in discussing dream images of the collective unconscious type, as opposed to those from the individual's personal history comments:

"The products of this second category resemble the types of structures to be met with in myth and fairy tale so much that we must regard them as related."26

The above expression of Becker Sideman, "Worn smooth by ages of telling", captures concisely and beautifully the concept of the evolution of a folk tale or myth. If a story is told and passed from one person to the next, certain of the components of the story will strike 'chords' with some individuals, depending on their personal experience, and other components will strike chords with other individuals, depending on their experience. Each person will tend to emphasise those components which are relevant to him/her and to forget or play down the parts which they don't relate to, that is, the unshared experiences. As the story continues to be told and passed on, the unshared content is discarded and the surviving content is propagated. This surviving content is the part that all people relate to; that all find relevant and significant, and hence it is the part that is collective. ("Worn smooth by ages of telling").

This collective part has two aspects, since it is comprised of both the shared culture and the archetypal component shared by all people. Within a single culture then, the shared acquired understanding becomes the vehicle for the truly archetypal content! That is, the vehicle, cultural knowledge, is intra-cultural, while the archetypal content is inter-cultural. This is the reason why Jung emphasised that the expression of an archetype may vary through time and culture, yet still be consistent in its unconscious and symbolic significance.
This discussion does to some extent support the notion of the formation of stories containing archetypal symbols. But the stories are not simply a chain of symbols strung together at random, they have a story line; and a very significant story line. The presence of this significant story line is itself archetypal, and is the most vital aspect of myth, because the story line is the drama of individuation at the collective level. The self knows of itself, and of its cultural and historical transcendence, and tells its story, a story of potential, of hopes, of fears, of danger and courage; a collective story, yet one which each of us may experience.

The archetypal images as discussed so far, have been viewed as wholly positive concepts. But the archetypes have a negative aspect also. Considering that the instincts are also in essence archetypal, this negative side of the archetypes should be no surprise. (For example, the instinct of normal hunger for food can sometimes become unrestrained gluttony.) Jung comments:

"Just as all archetypes have a positive, favourable, bright side that points upwards, so also they have one that points downwards, partly negative and unfavourable, partly chthonic, but for the rest merely neutral."²⁷

In that same discussion and with reference to the 'old man' archetype Jung goes on to say:

"The old man, then, has an ambiguous elfin character- witness the extremely instructive figure of Merlin- seeming, in certain of his forms, to be good incarnate and in others an aspect of evil."²⁸

Myth, folk-tales and legend, are manifestations of the collective unconscious, propagated on the vehicle of cultural knowledge and experience, but with the vitality, saga and transcendence, of ancient and eternal psychic significance.

Appendix 1, is an extract from Pears Encyclopaedia of Myths and Legends (ed. Sheila Savill) and outlines a myth of the Navajo Indians of North America.²⁹ It contains many examples of the Jungian concept of the collective, that have been discussed here, and is probably one of the finest examples chronicled, of the mythical story of the Self and the struggle of the individuation process at the collective level. In the opening paragraph (91) of that extract, the editor, Sheila Savill, notes that this myth involves classic episodes of the hero's trial, and that this content is familiar in stories throughout the world. A study of the myth reveals its Jungian imagery and symbolism.

*The two twins Nayanezgani and Thobadžistshini set out on their sacred trail and meet Spider Woman in her underground home. She welcomes*
them and asks them questions about who they are and where they are going. They evade her questions four times, until she suggests they sought their father, and then they admit it and say they wished they knew the way.

Twins occur commonly throughout mythology. Here 'twin' can symbolise the ego and its counterpart the shadow which are really the same but different; two sides of the one; the personification of conflict! The myth states clearly the trail is sacred, that is, of the numinous; making the point at the outset that the story is significant. Spider Woman is clearly an anima figure, (the twins are male), and she comes from under the ground, the unconscious, and spiders can be dangerous. The spider is an excellent figure for the anima; people commonly fear spiders yet also admire them for their patience, persistence and cleverness in building beautiful and complex webs. So this states the double nature of the anima (and indeed of all the archetypes).

She asks them the questions! If this was simply their journey they would ask the questions. The anima figure, is here, to some extent the initiator, or more exactly the twins and the anima share the initiative. But the anima is considered in Jungian psychology to be a messenger between the Self and the conscious mind, so here is suggested the co-operative nature of the ego and the unconscious in an interaction, essential for progress in individuation to occur.

They evade her questions four times, is suggesting they don't trust her and are showing their knowledge of her potentially dangerous nature, but also indicates a lack of co-operation on their part, that is lack of co-operation of the consciousness. But when they see she is knowledgeable and offering help, they decide to trust her and discretely ask for help; 'they wish they knew the way'. The number four occurs here for the first time and is the first reference to wholeness. Jung in his studies of mythology and religion discovered that the number four is associated with wholeness or rather wholeness of the individual. Round mandalas indicate wholeness but square mandala images; the possibility of integration. The Pythagoreans considered the number four to be perfect.

Spider Woman, the anima, advises them of the danger of the journey, and that their father might punish them for their intrusion.

The father, the Self, could damage the unprepared, ego consciousness. The twins are undaunted and exhibit the courage to seek wholeness.

Now Spider Woman tells them of the four dangers; again the reference to wholeness and its arduous journey. The dangers, she says, are of being crushed, cut, torn and engulfed.
Threats to the successful individuation.

*She gives them two life feathers from an eagle, plus another feather.*

In North American Indian culture the eagle was considered the 'king' of the birds, and in general in mythology as a symbol of the spirit.32 To Jung, 'king' was another reference to the conscious self or wholeness.33 Feathers are soft things, indicating possible success through some yielding, rather than through direct affront. In addition, in North American Indian culture the eagle was sometimes seen as a representation of the intuition or 'looks afar place'.34 Some intuition would be needed in this individuation journey.

*The twins are now given a protective spell to subdue their enemies, and part of the spell tells them the trail (journey) is beautiful, and to be still.*

The 'still' reference suggests being quiet and prepared, not scattered. *They survive the perils of the journey, and arrive at the house of Tshohanoai, the Sun Bearer.*

Now we know who the father is. The sun is a symbol of consciousness, but here being proximate to the father as its bearer, is a direct reference to the greater conscious Self. The house is square, already mentioned as a symbol of wholeness, and is on the shore of a vast stretch of water; the unconscious.

*More dangers are met and survived at the entrance to the house, with the help of the anima's advice and magic charms.*

*Once inside the house, they see a woman in the western corner, two youths in the northern corner and two girls in the southern corner.*

As referred to earlier, in North American Indian culture the north indicated the place of wisdom, the east indicated the intuition, the south indicated innocence and trust, and the west, the place of introspection- 'the looks within place'. These were considered to be the four ways of perceiving.35 The two youths in the northern corner would seem to be reflections of the twins, the 'two' suggesting this. The two girls in the south, seemingly also reflections, represent the twin's innocence and trust, (the south), presumably trust in the Self and the process.

*They are now wrapped in innocence and trust! In fact four wrappings.*

The woman in the house, in the western corner, is another anima figure, a second anima figure. This duplication of symbols is also typical of dreams, where an archetype may appear in more than one form or alternatively one image may serve as the vehicle for more than one symbol. This is very common and is a consequence of the economy and profound metaphorical capacity of the psyche.
The woman, the anima, is in the west, the place of introspection, 'the looks within place'. She is looking within? The anima communicates with both the conscious and unconscious, the messenger, and has spoken to the twins, now she is to speak with the father, the Self. since she is the mediator.

*After a rattle (magic; the illogical) has shaken four times at the door, the father arrives bearing the sun.*

The occurrence of the number four, wholeness, has increased as the story has progressed and is now everywhere, as wholeness approaches. The father bears the sun, that is, the Self is not synonymous with consciousness, but the potential exists.

*The father places the sun on the west wall, introspection, consciousness looking within. The woman now reveals to the father that his sons have come. Now there is disruption and anger and the father tips the twins out of their wrapping of innocence, and hurls them at the four sides of the house.*

The twins are tested in the four ways; in their wisdom, in their intuition, in their innocence and in their introspection.

*But they survive and having smoked the "poisoned pipe" to the end, comment on its sweetness.*

The achieving of the treasure makes the arduous struggle seem sweet. *The Sun Bearer acknowledges them and accepts them into his house.*

Integration!

The myth can be understood as using imagery as descriptive allegory of the process of becoming conscious, but can't be interpreted as allegory of other concepts, such as creation, a very common theme in myth. Some components of the myth would be extremely difficult to interpret in any more 'pragmatic' sense, for example, the wrapping of the twins by the girls from the southern corner, and then being placed on the shelf. This has the same seemingly trivial yet enigmatic quality, as occurs in dreams.

When an archetype is manifest it has a profound influence on the individual, for example as outlined previously in my own experience. This manifestation of the power of the archetype to centralise, focus, order and infuse with psychic significance, an individual's experience, for a period of time, suggests that archetypes have an inherent latency, as well as an activity. As Jung put it, 'an innate readiness for action'. It would be impossible for all archetypes to be manifest simultaneously, total chaos would be the result. Jung has said:

"There are as many archetypes as there are typical situations in life. Endless repetition has engraved these experiences into our psychic
constitution, ... When a situation occurs which corresponds to a given archetype, that archetype becomes activated and a compulsiveness appears, which, like an instinctual drive, gains its way against all reason and will, or else produces a conflict of pathological dimensions, that is to say, a neurosis.\

A key aspect of the activation of an archetype is its appropriateness and timing; it is essentially a response. The word response therefore is at least partly definitive of archetypes. The archetype has the capacity to respond to psychic situations, and to make a connection to our roots, a counter balance as it were, to dehumanised thought. Archetypes are a kind of psychic umbilical cord bringing nourishment, that is, psychic sense, from the nurturing origins to the present, consistent with their time and place transcendent nature. Jung stressed the need to avoid interpreting the activation of an archetype, at a purely intellectual level, and that to do so is perilous. This is because such an interpretation denies the personal, emotional connection to the archetype; the very connection the archetype is making.

Since the existence of a multitude of archetypes can be inferred from Jung's previously stated, 'as many as typical situations in life', it raises the question about whether the number is infinite. But there is a difference between the potentially infinite possibilities of the future and the finite psychic experiences of the past. We are not dealing with possibilities but rather probabilities and while possibilities cannot be predicted, probabilities can be predicted and that is what the psyche does by means of a collective memory of repeated exposure to recurring, significant events throughout the ages of psychic phylogeny. Psychic evolution has produced a 'catalogue' of responses (archetypes) which prepare us for probable events, while at the same time revealing the significance of those events and so maintaining a vital psychic connection to life's experiences.

Many writers speak of the bipolar nature of the archetypes. Each archetype seeming to have good and bad aspects. Jung:

"The contents of the collective unconscious, the archetypes, with which we are concerned in any occurrence of psychic mass-phenomena, are always bipolar: they have both a positive and negative side."\

If the activation of an archetype in the individual guides and influences that individual's behaviour, then it raises the whole question of archetypal activation at a collective level. If a group of people in a culture are confronted with a similar situation, then many people may have the same or similar archetype activation. Since the archetype is so powerful, a 'mass' activation
would be expected to have powerful cultural consequences, for the better or for worse. The collective psyche is comprised of the archetypes and therefore any mass manifestation of an archetype would have a resonant potential in a culture. Jung says:

"During a collective manifestation of archetypes there is always a great danger of a mass movement, and a catastrophe can be avoided only if the effect of the archetype can be intercepted and assimilated by a sufficiently large majority of individuals. At the very least there must be a certain number of individuals who are still capable of making their influence felt." 38

A collectively activated archetype can become rampant in a society unless there exists a critical ratio of unaffected to affected people. This minimum number of unaffected people would be capable of being confronted with the manifest archetype in their surroundings yet retain the ability to remain balanced in choice of action. That is, to continue to make sound judgements based on a broad perspective rather than be incited by the infectious archetype. Yet in contrast to this Jung has said elsewhere that the archetype once manifest is irresistible because it exists at an emotional level, below, more ancient and more fundamental to, that of the intellect and consequently cannot be rationalised away. In fact Jung makes it clear that to attempt to do so is psychically dangerous with the risk of neurosis.

It would seem therefore that either the confrontation with the archetype isn't sufficient in some people to cause its manifestation in them or it is manifest in them but its effect is 'assimilated' (Jung's word) by some inner balanced condition. This inner balanced condition could be due to the manifestation of another opposing, neutralising archetype. Or perhaps repeated exposure to an archetype in some balanced, passive context, brings about a psychic tolerance and therefore the ability to absorb the manifestation in a non psychically damaging way and the individual is able to continue making sound decisions in a personally safe manner. The inner balanced condition referred to above, will, later in this writing, be seen to be elucidated by a discussion of the ego / shadow polarity.

Previously it was mentioned that Jung has said that the manifest archetype has a bipolar nature, a positive and a negative side. This bipolar nature is perhaps more difficult to understand than the concept of the archetype itself. Hillman comments on Jung's use of polarities:

"Jung's life and thought makes more use of polarities than does any other major psychological vision." 39
It would seem that if the archetype is collective experience, then the appropriate action would be inherent in the archetype manifestation and that the inherent action would be clearly one thing, not negative nor positive. To the evolving psyche; if the response enhances survival, it is positive. The other point to be considered is that although the collective has all its history to draw on, each situation is also unique in its immediate context, and to have an exclusively reflex response would be limiting to something as complex as human situations and therefore possibly dangerous.

Considering the archetype as essentially a 'readiness for action'; the manifest archetype is a kind of point in the individual's experience at which the collective unconscious says 'I recognise this, I know what this is, I remember it from the past, during my millions of years of evolution'. So as well as a readiness for action, the archetype is an alert; a flag indicating the point at which action is imperative; the psyche saying 'now' at the crucial moments in our lives. This view sees the archetype as a kind of psychic punctuation, or perhaps as the choreography of the spirit, bringing order and sense to our ongoing experience by giving us a developmental / time constellation in which to move.

This certainly makes clear why Jung has said the archetype manifestation is ignored at our own peril, with the risk of neurosis, because if the archetype is indicating the time for action then 'no action' is preserving the status quo; living with the unsatisfactory situation which elicited the archetype in the first place. And how many of us are guilty of situational brinkmanship, leaving our action to the last possible moment of the archetypal window of opportunity?

The foregoing paragraph is paraphrased by my own experience in the following:

About fifteen years ago I was employed as a scientific officer at a university where I had worked for about fourteen years. The position was good and the scientific aspects of the work extremely interesting. Yet the position was not satisfying on a day to day basis. This dissatisfaction had persisted for a few years and whenever I felt very dissatisfied I would remind myself of all the advantages of the position and how much worse things could be, listing the opportunities; and so rationalize the dissatisfaction as being unwarranted. So periodically I would refresh my enthusiasm by an act of will and an act of inappropriate rationality.

The act of will would often be needed at the beginning of the year on returning to work and each year a greater effort of will was required. Finally
I returned to work one year as usual and as the dissatisfaction rose to the surface I began the act of will which would manifest the energy to continue my work; and nothing happened!

I frantically began rationalizing the situation and increased my effort of will, still nothing happened. All energy to continue had gone and when I finally realized that all effort was useless I resigned my position.

At the time of the experience there were mental images personifying the obstinate nature inside, which was totally inscrutable and refractory. These images were of a definite type and personified the inner resolve not to continue. More exactly, the image was of a squatting figure with folded arms and inscrutable face. In confiding to a friend about the situation, I described this image and its frightening non-negotiable resolve saying; "something inside has folded its arms and will not move".

A few months after that experience I was visiting the National Gallery in Canberra, when I was confronted by a figure in a glass cabinet. At the instant of first sighting the figure I experienced a feeling of fear and associated fascination - the numinous. An increased heart rate; bristling at the back of the neck and feeling faint and disoriented. The image was the inner personification of my resolve which had firmly ended my position of a few months before.

The clay figure before me in the glass cabinet was about a metre tall and was of a seated figure; knees drawn up as though sitting in front of a fire with folded arms resting on the knees. The face was strange and inscrutable and there was a feeling for me of complete familiarity and yet a simultaneous feeling of the frighteningly alien.

The statue in the cabinet was of the American Aztec rain god Tlaloc; the god of fertility, inspiration, and growth. This was exactly the personification of my inner decision maker. Prior to this I had never heard of the rain god nor the name Tlaloc. For about a half hour I experienced the 'hard to look at, hard to leave', ambiguity of the image, until it was time to go. On leaving the gallery there was again an inner struggle over whether to buy or not a postcard size picture of Tlaloc. I bought the picture. It has been on the wall of my study ever since.

Since ending my position at the university there has been a great struggle to re-establish myself vocationally, emotionally and socially. Yet with out doubt it has been the most creative and fertile time of my life; a time of rain and a time of growth. Salvation by the manifestation of an archetype
which ended my situational brinkmanship at what was perhaps the last moment of opportunity.

This personal experience of the connection of the inner psychic state and the outer experience is an example of what Jung called synchronicity and he wrote extensively on the topic, referring to synchronicity as an acausal connecting principal. 40

Since the archetype has the capacity for social propagation and the power for benefit or destruction in a society, its study is pertinent in a world torn by many and varied cultural conflicts at the international, national and local levels. Many of these conflicts are systemic, persistent, intrinsically polarized and seemingly insoluble. In the developed world the environment / industry polarity typifies these at the social and political level and its confrontational nature places the polarity clearly and vividly before all individuals, almost demanding of us that we make a choice and align with one or the other.

Social ecology looks to finding solutions to these problems at the individual, community, national and international level by considering the wider context of the problem and by transcending interdisciplinary boundaries.

The problem that is insoluble in an exclusively environmental approach, may have a solution in a social psychological approach. For example, the management of a particular industry may not be able to be persuaded to pursue a course of less damage to the environment by altering manufacturing methods, when a logical appeal is made. Then a condemnation of the management and the company by a community may result in a consumer driven change in the communities perception of the companies public image. This change may be from an image of 'hard headed profit first' company, to an 'immoral' company, which may elicit different responses from the community. The change in the public response may then pressure the company to rethink its environmental attitude and perhaps lead to more ecologically sensitive methods of production. The social ecological approach to problems contrives to be holistic.

In Jung's individuation process the approach is also essentially holistic. Individual problems that appear to be of an intellectual kind and intractable in that domain, may suddenly dissolve when an emotional insight is gained which reveals the intellectual approach as totally inappropriate for that problem. One example of using the whole of our nature in problem solving is Jung's statement that in his experience he found that problems of a seemingly sexual nature were often resolved by a spiritual insight and conversely
seemingly spiritual problems were often resolved by some insight of the individual into their own sexual nature.

The word holistic is probably the most frequently heard word in discussions of problem solving approaches for environmental and social issues. This is partly due to a backlash response to the decades of an exclusively intellectual approach to social problems. What we feel about a situation is significant, as is what we think about the situation. Thinking and feeling are both archetypal human responses. To ignore either of these archetypal potentials is to ignore a part of our innate nature and as Jung would say, we do so at our own peril. But Jung's warning applies also at the social level since the social manifestation of the archetypes is a collective projection of many individuals and the same principles and absolutes that apply to the individual also apply to the culture.
THE INHERITED ARCHETYPE.

So far in this text the existence of the archetypes has been assumed from Jung's works; from the works of other writers and from personal experience. But how can an archetype be defined? And is an identified archetype only another name for an influential event or single facet of our potential experience? And since it was previously stated that archetypes are inner psychic reflections of the outer world, modified according to survival value and racial significance, then is the act of naming an archetype as a discrete component of the psyche, simply attempting to catalogue all sensory experience?

The answer to this last question is definitely no, since the central criterion for the acceptance of a psychic phenomenon as archetypal, is its (the phenomenon's) cultural occurrence throughout different societies and times, and also its occurrence in different individuals (for example revealed in dreams) without the possibility of having been transferred from any external source. That is, it is demonstrated to be trans-individual.

However, it is not clear how such a psychic feature could be inherited. The biological stand on this is clear:- to be inherited a feature must be conveyed by the genes. Samuels, in the publication 'Jung and the Post Jungians', points out the difficulty in accepting the archetypes as inherited traits, and therefore the difficulty of accepting the existence of the collective unconscious:

"In 1919 Jung introduced the term archetype. Any consideration of the ways in which primordial imagery is transmitted over time runs foul of the Lamarckian fallacy. As applied to psychology, this suggests that fantasies are memories of specific, prehistoric experiences and that their content is inherited from previous generations. In the same way that biologists cannot accept that acquired characteristics are inherited, it is impossible for psychologists to hold that mental imagery or other contents can be passed on in that way. However, it is perfectly reasonable to argue that, while content is not inherited, form and pattern are;"[41]

Jung can be quoted as describing the archetypes in many ways; as systems of readiness for action; as a psychic organ present in all of us; representing or personifying instinctive data of the dark primitive psyche; an unconscious content which is altered by becoming conscious; as being in itself
empty and purely formal; and as a possibility of representation which is given
a priori. The various descriptions used by Jung when speaking of the
archetypes would probably fill a volume in themselves. Of all these perhaps
his most direct and pertinent statement would be:

"The contents of the collective unconscious ... are known as
archetypes."\(^{42}\)

The collective unconscious however, is defined as comprising the
archetypes. This seemingly circular definition when reduced to its essentials is
a statement that there is a structure of the psyche that is inherited in the same
manner as the instincts. That structure is called the collective unconscious and
its contents; the archetypes. David L. Hart makes this comment:

"Thus, for instance, the mother acquires her peculiar force and influence
on one's life not primarily from a particular woman but from the vast
storehouse of inherited human experience of 'mother' - that is, from what Jung
calls the mother archetype."\(^{43}\)

If it is accepted that mind (taken as subjective awareness) is generated
by the brain then functions of the mind relate to structures of the brain. This
relationship between structure and function doesn't necessarily imply a
localised or spatial correlation but rather a systemic or organisational or
process correlation. The current biological evidence would certainly support
the diffused organisational model for this correlation, if not for the archetypes
certainly for other functions of the brain. At a brain structure, strategic level
though, there is localised correlation, as for example the regions of the brain
which process visual sensory input. Considering that the brain has evolved
over its millions of years of history and that the brain is the experiential and
directive organ of human life, it would be unprecedented that the brain, so
central to survival, has no inherited behavioural characteristics. Elie Humbert
discusses Jung's view of the possibility of inheritance of archetypes and makes
this statement:

"Let me add that for Jung - and he was not hesitant on this point - the
archetypes are inscribed in the body in the same way that all organs of
information are inscribed in living matter. This implies, among other things,
that archetypes are genetically transmitted."\(^{44}\)

The great precedent for the inherited collective is obviously the instincts.
The instincts direct behaviour towards survival. The concept of the archetypes
as a collective unconscious, is a proposal that there are other features of
psychic life which also prepare a human being for survival. Evolutional theory
would certainly predict the evolution of such survival features in the brain, and
therefore behaviour; if not, then the natural selection of survival enhancing features does not occur, and there would be no evolution.

