

Psychosynthesis Research Foundation

ROOM 314, 527 LEXINGTON AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017
TEL: PLAZA 9-1480

REGISTERED OFFICE
TREASURER
602 BELLEVUE RD.
WILMINGTON, DEL. 19809

February 1, 1969

Dear Colleague:

The fifth meeting of the 1968/69 series of Psychosynthesis Seminars (held on the third Friday of each month) will take place on Friday, February 21st at 7:30 P.M.

Our speaker will be Dr. Ira Progoff of New York City; the subject: "Methods of Evoking the Psyche - the Relation of Wholistic Depth Psychology to Psychosynthesis." Following his talk will be the usual group discussion.

We trust it will be possible for you to be with us.

Cordially,

JACK COOPER, M.D.

Date & Time of Meeting: Friday, February 21, 1969 - 7:30 P.M. prompt.

Place: "Directors Room", mezzanine floor, Park Sheraton Hotel, 7th Ave. & 55th St., N.Y.C. (There is a public car park across the street from the hotel.)

Speaker: Ira Progoff, Ph.D.

Subject: Methods of Evoking the Psyche - the Relation of Wholistic Depth Psychology to Psychosynthesis.

PSYCHOSYNTHESIS SEMINARS

1968-69 SERIES

Fifth Meeting: February 21, 1969

Speaker: Dr. Ira Progoff
45 West 10th Street
New York, N.Y. 10011

Subject: Towards a Transpersonal Psychology: The Organic
Approach of Wholistic Depth Psychology in Relation
to Psychosynthesis.

Participants:

George Bailin, Ph.D.
A.J. Brodbeck, Ph.D.
Dikran Dingilian
Helen Dinklage
Jack Cooper, M.D.
Rena Cooper
Abraham Elizur, Ph.D.
Mrs. Elizur
Frank Haronian, Ph.D.

Frank Hilton
Hilda Hilton
Barton W. Knapp, Ph.D.
Emanuel D. Kotsos, M.D.
Victorija Mickans, M.D.
Buell Mullen
Ira Progoff, Ph.D.
Rev. Ted Smith
Alfred D. Yassky

Psychosynthesis Research Foundation
Room 314
527 Lexington Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10017

TOWARDS A TRANSPERSONAL PSYCHOLOGY:

The Organic Approach of Wholistic Depth Psychology in relation to Psychosynthesis

by

Ira Progoff, Ph.D.

I met Dr. Assagioli when he was over here in 1958. As I think back now to the impression I had of him, I recall the feeling that he was very much in line with what I myself have been trying to do. I felt that we each had to continue along our individual tracks while we were going parallel to one another. I felt also that we would intersect from time to time, and that we would meet to share the correspondences in our work and to clarify our relation to each other. This is one of those times. Therefore I would like to take our session tonight as an opportunity to work out a repositioning of the conceptions I have been developing in depth psychology and to mark them off in relation to psychosynthesis.

I say "repositioning" because that seems to be necessary in view of the change in attitude taking place throughout the psychological field. We are in a quite different position now. At the time of Assagioli's visit, many of the positions that he and I shared, our attitudes on both theoretical and practical matters, were severely in the minority. We were simply not being heard. It was not only that we were not being listened to. We were not even being heard. Both of us, each in our respective manner, were seeking to shout out what we had perceived. But we were hardly heard at all in the general din of flat certitude among others in the psychological field.

That atmosphere has changed, however. Where I had become accustomed in earlier days to being received by public audiences with responses that ranged from simple scepticism to active antagonism, it is now quite different. I have even begun to worry lately that I may be in danger of becoming respectable. But that is probably too small a possibility to call for concern. It is one crisis that I can safely postpone.