In the well known book 'The Selfish Gene',\textsuperscript{45} British zoologist Richard Dawkins argues that the primary unit of evolution, that is, the precise point of action (the interface) of natural selection on life is not the species, nor even the individual member of a species, but the gene. The main facts supporting that view are that the gene is the unit of transference of traits from an individual to the offspring; hence the traits survive, not the individual. Also, the gene is the site where mutations occur; the mutation being the origin of individual variation. The mutations (spontaneous changes in the DNA structure) will be subject to a selection pressure over time. This selection will discriminate between features which enhance survival and generation of offspring, and features detrimental to survival, which will be attenuated to extinction. This selection is in effect, selection for the genes.

The Dawkins's perspective of evolution is disquieting when first encountered since it must also encompass human beings, as evolved creatures. The disquiet comes from the consequence that even human beings have as it were, been built as vehicles for gene survival! (This view is of course a single perspective and not intended by Dawkins in a definitive sense for humanity).

This de-throning of the individual person as the central unit of evolution of the species is reminiscent of Copernicus and the loss of the Earth's centrality in the Solar System. However, despite the original perceived threat, either religious or psychological, in the Copernican view, it didn't produce any permanent human diffidence. But rather it led to an expanded frontier of understanding and an enhanced sense of wonder and curiosity; though perhaps with a certain nostalgia for the loss of 'favoured son' status, but this is probably compensated for by an increase in self reliance. Likewise, it is long since the brain displaced the heart as the organ of feelings, without any diminution of those feelings. Similarly the Dawkins' perspective needn't produce any permanent diffidence, since human beings will always have their subjective experience of life and their (almost) objective curiosity.

The Dawkins's work proposes another concept which is very pertinent to the present context. This other concept is what Dawkins calls the 'meme'. The meme as he describes it, is any idea which propagates itself in human culture, in a similar manner to the propagation of a gene; by having the capacity to replicate. Self replication is the fundamental mechanism by which anything survives the limit of its own durability, whether it is a gene or an
idea. Dawkins gives examples of memes such as tunes, ideas, fashions, catch phrases and building style. He describes the propagation mechanism:

"Just as genes propagate themselves in the gene pool by leaping from body to body via sperms or eggs, so memes propagate themselves in the meme pool by leaping from brain to brain via a process which, in the broad sense, can be called imitation. If a scientist hears, or reads about, a good idea, he passes it on to his colleagues and students. He mentions it in his articles and his lectures. If the idea catches on, it can be said to propagate itself, spreading from brain to brain."

Dawkins develops the idea of the meme further. He mentions that being confronted by the urgings of fellow biologists to put the meme concept into the biological context, and show enhanced survival of the carrier (brain) to justify meme persistence, he responds that the meme is another replicating unit. Therefore it does not need to be defended by reference to the carrier, and in that sense, it, the meme, is autonomous.

But this view is at least partly flawed by the fact that the gene in building its carrier organism rides on the success of that carrier. So it would seem that if the meme did enhance the survival of its carrier, the brain, then that would compound the evolution of the meme pool even if the meme evolution was largely independent of its carrier. In his discussion of replicating units, whether they be genes or memes, he lists key qualities which make for high survival value. These are longevity, fecundity and copying fidelity. Longevity in the case of memes, he argues, can be extensive, since for example, a scientific idea can last for centuries. Fecundity is potentially also great for memes since an idea can spread rapidly. It is obvious that because the regeneration period for an idea can be small therefore it implies a rapidly built 'ramification tree'.

When Dawkins discusses the third quality, copying fidelity, which contributes to high survival of memes, he admits to some hesitancy. Memes, for example, ideas, often exhibit low copying fidelity. Ideas are often modified by the recipient, added to or subtracted from, as they leap from person to person. He points out that genes are propagated in a definite, particulate manner (this is, after all, the essence of the gene mechanism). But if memes have a high rate of modification then they don't seem to be replicated in this same particulate way.

Dawkins suggests that the apparent non-particularity of the meme may be illusory. There is precedent for this illusion in gene propagation, in for example, human skin colour (intermediate colour) where the inheritance does
not appear to have occurred in a particulate way, yet gene inheritance is of course particulate. In searching for some kind of definitive statement about the meme, Dawkins analyses it this way. If two people encounter a scientific theory which is being propagated as an idea, and one believes in a part of the theory, say part A, but not in another part, say B, and another person believes in part B but not in part A, then A and B should be regarded as separate memes. If almost everybody who believes in part A also believes in part B, then A and B can be lumped together as one meme.\(^{47}\)

Dawkins then, arrives at a particulate nature for the meme, but why do some ideas propagate while others do not? He contends that memes will compete for the attention of a population and space and behave like 'selfish genes' do, competing for persistence in the society rather than in a gene pool.

What Dawkins doesn't mention, is that if memes leap from brain to brain and compete for persistence in a society, then presumably they have been doing so since there were brains available. Daniel Dennett refers to this:

"And just as the genes for animals could not come into existence on this planet until the evolution of plants had paved the way ... so the evolution of memes could not get started until the evolution of animals had paved the way by creating a species - *Homo sapiens* - with brains that could provide shelter, and habits of communication that could provide transmission media, for memes."\(^{48}\)

Why this is so important is that some of the original memes would have been persistent for a long time, and in that case there is opportunity for the memes to be subject to a *biological, genetic* selection if they confer a gene survival differential. This means that for the highly successful memes which are persistent and widespread, there exists a mechanism for genetic embedment, with the meme being seminal for the gene. Memes which achieved genetic embedment would then become the basis for a collective inherited aspect of the psyche, that is, they would become archetypal!

The problem which Dawkins experienced in attempting to define the meme or in resolving a single meme, is the same problem experienced in defining or resolving the archetype. Archetypes are genetically embedded ideas or predispositions; to recognise significance of situations, to know when to act in situations, and to remain connected to the emotional content of situations. If the previous statement sounds implausible from a hereditary perspective, a moments reflection on the instincts, indicates that the sentence sits quite comfortably as partially definitive of the instincts; also inherited. In a discussion of the inheritance of archetypes H.Dieckmann has this to say:
"Thus the archetype has one pole established in the psyche's genetic instinctual realm from which it obtains its energy, and its other pole in a collective symbolic imagery with its own specific cultural traits." \(^4^9\)

The consequence of the meme/gene connection is that the archetype may have two crucial aspects. The first is its meme nature and the second is its gene nature. The meme nature of the archetype implies that the seminal meme came into existence in competition with other memes, which vied for propagation with it, and at that stage its selection was not genetic and therefore not based on genetic biological advantage. The gene nature of the archetype is that it has undergone genetic biological selection independently to the meme selection which preceded it, and must therefore have had survival value for the evolving psyche, if in fact, the archetype is to be inherited.

Memes can be regarded as 'idea mutations' which evolve according to their own non genetic processes. The processes of meme selection would discriminate according to relative survival of the memes and give rise to the current 'meme pool'. Within that meme pool there would be persistent memes, which would then be subject to genetic selection, and some would achieve archetype status.

As an example, the concept that Jung refers to as the 'rebirth' archetype, \(^5^0\) is exemplified by the mythical phoenix bird of Egypt; reborn from its ashes after building its own funeral pyre it rises eternally young. It is possible to imagine the 'idea' of rebirth coming into existence by people observing vigorous plant growth occurring in soil rich with decaying matter; from death comes fresh invigorated life. More generally, the concept of spontaneous generation was the prevailing theory for the genesis of at least, the lower forms of life. This theory proposed that life forms such as worms and maggots arose spontaneously from decaying matter, and was the prevalent theory until the seventeenth century, when the scientist Redi proved these organisms have living parents.\(^5^1\)

Certainly the rebirth idea is clear in this birth from decay (death) proposition. Once the rebirth idea arises it then propagates as a meme and achieves some persistence in the meme pool. The concept of rebirth is then both persistent and widespread. The 'rebirth' meme, at this stage, could achieve propagation success by a \textit{non genetic} process, which could possibly occur in at least two ways. One process is that the rebirth meme provides some satisfaction to curiosity about enigmas of origins of life, which taps into, the presumably already existing instinct of curiosity. Hence the meme has appeal and will be remembered and transmitted from person to person. A second
possible process is, that it confers a biological advantage to individuals who remember and propagate it, that is, it has survival advantage for the 'carrier', but is not yet represented in the genes. If the meme does confer an enhanced survival on its carrier then it gets a share in this success, by propagation diffusion.

But for memes to be significant in any hereditary process they must become genetically embedded. In the above rebirth example, the individuals who accept the idea and hold it, may have a brain structure which predisposes them to do that, and so any such brain structure can be subject to genetic selection provided there exists a survival differential for the idea 'rebirth'. But the idea 'rebirth' can have great psychic survival value due to the fact that it can forewarn of life stages, for example, the death of childhood is the birth of adulthood. The concept of rebirth can also be psychically supportive in times of great loss or defeat and therefore, see us through many dark hours. It can also offer the hope of an afterlife, constituting the phoenix of the soul, certainly supportive in a dark hour.

From the foregoing discussion, four aspects can be distilled, which would be crucial for the genesis of archetypes:

Memes and their replication and selection mechanisms.
Genes and their replication and selection mechanisms.
The process by which a meme could become gene linked.
The selection mechanism for the genetically linked meme.

Of these, gene replication and selection is of course the basis of evolutionary theory and constitutes a foundation of biological science.

Previously it was stated that Dawkins considered memes to be subject to a selection process independent of gene selection, that is, an essentially autonomous process. His three stated qualities important for the success of replicating units, (longevity, fecundity and copying fidelity) form a basis to a study of meme selection processes, although these qualities were originally outlined by biologists in a gene selection context.

Genes can be thought of as DNA artefacts; structures produced by the DNA. (More precisely, lengths of DNA coding for the synthesis of critical proteins.) Organisms can be thought of as gene artefacts; structures produced by genes. Similarly memes can be thought of as mind artefacts, structures produced by the mind. Memes may be ideas, behaviours, significant, trivial, nonsense, vital, amusing; anything which has at least a fleeting existence in human thought or action. Memes are, as it were, mutations of the attention.
Once these 'mutations' come into existence they will either persist or not persist, depending on the processes of selection. Gene persistence also depends on processes of selection, and their favourable selection incorporates them into the carrier organism. To state this another way; genes largely compete for persistence by building 'machines' (organisms) which fight their wars for them in the arena of ecology; the organisms being the gene champions in the never ending intra and inter -species battles.

For genes to be subject to a selection pressure, it is a prerequisite that there exists some constraint of space or available material. This can occur at the chromosome level but is seen more obviously in the organisms ecological domain. In the ecological domain some of the constraints are on the availability of food, habitat and reproductive mates. Continuing to apply the processes of gene selection as a potential model for meme selection processes, it becomes apparent there must be some constraint on memes in order to produce a selection pressure process. The previous description of memes as mutations of the attention, suggests some possible constraints.

Immediate awareness has limits to its capacity; not all a person knows or can experience is in awareness simultaneously. Such a state would be, if not chaos, at least not workable as a set of experience helpful for guiding future actions or decisions. In effect it would be the unconscious state. The consciousness exists as a venue where ideas can be proximate to each other without being impossibly complex. And without an unconscious there could be no conscious, since the conscious is a subset of historical or imagined experience, which has momentarily won the struggle for attention, and if there was no unconscious, from what was the subset selected?

It is also worth considering, that if there was no competition between historical fragments for attention, then the juxtaposition of these fragments is predetermined, and thoughts and actions mechanical, without the possibility of creative selection. And in that case consciousness is redundant. Creatures driven almost exclusively by the instincts would be expected to be without a well developed consciousness. If there is no competition for attention between experiential fragments, but only 'hard wired' priorities, what then is the function of a consciousness, other than to see in retrospect what has already happened? Such a consciousness is a prisoner of experience, looking with a backward view at life's predetermined trajectory.

But such a consciousness can't exist, because nature can't evolve a functionless feature, since it is the function of a feature, which gives nature the
opportunity to select for effectiveness and therefore produce a reproductive differential.

Previously it was suggested that memes would compete for attention, that is, a momentary exposition in the consciousness. This competition would be possible if the available conscious domain was limited, as it would certainly seem to be.

Dawkins used the word meme to indicate an idea or concept which had already achieved some propagation in the culture, but I have here, been using the word meme in a more general sense, which overlaps and includes the word 'thought' or 'concept', that is, not in the sense of an exclusively interpersonal, propagated state.

Memes would have an origin in some individual, or simultaneously in more than one person, having arisen as an idea which won some exposition in awareness, and at that point the idea constitutes, as it were, an embryonic meme. For the reasons discussed previously this embryonic meme may or may not propagate throughout a community. If not, then the meme (concept) was not sufficiently vivid to the general community and remained only of individual significance. If however the meme achieved general propagation, then it has graduated from being a solitary event to being a 'species' and has entered the meme pool where it will be subject to 'inter-species' competition with the consequent selection pressure.

In biological evolution, once an organism, however simple, has been fabricated by an aggregate of genes then it presents the opportunity for further genetic mutations to contribute to its success and by so doing, the genetic mutations gain their own reproductive success. The more complex the organism becomes, the more opportunities it offers for gene attachment to the growing aggregate. These attached genes, hitch a ride to the future by fine tuning and enhancing the performance and survival success of the 'champion' they have collectively built.

It has been suggested above, that genes can be considered as DNA artefacts and organisms as gene artefacts. It has also been suggested that memes can be regarded as mind artefacts, arising as 'mutations' of the attention. When these memes enter the meme pool and a meme species has attained propagation, then these successful memes present the opportunity for further meme attachment, and those memes which attach to the already successful meme vehicle, share in its success, and by their nature may enhance that success; fine tuning like the genes in biological organisms. In this case a *meme organism* has come into existence; an organism which has been built by
the collective action of many memes. This organism can be considered a meme artefact and has achieved reproductive success because it appeals to the mind of many people and is easily propagated from mind to mind. It sits easily in the attention and manipulates the attention to gain propagation.

Some of these meme organisms may persist for a long time, perhaps many generations, if so, then gene evolution and meme evolution coexist. At this point if a connection is made between the gene selection and meme selection then the meme has the opportunity to become gene linked. That is, the meme may become embedded in the genetic material if *biological* mutations arise which bestow on an individual, a predilection for memes which in *addition* to being successful in the meme pool, *also contain a biological advantage*. An example of this connection and its genesis has already been discussed above in the phoenix idea. The meme organism once attaining gene attachment will be subject to meme evolution and gene evolution and the meme organism is then hereditary!

The meme organism will, like biological organisms, become more complex, and comprise a multitude of co-operative gene embedded memes. Such a meme organism would then: be inherited, contain ideas which have a natural appeal to the mind, have psychic survival value, and ultimately physical survival value, and would be shared by all people. These shared artefacts would not necessarily be conscious, just as the functions of most of the organs of the body are not conscious. They would have the potential to constitute a collective unconscious, that is, the meme / gene connected evolution, presents a possible genesis for the psychic archetypes.

The foregoing discussion of the meme / gene concepts and their possible relationship to the psychic archetypes is not intended to be presented here as some kind of definitive statement about the genesis of the archetypes, but rather its inclusion in this analysis is for purposes of outlining a possible mechanism for a genesis, since the literature offers very little in way of possible origins. This lack of any rudimentary hypothesis regarding an evolutionary origin for the archetypes leaves a kind of subliminal uncertainty in any discussion of the mechanism of archetypes and deprives the discussion of an important dimension. Jung certainly makes it clear he viewed the origin of the archetypes from a Darwinian perspective. To re-quote Jung:

"there are as many archetypes as there are typical situations in life. Endless repetition has engraved these experiences into our psychic constitution..."52
Further, in referring to 'patterns of functioning' which he calls 'images' he goes on to describe these images as 'primordial' and continues:

"They are the 'human quality' of the human being, the specifically human form his activities take. This specific form is hereditary and is already present in the germ plasm." 53

These statements, together with the fact that his definitive core or central tenet of the archetypes is the proposition that they are inherited, indicate the Darwinian perspective, since the concept of the inherited trait is itself a central tenet of Darwinian evolution.

If archetypes are inherited they are passed from parent to children, and if that is to occur it must be gene linked, if not, then it is implied that a completely new manner of inheritance is involved, a mechanism yet to be described.

Put another way; after fertilisation the zygote either carries the propensity for latent archetypes or it does not. If it does, then that latency was transferred by genes. If it doesn't, then the archetypes are not inherited. No other mechanism of inheritance is known and even if another mechanism of cellular transfer was described it would be an exclusively biochemical discussion and not of central importance here. Of course if the propensity for latent archetypes was acquired after fertilisation then inheritance of archetypes doesn't occur, and they are then to be classified along with all other acquired traits. In that case the archetypes are culturally acquired after all, and the collective unconscious doesn't exist. This is because each person would have acquired traits from a specific facet of a society and although there could be some shared common attributes, there would be no totally common collective.
THE UNIVERSALITY OF POLARITY.

Previously Jung was quoted referring to the dual nature of the archetypes:

"just as all archetypes have a positive, favourable, bright side that points upwards, so also they have one that points downwards, partly negative and unfavourable, partly chthonic, but for the rest merely neutral." \(^{54}\)

Jung gives an example of this duality in Merlin:

"... in certain of his forms, to be good incarnate and in others an aspect of evil." \(^{55}\)

On closer inspection the discovery of this dual nature in archetypes should perhaps come as no surprise, since it seems to be a universal fact that the closer the study of fundamental phenomena, the more ambiguous the observations and conclusions become. In general a close approach to the intrinsic nature of phenomena reveals what appears to be a duality of function or form or process, which defies resolution and leads to paradox. So pervasive, regular and universal is this observation that it could almost be said, that in any close and detailed study, the manifestation of paradox or conflict is indicative of proximity to fundamentals. This can be observed in most fields of study, certainly in the physical sciences, in the behavioural sciences and in religious studies.

In physics the discovery of the electron was considered one of the most revealing additions to scientific knowledge that had occurred, but as that study continued the positron was discovered, of opposite charge to the electron but equal mass; the electron's double or antithesis. (If electrons and positrons collide they annihilate each other.) Further, the electron revealed a wave-like nature and a particle-like nature. The still unresolved wave/particle paradox isn't a particular problem to science, since the mathematics is in place for predictions about the electron's behaviour in its pure science context or in its technological context and it is only the intuition that goes hungry for a resolution to the wave/particle paradox.

In Cosmology the big bang theory for the origin of the universe requires the acceptance that the entire universe came from a single point; 'every thing from nothing', leaving the intuition to boggle at the concept that is the antithesis of a foundation stone for physical science; the conservation of matter.
In religious studies, and / or psychology, the question of free will leads to directly opposing conclusions. If mind is the subjective experience of brain processes, and brain processes the interaction of billions of neurones, each a biochemical / electrical unit whose functioning is entirely mechanistic, then all actions are determined by pre-programmed response to experience and free will seems impossible. In which case no individual can be accountable for any action; no good, no evil. Yet in experience of life we are constantly selecting options which would seem to absolutely indicate free will, that we do respond to our environment in a manner which must be free will in action.

In all of these paradoxical situations the confrontation of opposing conclusions, human conclusions, presents the paradox. Presumably the phenomena are not 'confused', but have an underlying mechanism which manifests both the opposing aspects, and which is intrinsically dual in its nature but obscure to human understanding.

In the psychic context Jung observes:

"... for it turns out that all archetypes spontaneously develop favourable and unfavourable, light and dark, good and bad effects. In the end we have to acknowledge that the self is a complexio oppositorum precisely because there can be no reality without polarity." 56

Jung's "no reality without polarity", could perhaps be restated as; reality is a consequence of polarity. This statement certainly brings to mind the eastern philosophic concept of yin / yang. Chambers Dictionary offers this for yin / yang:

"the two opposing principles of Chinese philosophy and religion ... the former negative, feminine and dark, the latter positive, masculine and light." 57

Jung, in a discussion of the anima, comments:

"We encounter the anima historically above all in the divine syzygies, the male-female pair of deities ... and of classical Chinese philosophy, where the cosmogonic pair of concepts are designated yang (masculine) and yin (feminine)." 58

From the foregoing discussion of polarity and manifest paradox, it is evident that the concept of polarity in psychic phenomena has well grounded precedents in general. The whole concept of the archetypes, has as a central perspective, that they originate as psychic reflections of the outer world, (internalised environment), therefore this broader discussion is pertinent to a discussion of psychic polarity and provides more than a metaphoric
comparison, being rather a fertile and ramified context for the specific psychic study.

In Zen Buddhism use is sometimes made of psychic devices known as the Koans. The purpose of these devices is to promote an enlightenment experience in the noviciate, an experience which gives some higher level of intuitive insight into their own nature. In practice the noviciate concentrates with all possible focus and energy on the koan, to the exclusion of all else.

Possibly the most well known koan in the Western World is: "What is the sound of one hand clapping"? Repeated reference to this koan in a joking or humorous way has of course trivialised it in the West. The Western mind tries to solve this koan, but eventually decides there is insufficient information contained in it to find a solution, and so gives up, usually then dismissing it as nonsense. But the koan is not intended to have a solution, its purpose is to deliberately present the rationality with a situation that it, the rationality, has no chance of solving. It becomes a brick wall to the rationality. With the mind still powerfully focused on the paradoxical koan there can be an intuitive insight, subject to other preparations and previous training, which transcends the rationality.

From the perspective of polarity, this koan presents the mind with a situation, which it, the mind, knows from everyday life is obviously polar; two hands to clap. But the koan inherently deprives the mind of an intrinsic polarity and in the struggle to understand it, the mind is presented, not with the missing opposite, but with the underlying singularity which unifies all polarity. The noviciate, due to other preparation, experiences the singularity in an ego / other context and makes a discovery about the Self.

Jung, in his Foreword to 'An Introduction to Zen Buddhism' by Suzuki, refers to enlightenment as embracing an insight into the nature of self.\textsuperscript{59} Further in the same publication, Jung speaking of the Zen enlightenment experience, comments:

"If the fragments offered by, or forced up from, the unconscious are successfully built into the life of the conscious, a psychic existence form results, which corresponds better to the whole of the individual personality, and therefore abolishes fruitless conflict between the conscious and the unconscious personality."\textsuperscript{60}

M. Fordham in a discussion on Jung's concept of the Self, individuation, and the Eastern experience of the enlightenment says:
"In varying ways the parts of the self can cohere and then a sense of identity or wholeness and unity with the cosmos can emerge ... However, less absolute and more relative states of wholeness are achievable."  