The change in attitude toward certain psychological points of view, and especially toward the general orientation that Assagioli and I have shared for many years, is a fact, however. And it is an exceedingly meaningful fact, not only from the point of view of psychological theory, but socially as well. It involves a direction of change that we have been strongly advocating, and for which we have been impatiently waiting. So we should regard it as good news. And it is. But like all basic changes, it involves many diverse factors. In the complicated culture of our times, things are altogether interrelated. When as basic a change as this takes place in psychology, the very image of man is involved. Thus there are many overtones and implications. The fact therefore that a major shift has taken place in psychological attitudes should not be accepted on the face of it as an unmixed blessing. We should examine it carefully so that we can become aware of the many aspects of what is involved.

The psychological concepts of modern times derive from a twofold tradition. One is the tradition of academic psychology with its materialistic, essentially mechanistic background. The other is the tradition of psychiatry,

specifically of depth psychology, which also begins with a mechanistic background. This line of psychological development does, however, also draw on other philosophical sources, particularly where work like Jung's and Assagioli's is concerned.

The Jungian line of thought particularly utilizes the contents of other cultures and other religions. It has also a cultural perspective for the psyche of western man that is very interesting. Jung did his work in the light of what he called the "underside" of western psychology, that part of the western spiritual tradition that did not dominate the conscious religions but remained repressed and implicit. This is one of the really major things I learned from Jung. It carries the understanding that in history when two cultures come into conflict, one becomes dominant and the other goes into an inferior position. The fact that one becomes the dominant culture does not mean that the other disappears. The secondary one is then not active but continues to remain alive beneath the surface, and it transforms itself in coming up. For example, you could repress the pre-Christian religions of Europe, but they came back up in ideologies. The Scandinavian countries had hardly become Christian when heresy began bubbling up until finally there came the Reformation. But that was not enough for the Teutonic psyche. So then there came the political ideologies like the Nazi movement. And certain aspects of the Marxist movement have to be understood as outcroppings of the historical psyche of the European peoples. The power of Marxism certainly involves something much deeper than an interpretation of economics.

As Nietzsche said, we come as epigoni, as latecomers in history. And that means that we come not just at the end of a cycle, but that there is a great deal working within us of an historical nature. We contain history of many different kinds within us in the form of symbolic systems. These symbolisms used to be meaningful. But they no longer work. The contents of their imagery are no longer socially relevant.

When I did my first work on Jung, which was my doctoral dissertation, I was primarily interested in the study of history. The reason I became interested in Jung was that it seemed to me that you could not understand history by studying historians or the works of sociologists. You had to have a depth dimension if you were going to understand the social life of man in the perspective of time. I could not find anyone who had a depth dimension to his work and who had something meaningful to say about history.

I looked very hard, but I did not know about Jung. Finally when I found Jung, I read his Integration of the Personality. That book dealt with the alchemy material and I could hardly understand any of it. That was really obscure and difficult for me. And yet I sensed that Jung had a feeling for the historical movement that goes on beneath the surface. I sensed that he was dealing with the underside of the western psyche, for the underside of the Christian psyche took the form of alchemy.

In that kind of historical context we can consider what has happened in this past decade. When I was doing my first work on Jung, to be interested in Jung was to open oneself to ridicule among psychologists. But while everyone was thinking of human problems in terms of neurosis or pathology to be treated and diagnosed, Jung understood this as the need for an experience of meaning. Virtually alone in his day among psychiatrists, he recognized that people were ill because they had not found a way or had lost their way of feeling and experiencing from within the meaning of human existence. In that perspective we can see that what has happened in our time is that having lost it, people tried to get meaning in

rationalistic ways, as by science or by some conscious ideology in the manner of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It was a noble attempt, but it could not work. It only served to tighten the psyche.