The conscious / unconscious relationship is itself another polarity which under the conditions referred to by Jung, have a potential for a singularity, which ends the duality inherent in conflict, not by a unilateral supremacy, but by the subsumption of both in the singularity; that is, the resolution of the polarity. This singularity, not being either pole, suggests that it, the singularity, is the relationship between the poles. Jung refers to this conscious / unconscious tension and its equilibrium in the context of the development of the Self:

"It must be considered a psychic catastrophe when the ego is assimilated by the self. The image of wholeness then remains in the unconscious..."  

Here clearly it is a supremacy situation, possibly temporary, in the conscious / unconscious polarity.

One of the most fundamental archetypes to be found in Jungian psychology, is the shadow. Jung:

"The archetypes most clearly characterised from the empirical point of view are those which have the most frequent and the most disturbing influence on the ego. These are the shadow, the anima and the animus. The most accessible of these, and the easiest to experience, is the shadow, for its nature can in large measure be inferred from the contents of the personal unconscious."  

Jung then goes on to describe the shadow as the dark aspects of the personality, but describes some exceptions where the good qualities are repressed and the ego plays the negative role. In this case the more common ego / shadow roles are reversed. Jung is here clearly presenting the ego / shadow pair as a polarity, the shadow being the archetypal personification of the repressed psychic material and constituting the individual unconscious. It is clear that the shadow is well named, since it is the ego which casts this shadow or perhaps better; casts off this shadow.

The shadow is then to a large extent the archetypal personification of the personal unconscious. But this is not clear at all, since central to the whole archetype concept is that the archetypes constitute the contents of the collective unconscious, not the personal unconscious. If the shadow is the personification of an aspect of the personal unconscious, then in what capacity is it archetypal, and couldn't it be asked of Jung; is the shadow an archetype or
not? But the shadow is archetypal because the personal unconscious is archetypal, in the sense that the evolved collective unconscious knows well, of the existence of the personal unconscious and uses the symbol of a same sex personification to manifest an aspect of it; and anything the collective knows is archetypal. Further in this writing the shadow will be defined more specifically, since the description in the first sentence of this paragraph has a confusing overlap with the anima or animus.

Jung says that the shadow can be seen through and recognised fairly easily and states:

"With a little self criticism one can see through the shadow - so far as its nature is personal. But when it appears as an archetype, one encounters the same difficulties as with anima and animus. In other words, it is quite within the bounds of possibility for a man to recognise the relative evil of his nature, but it is a rare and shattering experience for him to gaze into the face of absolute evil."[64]

To encounter the evil aspects of the personal unconscious is not a confrontation with an archetype, but to encounter the collective's knowledge of the evil capacity of the unconscious is an archetypal encounter.

From the foregoing discussions and from the Jung statements it is clear that the shadow and the ego constitute a psychic polarity.

In general it can be said that a polarity is a conjunction of opposites keep separate by some barrier, force or energy. Opposite electric charges (positive and negative) attract, but can be kept separate by electrical insulation. In the psychic context the ego and shadow are kept separate by a conscious / unconscious 'barrier'. That is, the repressed psychic material, the shadow, is held from consciousness. But of course that material doesn't cease to exist; it is simply not easily available to consciousness. Jung's quote, just previously, regarding the ego being able to become aware of the contents of the shadow, raises several questions. If the contents of the personal unconscious are known to the ego then that content is no longer permanently unconscious and shouldn't the shadow cease to exist?

Even to propose that hypothetical question, supposes that all the repressed material can potentially be made conscious, and that is not at all certain. If a significant part of the repressed material were to become conscious, it would be expected that the shadow would be attenuated to a greater or lesser extent. It is well established that when psychic material is repressed it still maintains a psychic energy and exerts an influence on behaviour. But that influence is largely unconscious; its actions and
manipulations avoiding the censorship of the conscious ego. And in that case the ego is surprised by actions in which it doesn't appear to have played a part, yet may well be held responsible for that action.

If the shadow is the personification of the repressed, unconscious material and is one half of a psychic polarity with the ego, then in what psychic terms can the ego be described? Libraries of discussion and analysis have been written on the nature of the ego, from the psychological, philosophical, biological, physiological and religious points of view. Here the discussion is limited to the Jungian and archetypal perspectives, with the polar interaction the central focus.

The enigmatic nature of the ego quickly becomes apparent when we scratch the surface of the word-ego, by asking questions. Normally the ego would be described as conscious as opposed to the shadow which is unconscious. If the ego is conscious, of what is it conscious? Could the ego still be sensibly called the ego if there was no material to be conscious of? And could there be a conscious state without content? Is the ego the name for the material or the state itself or both? If the material only passes through consciousness, how can that material be a part of the ego, and does one conscious passing qualify for inclusion in ego, or two, or only the possibility of passing? If the repressed material, the shadow, becomes available to consciousness then has the shadow been subsumed by the ego, and if so, the shadow / ego polarity has ceased to exist and can the ego then be an ego, without reference to the shadow - and isn't this then "the sound of one hand clapping"? And even if all these questions were to be finally answered, what are we to make of the dream ego, which isn't supposed to be conscious?

In a discussion of the waking and dream ego, J. A. Hall uses the expression - 'a centre of subjectivity', for both these ego forms. But certainly the dream ego doesn't orchestrate the dream, since the dream ego is surprised by events in the dream and doesn't appear to have any fore-knowledge of these events. Also the expression - 'a centre of subjectivity', doesn't necessarily include consciousness, if it did, then the expression couldn't be used for the dream ego at all, since it, the dream ego, surely isn't conscious. And if 'centre of subjectivity', doesn't include consciousness, then the ego isn't necessarily conscious!

The ego, like many other psychic factors, is an elusive concept. All the previous questions while being provocative, also suggest that perhaps something is wrong with the assumptions about psychic phenomena and the language terms used to describe them. It is probably safer to be less insistently
definitive in approach to psychic studies and to abandon the idea that the ego or the psyche or the shadow is an object or 'thing', and as a thing - definable. Jung states:

"The ego, as a specific content of consciousness, is not a simple or elementary factor but a complex one which, as such, cannot be described exhaustively."66

These questions then, emphasize the danger of approaching psychic concepts as though those concepts are defined objects. While it seems clear the shadow - ego relationship does form a polarity in sufficient equilibrium for psychic stability, it is however naive to assume this polarity arises from two independently definable poles. Similarly 'left' and 'right' sides cannot be defined without reference to each other, yet their relationship is clear.

Underlying this 'object' assumption is the idea that the poles themselves have a potential to exist separately, in theory if not in reality. But the ego cannot exist separate to the shadow anymore than a wood carving can exist indifferently to the parings that were discarded in the carving process. It is in the discarding process that the carving comes into existence and so it is also in ego formation that the discarding process itself forms the ego from the material which is not discarded, and the shadow from the psychic parings; the exclusiveness of each defined with reference to the other. Jung comments:

"...all consciousness is manifestly founded on unconsciousness, is rooted in it and every night is extinguished in it."67

It can be seen, to exhaust the previous metaphor, that if the parings were gathered and fitted together, and reformed, the resulting mould shaped image is everything the carving is not, its perfect complement. So the shadow is everything the ego is not and is its perfect complement. James Hillman in 'Senex and Puer' in a discussion of the light of consciousness, says:

"Consciousness and the unconscious are created into a polarity at the same moment out of original twilight states; and they are continually being created at the same moment. The process of making conscious thereby also makes unconscious..."68

In a discussion of the ego, Murray Stein states:

"This ego-consciousness is a structured psychological entity - a "character structure" made up of habitual tendencies of thought, impulse management, and so on."69

The question of the attenuation of the shadow by means of some portion of it becoming conscious, needs to be reconsidered in the context of the last several paragraphs, since there is a difference between the ego being aware of
some of the shadow's aspects, and actual acceptance of those aspects. The ego then, would seem to have at least some capacity to look at the shadow and say "that which I perceive isn't me"! If any of the repressed shadow material were to be accepted as ego material, then the ego is obliged to be redefined in the process. But the ego is still relative to the shadow and can't be defined independently.

Again it can be said there are precedents to the psychic study, in the physical world, which also refute assumption. Mary Gammon discusses relativity and archetypes in 'Window into Eternity' and commenting on atomic particles says:

"Only in relation to other particles does the single particle become a wave or, if one prefers, a particle. Thus a particle exists only in relation to an aggregate of particles."^{70}

Would a single proton be recognisable and identified as the same proton, if it were encountered a second time by instrumental technique? Of course not, because it has a limited number of parameters such as mass, charge and energy and ultimately the question of recognition is as naive as asking would heat be recognised again as the same heat if it were encountered a second time, because heat is not a thing; not an object. It is the question that causes the problem. So even a concept as physical as a proton, isn't simply definable at an individual level. Much less then the psychic case.

Previously the concept of the Zen koans and their purpose in training of Zen Buddhist noviciates was discussed and Jung's Foreword to the Suzuki book quoted where Jung has referred to the enlightenment experience as an induced insight into the Self. The use of the koans to achieve a psychic insight into the nature of the Self, coupled with Jung's observations about the shadow, raises the question: is the achieved insight into the nature of the Self, the result of the contents of the personal unconscious, the shadow, becoming conscious? That is, is the enlightenment experience the result of the resolution of the ego / shadow polarity; with the experience coming from the realisation of the underlying singularity?

Jung's quote from the Suzuki book, concerning the nature of the enlightenment experience, referred to the abolition of the fruitless conflict between the conscious and the unconscious personality. Jung has also been quoted in his comment that the shadow can be seen through with a little self criticism, so far as its nature is personal. But the enlightenment experience must certainly require something more than a little 'self criticism'! It would seem then almost certain that this 'abolition of fruitless conflict' is not simply
the vision of the singularity underlying the ego / shadow polarity, but must also involve something much deeper, and constellate to some extent the collective unconscious.
PSYCHIC POLARITY AND THE ARCHETYPES.

Jung has described the shadow as the dark aspects of the personality, the cast off experience that the conscious mind doesn't want to own. If the conscious mind did not disown material, then it, the conscious mind, wouldn't be a subset of experience and the ego would then comprise all experience and could hardly be called an ego at all, because there would be nothing to distinguish it from the total of the personal aspect of the psyche. In this sense the ego can at least loosely be described, certainly not defined, as the exclusive conscious material together with the tension which exists, between the cast off material in its unconscious state and the conscious 'favoured' material.

Obviously questions can be asked about the selection criteria itself, and the selection process would also need to be considered in any description of the ego, but the point being made here is to clarify the ego as an aspect of a polarity. Without polarity; no exclusiveness. Without exclusiveness; no ego. Jung:

"Between the conscious and the unconscious there is a kind of 'uncertainty relationship', because the observer is inseparable from the observed and always disturbs it by the act of observation."71

If the ego is considered as an identity due to its exclusiveness, then the personal unconscious can also be considered an identity due to its exclusiveness, and this makes it clearer to see that the shadow personification of the personal unconscious is precisely what we would expect. If the carving is an identity, then the parings are also an identity. It would seem then, that the use of the word personification in describing the shadow, is more literal than metaphorical. However, there is a great deal of difference between material selected according to compliance to criteria and material rejected by non compliance. Material selected for compliance is a narrower subset than material of non compliance and is therefore more tightly constellated than the non compliance material. The unconscious material (non compliance) would therefore be expected to be less organised than the conscious material, because it is less centred, and the unconscious / conscious equilibrium would then favour dominance by the conscious; hence the ego.
Since the ego would seem to be formed by compliance to selection criteria, and the shadow to non compliance, the question of the nature of the criteria is pertinent to any discussion of polarity.

If the selection criteria is broad and consists of characteristics considered to be desirable, then the focus for selection will be on positive features and potentials, and the material discarded will be the negative features of non compliance, and as a consequence less centred and less dominant. If however the selection criteria are focussed on the rejection of undesirable characteristics, then the rejected material experiences some improvement in the tightness of its constellation and also some increase in its centredness and organisation, because this material is rejected for compliance to negative selection criteria. Any increase in the organisation of the repressed material will as a consequence narrow the gap in the ego dominance and increase the power of the shadow.

When the selection criteria is obsessively and overwhelmingly focussed on rejection of a narrow set of undesirable traits, then there is the risk of the rejected material being more organised than the selected material, which is more loosely constellated. In this case the conscious ego comprises the material 'left over' from selection and the shadow could be dominant, or at least very strong.

Previously Jung was quoted describing exceptions to the normal ego/shadow balance, where the ego does play the negative role. It may be that this discussion of sources of imbalances of the ego/shadow equilibrium, has some pertinence to the occurrence of sadistic violence by members of the clergy, whose claimed religious stance is gentle altruism and whose model is the forgiving and totally non violent Christ figure. This has occurred, for example, in the medieval inquisition. In this case perhaps a dominant and violent shadow is produced by an overly excessive focus on the traits to be avoided, rather than on more positive traits to be cultured, and all the foregoing discussion would predict a strong shadow as a consequence.

Certainly this aspect of the relative constellation and organisation of constituents of the ego and shadow has some bearing on the whole topic of compensation, both in dreams and in manifest behaviour. Also it needs to be stated that the total psyche comprises many polarities and the stability of the whole psyche would be dependent on the overall equilibrium of those polarities with their dominant / subordinate interactions and tensions.

While the ego is usually dominant over the shadow, the shadow will nevertheless exercise an influence on the individual's behaviour. If the ego is
ignorant of the shadow's content then this influence is largely unconscious. But if the ego is to some extent aware of at least a part of the shadow, then the influence of the shadow can be moderated by the ego and in that case the behaviour complies to the selection criteria applicable to ego formation and maintenance. Jung comments:

"Although with insight and good will, the shadow can to some extent be assimilated into the conscious personality, experience shows that there are certain features which offer the most obstinate resistance to moral control and prove almost impossible to influence. These resistances are usually bound up with projections, which are not recognized as such, and their recognition is a moral achievement beyond the ordinary."72

It could be asked of Jung what he means by 'moral'. Is moral the individual ego's view of life, or is moral the culture's behavioural average, or is moral an externally imposed authoritarian view, coming from a particular religious stance, or is it an innate knowledge of right and wrong? But almost certainly Jung is using the word 'moral' to indicate a psychic maturity of the individual and at this point a connection is made between moral and self knowledge. Since Jung's individuation process is essentially a pathway to self knowledge then the individuation journey is by its nature also a moral journey.

To the extent that the ego is aware of shadow traits then it, the ego, can modify shadow influence. Those shadow traits which are unknown to the ego can escape the ego's censorship and become manifest. That is, the shadow can see through and act through, the ego's blind spots.

The ego / shadow polarity is then far from being a complete and settled dominant / subordinate relationship, but consists of a dynamic interaction rather than a static one. In this scenario the shadow will be opportunistic and not miss a chance to 'have its say', no matter how ruthless or misleading that 'say' may be. It is also important to note that the shadow has full access to knowledge of the ego's actions but the reverse is certainly not true. The shadow then, is far more knowledgeable but the ego has the greater power of volition; usually.

Previously the dual nature of the archetypes was referred to, and their capacity for positive or negative manifestations stated, so indicating an apparent, inherent polarity of the archetypes. But human actions, including cultural and social actions, are ultimately actions of the individual, and even archetypes, as structures of the collective unconscious, can only find expression through individuals. The archetypes themselves, as inherited psychic structures, would seem to be amoral in the same way that the instincts
are amoral, in that they are neither positive nor negative, until expressed. The expression of the instincts, as also the expression of archetypes, will become positive or negative, moral or immoral, in the moment of becoming manifest.

But individual behavioural manifestations, whether from a source of personal experience or the collective, are surely mediated by the ego / shadow equilibrium, as discussed just previously, as this would seem to be the only passage from the inner to the outer worlds. The question then arises; is the potential dual nature of the archetypes, which we would expect to be neutral, due to the archetype's passage through the ego / shadow tension on the threshold of expression? Norah Moore makes a connection between the shadow and the negative side of the other archetypes in the following statement:

"The shadow can be attached to the dark side of other archetypes, and be difficult to distinguish from them."^73

In waking life, simply to speak or to move a muscle in any co-ordinated manner, or to respond to a situation, requires a participation on the part of the ego or the shadow. A psychic state without any presence of the ego (conscious) or shadow (personal unconscious) is a state of some degree of coma.

If archetypes have an innate dual nature at their origin in the collective unconscious, then we would expect to see evidence of some process of selection of the positive or negative aspects prior to manifestation. But since the archetypes are the content of the collective unconscious and by Jung's definition inherited, then they cannot be influenced at their source, by any action of the individual ego or personal unconscious, because if they can, then they are no longer intrinsically collective, but subject to modification by the individual and not collective after all.

This situation is analogous to the idea of genes not being able to be influenced by an individual's actions, that is, 'there is no inheritance of acquired traits'; inheritance of acquired traits is the Lamarckian view. If archetypes cannot be influenced at their source in the collective, by the individual's actions, yet when manifest exhibit a dual nature (and it would seem unlikely the positive or negative face is a totally random outcome), then the ego / shadow equilibrium is a potential influence for the positive or negative aspect of archetype action. In a sense this would be no surprise, since the archetypes as stated previously, are a readiness for action, not a reflex response, and therefore should initiate action appropriate to the particular circumstance.
If the ego/shadow tension is the source of the ambivalent nature of the archetypes, then the shadow is a longer and more dangerous shadow than imagined, since it can give a negative face to an intrinsically neutral archetype; with all the potency and behavioural omnipotence that the archetype implies.

In this ego/shadow equilibrium influence on the manifesting archetype, the power of that equilibrium is the same power that the equilibrium exerts on the instincts. For example it is obvious that the sex instinct is neutral in itself (of course biologically positive) and neither positive nor negative until expressed, when it can be destructive (damaging to human relationships) or constructive (enhancing human relationships). Since the instincts are inherited and powerful like the archetypes, and are aspects of the same collective continuum, the influence of the ego/shadow equilibrium on the manifesting archetype has a well established precedent in the instincts. Jung, in a discussion of the duality of the archetypes comments:

"We must not overlook the fact that opposites acquire their moral accentuation only within the sphere of human endeavour and action, and that we are unable to give a definition of good and evil that could be considered universally valid."74

If these archetypal opposites acquire their moral accentuation within the sphere of human endeavour and action, where else can this acquisition occur, but in the only route from the inner to the outer; the ego/shadow polarity relationship, which is in effect, "human endeavour and action".

Jung makes seemingly ambiguous statements about the shadow:
"...its nature can in large measure be inferred from the contents of the personal unconscious."75

But towards the end of the same volume:
"If it has been believed hitherto that the human shadow was the source of all evil, it can be ascertained on closer investigation that the unconscious man, that is, his shadow, does not consist only of morally reprehensible tendencies, but also displays a number of good qualities, such as normal instincts, appropriate reactions, realistic insights, creative impulses, etc."76

In the second statement Jung's inclusion of the instincts in the shadow's constitution would seem to give some component of a collective nature to the shadow, yet clearly in the first statement, and many times elsewhere, he has proposed the shadow as being the personal unconscious. This apparent contradiction can to some extent be explained by the fact that the collective unconscious knows of the existence of the personal unconscious, personifying
it as the shadow figure, while at the same time the personal unconscious has as
its contents personal experience. Because the collective knows of the existence
of the personal unconscious and the ego, from its aeons of evolution, and
personifies them (seen in dreams) as the shadow (same sex figure) and the
dream ego, there is as a consequence an interaction between the personal and
collective unconscious. Lionel Corbett makes this comment about one aspect
of that interaction:

"... mythical elements in dreams do not only depict pathology, they
depict the larger perspective in which we live. This perspective is also alluded
to by dream symbols and images that do not necessarily form part of a
collective story, but which convey a sense of depth to the individual
experimenter." 77

Furthermore, since the ego / shadow equilibrium is the mode of
expression of the psyche in the outer world, collective contents, by necessity,
can only achieve expression via the ego / shadow polarity. Contents of the
unconscious come into expression through the conscious ego, or if aspects of
the shadow are unknown to the ego, escape conscious detection, yet manifest
as action. The most notable of these unconscious actions being the projections.
AN ARCHAEOLOGY OF ARCHETYPES.

As stated previously, it is well entrenched in Jungian psychology that long standing human stories such as myth, legend, and fairy tales have archetypal content, and often this archetypal content can be discovered by careful examination of the motifs, symbols and concepts, contained in those stories. In such an examination a greater understanding of the deeper meaning of the story is often revealed. That is to say, we learn more about the story, from the archetypes; often a story of some aspect of the human saga.

But conversely, it is possible to learn about the archetypes, from the story. In which case, myth, legend and folk tales become sources of information about the archetypes, and in this sense it could be said that there is an archaeology of the archetypes. An archaeology which recognises that psychic artefacts are buried in the story; remnants of the human psyche, sifted from the dust and clutter of what is only individual, to tell an even older story, of the collective, a story which reminds us that the human psyche passed this way before; long before.

If the positive or negative nature of the inherently neutral archetype is a result of the archetype's transit through the ego / shadow equilibrium at the time of the archetype manifestation, then mythological stories and legend may support that proposed process.

In the famous folk story of Aladdin and the Lamp, there occur several motifs which can be seen to involve some archetypal figures, especially the shadow, the ego, anima, and the Self. This story is reproduced in Appendix 2, and is copied from 'Stories from the Arabian Nights'.

*In the folk tale, Aladdin, a poor boy who is lazy and whose father is dead, is watched and approached by an African Magician who pretends to be a loving, long lost uncle but who really intends to use the boy to find a magic lamp.*

The poor boy or peasant boy, that is, the naive inexperienced youth occurs often in folk tales and fairy tales and is almost always configured as the embryonic hero. As a contrast to the magician (magic and unknown, mysterious) the naive boy lacks the knowledge of the mysterious. The magician is a shadow figure, dark, same sex, dangerous. Of the magician in general, Jung says:
"The hunter or old magician and the witch correspond to the negative parental imagos in the magic world of the unconscious." 79

Although the boy is naive, he is necessary for the completion of some project which even the power of the shadow, unconscious, cannot perform alone. Clearly the boy symbolises the conscious ego, which is not always aware of the actions of the unconscious but has the greater volition.

The magician treats the boy and his mother with kindness and gives them gifts in order to win their trust.

The unconscious can be deceitful, fooling the conscious.

The magician then takes Aladdin on a day's journey to a secret place where he gets Aladdin to go down into a hidden tunnel, which the magician has uncovered by magic.

The magician (shadow) escorts the boy (conscious) to the under place, the unconscious place, which is unknown to the conscious ego. This place is uncovered by magic; the power of the unconscious. The ego couldn't find the entrance to the unconscious without the action of the shadow. But the shadow couldn't complete the task without the ego's volition. Without knowing it, the boy has begun his journey to hero status; Selfhood.

It can be seen at this point that although the shadow, the magician, has his own agenda, nevertheless his actions are necessary for the journey to Selfhood, and it is for this reason that the Jungian view is that a higher power is indicated in directing the drama of individuation. In this sense the Self is moving towards its own manifestation journey; a journey not without danger. In this journey the ego and shadow interact to produce a result that neither could achieve alone, and the 'marvellous' aspect to this, is that although the interaction is antagonistic at the tactical level, it is co-operative at the strategic level.

In their apparent opposition the ego and shadow are bringing about a growth of something higher which subsumes them both. This concept of the birth of something higher from the interaction of conflicting opposites is not exactly the same as a resolution (end of opposition) to the conflict. Rather the maintenance of the conflict equilibrium is the foundation of the higher identity, and therefore the vision of the singularity, referred to previously, is not the vision of the conflict resolution, but is instead the vision of the conflict's function seen from the perspective of the higher identity, which is dependent on that function.

This essential nature of conflict returns the discussion again to the ancient concept of yin / yang and its foundation position as the prerequisite for
existence. Jung referred to the singularity underlying psychic opposition, not as a resolution but as a marriage of opposites,\textsuperscript{80} a word well chosen, which doesn't imply a static situation but instead suggests the birth of the new from the old. In his study of the functional nature of conflicting opposites Jung refers to the 'mysterium coniunctionis',\textsuperscript{81} a secret union of opposites; a concept entrenched in Alchemy which transcends the simple idea of a resolution.

Before Aladdin enters the underground place the magician gives him specific instructions and also a magic ring.

Aladdin, the ego, is instructed by the shadow, since the ego doesn't have the knowledge of the unconscious and must listen to the shadow. He is also given a magic ring; something of the power of the unconscious.

Aladdin is to find a lighted lamp, extinguish it and return with it. The magician knows that he cannot get the lamp himself but must get Aladdin to get it for him.

The lighted lamp, the consciousness, must be to some extent closed down in order to interact more fully with the unconscious.

The boy follows the instructions and after passing through great halls and a wonderful garden of trees hanging with precious stones of many kinds, he finds the lamp and on his return journey fills his pockets with the precious stones.

Aladdin, the ego, discovers many things in the unconscious which he didn't know existed, discoveries about himself, which he stores in his pockets and is therefore enriched by the experience.

When Aladdin is about to come up out of the place in the ground the magician demands he hand up the lamp, but the boy insists that the magician wait until he is out of the tunnel.

Now it is clear the magician, the shadow, has his own agenda; dominance of the consciousness and possession of the power of the lamp which is greater than the shadow's own power. The boy insists on returning to above ground, that is, to full consciousness.

The magician is enraged by this and using his magic causes the opening to close over Aladdin, who is then trapped underground and left in darkness.

The magical power of the shadow traps Aladdin, the ego, in the unconscious. The individuation journey certainly has dangers and Jung refers to this fact many times.

The magician leaves Aladdin to his fate and returns to Africa.
Now Aladdin, the ego, must find his own escape and the shadow has returned to his own natural and exotic place.

*Accidentally rubbing the ring which the magician had given him, Aladdin releases a magical being from the ring who declares himself to be the slave of the ring and that he will obey whoever wears the ring. Aladdin asks to be taken from the dark place and is instantly transported to his mother's home.*

Aladdin has saved himself by using some of the power gained from the shadow, without which he couldn't have been saved. Ironically the shadow which trapped him has also given him the power to release himself. The antagonistic, yet magically co-operative interaction of the ego/ shadow pair, again indicates a higher planning and unobserved director to the unfolding drama. The escape is magical. Not logical, but of the unconscious. The being from the ring is the slave of the wearer, not an adviser nor necessarily a helper, just a slave, not Aladdin's slave but a slave to the wearer of the ring. A slave which only has life through the wearer, not an independent life. Seemingly the powerful being is amoral and neutral; an exclusively archetypal influence from the collective unconscious has now entered the story for the first time, for better or for worse.

*Not knowing the power of the lamp Aladdin and his mother decide to sell it to get money for food. But on rubbing the lamp a huge figure rises from it and towering above them asks them what they want, and tells them it is the slave of whoever holds the lamp.*

Now the second exclusively archetypal figure from the collective unconscious appears in the story.

*Aladdin and his mother are terrified of the genie which is glaring down on them.*

This being is a terrifying figure, and it also, like the slave of the ring is amoral, neutral and powerful. The manifestation of an archetype can be terrifying or inspiring but is always accompanied by an experience of the numinous.

*Though trembling with fear, Aladdin asks for food which the genie instantly provides. The mother is sure the genie is evil and wants to sell the old lamp but Aladdin realises the worth of the lamp and the ring and decides to keep both to make use of them.*

The archetypal figure, the genie, can present as evil since it doesn't have a particular moral stand. Neither the being from the ring nor the genie of the lamp have any agenda of their own, in contrast to the magician. Archetypes
have a expression through the ego / shadow interplay but are latent until evoked, as is the genie from the lamp. The ego / shadow pair however, is at the interface of the inner world of the psyche with the outer world, and this interface is the site of action and response, and of necessity that response must be specific. For action to be appropriate, the ego / shadow interface must 'take a stand'. The underlying collective is however the source of vitality, and imparts a momentum to the energy of those responses in a manner which implies previous and profound knowledge of human situations, needs and dilemmas.

Both these ring and lamp archetypal figures have their manifestation origin in an object, the ring and the lamp, and these objects are their symbols. Although these archetypal figures manifest as human figures (as would be expected since they are personifications of structures of the psyche) yet they grow from a small symbol, the ring and lamp. Whereas it seems ridiculous to suppose that they have any autonomous life within the symbol object, yet there is an aura about them of an ancient existence.

This idea of an ancient existence of magical figures is common and pervasive throughout fairy tales and folk tales. The ancient existence doesn't seem to have continuity, but is rather expressed intermittently (has life only when elicited from the corresponding symbol) and this is the nature of the archetype - its latency until elicited! Archetypes, being constituents of the collective, are ancient and do have a vast evolutionary history and it should come as no surprise to find that their personification in myth includes the fact of that ancient nature.

The ancient existence of archetypes is to some extent in conflict with their intermittent nature and offers another kind of polarity between structures within the psyche. If the archetypes are only expressed intermittently, then in what form is their latency held? That is to say, what really happens to the genie when it returns to the lamp?

For several years Aladdin and his mother live well by selling the valuable plates and things which the genie brings them, until one day Aladdin falls in love with the Sultan's daughter.

The Sultan (another form of King) is a symbol of the Self. Jung makes this King / Self connection throughout his writing.82

After much trickery on the part of both Aladdin and the Sultan, Aladdin eventually wins the consent of the Sultan, to marry the daughter, by getting the genie of the lamp to help him. He is so changed by the power of the lamp
and by his golden robe, "such as a king might wear", that the people don't recognize him as the poor boy of previous times.

Aladdin the ego moves towards the Self, but this gradual mergence is not smooth nor easy, but full of dangers, difficulties and trials. With Aladdin's gradual change he is becoming more 'King like'. This transformation is facilitated by the interaction of the shadow and other aspects of the unconscious, such as the gems (self knowledge) he found in the underground garden in his unconscious, together with the manifest archetypes, the collective. The King meanwhile is careful about testing Aladdin to be certain he is ready for Selfhood.

The princess is an anima figure and this becomes clear as the story unfolds and her part in the drama is seen to be central.

Aladdin asks the genie of the lamp to build a magnificent palace for him to live in with the Princess. The Sultan is pleased and impressed and Aladdin marries the princess. Aladdin and the princess live in the palace and Aladdin serves the Sultan and wins many wars for him. Aladdin remains uncorrupted by his rise to power and his proximity to the Sultan, and is gentle, courteous and kind to all.

Aladdin is passing all the tests of the King and proving his worthiness to be close to the King. Through his marriage to the princess Aladdin is connected to the King, since she is related to the King by birthright and yet she is related to Aladdin by their actions of choosing each other. The anima, the princess, is the mediator between the ego and the Self and other psychic aspects. Jung says of the anima:

"...the anima is the archetype of life itself."§3

But now the magician learns of Aladdin's escape from underground and his wonderful palace, and intent on possessing the lamp returns from Africa and tricks the Princess, who doesn't know of the lamp's power, into giving him the lamp. The magician then rubs the lamp and the genie appears and is ready to obey the magician. The magician tells the genie to carry off Aladdin's palace with the Princess inside and to set it down in Africa. The genie immediately obeys and the palace is removed.

The Princess who has been central to the interaction between Aladdin and the Sultan has now become central to the interaction between Aladdin and the magician. The anima personified by the Princess has facilitated the relationship between the ego (Aladdin) and the Self (Sultan) but now the anima initiates further conflict between the ego and the shadow.
The genie (the evoked archetype) has confirmed its amoral, neutral nature in that now it does the will of the shadow, which includes possessing the Princess (the anima).

The Sultan finds that the palace has gone with his daughter and thinks that Aladdin has cheated him and abducted the Princess by some enchantment. In anger the Sultan has Aladdin put in chains and is ready to kill him. Aladdin wins the chance to find and return the Princess and temporarily save his life. In despair Aladdin rubs the ring and the genie of the ring appears and Aladdin asks for the return of the Princess and the palace and that his life be saved. But the ring genie tells Aladdin that only the genie of the lamp can do that, so Aladdin asks to be taken to the palace and the Princess.

The shadow, magician, has caused the neutral archetype, the lamp genie, to undo what was previously achieved by Aladdin. The anima, the Princess, is absent but the absence itself has initiated further conflict between the ego, the shadow, and the Self, and has diverted the 'lamp archetype' to destructive purposes. There is now an estrangement between the ego and the Self. The anima, the princess, is causing a vigorous and vital conflict between the psychic factors. Aladdin the ego has evoked another archetype, the ring genie, to help, but this archetype cannot undo what the other archetype has done. This helplessness on the part of the 'ring archetype' suggests a specificity of archetype action or a hierarchy of archetype power or perhaps both.

If a person is under the influence of a particular archetype it seems reasonable to expect that the archetype manifestation would inhibit the manifestation of other archetypes and that there would be a limit to the number of simultaneous manifestations. If this was not the case then multiple manifestations would produce a chaos of conflicting psychic directions and energies in the individual.

The ring genie transports Aladdin to the Princess and the palace in Africa, and after meeting, they plan to defeat the magician and take the lamp back. The magician is deceived by the Princess using feminine charm and is killed by Aladdin and the Princess. Aladdin takes the lamp back and on rubbing the lamp, commands the genie to return them and the palace to the Sultan's land.

The ring archetype is helpful in Aladdin's quest but cannot directly oppose the lamp archetype; a mutually exclusive influence in the archetypes. The anima and the ego now co-operate in the defeat of the shadow. (Later it is to be found that this is not a permanent defeat). The anima, the Princess, is
largely responsible for the loss of the lamp but now is largely responsible for its return; the net gain being further co-operation of the anima and the ego and the whole conflict moving towards a conclusion. The use of feminine charm by the anima is a reminder of the capacity of the anima to deceive, including the deception of the ego.

The Sultan is astounded and elated by the return of the Princess and the palace, and Aladdin and the Princess tell him of the lamp and the magician. There is once more, peace between Aladdin and the Sultan. But now the magician's brother vows revenge on Aladdin and is determined to steal the lamp. This second magician kills a holy woman in order to take her robe and veil for a disguise. Dressed as the holy woman this magician also deceives the Princess and tells her that the palace is imperfect without a "roc's egg" hung in the dome. Aladdin wants to please the Princess with this addition to the palace.

The Sultan, the Self, and Aladdin are close again but the magician, the shadow, is resurrected and is still in opposition. The holy woman is a second anima figure. The Princess and Holy Woman are anima figures that very commonly appear throughout folk tales and legend. (The extent of the world wide attention, focus and grief given to the recent deaths of Princess Diana and Mother Teresa is a confirming example of the immediate psychic archetypal recognition and reverence for these two, by the population).

The shadow fakes an anima figure in order to deceive and manipulate the situation to regain power. The roc is a giant magical bird of middle eastern mythology, "capable of devouring elephants". 

Aladdin calls the genie from the lamp and asks for the roc's egg to be hung in the dome of the palace. At hearing this the genie is enraged and shrieks that Aladdin has requested that he kill his master by destroying the egg. But the genie then tells Aladdin that he knows it was requested naively and that the magician faking the holy woman is to blame. The genie then vanishes.

The egg is a symbol of potential and incubation of latent power and combined with the magical roc, has in Middle Eastern mythology the status of the sacred. The shadow has attempted to trick Aladdin into committing psychic sacrilege. This sacrilege was to occur in the palace and so defile the palace.

But now a most remarkable event has occurred; the genie has revealed another master other than the lamp holder, and this master is superordinate to the lamp holder. The archetype has in fact a permanent master to answer to!
In addition to this revelation the genie has now revealed a moral side to its nature. It has refused to commit the sacrilege and also it has perceived Aladdin's innocence and in addition to forgiving him, has warned him of the magician. There is revealed a level at which the archetype does have an intrinsic morality!

The archetype has until now, had a positive or negative action depending on the influence of the ego / shadow equilibrium but has been amoral and neutral in an intrinsic sense. In so far as there was polarity and conflict in that equilibrium, the archetypes could be projected positively or negatively, but when the archetype was directed negatively towards an unseen, ultimate master then it is found to have a moral side.

The conflict played out between the ego and shadow is conducive to growth towards Selfhood. Interaction between the ego and shadow is therefore amoral at a higher psychic level, because the details of that polarity are amoral in the sense that this is a war of growth and any action which strengthens the one, strengthens the other; as long as Selfhood is approaching. In a discussion on conflict in neurosis Jung makes the following very significant statement:

"A neurosis is by no means merely a negative thing, it is also something positive. ... In reality the neurosis contains the patient's psyche, or at least an essential part of it; and if, as the rationalist pretends, the neurosis could be plucked from him like a bad tooth, he would have gained nothing but would have lost something very essential to him. That is to say, he would have lost as much as the thinker deprived of his doubt, or the moralist deprived of his temptation, or the brave man deprived of his fear."85

The unseen director of all this saga has allowed the archetype manifestations to be used one way or another. But when the point is reached at which the archetype manifestation is potentially destructive of the growth process itself, then the archetype has reached a psychic taboo and takes a moral stand. In the psychic context 'moral' therefore means; that which is conducive to growth. The conventional understanding of what constitutes sound moral character is by no means contradicted by the previous sentence, since psychic growth towards Selfhood increases altruism. To repeat the earlier comment by Jung:

"We must not overlook the fact that opposites acquire their moral accentuation only within the sphere of human endeavour and action..."86

It is necessary to remember that the psyche, like a species of organism, is the instrument of its own success. From the evolutionary point of view the psyche must have mechanisms of self promotion and preservation. The
archetypes, for all their ambivalence, must ultimately be conducive to psychic development and welfare. But this is not to say that psychic catastrophe can't occur at the individual or collective level, as also catastrophe can occur to an organism or species. (The antlers of a buck deer are certainly conducive to survival as instruments of defence and contest, but can dangerously entangle the buck.)

Archetypes, as structures of the psyche, must be fundamentally 'good' - for the psyche. The projection of an archetype through the ego / shadow pair may be positive or negative in action and as previously stated good in promoting opportunities for growth towards Selfhood by facilitating conflict. However components of the total psyche above that conflict constitute the unseen director of the continuing drama, a drama which is played out progressively more in the palace of the psyche, which, in the Aladdin story, was to have been desecrated. The genie ultimately answers to this unseen power and cannot directly in itself damage the Self or psyche.

Now the question of what really happens to the genie when it returns to the lamp, can be answered - *it sleeps at the feet of the true master!* The latency of the archetype is essentially its attendance to the evocative directive of the psyche.

*Aladdin with the help of the Princess kills the second magician and peace follows. Aladdin and the Princess live together in happiness for many years and when the Sultan dies they succeed to the throne and rule wisely and well and there is peace throughout the land.*

Aladdin is triumphant over the re-emergent shadow with the help of the anima (the Princess) which again has initiated the conflict between Aladdin and the shadow by allowing the shadow to approach. The anima, personifying the total unconscious has interacted with the ego and the shadow which itself personifies the compensating aspects of the unconscious. Through this, Aladdin has moved much closer to the Sultan, and the Sultan has accepted him.

The Sultan dies, *as a separate identity*, and Aladdin is now the Sultan. The ego and the Self have achieved conscious Selfhood in harmony with the anima and live peacefully and govern wisely in the palace of the psyche. There is also peace throughout the land; the manifest Self is at peace and miraculously brings peace to the world.

Social and cultural states are surely reflections of the inner states of the myriad psyches which comprise those states. Social unrest ends when individual unrest ends. Jung states:
"... the psychopathology of the masses is rooted in the psychology of the individual."  

Further in the same discussion Jung comments on the social state of Germany, after the first World War:

"...the tide that arose in the unconscious after the first World War was reflected in individual dreams, in the form of collective, mythological symbols which expressed primitivity, violence, cruelty: in short, all the powers of darkness."  

The shadow is dealt with, not by denial but by the path to individual Selfhood, that is, the process of individuation; a process which requires the participation of the ego, the shadow, and the Self, with the mediation of the anima (or animus).

It is of interest to observe that the Sultan (the Self) at no time interacted with the magician (the shadow) directly, but only through Aladdin (the consciousness) or the Princess (the anima). To propose that the Self could deal directly with the shadow is to propose that the ego could be bypassed and this assumes that the Self is a ready made entity which only has to move into consciousness for Selfhood to be attained. But the unconscious aspect of the Self is a half of the embryonic conscious Self which requires the other embryonic half, the consciousness, to manifest its potential. Polly Young-Eisendrath gives a critique of the idea of the Self as an aware entity, which in some way can 'consciously' contrive to fulfil wishes and desires:

"What I have just described is an account of the Self in analytical psychology that is non-essentialist and does not posit an eternal ongoing Self - or a Self with views and desires - but rather conceives of this archetype as the predisposition to unity within the context of multiplicity or diversity in inner and outer life."  

It is the potential itself which seeks fulfilment in actualisation, working unconsciously, like the digestive system, tirelessly, to digest everything which comes to it in order to promote the well-being of the whole organism. Ann Ulanov, in a discussion of the Self, makes this statement:

"The Self is neither wholly conscious or unconscious but orders our whole psyche, with itself as the mid-point or axis around which everything else revolves."  

The roc's egg which was to be hung in the palace, and so killed, was claimed by the genie of the lamp to be his master, but this master unlike the other psychic aspects, was not personified. Instead this aspect was symbolised as potential, growth and holiness; the roc's egg. The unseen master, the
director of the drama of individuation, which allowed the struggle to continue, is discovered to be that potential itself, in the process of becoming manifest. Jung in a discussion of an individual patient's dream, has the following to say of the symbolism of the egg.

"The egg is a germ of life with a lofty symbolical significance. It is not just a cosmogonic symbol - it is also a 'philosophical one'. As the former it is the Orphic egg, the world's beginning; as the latter, the philosophical egg of the medieval natural philosophers, the vessel from which, at the end of the opus alchymicum, the homunculus emerges, that is, the Anthropos, the spiritual, inner and complete man, who in Chinese alchemy is called the chenyen (literally, 'perfect man')."\(^91\)

Whereas the Sultan was the personification of the actualised Self, the roc's egg was the symbol of the potential of that Self to exist. The potential itself wasn't personified, and this is because any personification is untrue until the Self is actualised, since only then is its form known. For this form to be known requires the potential and the ego to coalesce; Aladdin and the roc's egg become one - the Self - the Sultan. As Jung would say, the homunculus emerges.

The archetypes then, are seen to have a dual nature in so much as they acquire a positive or negative aspect on manifestation at the ego / shadow equilibrium, that is, at the threshold of volition. At a higher psychic level, they are found to be neutral while their manifestation, positive or negative, promotes integration of the ego with the unconscious potential of the psyche. When the archetype manifestation is constellated with the ego or shadow as to be possibly negative towards the emerging potential, then the archetype has reached a psychic taboo and is revealed as intrinsically positive towards that potential; as would be expected of any evolved psychic organ.

While it is true that the genie does the will of the holder of the lamp, it is also clear that the holder does not own the genie. The ego - shadow equilibrium may be decisive in the positive or negative action of the archetype but is never fully in control of the archetype. Rather the great power of the initiated archetype is liable to corrupt the holder of the lamp, by the capacity and outcomes of its action. For example, the magician lusts for the power of the lamp and is corrupted by that power. For this reason the initiated archetype is infectious in a population and if rampant may do immense harm. It is this kind of infectious, destructive archetype that Jung was able to perceive active in the dreams of individuals in pre-second World War years. Jung:
"When such symbols occur in a large number of individuals and are not understood, they begin to draw these individuals together as if by magnetic force, and thus a mob is formed. Its leader will soon be found in the individual who has the least resistance, the least sense of responsibility and, because of his inferiority, the greatest will to power. He will let loose everything that is ready to burst forth, and the mob will follow with the irresistible force of an avalanche."\textsuperscript{92}
THE DUAL NATURE OF THE ARCHETYPE.

Observations and discussion of the dual nature of the archetype is so common in the Jung works and in the general Jungian literature that it is perhaps the only aspect of archetypal psychology on which all writers agree. However the general conclusions are that the archetype has an intrinsic dual nature (not a neutral nature) which can manifest one side or another, more or less by chance or the luck of the draw - great good or great evil, but little is said of the mechanism of selection between the two faces of the archetype. In a discussion of the 'moral' archetype Robert Grinnell makes the following comment:

"The other archetypes are "amoral" in their primordial state, even though they are constellated in positive or negative form, and indeed it seems almost impossible to predict which of these alternatives will have the upper hand in a situation."93

Other writers also speak of the dual nature of the archetypes. Hillman speaks of polarity as a potential within the archetype, and during a discussion of psychic polarity in general he states:

"... for psychology the primary poles are conscious and unconscious... However, this primary polarity is given only as a potential within the archetype which theoretically is not divided into poles. The archetype per se is ambivalent and paradoxical, embracing both spirit and nature, psyche and matter, consciousness and unconsciousness; in it the yea and nay are one."94

In the above, Hillman also is presenting the polarity of the archetype as an intrinsic feature of mystical nature, "ambivalent and paradoxical". His reference to both "psyche and matter" suggests the subjective and objective aspects of the archetype, the personal psychic experience of the evocation and the worldly consequence of the manifest archetype. It can be seen that the polarity of the archetype can be experienced in these two worlds of the inner and the outer. Certainly in the outer world the action of an archetype is potentially polar, as for example; a war driven by aggression and the quest for power, or a war driven by defence of a weaker nation. In the subjective context the experience of the evoked archetype is always described as an experience of the numinous, an experience producing both fear and attraction simultaneously; an inner polarity.

Previously Jung was quoted giving Merlin as an example of archetype duality, being variously portrayed as good incarnate or an aspect of evil. Jung
was also quoted regarding archetypes having a bright side that points upward and a negative one which points downwards. The inference being that the archetype is intrinsically dual-natured. Andrew Samuels refers to the dual nature of archetypes:

"Archetypes express a built-in polarity between positive and negative aspects of experience and emotions."\(^95\)

If the archetype has an intrinsic or "built-in" dual nature, how comfortably does this sit with the archetype as an evolved psychic structure? In general, anatomical organs evolve to serve the purposes of survival. If psychic structures, psychic organs, have evolved for survival value then they would be beneficial to the psyche - not positive and negative intrinsically. In the previous discussion of the ego / shadow interface and in the Aladdin story, the dual nature of the archetype was attributed to the equilibrium existing at the moment of archetype manifestation.

When the shadow has a moment's window of opportunity to seize the archetype in the act of its surfacing and direct it to the shadow's own unconscious purposes, then the power of the archetype may have a destructive action. But if the surfacing archetype is perceived by the conscious ego, then there is the opportunity for the motivating and organising power of the archetype to be immensely beneficial. The individual is enchanted by the manifesting archetype, and would be described as either fanatical or inspired, depending on which way the archetype was refracted as it crossed the threshold of volition. And of course depending on the attitude of the observer.

If the archetype is considered to be intrinsically bipolar, not neutral, in its latency, then there is the problem of reconciling this bipolarity to the phylogeny of the archetype as a survival adaptation. To be inherited it must have evolved, to have evolved it must impart some survival advantage.

Jung is repeatedly quoted by other writers as stating that the archetype is unknowable in essence and perceived only when its essential capacity is occupied by some content. Samuels, in a discussion of the problem of inheritance of psychic features states:

"... it is impossible for psychologists to hold that mental imagery or other contents can be passed on in that way. [Samuels refers to inheritance of acquired traits.] However it is perfectly reasonable to argue that, while content is not inherited, form and pattern are ..."\(^96\)

Jung insists that the archetype is a capacity, not a content, and that the capacity itself is unknowable. This description appears unscientific because it is too vague and because the notion of the archetype as a 'capacity' and as
unknowable leaves nothing to be challenged, that is, the notion is unfalsifiable. Michael Adams, in a discussion of Jung’s use of the word archetype, comments:

"Many non-Jungians erroneously believe that what Jung means by archetypes are innate ideas. Jung expressly repudiates any such notion. Archetypes are purely formal, categorical, ideational potentialities that must be actualized experientially."97

But there are certainly other notions equally elusive which nevertheless are accepted as fact.

Instincts are of course inherited and as stated previously form a continuum with the archetypes. Fear, as an instinct, is a capacity not a content. Different individuals will fill that capacity with content depending on the various psychological influences in their lives. That content may be a fear of heights or of snakes or of darkness, but each is identifiable and definable. However, fear itself, without content (and also excluding content in the personal unconscious) is an elusive quality and indefinable. Fear has no sense outside its context of experience; it is not a quality which could be measured (without content) and has no existence outside of living beings.

Because the archetypes and the instincts do comprise a continuum in their shared innate nature and inheritance, then in the discussion of the duality of archetypes it is useful to examine the apparent intrinsic dual nature of the instincts. Taking fear as an inherited capacity, it can be seen that if the capacity is occupied by content which is really dangerous in its nature, to the individual, then the fear fulfills a safety requirement of the individual. And of course that is the function of the fear instinct— to warn, and protect an individual from potentially lethal or dangerous situations. So the capacity to fear serves a vital survival function and is inherited but its content is not inherited.

Individuals certainly have different fear contents; from spiders and snakes to heights or enclosed places. The content will come from the individual's environment because if a potentially dangerous factor exists in a particular environment then it is biologically wise to avoid that factor, so the fear capacity will generate avoidance behaviour and promote survival. In any individual the fear content will be absorbed to a large extent from the behaviour of the adults close to the growing and developing child and is mostly rational. For example a fear of heights is biologically wise if it generates cautious behaviour in the vicinity of heights.
However there are other aspects of fear, which, if refracted through the ego / shadow equilibrium in a biased manner in favour of the shadow's perspective, can elicit behaviour which is negative in its action, and some of these would be described medically as phobias. In an environmental context, the widespread destruction of sharks, stemming from irrational and compulsive fear, would be a negative outcome from the fear instinct, even though it is wise to fear the shark, within reason. It is possible then to describe fear as having positive and negative sides and therefore an intrinsic dual nature which would assign a mysterious quality to the action of an instinct; just like the archetype. The mysterious nature of the fear instinct is however more clearly seen and more appropriately assigned to the fear capacity without content, which is then discovered to be an elusive quality defying definition and adequate description; and again just like the archetype.

This discussion of the dual nature of the archetypes, whether intrinsic or by refraction through the ego / shadow threshold of volition, is elucidated by the symbolic context of the ancient Roman god Janus. (The source of the name January.) Janus is well known mainly from depictions of the god having one head but two faces, which present in opposite directions (see Appendix 3). In the Encyclopedia of World Mythology, Janus is described as the god whose name denotes any passageway. Images of the god were placed in passageways and the god was considered present in every door or gate. It is significant to note that this double aspect head of Janus is very ancient and its origins unclear - in the nature of archetypes embedded in other ancient myths and legend. The same encyclopedia has this to say:

"The precise origin and earliest character of Janus eluded even Roman savants. His name denotes any passageway, usually the classical arch, and yields the common Latin word for 'door' (iānua). The god was considered present in every door or gate. Nevertheless he remains best known for his function in certain public arched gateways which did not belong to a fortification system. It is not clear whether iānus primarily meant the passageway itself or its god. Equally unclear was Janus's function within the passageway."98

The dual nature of an archetype can itself be considered archetypal, since this dual nature is as ancient as the existence of other archetypes. The double face of Janus is certainly suggesting duality and when symbolically placed in doorways would seem to be signifying the double nature of the doorway as the going in and going out, inward looking and outward looking.
But in the exact use and placement of the Janus image, the going in and going out, seems an inadequate explanation of the Janus symbol.

Janus images were especially placed in *passageways*, inferring the *transition* between inner and outer, rather than simply the door itself. Jung uses the word passage in a psychic context in the following:

"The shadow is a tight passage, a narrow door, whose painful constriction no one is spared who goes down to the deep well."\(^{99}\)

Further, the countenance and aspect of the two faces do not seem to imply differences such as introversion and extroversion, inward looking and outward looking, as might be expected. The deployment of the Janus image at *public* arched gateways, also lacks a personal ethos of inner and outer but instead suggests *the formal grand exit or entry*. One famous but small temple of Janus (see later in this writing) was considered as a symbol of war or peace by the Romans; again inconsistent with the simple inward - outward explanations.

The Janus image is better understood and its use and deployment clarified, when it is considered as a symbol of the opposite and polar nature of projected actions. The dual nature of an archetype can certainly result in opposite actions at the point of manifestation, as the psychic energy of the archetype is imparted and directed positively or negatively in the passageway of volition. Janus is appropriately symbolic of that dual nature.

It is significant in this discussion to note that this 'dual nature' god was deployed in the passageways and at the doors; that is, at the *threshold* of the inner and the outer. This archetypal symbol of a dual nature with its emphasis on the *transition* from the inner to the outer, is suggestive of the concept of the dual nature of archetypes being a consequence of their refraction through the ego / shadow interface at the moment of becoming manifest, rather than an intrinsic dual nature; the archetype's positive or negative action being acquired in the 'passageway' of actualisation.

The previous quote from the Encyclopedia of World Mythology, states that the image of Janus was deployed in public arched gateways which did *not* belong to a fortification system. If the two way countenance of Janus supposes two outcomes at the threshold of the inner and the outer, then it would seem inappropriate to suggest, by the placement of a god figure at the doorway of a *fortification*, that the outcome at that doorway could be dual; since it would constitute a statement of uncertainty about the outcome of a conflict of war and hence an insecurity and an act of loss of faith in Janus!
A further statement in the Encyclopedia of World Mythology, on a small but famous temple dedicated to one form of Janus, is revealing:

"The small rectangular building had double doors at each end, which caused this Janus to be called geminus, 'twin' ... A statue of the two-faced god was within this bronze enclosure ... This unusual temple stood as a symbol of war or peace to the Romans. Many Latin writers confirm how the open Janus betokened war and the closed Janus peace, the opposite of what might be expected. In explanation of this anomaly, students in modern times have argued that Janus was imbued with the vigour of war and therefore was closed in peace and open in time of war."\(^{100}\)

As a symbol of the potential of an evoked archetype for positive or negative actions on a colossal scale, the open Janus would certainly symbolise the more obvious negative result of a contagious, destructive, unleashed archetype - "the vigour of war". The positive action of an archetype is more likely to be a result of the action of the rational ego and as a consequence less obvious and vivid than the archetype refracted towards the shadow end of the ego/shadow equilibrium. The "closed Janus" then, would appear to lack this vigour of war, since evoked archetypes perceived by the conscious mind would be mediated by restraint - the closed Janus.
THE CENTRALITY OF THE EGO/ SHADOW POLARITY.

It is important in any discussion of psychic polarity to emphasize the co-dependence of each 'pole' on the other for continued existence.

A magnetic pole of a magnet has no existence on its own without reference to the other pole, since a magnetic pole is not an object nor a place but is a direction and there can be no direction without the opposite. A magnet cut in half makes two smaller magnets, each with its polarity (direction).

Without an ego there couldn't be a shadow and without a shadow there couldn't be an ego, as discussed previously in this study. When faced with polarity, it seems to be human reflex to conclude that the polarity needs to be 'fixed', that any intrinsic polarity is symptomatic of a lack of stability or coherence. In a psychic context an out of balance polarity can of course be associated with illness but the natural function of polarity as a dynamic equilibrium producing stability, is well established in psychological thought. Hillman comments:

"Analytical psychology as a structured field depends for this structure upon polar descriptions."101

Life as an interaction between an organism and its environment is essentially polar in its nature; the organism achieving successful existence by balancing the demands of the environment with its own needs. In the inner world of the psyche a similar successful existence is achieved by balancing the demands of various psychic components; for example the balance between the instincts and the rationality. Jung's work constantly refers to polarity, especially in discussion of the archetypes. To re-quote Hillman:

"Jung's life and thought makes more use of polarities than does any other major psychological vision."102

Jung was able to repeatedly extract the essential polarity existing in fairy tale and legend and to reveal the psychic context and significance of that polarity. He was also able to identify these psychic concepts in alchemical writings. Jung in a discussion of a German fairy tale, 'The Princess in the Tree', makes the following statement:

"Between the three and the four there exists the primary opposition of male and female, but whereas fourness is a symbol of wholeness, threeness is not. The latter according to alchemy, denotes polarity, since one triad always
presupposes another, just as high presupposes low, lightness darkness, good evil. In terms of energy, polarity means a potential, and wherever a potential exists there is the possibility of a current, a flow of events, for the tension of opposites strives for balance.\textsuperscript{103}

In the Aladdin story it was seen that the growth of Aladdin towards Selfhood, becoming the Sultan, was facilitated by his continual struggle with the shadow. It could be asked however; was his growth merely facilitated by that struggle, or was the struggle in fact an essential prerequisite for his growth? This is the idea suggested in the words of the old and common proverb, 'adversity strengthens the ego'. (Ego in this context referring to the personality or character, not the modern, more specific psychological meaning).

It is possible to view psychic polarity, and the resultant tension which is generated, in perhaps two ways.

In the first way, polarity can be regarded as a psychic configuration which the psyche learns to deal with, and if successful, eventually removes, producing a state of balance which is essentially static in its nature. In this case the absence of polarity itself, removes tension. Here, the tension between polarities is regarded as an unfortunate situation and good psychological health depends on its removal. This would not be the prevailing psychological view.

In the second way, polarity is regarded, not as an unavoidable curse and consequence of psychic life, but as the origin of psychic life; the source of tension and the generator of spirit. The polar tension itself is not a consequence of psychic life; psychic life is a consequence of the polar tension. Rather than being a static balance, this balance is essentially dynamic in its nature, that is, there exists a continual interaction between psychic components, each of which in its action is to some extent, expansionist in relationship towards the others.

Homeostasis produced by a static balance is very different in its nature to homeostasis produced by a dynamic balance. In the static situation, no change is possible since there is no opposition of forces and in fact no forces exist nor need to exist. In the world of living nature, this situation is analogous to a world without environmental pressures, without predators and competitors, and without selection for successful form or behaviour. In the natural world the static situation is lethal, because, should the environmental conditions change, there is no flexible mechanism to accommodate the changes and in fact the natural world owes its existence to the opposition of
life forms. Human beings are a life form, immersed in life, and engaged with life.

Homeostasis produced by a dynamic balance is an equilibrium of opposing forces. If one of those forces is increased the equilibrium will shift unless the opposing force is also increased. Disturbing a system in dynamic equilibrium produces a response from the system, and the action / reaction opposition has an 'equilibrium seeking' result. By their nature, dynamic equilibria are buffered against chaotic collapse.

This concept of homeostasis based on a dynamic equilibrium is a ubiquitous fact and could be classified as a true universal. A whole branch of chemical science is based on reactions which are in a state of dynamic equilibrium, and which respond in predictable ways, to physical or chemical stresses placed upon them. In the galactic sphere, stars are stable since their expansion forces are in equilibrium with their contraction forces, for a certain time. Blood pH is held in dynamic equilibrium by the body's physiology (and is 'buffered' against threatened dangerous shifts).

In the psychological context the equilibrium existing due to psychic polarity and subsequent conflict is connected with the incidence of neurosis. In a discussion of conflict and neurosis Jung has this to say:

"Without this initial opposition there is no flow of energy, no vitality. Lack of opposition brings life to a standstill wherever that lack reaches."\(^{104}\)

This statement of Jung's appears to be presenting neurosis as a sign of a healthy state! But in the full context of his view of this, he is presenting the presence of neurosis as an improvement seeking reaction. And in the same paragraph goes on to say:

"In the neurosis is hidden one's worst enemy and best friend."\(^{105}\)

Darwin's publication of 'On The Origin of Species' in 1859, proposed a theory of evolution based on natural selection. But that publication, in addition to presenting a mechanism for the origin of life, also presented an idea which perhaps was more confronting to human sensitivities than the concept of evolution itself. That contained idea was the notion that each species was in opposition to every other. Species weren't limited in population nor extent by their own deference to others but were confined and contained by the expansive pressures of all others (including situations of symbiotic relationships which are never the less, self serving). Every species was seen to be living in an environment which was a multi - polarity of numerous species, each in opposition to the others yet coming to a dynamic equilibrium with the others and consequently forming a collectively stable whole.
Without this multi-polarity there would be no natural selection nor its consequent reproductive differential for survival fitness, and therefore no ecology, and in fact no species. It is discovered that the tension of polarity in nature is not some unfortunate consequence of life, but that life is the consequence of the tension of polarity, exactly as the earlier and identical psychological statement. The ecological context of polarity and its tension has presaged the psychic context.

It has been previously stated that the literature on the psychic archetypes contains numerous references to an intrinsic polarity of the archetypes. That concept of an intrinsic polarity has also been discussed here and a case presented for the apparent intrinsic polarity being in fact due to the refraction of the archetype through the ego / shadow equilibrium. In this view the ego / shadow equilibrium has superimposed its own polarity onto the projected archetype.

The observed polarity of the archetypes gives rise to a duality in the nature of manifest archetypes. This induced duality leads to the observed fact, of many, if not all, psychic phenomena existing in pairs. In a discussion of archetype manifestation and pairing, Patrick McNamara makes the following statement:

"As unconscious contents move towards the threshold and are then subjected to the doubling effect ... Some of these psychic complexes / entities also become personified ... The combined effects ... lead (at the cultural level) to an amazing array of archetypal figures who are twins, opposites, syzygies, doubles ..."\(^{106}\)

Each member of these pairs appears to be the antithesis of the other, for example the wise old man and the wicked magician. From an initial and perhaps simple view, the wise old man is the image refracted towards the benevolent end of the ego / shadow equilibrium and the wicked magician is the image refracted towards the malevolent end of the equilibrium. This statement however, needs qualification and modification, because it suggests that all the good traditional moral qualities are in the realm of the ego, and assigns all the bad traditional moral qualities to the shadow.

If it was this simple, then the conscious ego would only be capable of moral good and the shadow only capable of evil. But human beings are certainly capable of conscious, knowing, contrived evil. The gas chambers of the Nazis remind us of this fact, and even though it has been previously pointed out that Jung perceived the impending violence, in the unconscious of many people at that time, nevertheless the evil actions were implemented with
full awareness. Conversely the shadow is capable of benevolent acts, for example, a reflex action which is too fast for conscious mediation and which results in an altruistic act; many heroic actions in wartime would seem to be of this type.

When the conscious differentiates from the unconscious and the ego and the shadow polarity form, the selection for conscious attributes isn't necessarily exclusively for morally good traits, but is influenced by many factors in the social and psychological environment. The selection process is for traits considered desirable. This could include traits which a social consensus would consider evil, as in the case of a person deceiving and defrauding someone weaker or less aware, and then feeling that was a fair victory, because it demonstrated their own strength. For the shadow's part, there can be unconscious traits, which a consensus would consider good. For example, a capacity to be gentle, may be discarded and relegated to the shadow in the ego differentiating process, because it was considered weak, and therefore an undesirable quality, by the developing individual's significant and influential people.

If the ego differentiation process is largely orchestrated by the social and psychological environment of the individual, then it is expected that the traits assigned to the ego or shadow, will not be the same for all people. Therefore just as all ego's are not the same, then also all shadows are not the same, and they are not the only source of evil, nor are they only a source of evil. Jung commenting on understanding characteristics of the shadow observes:

"On this level of understanding, evil appears more as a distortion, a deformation, a misinterpretation and misapplication of facts that in themselves are natural."107

The relegation to the shadow, of a quality 'to be gentle', because it is considered weak, would seem to be a 'misinterpretation and misapplication of facts that are natural'.

The manifest duality of archetypes caused by refraction through the ego / shadow equilibrium produces a 'catalogue' of archetypes which exist in pairs of polar opposites. Each of these pairs have been produced by the bifurcation of a single archetypal feature of the psyche on its journey from the collective unconscious to conscious manifestation, and this idea has been argued in the previous discussion on the instinct of fear. In this journey to expression, however brief, the archetype was given an ego orientation or a shadow orientation, as it, the archetype, became externalised. A single archetypal capacity can be considered to have an ego form and a shadow form and
together these two forms can be seen as the source of the archetype's dual nature.

Previously Jung was quoted referring to the image of Merlin as having a 'good' form and an 'evil' form. The common and familiar form of the evil magician, as in the Aladdin story, has its antithesis in the good wizard or wise old man image. These two contrasting images of good and evil can be seen as the 'ego deflected', and 'shadow deflected', forms of a single archetype. The inherited archetype is seen to be the underlying capacity without specific content, as was observed previously in the case of fear as a capacity without specific content. Whereas it is possible to speak of fear as a familiar sensation to every person, although perhaps with different content, it raises the question about recognition and common experience of the archetypal capacity underlying the evil magician / wise old man images.

By comparing and contrasting the images of the evil magician and the wise old man, there can be found certain characteristics which are shared by the two, and other characteristics which are in opposition. The essential archetype is the inherited capacity without form, whereas the two polar forms of 'ego deflected' and 'shadow deflected' manifestations are the archetype in two particular, expressed, projected states.

It would be expected that any characteristics of the essential archetype would be present in each and both of the polar forms, but characteristics acquired by ego or shadow deflection, would be in opposition and would bear the marks of the contrasting extrusions of the archetype into two overt forms. This expectation is the same as that for the instinct of fear, in which, as stated previously, the essential instinct is the same for all fear experience but expressions differ in form. The common experience of fear contains many physiological signs such as increased heart rate and sweating and also other more subjective aspects such as an impulse for avoidance with feelings of terror or dread. This common experience of fear is in contrast to the individualised content of the fear instinct in which the situation feared is specific and not necessarily shared by other people.

On examining the wise old man and the evil magician figures, shared features can be found.

Both these figures have or are thought to have, special important knowledge or powers. The magician in the Aladdin story certainly exhibits special knowledge of the lamp and its magic. He also demonstrates special power when he opens the ground to reveal the trapdoor and the underground stairs; he can cast spells. Among historical figures, Rasputin certainly bears the
indicators of the archetype. He was spoken of as having personal magnetism, and being able to stop the bleeding of the tsar who suffered from haemophilia. It was claimed that an attempt to poison him failed due to an extraordinary resistance to the poison. In modern times the evil magician role is often perceived to be filled by the 'evil scientist' (special important knowledge), who is thought responsible for the world's ills and suffering, being the cause of wars and the origin of imagined plots and conspiracies; the hijacker of our lives from the 'better days' of the past.

The hermit is perhaps the most familiar image of the wise old man and in general expectation is assumed to have special knowledge for which people seek his counsel. He is generally thought to have special powers in matters of health and often a special understanding, friendship and communication with animals. In addition to the hermit, examples of the wise old man archetype are the North American Indian medicine man, the South Asian Indian guru and the religious monk. Folk stories and literature in general are littered with images of the wise old man. The Gandalf figure in the trilogy, 'Lord of the Rings' by Tolkien\textsuperscript{108} is the exact wise old man image and is the 'good form' of the magician that Jung has spoken of. Among public figures, Mahatma Gandhi is often revered and portrayed in a manner that certainly suggests that to many people he was perceived as special, and assigned a status by them indicating a wise old man archetype.

The special knowledge and power possessed by both images of the wise man and wicked magician is indicative of the special power and innate knowledge expected from the ancient origin of the archetype. An archetype which informs us that such men can and do exist, and prepares us to recognise them on sight.

The evil magician and the wise old man often have unknown origins. Very little is known of their home land or where they come from, and when they are not being active in a story or legend, they just seem to disappear and it is not known where they are, which adds to an aura of mystery about them. The evil magician in the Aladdin story returns to some exotic unknown place in Africa and Gandalf disappears and can't be found, many times in the Tolkien story. This unavailability and unknown origin is shared with other archetypal figures such as the genie of the lamp, and this genie archetype is itself an example of the ego deflected (Aladdin has the lamp), and shadow deflected (magician has the lamp), forms of the single underlying archetypal capacity.
When legend or fiction writers describe a person of mystical wisdom and his powers, they usually don't discuss the special person's childhood and his origins. Such a discussion would seem to lessen his status in the reader's eyes, unless some precocious talent was being presented, by making him more normal and as a consequence perceived as less special. We have an expectation that the mystical, knowing man, good or bad, had no childhood! The Bible clearly makes this point in the following passage:

"And on the sabbath he began to teach in the synagogue; and many who heard him were astonished, saying, 'Where did this man get all this? What is the wisdom given to him? What mighty works are wrought by his hands! Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary and the brother of James and Joses and Judas and Simon, and are not his sisters here with us?' And they took offence at him. And Jesus said to them, 'A prophet is not without honour, except in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house.'"\textsuperscript{109}

The expectation that the good wizard or wicked magician had no childhood is consistent with the concept of these two manifestations arising from the single underlying archetype. This underlying archetype in fact has no 'childhood' (development) in any individual's lifetime but arises ready formed from the collective unconscious, having evolved over many lifetimes and transcending any particular one. This expectation we have for the magician, good or evil, is also consistent with the expectation for the genie of the lamp, who springs from the lamp, 'ready made', every time!

The evil magician and the wise old man influence people. The evil magician can cast magic spells and capture the will by 'charm' or potions. He can deceive important people and therefore manipulate their behaviour. In the Aladdin story the magician gains the lamp and when he subsequently removes the palace, the Sultan is angry at Aladdin. The wise old man, or 'good' magician, also can cast spells, and influences people by advising them in important matters and when decisions are about to be made. He often advises kings and generals but is usually sought out by the people he advises; rather than being a leader, general or king himself. That is, he is to one side of the main stream of activity, because his influence is predominately in advice not action.

Archetypes certainly influence people, because that is their nature, to influence and galvanise us to action at critical moments when decisions or action are essential.

Another important feature shared by the common archetype of wise old man and evil magician, is that they usually do not have a normal social
interaction with others on a casual basis, and often have no regular friends. This social isolation enhances the idea of their unavailability and difference, and therefore they are perceived as being even more exceptional.

The archetypes are not personal in their nature, since they are structures of the collective, and would not be expected to be limited or confined to the specific case.

A further feature of the good and evil magician is the special clothes that they usually wear. Magicians good or evil, are normally portrayed in robes with tall magician's hat. Rasputin was a monk and would have worn the monk's habit. Gandhi rejected western clothes which he previously wore, and subsequently wore a simple wrapped loin cloth, which was different to the general population of India at that time.

To perceive the archetype is to recognise it from various attributes, and the first of these attributes is its immediate and obvious presentation. The robed magician is a visual sign of his significance over the ordinary.

All the foregoing shared features of the wise old man and the evil magician are indicative of the common underlying archetype, a capacity without particular or specific content until refracted through the ego / shadow equilibrium.

On refraction through the ego / shadow equilibrium however, the archetype takes on characteristics of the ego or shadow and these characteristics are responsible for the projection of the archetype in its ego clothing or in its shadow clothing. The archetype projecting both the good magician (wise old man) and the evil magician, reveals its pathway through the ego / shadow equilibrium by the contrast in the acquired characteristics.

It is important to remember that the person, actual or fictitious, that is considered as typical and representative of the good magician or bad magician is only symbolic of one aspect of the archetype that all people carry. The identity nominated as an example, may himself possibly be what he is, by reason of virtuous shadow or conscious evil. The main point being that the archetype is refracted one way or the other in an individual, and what is considered good or evil is with reference to the cultural consensus, and also in a more biological perspective, that which is better or worse for the survival of people. The Rasputin figure is symbolic of the consensus shadow, but Rasputin himself may have been consciously evil.

The possibility of an innate conscience, raises some considerations. If all human beings are born with a conscious and perfect discernment of good and evil, then such a conscience must be archetypal. If that is the case, then by
being excluded from 'good', there must also be an archetypal evil. The choice
to then act in a good or evil manner, would be dependent on resisting one
archetype or another, and the question could then be asked, what was it in the
conscious mind which made the choice, if it wasn't influenced by the
psychological ambience and context of the maturing person!

The archetype common to the good or evil magician has left signs of its
intrinsic 'capacity without form' on its expression in the outer world, as
outlined in the foregoing discussion. This intrinsic capacity was seen to be
present in both the expressed forms of the archetype. However the
acquirement of form by ego or shadow passage would embed ego or shadow
characteristics on the expressed archetype, and these two would be in contrast
to each other and would bestow on the archetype the two polar forms of the
archetype bifurcation.

In contrasting the good and evil magician figures, the most apparent
difference is that the good magician acts for the welfare of others, whereas the
evil magician acts for self interest. Gandhi was perceived as acting for the
common good of his people, even sacrificing himself by living an austere life,
for a selfless cause. The Aladdin story magician is totally devoted to pursuit of
his own power and influence even to the point of kidnapping the Princess. The
good magician Gandalf figure in the Tolkien story, denies himself great
additional powers, by refusing to accept a special ring, because he perceives
the power of that ring would corrupt him. Rasputin was generally perceived to
use his power and influence for his own selfish interests and if history has
recorded his life accurately, acted always for his own gratification.

The evil magician being a shadow figure, is representative of the
unwanted aspects of psychic life 'discarded' during ego formation; aspects
which are considered undesirable by the individual, who himself has had his
internal standards of inclusion / exclusion influenced by his cultural context.
This cultural context exists at the family, friend's group, town, nation and
many other diverse and wider levels.

While it may be biologically and genetically sound to say a species
survival strategy is best served by selfish individuals in order to evolve suitable
genes, as perhaps Dawkins would say, however a society's survival is best
served by selfless individuals. The society which promotes selfless action also
promotes its chances of survival. The genetic imperative isn't disconnected
from the social imperative. Stable societies promote individual survival and
therefore gene survival. In the world of nature, social bees form a collective
which enhances gene survival which enhances the collective survival, because
the genes for the instinct for the collective behaviour prosper. This very involuted or circular consideration, highlights the fact that human beings are a product of the natural world, and though so different, it is important to consider the biological foundations of human life during psychological discussion.

The two polar forms of the psychic archetype are representative of the conscious and personal unconscious, wanted and unwanted aspects of the personality; a personality which can live for itself only, or for others, or more normally - something of both. The discarded aspects of psychic life form the attributes of the shadow because they don't cease to exist on rejection, but are simply banished from conscious life, which then normally denies them the celebration of volition and conscious expression.

Genes also can be rejected, by natural selection, but don't necessarily cease to exist either, since they may be reduced to a low frequency level survival, where they wait in the 'wings' as it were, for their opportunity, should a future environment favour them. Many genes in this category are recessive, relative to dominant genes. This sidelined genetic material of low expression is not immediately annihilated by nature but persists as a background resource of genetic tools, just in case, and in this form can be spoken of, perhaps with some licence, as nature's shadow. This biological shadow isn't greatly expressed unless it is needed for survival reasons, such as a change in the environment which causes a greater survival rate for the low frequency gene, resulting in a higher expression.

The psychological shadow also, doesn't have a high expression normally, but certainly must contain material which can be good for survival under certain conditions. The average person isn't particularly violent, consciously, but in time of emergency many people exhibit violence which may be justified in a survival sense. In time of war this is demonstrated by quite normal people being able to kill others by violent means because suddenly it was necessary for personal safety, or for the protection of others. This almost instant ability would seem to have come from the unconscious, springing ready made from the attributes discarded in a more civilised time or context. If the psychic attributes discarded during ego formation had really been annihilated, then shadow responses would not be available. In a similar manner to that in which the biological strategy was to archive its currently less useful genes, just in case, so the psyche has an unconscious resource of psychic attributes also, just in case.
The comparison of the biological / genetic circumstance, with the psychological circumstance, yields pertinent comparative strategies, which at the very least are fruitful for analysis of the psychological case. However, the discarded psychic material in the personal unconscious is very different to the biological / genetic case, since the psychic material is sufficiently organised to consolidate into the shadow identity or personification.

The second most apparent difference, after the 'selfless / selfish' difference, between the good and bad magicians, is that the good magician is usually perceived to oppose oppression by resisting an evil or sinister influence. In this role the good magician opposes the tyrant but himself answers to no authority other than his own counsel. The evil magician often seems to have an unfair advantage by some mighty support or delegated authority. The magician in Aladdin has the advantage that he is the only one who knows all about the lamp. Rasputin has the advantage of the tsar's confidence, and access to the most powerful people. On the other hand Tolkien's Gandalf must oppose the growing evil enveloping the land, an evil which appears much stronger that he is. Gandhi opposed the power of the British empire by what appears to have been a personal inner revolution; his simplicity against the perceived oppressor.

The good magician often seems to snatch victory from the greater evil forces at the last moment. But his victory is often due to some personal moral attribute rather than sheer power. Gandhi focuses a nation by his simple determination and austere life. He can resist an empire by refusing to eat, and all the impersonal power and pressure of the empire is neutralised. Gandalf plays a vital part in victory over the evil empire in the Tolkien story, because he is personally incorruptible, whereas Rasputin manipulates the powerful to achieve his aims. The good magician usually suffers in his struggle against the oppressor, Gandhi's privation and hardship, and in the Tolkien story Gandalf undergoes a transitional, transforming, symbolic death.

In contrasting these opposing attributes of a single archetype, refracted to the ego end, or the shadow end, of the ego / shadow equilibrium, it can be seen that the characteristics of the archetype personification are the characteristics of the ego or shadow; the proposition already presented.

The shadow deflected, magician archetype has much greater knowledge than the ego deflected, magician archetype, because the shadow knows everything consciously acquired and everything unconsciously acquired, so Aladdin's magician has the greater knowledge. The ego usually knows only the consciously acquired knowledge. In addition to this, the ego forgets; the
shadow never forgets. To the unconscious, the conscious is transparent: to the conscious, the unconscious is opaque, usually. The unconscious shadow has access to the physiology of the individual, that is, it has influence in important and powerful ways; Rasputin. The shadow acts for itself, for its gratification and selfish reasons, because those attributes were selected for exclusion from ego and consequently included in shadow, by default. Here is needed the general qualifying observation that the shadow image under discussion is the consensus shadow.

Gandalf, as the ego deflected, magician archetype, pits his power of volition against evil forces because that is the nature of the ego; the greater volition, since it can choose to exclude. He refused the power of the corrupting ring, by free choice, and that corrupted power is assigned to the shadow. The shadow gets what is excluded, and its identity forms by whatever orderly system can be gleaned from the chaos of the discarded fragments of experience, and lives forever in the twilight of the censoring volition of the ego.

The ego deflected magician archetype, acts for others because the ego has formed according to criteria largely absorbed from the social environment of the particular culture in which the individual has been nurtured. Any culture will favour those actions which support the coherence of that culture, so the individual acts for others, in the consensus culture, and may be self sacrificing.

Gandhi sits in the dirt in his simple loin cloth and denies himself food and comfort, a denial which increases his power of volition and assigns 'comforts' to the shadow, the selfish and evil oppressor, and in this action Gandhi manifests the instantly recognisable good magician. Instantly recognised, because the potential good magician resides in all of us, in equilibrium with the potential evil magician. These two are the one inherent archetypal magician, manifest in the world according to balance or bias in the ego / shadow relationship.
EGO, SHADOW, AND INDIVIDUATION.

Previously the polarity of the ego / shadow pair was described as an essential polarity, more than just important for ego formation, rather the polarity is ego formation. This is so, because the ego is an exclusive subset chosen from all experience and potential response, and by its formation is polar, relative to the cast off unwanted fragments of the embryonic shadow. It was also argued that the shadow provides an archive of possible responses to situations beyond that encountered in the 'normal' life. These considerations are reminders, that of course, the shadow is a major and normal structure of the psyche.

In the discussion of the manifest good magician and the manifest bad magician, the shadow was portrayed as the negative, wicked and dark side of human nature responsible for all evil, deflecting the power of an archetype to its own selfish purposes. This was modified by the observation that not all evil is unconscious and not all good is conscious. In addition to this, Jung has been quoted describing many positive attributes of the shadow. As stated previously the shadow has been formed by what is rejected from ego, by ego selection criteria; criteria influenced by a cultural environment at a personal specific level, but also at a broader more general level. This broader more general level of selection criteria contributes to the formation of a shared component of ego at a collective level and constitutes, what can be called, the consensus ego.

The consensus ego is that which most agree should be consciously mediated behaviour. Such behaviour is perceived as 'good' by most people. The other part of ego, the unique and specific part is that which we as individuals consciously manifest in addition to the consensus ego actions. This unique, and perhaps controversial part, may be condemned as evil by others who have assigned these actions and attitudes to their own shadow.

The consensus shadow has already been spoken of in earlier discussion and is the shadow component which most people agree should be assigned to the shadow, where it is hoped it will remain hidden and innocuous. In addition to the consensus portion of the shadow, is the specific personal portion, which many others would not agree should be assigned to the shadow at all.

If the ego is formed according to selection criteria imposed in an overly selfless social ambience, then there is the danger of the individual being the habitual martyr; self indulgence and self caring having been relegated to the shadow. In this case, the individual fails to defend his / her own rights. The
shadow, which contains this individual's selfish potential, offers at least some chance for the person to be recognised as having rights of their own. These rights will probably be won by underhand and devious ways, possibly ruthlessly, as the shadow looks for an opportunity to express its contribution to personality.

If however the ego is formed according to selection criteria absorbed in an overly selfish social environment, then the individual has assigned the greater part of selfless attitudes to the shadow and the shadow may, in moments of opportunity, manifest some actions of selflessness.

Since the ego and shadow are formed by the separation of psychic experience and potential, at some stage in the growth process, then it raises the pertinent question about the irreversibility of material and attitudes, across the division of the ego / shadow polarity. Can the ego / shadow content and balance change after the formation of the polarity into a stable equilibrium, and arrive at and establish, a new equilibrium, which enhances social integration and yet allows full scope for a unique and satisfying expression of personality?

One of the central structures of Jung's psychology is the concept of individuation. Previously this was discussed in the context of psychic growth. Marie von Franz, during a discussion of the individuation process, emphasises the part played by dreams, and being consciously aware of them, in affecting change in the personality:

"Thus our dream life creates a meandering pattern in which individual strands ... become visible ... If one watches this meandering design ... one can observe ... a directing tendency ... creating a slow, imperceptible process of psychic growth - the process of individuation.

Gradually a wider and more mature personality emerges, and by degrees becomes effective and even visible to others. ... this psychic growth cannot be brought about by a conscious effort of will power, but happens involuntarily and naturally."\cite{110}

Belief in the individuation process is a statement about the capacity of people to change their attitudes to life and to others, and to find new ways of relating to others and of approaching problems. For these changes to bring about a permanent, better adapted outlook and more successful way of dealing with problems, there must be a change in the ego / shadow equilibrium. If this were not so, then there would be no hope of making permanent and stable changes, since without an alteration to the equilibrium, any changes would be
superficial and exist only as an idea in consciousness; an idea which may evaporate at the first challenge. Again Marie von Franz:

"... for then comes the much more difficult problem where most people have great trouble: they know what their shadow is, but they cannot express it much or integrate it into their lives." [111]

Any affirmation about the individuation process then, is a belief, that by gradually bringing unconscious content into consciousness, the selection criteria which originally structured the ego / shadow relationship, can be reviewed in the awareness of a greater maturity, and possibly altered. Attitudes originally assigned to the shadow may be discovered to be valuable additions to conscious actions and enhance and expand maturity, while other consciously held attitudes may be discovered to be impediments to maturity. It is also possible the ego may become more sympathetic to the strivings of the shadow and learn to integrate those strivings, without capitulating the power of volition, nor succumbing to the more seductive of the shadow's rapacious appetites. This integration needs to be based on self knowledge, self understanding, self restraint and regulated liberty.

The foregoing is not in any way attempting to be definitive of the individuation process, but if the ego / shadow equilibrium is responsible for the archetype's manifest polarity, then the archetypes must also be central to the individuation process. As more of the shadow becomes conscious, the ego has the opportunity to mediate actions initiated by the unconscious and convert those actions from purely unconscious reflex actions to morally mediated actions. The most immediate danger in this concept of a watchful 'moral' ego sifting every potential response from the unconscious, looking for 'sins', is a complete loss of spontaneity, and places a catalogue of rules between the individual and the vitality of life and spirit.

The individuation process as described in the last quote of Marie von Franz certainly doesn't sound like the above stultifying description; clearly something else is happening in the individuation process.

That same last quote by Marie von Franz contains a lead to that vital 'something else'. To re-quote: " ... they know what their shadow is, but they cannot express it much or integrate it into their lives".

Similar to the difference between knowledge of unconscious content and its integration, is the difference between self control and self realization. Self control implies a contrived, wilful censorship of some part of the psyche by another part of the psyche, but self realisation implies a wider self view and acceptance, with a more generous scope for potential actions. Jung comments:
"Whoever progresses along this road of self-realization must inevitably bring into consciousness the contents of the personal unconscious, thus enlarging the scope of his personality."

The 'wilful censorship' perspective maintains the shadow as something outside the sense of self, and so fosters the idea of the whole personality being the exclusive ego. The integration that Marie von Franz refers to is the acceptance of unconscious content into consciousness, which then perceives the conscious and unconscious as essential components of a greater whole. If the ego only knows of shadow content but doesn't accept that content, then the content still exists in a context of rejection with an assigned status of undesirability and consequent censorship. The ego is trying to be broad minded and tolerant, but would really like to be divested of the shadow material; but of course it is divested of the shadow material which in turn wants to belong and be expressed as a part of the whole - or unilaterally.

Previously the psychic energy of archetypes was referred to, and this energy was observed, for example, in the Aladdin story in the form of the genie of the lamp, who personifies this latent and manifest power. And it was also seen in the discussion of the good and bad magician who were presented as the ego deflected and shadow deflected forms of a single underlying amoral archetype. (Amoral at that level). Because the archetypes are endowed with enormous psychic energy in the same way that the instincts are, then an activated archetype which is refracted towards the shadow end of the ego / shadow equilibrium, has a far greater consequence than that experienced from the escape, from the shadow, of personal disowned material.

The ego, confronted by the escape of archetypal material through the shadow, is almost certainly going to be appalled by the magnitude of those actions. This repulsion will lead to further re-enforcement of shadow censorship. If the severity of the censorship of the shadow by the ego is reduced by a greater acceptance of shadow material, and a wider sense of self emerges, then not only is the escape of potentially destructive personal material reduced, but also the negative action of archetypal energy may be reduced.

In consequence then, that shadow which is severely censored and disowned has a greater potential for negative actions than that due solely to personal material, because if it, the shadow, is a pathway for archetypal manifestation, then the archetype is imbued with the negative aspects of the shadow, as it, the archetype, crosses the threshold into expression. But now it can be seen that there is a possible mechanism to moderate the expression of features of the collective unconscious, without proposing that the collective
material can become conscious in the individuation process - a proposition generally considered not possible. If the content of the collective unconscious could be brought into the conscious then it could barely be called collective. In addition to this, the collective unconscious images and symbols are not comprised of material which the conscious can readily comprehend. Jung referring to the archetype makes this statement:

"It does not appear, in itself, to be capable of reaching consciousness ... it seems to me probable that the real nature of the archetype is not capable of being made conscious, that it is transcendent, on which account I call it psychoid."113

However Jung is not stating that there are no conscious representations of archetypes, as for example the magician or the genie, but rather that the essential archetype is of a psychic form which is distinct from normal and conscious mental images and concepts and beyond the conscious cognition.

If the ego / shadow equilibrium does determine or influence the expression of the archetype at the moment of its ascension from the collective, then this constitutes a connection between the ego / shadow equilibrium and the collective unconscious. This to some extent explains why the individuation process can produce a maturity, which appears to involve more than bringing the personal shadow material into consciousness, while simultaneously excluding the possibility of the collective becoming conscious.

The manner in which the ego may potentially relate to the shadow can be seen to exist at three levels: very rigid censorship by the ego, knowledge of the shadow by the ego, and integration of ego and shadow into a mature and responsible self, that is, individuation.

It would be expected that severe censorship by the ego would produce a shadow with a high degree of autonomy and opposition to the ego stance, since there is no dialogue to mediate actions. This opposition between the shadow and the consciousness is not simply a polarity. A polarity is a wider concept which may include the possibility of communication between the opposites and a consequent mediation of actions. Therefore the more severe the censorship, the greater autonomy for the shadow.

Knowledge of the shadow by the ego doesn't guarantee mediation and maturity for the personality, and this fact is indicated by Marie von Franz in her previous quote. It would seem however that knowledge of the unconscious is a prerequisite for integration, for how could there be a dialogue without knowledge of the other?
Integration is perhaps the most common word used in discussion of the individuation process, and all the indicators are, that knowledge is something less than integration. But what exactly is this difference and how does knowledge mature into acceptance and integration?

In the Aladdin story, which was interpreted as having as a central theme the individuation journey for Aladdin, the magician was seen to fill the role of the shadow and his interaction with Aladdin was mediated by the Princess, the anima. But in this story the magician was killed and even after his rebirth in the form of his brother, he was again killed, and this twice killing was supported by, and carried out with the help of the anima. This destruction of the unconscious personification seems in contrast to the concept of acceptance and integration as essential to individuation and we would perhaps have expected to see a co-operation develop between Aladdin and the magician!

However on closer examination of the Aladdin story and its psychological personifications this expectation is discovered to be unrealistic. The shadow, and consequently the magician, was never considered by Jung to personify the entire personal unconscious. (Aladdin entered the underground tunnel to find the lamp, and certainly the magician and the underground are not the same.) The shadow is the personification of the autonomous, organised, rejected material in opposition to the conscious stance and is not the content of the personal unconscious. Jung speaks of the anima as the personification of the unconscious, and in the Aladdin story, Aladdin and the Princess (the anima) do co-operate and share the future in their integration. But the direct opposition of the conscious and the unconscious must end for co-operation and peace to exist. If the ego only knows of the shadow, that is, the personified opposition, then certainly it doesn't necessarily follow that integration occurs.

In the Aladdin story it is the Princess and Aladdin who must co-operate and in the individuation journey it is the unconscious and the conscious which must co-operate. This co-operation needs knowledge as a condition, but it would seem that the knowledge needs to be more than the knowledge of the shadow personification only. If the shadow is the personification of the autonomous opposition then there is much more to be known in the 'ocean' from which the shadow arises, because this ocean is the shadow's foundation and context. Neptune arising from the sea will be less frightening if we know where he lives, how he lives, what food be eats, who his parents were, who his children are and what his fears and hopes are! Jung comments succinctly:
"If the encounter with the shadow is the 'apprentice - piece' in the individual's development, then that with the anima is the 'master - piece'.\textsuperscript{114} Knowledge of the foundations, origin and context of the shadow is perhaps more important than only having a clear image of the shadow itself, which is by its relationship to the conscious, always going to be an image difficult and frightening to confront. The difference between knowledge of the shadow, contrasted with knowledge of its context and origin, is better clarified by the word understanding, which implies compassion in addition to knowledge. If knowledge and understanding are prerequisites to conscious - unconscious co-operation then in a similar manner it can perhaps be said that compassion is a prerequisite to acceptance.

If self compassion and acceptance are to be conducive to the individuation process then that compassion and acceptance need to be for the origin and context of the shadow, not for the shadow personification itself. Acceptance of the shadow itself could lead to acceptance of evil or rapacious acts by the shadow, which is certainly not the hoped for result of individuation. But if the personal history of the formation of the shadow (and ego) is to some extent known and understood then there is the possibility of compassion for the circumstances leading to shadow formation, and as the circumstances are accepted, then there is less reason for the unconscious to oppose the conscious, by shadow formation. In this process of gradual approach and journey to the unconscious, with compassion, we may at some point make the surprising and unexpected discovery, that we are our own best friend!

But this doesn't mean that the conscious has somehow managed to win in a confrontation with the shadow, because the conscious has changed also, and is now partly comprised of what was previously unconscious; the conscious and unconscious have moved towards each other. Jung makes the following observation during a discussion of the alchemical figure of the King:

"Consciousness is renewed through its descent into the unconscious, whereby the two are joined. The renewed consciousness does not contain the unconscious but forms with it a totality symbolized by the son.\textsuperscript{115}"

The process of individuation is the coming together of opposites, the unconscious and the conscious, to dissolve the need for the shadow in opposition to the tyranny of the ego; an ego which must also reduce its need to play the tyrant. As the tyranny of the ego is reduced then also is the opposition from the shadow reduced. If the ego is considered the champion of the
consciousness, then the shadow is the champion of the unconscious, and no purpose is served by the continual gladiatorial conflict between the two; other than to initiate the individuation journey in the first place. However it is this initial conflict which may remind a complacent ego, that it isn't everything, and the individual is nudged into the struggle towards growth. A complacent and lazy Aladdin is confronted by the plotting magician and begins his journey. Although it is the unconscious which initiates the individuation journey, it is the conscious which seizes the opportunity and accepts the struggle and the journey, since it is the conscious which has the greater power of volition.

Individuation is often described as the process of becoming whole, but this becoming whole will require a corresponding whole engagement with the decision to review our own attitudes and perspectives.

In the North American Indian concept of the medicine wheel, a process of psychic growth is presented which is similar to Jung's individuation, and this Indian 'individuation' was previously discussed in the North American Indian myth of Nayanezgani and Thobadzistshini. That discussion included the Indian concept of the four ways of perceiving, which are arranged as the cardinal points of the compass, with North being the "place of wisdom" (thinking); East being the "looks afar place" (intuition); South being the "place of innocence and trust" (feeling); the West being the "looks-within place" (introspection). This description of the four ways of perceiving is in concept, Jung's four functions of Thinking, Intuition, Feeling and Sensation.

Hyemeyohsts Storm, in the book Seven Arrows, discusses the process of the medicine wheel:

"At birth each of us is given a particular Beginning Place within these Four Great Directions on the Medicine Wheel ... After each of us has learned of our Beginning Gift, our First Place on the Medicine Wheel, we then must Grow by Seeking Understanding in each of the Four Great Ways."116

In the Jungian process of individuation also, the four functions are considered to be central and vital in individual growth. The superior function, or functions, will play a major role in the censorship of experience and attitude and therefore in ego formation and consequent shadow formation.

Constituents of the shadow are more likely to be attitudes with a higher content of the inferior functions. Jolande Jacobe refers to this:

"For as long as an individual has differentiated only his main function and apprehends outward and inward reality almost exclusively with this side of
his psyche, his other three functions remain inevitably in the darkness or 'shadow', from which they must be reclaimed, as it were, piece by piece."\textsuperscript{117}

As the inferior functions are developed and play a part in attitude formation, maintenance and review, then more of the contents of the unconscious are found to have been banished from consciousness due to a limited set of criteria; criteria which are then seen to be narrow, restrictive and inhibiting.

\begin{quote}
I place my foot upon the path,
my hand upon the door,
my feet they seek my spirit's hearth,
my hands they seek my spirit's store,

my soul comes from the lonely past,
to seek this ancient path at last,
and though some things I see I dread,
I walk this path with hopeful tread.

The path runs all four ways in one,
but from the north my bearings come,
and though my heart moves to the south,
the east shall enter in my mouth,
and from the mirror in this hall,
the west will show myself all.
\end{quote}

If we are \textit{psychically} biased then we come to biased conclusions. Biased conclusions and actions are avoided when we act on our inner psychic bias and integrate the conscious and the unconscious to a wider acting Self. But nowhere is it found in any great writing in any cultural or religious context whatever, that we are instructed or advised in how to effectively admonish others; always the responsibility is for our own actions, maturity and compassion, and the struggle - with ourselves.
REVIEW

It is probably true to say that in all research writing, more questions are discovered and raised than are answered by that research writing. These are considerations which are relevant to the thesis but not in the domain of its major charter. This would seem to be a kind of universal observation, because ultimately everything is connected and it is only the mind which artificially divides a topic in order to weigh and consider a digestible sized piece. So a seemingly innocent question leads to others and those to others and the thesis may stray from its intended and chosen constraints.

In this thesis also, questions are raised which are not adequately dealt with here and these indicate branch lines of ideas which could be pursued and possibly yield interesting and relevant observations. The discussion early in this writing, regarding a possible genesis for the inherited nature of an archetype, is not presented as any conclusive answer to that question, but rather to raise the possibility of a mechanism.

Long before the existence and nature of genes was known, the fact of inheritance of physical traits was established from common observation, and the much later biochemical discoveries, led to the exposition of how those traits were inherited. Jung was insistent that the basis of his conclusions regarding the archetypes, rested on observations, and the theory grew out of and was subsequent to, those observations. It is natural then to look for a possible mechanism of the inheritance of the collective unconscious. This whole topic of the inheritance of collective psychic features presents itself in this writing as one of those questions raised by a research writing but which needed to be truncated in order to adhere to the major thesis charter. (Even if progress could be made in such a difficult aspect.)

The presentation of the ego / shadow equilibrium as the source of the positive and negative aspects of archetypes may explain many of the archetypes existing in pairs, for example the good wizard and the evil magician, but does it explain all the archetypes which seem to come in pairs? This is another aspect which could be pursued in further research.

The levels of archetype morality from positive or negative at the first level, to neutral at a higher psychic level, and ultimately to a moral stance at a still higher level, was observed in the Aladdin story, especially with the genie of the lamp. These observations raise the question of whether an archetype could be anything but moral, if it has evolved as a psychic constituent, and any
such discussion needs to begin with some defining statement regarding the
concept of evil. If evil is perpetrated on an archetypal scale, is it always due to
the ego / shadow equilibrium deflection, or can a naturally inherited feature be
evil?

It is certainly more comforting to believe in the ego / shadow deflection
idea of evil at that level, rather than an intrinsically evil collective feature,
since there is always hope of salvation from evil, by the capacity to grow, but
who can outgrow an archetype? This problem is most likely answered by the
question itself, because if evil was in fact archetypal, then how could
widespread altruism exist at all, as it does? The poet Kahlil Gibran speaks of
good and evil in words which have an extraordinary resonance to this
psychological context:

"You are good when you are one with yourself.
Yet when you are not one with yourself you are not evil.
For a divided house is not a den of thieves; it is only a divided
house."118

As it was stated earlier, libraries of research have been written on the
nature of the ego, yet many aspects could benefit from further research. Many
authors equate the ego with consciousness while others view the ego as a
centre of consciousness and there is great confusion about this elusive identity.
There is also confusion between each author's understanding of each other's
concept of ego. R. S. Charlton. states in his article 'Fictions of the internal
object':

"Perhaps the most significant and misunderstood difference between
Jungian theory and other psychoanalytic speculations is the fact that the
Jungian ego is consciousness. Jung stated it this way - '...the ego is never more
and never less than consciousness as a whole' (Jung 1959, para. 7)."119 [the
Jung quote is CW vol. 9(ii) para. 7.]

However the quote from Jung in the above, was in fact preceded in the
Jung work in paragraph 5, by the following statement by Jung:

"When I said that the ego 'rests' on the total field of consciousness I do
not mean that it consists of this. Were that so, it would be indistinguishable
from the field of consciousness as a whole. The ego is only the latter's point of
reference ..."120

The two statements by Jung certainly seem contradictory, which doesn't
help, but Charlton comes to a conclusion about Jung's view of the ego, which
is not representative of Jung.
It would seem reasonable to say that consciousness is a state not a content. It also seems reasonable to say that the ego can't be content, since the content of consciousness changes from moment to moment and therefore if the ego were only content, then it, the ego, would be like a feather - blown in the wind of the moments preoccupation. Yet all the common observation points to a much more stable identity for the ego. To further complicate matters, there is the experience of the dream ego.

This lack of any consensus regarding the nature of the ego is astonishing, when the volume of psychological work referring to it is considered.

In the very beginning of this writing, the split between thinking and feeling was discussed as an unnatural split, which causes inappropriate conclusions and false answers to social and moral problems. Thinking answers are found for feeling problems and feeling answers for thinking problems.

An example of this split was the idea of withholding an infant's citizenship until a month or so after birth. As discussed earlier, this idea was seriously suggested, for consideration and discussion as an option, by Peter Singer. This option was suggested in response to the problems surrounding abortion, and especially those abortions performed at later stages of pregnancy.

There are a whole range of problems in this area, such as the question of the use of the aborted foetuses in research, since, if it was legal to abort the foetus because it wasn't considered to have rights, then why protect it after the abortion? The problem 'centre-piece' of this moral quagmire is the question; when does the foetus become a person?

The suggestion of postponing citizenship, transfers the foetus problem to an infant problem and finds a possibly tidy legal solution to the problem of the natural graduation from zygote to infant. The non-citizen infant would then have no rights and therefore the problem vanishes!

If there is already vehement controversy in the society over the rights of an early term embryo, because it is potentially a person, but maybe not really now, then the social division resulting from the citizenship 'answer', would probably be described as civil war. The 'narrow' thinking answer is discovered to be an answer to the legal problems; a pseudo-answer to the moral problems; and no answer to the social problems. This is because it is totally devoid of the human feelings, on both sides of the discussion, which are central to the controversy. Of course the problem will not be easily solved at all, but any attempt at a solution must involve feelings.
Approaching social and environmental problems with only half our human nature, is a failing that social ecology attempts to avoid, and earlier in this writing it was seen that there are strong links between social ecology and Jungian psychology. Writers in both these areas use very similar language, and overlap in expressions such as 'holistic' and the 'Self', and both subscribe to the concept of the development of the individual as a prerequisite for social maturity and stability. In social ecology, research is seen to be an opportunity for self growth, indicating the belief that human actions must involve the person as part of the context of those actions, and in Jungian psychology the individuation process is a central concept.

Social divisions were seen to be presaged by individual psychic divisions and these psychic divisions were found to be, in the first instance, a direct result of natural polarity, which exists in the human psyche. This polarity exists at different levels, such as that of the ego and the shadow, at the individual level. At a deeper level the apparent polarity of features of the collective unconscious presented as a paradox, since an archetype seems to have a capacity for great benevolence or great malevolence at both the individual and the social level.

The concept of polarity was observed to be an intrinsic attribute of the world, and in that sense it could be referred to as a universal. This intrinsic polarity is not only the source of nature's diversity but also the source of nature's existence, because if there is no opposition, then no selection, no selection then no adaptation, and no adaptation then no life.

The psychic polarity of ego and shadow is seen to follow naturally, or inevitably, from the intrinsic polarity, since if there is to be a psychic fitting to an environment, then features must be selected, and as a consequence also discarded. Adverse environmental and social conditions test each psychic feature for inclusion or exclusion, and so the ego / shadow polarity produces a personality and character - forged in adversity. This immediate discussion can perhaps be summarized by the statement: polarity is an archetype.

The individual's polarity, of ego as a centre of consciousness, and shadow as a personification of opposition, is seen to be absolutely unavoidable since it is the basis of conscious life, but if the ego and shadow components of that polarity are rigidly, mutually exclusive, then it is more than a polarity, it is a conflict. In this case the ego is overly authoritarian and tyrannical, and the shadow refractory and subversive. The Jungian process of individuation is a process of attenuating the conflict to achieve an equilibrium based on self knowledge, understanding and acceptance. This new state of inner equilibrium
is greater than the sum of the ego and shadow, and when it exists at a high level of integration then it is referred to as the Self.

Because the ego / shadow equilibrium constitute the interface between the psyche and its world, then actions and responses of the psyche, pass through that interface. It has been presented that since motivations imbued with archetypal imperative must pass through this interface, then the archetype expression is influenced be the ego / shadow equilibrium, and it was suggested that this equilibrium is the source of the archetype's apparent moral polarity.

The apparent archetype ambivalence can be compared to a hand of the body. At one level this hand has an 'intrinsic' moral polarity, since it may carry offensive weapons or carry food for the hungry. At another level this hand is seen to be amoral, because it simply does the bidding of the 'bearer' of the hand. Finally the hand is seen to be intrinsically moral because it is the evolved tool of the psyche and body, and facilitates action in the world in order to be effective and survive.

The positive or negative ambivalence of the archetypes was examined, especially in the exposition of the Aladdin story, which saw the archetypal genie morally polar, since its actions could be 'good' or 'bad'. This genie was then discovered to be amoral since it merely did the bidding of the holder of the lamp. At a deeper level the genie makes a stand and refuses to harm its ultimate and permanent master, revealing an intrinsically moral archetype.

If the Self is the ultimate master of growth and volition, then the manifestation of the Self is able to mediate archetypal energies by an integration of the conscious and unconscious, so that actions are made at a high level of maturity and responsibility, revealing an ultimate morality. The genies of the lamps answer to their natural and permanent master and refuse to defile him. Aladdin assumes his Sultanhood, ruling in balanced polarity with the Princess, and in an equilibrium of sense and compassion, and there is 'peace throughout the land'.
APPENDIX I
NAVAJO INDIAN MYTH

(ii) NAYANEZGANI AND THOBADZISTSHINI

91 Very different in character is the story of the Navajo heroes mentioned earlier (54–58), whose journey to the home of the Sun-Bearer involves classic episodes of the hero’s trial, familiar in stories from all parts of the world.

92 Leaving home early in the morning the twins set out on a sacred trail. A little after sunrise they noticed smoke rising from the ground near Dsinnaotl and discovered it came from the underground home of Spider-Woman, who welcomed them, asking who they were and where they were going. Four times they evaded her questions, but when she suggested they sought their father they tacitly admitted they did, saying they wished they knew the way to his hogan.

93 Spider-Woman warned them the trail was both long and dangerous. Moreover, far from welcoming them, their father might punish them for their intrusion. The twins were undaunted.

94 Spider-Woman told them the four particular dangers they would meet were clashing rocks that crushed travellers; knife-sharp reeds that cut them to shreds; cane cacti that tore them to pieces; boiling sands that engulfed them (cf. 13–14 and vol. 1: 2.2. 353–362). She gave the twins two life-feathers (feathers plucked from a living eagle) joined into a talisman called ‘feather of the anaye’, and also another life-preserving feather. She then taught them a spell that would subdue their enemies:

95 Put your feet down with pollen. Put your hands down with pollen. Put your head down with pollen. Your feet are pollen. Your hands are pollen. Your body is pollen. Your mind is pollen. Your voice is pollen. The trail is beautiful. Be still.

96 With the aid of Spider-Woman’s charms and spell the youths survived all the perils of their journey and came at last to Tshohanoai the Sun-Bearer’s hogan, a great, square, turquoise house built on the shore of a vast stretch of water.

97 At its entrance they were threatened first by a pair of huge bears, next by a pair of serpents, next by winds and finally by lightnings; but safely passed by them all, grasping their life-feathers and chanting the soothing words Spider-Woman had taught them.

98 On entering their father’s hogan they saw a woman sitting in its western corner, two handsome youths in its northern, two beautiful girls in its southern corner. The girls immediately stood up and, without a word, came and wrapped Nayanezganini and Thobadzistshini into a bundle with four ‘sky-coverings’—of dawn, daylight, dusk and night—and put them on a shelf, where they lay quietly waiting.

99 After a while a rattle at the door shook four times and Tshohanoai strode into the hogan carrying the sun upon his back. Taking it off he put it on the west wall of the house where it clanged for a while and then hung still.

100 Tshohanoai asked his wife who the two visitors were he had seen coming to the hogan. At first she refused to answer, but later said they claimed to be his sons, which made her wonder how truthful he had been in telling her he never visited anyone in the course of his daily journeys!

101 Angry, the Sun-Bearer took Nayanezganini and Thobadzistshini down from the shelf and, unrolling the bundle, tipped them out onto the floor. Then he picked them up and hurled them at each of the four sides of his
house in turn, against great spikes and rocks; but the Spider-Woman's
talismans preserved them. Next Tshohanoai tried to steam them to death in his
sweat house (sauna); then to poison them with doctored tobacco, but the
twins survived every trial and not only smoked the poisoned pipe to its end
but commented on its sweetness.

102 Impressed by their insouciant courage the Sun-Bearer at last
acknowledged them as his sons and welcomed them to his hogan. (Navajo
myth, Arizona.)
**APPENDIX 2**

**THE ALADDIN STORY**

**ALADDIN AND THE WONDERFUL LAMP**

Far away on the other side of the world, in one of the great wealthy cities of China, there once lived a poor tailor called Mustapha. He had a wife whom he loved dearly and an only son whose name was Aladdin.

But, sad to say, although the tailor was good and industrious, his son was so idle and bad that his father and mother did not know what to do with him. All day long he played in the streets with other idle boys, and when he grew big enough to learn a trade he said he did not mean to work at all. His poor father was very much troubled, and ordered Aladdin to come to the workshop to learn to be a tailor, but Aladdin only laughed, and ran away so swiftly that neither his father nor mother could catch him.

'Alas!' said Mustapha sadly, 'I can do nothing with this idle boy.'

And he grew so sad about it, that at last he fell ill and died.

Then the poor widow was obliged to sell the little workshop, and try to make enough money for herself and Aladdin by spinning.

Now it happened that one day when Aladdin was playing as usual with the idle street boys, a tall dark old man stood watching him, and when the game was finished he made a sign to Aladdin to come to him.

'What is thy name, my boy?' asked this old man, who, though he appeared so kind, was really an African Magician.

'My name is Aladdin,' answered the boy, wondering who this stranger could be.

'And what is thy father's name?' asked the Magician.

'My father was Mustapha the tailor, but he has been dead a long time now,' answered Aladdin.

'Alas!' cried the wicked old Magician, pretending to weep, 'he was my brother, and thou must be my nephew. I am thy long lost uncle!' and he threw his arms round Aladdin's neck and embraced him.

'Tell thy dear mother that I will come and see her this very day,' he cried, 'and give her this small present.' And he placed in Aladdin's hands five gold pieces.

Aladdin ran home in great haste to tell his mother the story of the long lost uncle.

'It must be a mistake,' she said, 'thou hast no uncle.'

But when she saw the gold she began to think that this stranger must be a relation, and so she prepared a grand supper to welcome him when he came.

They had not long to wait before the African Magician appeared, bringing with him all sorts of fruits and delicious sweets for dessert.

'Tell me about my poor brother,' he said, as he embraced Aladdin and his mother. 'Show me exactly where he used to sit.'

Then the widow pointed to a seat on the sofa, and the Magician knelt down and began to kiss the place and weep over it.

The poor widow was quite touched, and began to believe that this really must be her husband's brother, especially when he began to show the kindest interest in Aladdin.

'What is thy trade?' he asked the boy.

'Alas!' said the widow, 'he will do nothing but play in the streets.'

Aladdin hung his head with shame as his uncle gravely shook his head.

'He must begin to work at once,' he said. 'How would it please thee to have a shop of thy own? I could buy one for thee, and stock it with silks and rich stuffs.'

Aladdin danced with joy at the very idea, and next day set out with his supposed uncle, who bought him a splendid suit of clothes, and took him all over the city to show him the sights.

The day after, the Magician again took Aladdin out with him, but this time they went outside the city, through beautiful gardens, into the open country. They walked so far that Aladdin began to grow weary, but the Magician gave him a cake and some delicious fruit and told him such
wonderful tales that he scarcely noticed how far they had gone. At last they came to a deep valley between two mountains, and there the Magician paused.

"Stop!" he cried, "this is the very place I am in search of. Gather some sticks that we may make a fire."

Aladdin quickly did as he was bid, and had soon gathered together a great heap of dry sticks. The Magician then set fire to them, and the heap blazed up merrily. With great care the old man now sprinkled some curious-looking powder on the flames and muttered strange words. In an instant the earth beneath their feet trembled, and they heard a rumbling like distant thunder. Then the ground opened in front of them, and showed a great square slab of stone with a ring in it.

By this time Aladdin was so frightened that he turned to run home as fast as he could, but the Magician caught him, and gave him such a blow that he fell to the earth.

"Why dost thou strike me, uncle?" sobbed Aladdin.

"Do as I bid thee," said the Magician, "and thou shalt be well treated. Dost thou see that stone? Beneath it is a treasure which I will share with thee. Only obey me, and it will soon be ours."

As soon as Aladdin heard of a treasure, he jumped up and forgot all his fears. He seized the ring as the Magician directed, and easily pulled up the stone.

"Now," said the old man, "look in and thou wilt see stone steps leading downwards. Thou shalt descend those steps until thou comest to three great halls. Pass through them, but take care to wrap thy coat well round thee that thou mayest touch nothing, for if thou dost, thou wilt die instantly. When thou hast passed through the halls thou wilt come into a garden of fruit trees. Go through it until thou seest a niche with a lighted lamp in it. Put the light out, pour forth the oil, and bring the lamp to me."

So saying the Magician placed a magic ring upon Aladdin's finger to guard him, and bade the boy begin his search.

Aladdin did exactly as he was told and found everything just as the Magician had said. He went through the halls and the garden until he came to the lamp, and when he had poured out the oil and placed the lamp carefully inside his coat he began to look about him.

He had never seen such a lovely garden before, even in his dreams. The fruits that hung upon the trees were of every colour of the rainbow. Some were clear and shining like crystal, some sparkled with a crimson light, and others were green, blue, violet, and orange, while the leaves that shaded them were silver and gold. Aladdin did not guess that these fruits were precious stones, diamonds, rubies, emeralds, and sapphires, but they looked so pretty that he filled all his pockets with them as he passed back through the garden.

The Magician was eagerly peering down the stone steps when Aladdin began to climb up.

"Give me the lamp," he cried, stretching out his hand for it.

"Wait until I get out," answered Aladdin, "and then I will give it thee."

"Hand it up to me at once," screamed the old man angrily.

"Not till I am safely out," repeated Aladdin.

Then the Magician stamped with rage, and rushing to the fire threw on it some more of the curious powder, uttered the same strange words as before, and instantly the stone slipped back into its place, the earth closed over it, and Aladdin was left in darkness.

This showed indeed that the wicked old man was not Aladdin's uncle. By his magic arts in Africa he had found out all about the lamp, which was a wonderful treasure, as you will see. But he knew that he could not get it himself, that another hand must fetch it to him. This was the reason why he had fixed upon Aladdin to help him, and had meant, as soon as the lamp was safely in his hand, to kill the boy.

As his plan had failed he went back to Africa, and was not seen again for a long, long time.

But there was poor Aladdin, shut up underground, with no way of getting out I
He tried to find his way back to the great halls and the beautiful garden of shining fruits; but the walls had closed up, and there was no escape that way either. For two days the poor boy sat crying and moaning in his despair; and just as he had made up his mind that he must die, he clasped his hands together, and in doing so rubbed the ring which the Magician had put upon his finger.

In an instant a huge figure rose out of the earth and stood before him.

'What is thy will, my master?' it said.

'I am the Slave of the Ring, and must obey him who wears the ring.'

'Whoever or whatever you are,' cried Aladdin, 'take me out of this dreadful place.'

Scarcely had he said these words when the earth opened, and the next moment Aladdin found himself lying at his mother's door. He was so weak for want of food, and his joy at seeing his mother was so great, that he fainted away; but when he came to himself he promised to tell her all that had happened.

'But first give me something to eat,' he cried, 'for I am dying of hunger.'

'Alas!' said his mother, 'I have nothing in the house except a little cotton, which I will go out and sell.'

'Stop a moment,' cried Aladdin, 'rather let us sell this old lamp which I have brought back with me.'

Now the lamp looked so old and dirty that Aladdin's mother began to rub it, wishing to brighten it a little that it might fetch a higher price.

But no sooner had she given it the first rub than a huge dark figure slowly rose from the floor like a wreath of smoke until it reached the ceiling, towering above them.

'What is thy will?' it asked. 'I am the Slave of the Lamp, and must do the bidding of him who holds the lamp.'

The moment the figure began to rise from the ground Aladdin's mother was so terrified that she fainted away, but Aladdin managed to snatch the lamp from her, although he could scarcely hold it in his own shaking hand.

'Fetch me something to eat,' he said in a trembling voice, for the terrible Genie was glaring down upon him.

The Slave of the Lamp disappeared in a cloud of smoke, but in an instant he was back again, bringing with him a most delicious breakfast, served upon plates and dishes of pure gold.

By this time Aladdin's mother had recovered, but she was almost too frightened to eat, and begged Aladdin to sell the lamp at once, for she was sure it had something to do with evil spirits. But Aladdin only laughed at her fears, and said he meant to make use of the magic lamp and wonderful ring, now that he knew their worth.

As soon as they again wanted money they sold the golden plates and dishes, and when these were all gone Aladdin ordered the Genie to bring more, and so they lived in comfort for several years, and all that time Aladdin kept the magic fruit he had brought home from the lovely garden.

Now Aladdin had heard a great deal about the beauty of the Sultan's daughter, and he began to long so greatly to see her that he could not rest. He thought of a great many plans, but they all seemed impossible, for the Princess never went out without a veil, which covered her entirely.

At last, however, he managed to enter the palace and hide himself behind a door, peeping through a chink when the Princess passed to go to her bath.

The moment Aladdin's eyes rested upon the beautiful Princess he loved her with all his heart, for she was as fair as the dawn of a summer morning.

'Mother,' he cried when he reached home, 'I have seen the Princess, and I have made up my mind to marry her. Thou shalt go at once to the Sultan, and beg him to give me his daughter.'

Aladdin's mother stared at her son, and then began to laugh at such a wild idea. She was almost afraid that Aladdin must be mad, but he gave her no peace until she did as he wished.

So the next day she very unwillingly set out for the palace, carrying the magic fruit wrapped up in a napkin, to present to the Sultan. There were many other
people offering their petitions that day, and the poor woman was so frightened that she dared not go forward, and so no one paid any attention to her as she stood there patiently holding her bundle. For a whole week she had gone every day to the palace, before the Sultan noticed her.

‘Who is that poor woman who comes every day carrying a white bundle?’ he asked.

Then the Grand Vizier ordered that she should be brought forward, and she came bowing herself to the ground.

She was almost too terrified to speak, but when the Sultan spoke so kindly to her she took courage, and told him of Aladdin’s love for the Princess, and of his bold request. ‘He sends you this gift,’ she continued, and opening the bundle she presented the magic fruit.

A cry of wonder went up from all those who stood around, for never had they beheld such exquisite jewels before. They shone and sparkled with a thousand lights and colours, and dazzled the eyes that gazed upon them.

The Sultan was astounded, and spoke to the Grand Vizier apart.

‘Surely it is fit that I should give my daughter to one who can present such a wondrous gift?’ he said.

But the Grand Vizier wanted the Princess to marry his own son, so he advised the Sultan to promise nothing in a hurry, but to wait for three months. This the Sultan thought was good advice, so he told Aladdin’s mother to return when three months had passed, and then her son should marry the Princess.

Aladdin was so happy when he heard what the Sultan had promised that the days slipped quickly past. But when only two months were gone, he noticed one evening that there were signs of rejoicing throughout the town, and that there was a great stir about the palace. He asked the reason of all this, and was promptly told that the Princess was, that night, to wed the son of the Grand Vizier.

Aladdin was very angry, and as soon as he reached home he took down the magic lamp and rubbed it as he had done before. Immediately the Genie appeared, and asked what was his will.

‘Go to the palace,’ said Aladdin, ‘and bring me here the Princess and the Grand Vizier’s son.’

It was no sooner said than done, and the Genie carried in the royal bed and set it down before Aladdin.

‘Now take the Vizier’s son out of bed and keep him safely until morning,’ ordered Aladdin.

The Princess was terrified, but Aladdin told her that she need have no fear, for he himself was her real bridegroom.

Early in the morning the Genie brought back the Vizier’s son, as Aladdin had directed, and then carried the royal bed back to the palace.

But when the Sultan came to say ‘Good morning,’ to his daughter, he found her in tears, and the Vizier’s son shivering and shaking.

‘What has happened?’ asked the Sultan.

But the Princess would do nothing but weep.

That night the same thing happened, for again Aladdin ordered the Genie to fetch the royal bed, and once more the Vizier’s son was shut out into the cold.

The Sultan was very angry with his daughter when he found her weeping the next day. He was still more angry when she refused to answer any of his questions.

‘Cease thy tears,’ he cried, ‘and speak instantly, or I will have thy head cut off.’

Then the Princess told all that had happened, and the Vizier’s son, shaking and miserable, begged to be separated from the Princess at once, that he might not spend such another night of misery.

So all the rejoicings came to an end, the marriage was stopped, and the Princess was once more free.

Now when the three months were ended, Aladdin’s mother again presented herself before the Sultan, and reminded him of his promise, that the Princess should wed her son.

‘I ever abide by my royal word,’ said the Sultan; ‘but he who marries my daughter must first send me forty golden basins filled to the brim with precious
stones. These basins must be carried by forty black slaves, each led by a white slave dressed as befits the servants of the Sultan.’

Aladdin’s mother returned home in great distress when she heard this, and told Aladdin what the Sultan had said.

‘Alas, my son!’ she cried, ‘thy hopes are ended.’

‘Not so, mother,’ answered Aladdin. ‘The Sultan shall not have long to wait for his answer.’

Then he rubbed the magic lamp, and when the Genie appeared, he bade him provide the forty golden basins filled with jewels, and all the slaves which the Sultan had demanded.

Now when this splendid procession passed through the streets on its way to the palace, all the people came out to see the sight, and stood amazed when they saw the golden basins filled with sparkling gems carried on the heads of the great black slaves. And when the palace was reached, and the slaves presented the jewels to the Sultan, he was so surprised and delighted that he was more than willing that Aladdin should marry the Princess at once.

‘Go, fetch thy son,’ he said to Aladdin’s mother, who was waiting near. ‘Tell him that this day he shall wed my daughter.’

But when Aladdin heard the news he refused to hasten at once to the palace, as his mother advised. First he called the Genie, and told him to bring a scented bath, and a robe worked in gold, such as a king might wear. After this he called for forty slaves to attend him, and six to walk before his mother, and a horse more beautiful than the Sultan’s, and lastly, for ten thousand pieces of gold put up in ten purses.

When all these things were ready, and Aladdin was dressed in his royal robe, he set out for the palace. As he rode along on his beautiful horse, attended by his forty slaves, he scattered the golden pieces out of the ten purses among the crowd, and all the people shouted with joy and delight. No one knew that this was the idle boy who used to play about the streets, but they thought he was some great foreign Prince.

Thus Aladdin arrived at the palace in great state, and when the Sultan had embraced him, he ordered that the wedding feast should be prepared at once, and that the marriage should take place that day.

‘Not so, your Majesty,’ said Aladdin; ‘I will not marry the Princess until I have built a palace fit for the daughter of the Sultan.’

Then he returned home, and once more called up the Slave of the Lamp.

‘Build me the fairest palace ever beheld by mortal eye,’ ordered Aladdin. ‘Let it be built of marble and jasper and precious stones. In the midst I would have a great hall, whose walls shall be of gold and silver, lighted by four-and-twenty windows. These windows shall all be set with diamonds, rubies, and other precious stones, and one only shall be left unfinished. There must also be stables with horses, and slaves to serve in the palace. Begone, and do thy work quickly.’

And lo! in the morning when Aladdin looked out, there stood the most wonderful palace that ever was built. Its marble walls were flushed a delicate pink in the morning light, and the jewels flashed from every window.

Then Aladdin and his mother set off for the Sultan’s palace, and the wedding took place that day. The Princess loved Aladdin as soon as she saw him, and great were the rejoicings throughout the city.

The next day Aladdin invited the Sultan to visit the new palace, and when he entered the great hall, whose walls were of gold and silver and whose windows were set with jewels, he was filled with admiration and astonishment.

‘It is the wonder of the world,’ he cried. ‘Never before have mortal eyes beheld such a beautiful palace. One thing alone surprises me. Why is there one window left unfinished?’

‘Your Majesty,’ answered Aladdin, ‘this has been done with a purpose, for I wished that thine own royal hand should have the honour of putting the finishing touch to my palace.’

The Sultan was so pleased when he heard this, that he sent at once for all the
court jewellers and ordered them to finish
the window like the rest.

The court jewellers worked for many
days, and then sent to tell the Sultan that
they had used all the jewels they
possessed, and still the window was not
half finished. The Sultan commanded that
his own jewels should be given to complete
the work; but even when these were used
the window was not finished.

Then Aladdin ordered the jewellers to
stop their work, and to take back all the
Sultan's jewels as well as their own. And
that night he called up the Slave of the
Lamp once more, and bade him finish the
window. This was done before the morn-
ing, and great was the surprise of the
Sultan and all his workmen.

Now Aladdin did not grow proud of his
great riches but was gentle and courteous
to all, and kind to the poor, so that the
people all loved him dearly. He fought and
won many battles for the Sultan, and was
the greatest favourite in the land.

But far away in Africa there was
trouble brewing for Aladdin. The wicked
old Magician who had pretended to be
Aladdin's uncle found out by his magic
powers that the boy had not perished when
he left him underground, but had somehow
managed to escape and become rich
and powerful.

'He must have discovered the secret of
the lamp,' shrieked the Magician, tearing
his hair with rage. 'I will not rest day or
night until I shall have found some way
of taking it from him.'

So he journeyed from Africa to China,
and when he came to the city where
Aladdin lived and saw the wonderful
palace, he nearly choked with fury to see
all its splendour and richness. Then he
disguised himself as a merchant, and
bought a number of copper lamps, and
with these went from street to street, cry-
ing, 'New lamps for old.'

As soon as the people heard his cry,
they crowded round him, laughing and
jeering, for they thought he must be mad
to make such an offer.

Now it happened that Aladdin was out
hunting, and the Princess sat alone in the
hall of the jewelled windows. When,
therefore, she heard the noise that was
going on in the street outside, she called
to her slaves to ask what it meant.

Presently one of the slaves came back,
laughing so much that she could scarcely
speak.

'It is a curious old man who offers to
give new lamps for old,' she cried. 'Did
any one ever hear before of such a strange
way of trading?'

The Princess laughed too, and pointed to
an old lamp which hung in a niche close by.

'There is an old enough lamp,' she said.
'Take it and see if the old man will really
give a new one for it.'

The slave took it down and ran out
to the street once more, and when the
Magician saw that it was indeed what he
wanted, he seized the Magic Lamp with
both his hands.

'Choose any lamp you like,' he said,
showing her those of bright new copper.
He did not care now what happened. She
might have all the new lamps if she wanted
them.

Then he went a little way outside the
city, and when he was quite alone he took
out the Magic Lamp and rubbed it gently.
Immediately the Genie stood before him
and asked what was his will.

'I order thee to carry off the palace of
Aladdin, with the Princess inside, and set
it down in a lonely spot in Africa.'

And in an instant the palace, with every
one in it, had disappeared; and when the
Sultan happened to look out of his window,
lo! there was no longer a palace to be
seen.

'This must be enchantment,' he cried.
Then he ordered his men to set out and
bring Aladdin to him in chains.

The officers met Aladdin as he was re-
turning from the hunt, and they imme-
diately seized him, loaded him with chains,
and carried him off to the Sultan. But as
he was borne along, the people gathered
around him, for they loved him dearly, and
vowed that no harm should befall him.

The Sultan was beside himself with rage
when he saw Aladdin, and gave orders
that his head should be cut off at once.
But the people had begun to crowd into the palace, and they were so fierce and threatening that he dared not do as he wished. He was obliged to order the chains to be taken off, and Aladdin to be set free.

As soon as Aladdin was allowed to speak he asked why all this was done to him.

'Wretch!' exclaimed the Sultan, 'come hither, and I will show thee.'

Then he led Aladdin to the window and showed him the empty space where his palace had once stood.

'Think not that I care for thy vanished palace,' he said. 'But where is the Princess, my daughter?'

So astonished was Aladdin that for some time he could only stand speechless, staring at the place where his palace ought to have been.

At last he turned to the Sultan.

'Your Majesty,' he said, 'grant me grace for one month, and if by that time I have not brought back thy daughter to thee, then put me to death as I deserve.'

So Aladdin was set free, and for three days he went about like a madman, asking every one he met where his palace was. But no one could tell him, and all laughed at his misery. Then he went to the river to drown himself; but as he knelt on the bank and clasped his hands to say his prayers before throwing himself in, he once more rubbed the Magic Ring. Instantly the Genie of the Ring stood before him.

'What is thy will, O master?' it asked.

'Bring back my Princess and my palace,' cried Aladdin, 'and save my life.'

'That I cannot do,' said the Slave of the Ring. 'Only the Slave of the Lamp has power to bring back thy palace.'

'Then take me to the place where my palace now stands,' said Aladdin, 'and put me down beneath the window of the Princess.'

And almost before Aladdin had done speaking he found himself in Africa, beneath the windows of his own palace.

He was so weary that he lay down and fell fast asleep; but before long, when day dawned, he was awakened by the song of the birds, and as he looked around his courage returned. He was now sure that all his misfortunes must have been caused by the loss of the Magic Lamp, and he determined to find out as soon as possible who had stolen it.

That same morning the Princess awoke feeling happier than she had felt since she had been carried off. The sun was shining so brightly, and the birds were singing so gaily, that she went to the window to greet the opening day. And who should she see standing beneath her window but Aladdin!

With a cry of joy she threw open the casement and the sound made Aladdin look up. It was not long before he made his way through a secret door and held her in his arms.

'Tell me, Princess,' said Aladdin, when they had joyfully embraced each other many times, 'what has become of the old lamp which hung in a niche of the great hall?'

'Alas! my husband,' answered the Princess, 'I fear my carelessness has been the cause of all our misfortunes.'

Then she told him how the wicked old Magician had pretended to be a merchant, and had offered new lamps for old, and how he had thus managed to secure the Magic Lamp.

'He has it still,' she added, 'for I know that he carries it always, hidden in his robe.'

'Princess,' said Aladdin, 'I must recover this lamp, and thou shalt help me. Tonight when the Magician dines with thee, dress thyself in thy costliest robes, and be kind and gracious to him. Then bid him fetch some of the wines of Africa, and when he is gone, I will tell thee what thou shalt do.'

So that night the Princess put on her most beautiful robes, and looked so lovely and was so kind when the Magician came in, that he could scarcely believe his eyes. For she had been sad and angry ever since he had carried her off.

'I believe now that Aladdin must be dead,' she said, 'and I have made up my mind to mourn no longer. Let us begin our feast. But see! I grow weary of
these wines of China, fetch me instead the
wine of thy own country.'

Now Aladdin had meanwhile prepared
a powder which he directed the Princess
to place in her own wine-cup. So when
the Magician returned with the African
wine, she filled her cup and offered it to
him in token of friendship. The Magician
drank it up eagerly, and scarcely had he
finished when he dropped down dead.

Then Aladdin came out of the next
chamber where he had hidden himself, and
searched in the Magician's robe until he
found the Magic Lamp. He rubbed it
joyfully, and when the Genie appeared,
ordered that the palace should be carried
back to China, and set down in its own
place.

The following morning, when the Sultan
rose early, for he was too sad to take much
rest, he went to the window to gaze on
the place where Aladdin's palace had once
stood. He rubbed his eyes, and stared
wildly about.

'This must be a dream,' he cried, for
there stood the palace in all its beauty,
looking fairer than ever in the morning
light.

Not a moment did the Sultan lose, but
he rode over to the palace at once, and
when he had embraced Aladdin and his
daughter, they told him the whole story
of the African Magician. Then Aladdin
showed him the dead body of the wicked
old man, and there was peace between
them once more.

But there was still trouble in store for
Aladdin. The African Magician had a
younger brother who also dealt in magic,
and who was if possible even more wicked
than his elder brother.

Full of revenge, this younger brother
started for China, determined to punish
Aladdin and steal the Magic Lamp for
himself. As soon as he arrived he went
in secret to the cell of a holy woman called
Fatima, and obliged her to give him her
robe and veil as a disguise. Then to keep
the secret safe he killed the poor woman.

Dressed in the robe and veil, the wicked
Magician walked through the streets near
Aladdin's palace, and all the people as he
passed by knelt and kissed his robe, for
they thought he was indeed the holy
woman.

As soon as the Princess heard that
Fatima was passing by in the street, she
sent and commanded her to be brought
into the hall, and she treated the supposed
holy woman with great respect and kind-
ness, for she had often longed to see her.

'Is not this a fine hall?' she asked, as
they sat together in the hall of the jewelled
windows.

'It is indeed most beautiful,' answered
the Magician, who kept his veil carefully
down; 'but to my mind there is one thing
wanting. If only you could have a roc's
egg hung in the dome it would be perfect.'

As soon as the Princess heard these
words she became discontented and miser-
able, and when Aladdin came in, she looked
so sad that he at once asked what was the
matter.

'I can never be happy until I have a roc's
egg hanging from the dome of the great
hall,' she answered.

'In that case thou shalt soon be happy,'
said Aladdin gaily, and taking down the
lamp, he summoned the Genie.

But when the Slave of the Lamp heard
the order his face grew terrible with rage,
and his eyes gleamed like burning coals.

:'Vile wretch!' he shrieked, 'have I not
given thee all thy wishes, and now dost
thou ask me to kill my master, and hang
him as an ornament in thy palace? Thou
deservest truly to die; but I know that
the request cometh not from thine own
heart, but was the suggestion of that
wicked Magician who pretends to be a holy
woman.'

With these words the Genie vanished,
and Aladdin went at once to the room
where the Princess was awaiting him.

'I have a headache,' he said. 'Call the
holy woman, that she may place her hand
upon my forehead and ease the pain.'

But the moment that the false Fatima
appeared, Aladdin sprang up and plunged
his dagger into that evil heart.

'What hast thou done?' cried the
Princess. 'Alas! thou hast slain the holy
woman.'
'This is no holy woman,' answered Aladdin, 'but an evil Magician whose purpose was to destroy us both.'

So Aladdin was saved from the wicked designs of the two Magicians, and there was no one left to disturb his peace. He and the Princess lived together in great happiness for many years, and when the Sultan died they succeeded to the throne, and ruled both wisely and well. And so there was great peace throughout the land.
APPENDIX 3
THE JANUS FACE

Roman coin with a double-headed Janus: the god facing both ways was believed to be present in every gate, door and passageway.
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POSTSCRIPT.

The "looks-within" place.

In the preface to this thesis Jung was quoted:- "The right way to wholeness is made up of fateful detours and wrong turnings". And it was stated that Jung's expression is also applicable to the thesis process. In the context of the preface, that quote was presented as a kind of Jungian bridge between the thesis process and the individuation process.

The statement of Jung's sits comfortably as an observation on individuation and on thesis writing, because there is an intimate connection between the two. In both cases:- we seek to understand; we assume there is purpose and meaning in the journey; and in both cases we know the journey is never complete. In the thesis process there is no final completion, since there are more bifurcations discovered than are explored, and in the individuation process, growth is open ended.

In my own case, the struggle with the objective nature of the thesis was paralleled by an inner subjective struggle. When a choice of approach needed to be made in a particular aspect of the thesis, then a corresponding inner choice was also implied. This inner choice is intimately connected to a sense of significance about the options and so in this way each researcher or writer explores, examines, assesses and develops the ramifications of their own inner world of relative significance. How an idea or choice is pursued may be an intellectual process, but the why of the choice is a feeling decision. As perhaps North American Indians might say; 'this is the looks-within place'.

What is uncovered by the thesis, has another, more personal uncovering in the psyche, neither follows the other but they develop together; the outer is engaged with the inner and this dual exploration discovers an inner, more symbolic life. And so:-

With each new symbol I discover,  
a part of me I uncover.  
Eyes and ears and arms and feet,  
these are the organs that I meet.  
Each symbol states a shape of me,  
that I to myself will clearer be.  
So the outer struggle must inward go,  
that the Self itself may heal and grow.

JH.