Back in the early nineteen-fifties and right into the sixties, it was still true that the point of view which Jung represented was ridiculed as mystical or woolly-headed. This was primarily because of his point that healing involves an experience of meaning, namely, a direct experience. It does not come by a conviction of meaning, through reason or insight or analysis. This became the main problem of psychologists because the methods of analytical therapy were increasingly reaching a dead end. They were just not satisfying, because it turned out that analysis could not do it. This was the point that underlay my book The Death and Rebirth of Psychology. What I was thinking of there as the death of psychology was the fact that Adler, and Otto Rank, and Jung, especially in the latter part of their lives, concluded that the analytical method is not an effective therapy. The inference was, therefore, that the mainstream of depth psychology as analytical therapy had come to a dead end. Psychology could only fulfill the great need for which it had been brought into being, namely, the experience of meaning, if it could produce ways of bringing about an experience in direct terms, really something that would be the equivalent of Zen. This involved the whole dimension that Jung had entered into, all of which was considered to be totally alien to the rational mind and so was ridiculed.

Then there occurred an event full of paradox and of significance. Since Western man became "scientific," he became addicted to material things and placed his faith in the experimental study of them. He lost sight of the other side of his life, the whole spiritual, symbolic dimension. Then there came this drug, LSD, as a product of modern chemistry, and it broke open the psyche for people who up until that time had no other way of discovering that this additional dimension actually exists. Certainly the need to express this deep level was present was even urgent; but no one could see it except a very few in the psychological field. Then came this strange paradoxical event, that materialistic science produced a drug which activated the symbolic dimension of the psyche and thus created the impression that people were actually having spiritual experiences by means of science! It was quite understandable and much to be expected that people who found their way to religious experience only by the road of drugs should misinterpret what was happening to them. But at least something was begun. The depth of the psyche was opened and the recognition of its reality was given to people who might not have had this experience otherwise.

History often seems to be shaped in crucial ways by events that are paradoxical, or ironic, or mere coincidence. The use and long range social effects of psychedelic drugs seems to me to be one of those historical paradoxes. The drugs received university credence because they were created in a laboratory and were marketed by pharmaceutical firms. Thus they had the support and aura of science. But their effect was to open a new period of history with respect to the perception and appreciation of inner realities.

More than any other single event, the brief rage of popularity given to LSD and comparable drugs has opened and extended the vistas of modern consciousness. I do not mean to imply at all that the drugs have led to authentic spiritual experiences. The claim that taking LSD makes it possible to simulate schizophrenia does have validity. But the claim that it leads to authentic spiritual experiences is certainly not valid.

One of the things that the psychedelic experience has done, however, is to shake up and break the rigidities of the rationalistic consciousness. It has demonstrated that there is indeed a dimension of symbolic experience that touches the depth of man and of nature and carries intimations of larger truths. The fact of these intimations has changed modern consciousness. Man can no longer be as narrowly self-confident as the scientific rationalist of a generation ago. Now, even after the drug experiences have lost their popularity and are generally discredited as a means of spiritual experience, people remember the quality of the experiences that took place and the window on reality which they opened. They want to go to that dimension of life once again, but this time without drugs. Thus we have now a variety of therapies being proposed that will achieve the same kind of "turn on" as drugs, but without using the drugs.

A great deal of what is now covering itself under the umbrella of "humanistic psychology" is of this type. It might better be termed, "turn on" psychology. Its goal is actually to achieve an experience that will seem to be spiritual, that will be exciting, and that will recall the intimations of larger realities that came with the original psychedelic experiences.

I feel considerable ambiguity about these psychological approaches. On the one hand, I am very pleased that an awakening to the symbolic dimension of spirit has occurred in our time. It has long been overdue in Western civilization. On the other hand, I am concerned about the dangers of opening up the floodgates of the depths of the psyche precipitously and without long, cautious and disciplined investigation. I suppose that one reason I have this concern is that I have been so actively involved in this dimension of experience for so many years and have observed the pitfalls when people lose perspective in working with it because of unripe enthusiasms.

There is a large significance that should by no means be forgotten in the fact that the same drug experience that gives the appearance of spiritual enlightenment is also used to stimulate schizophrenia. The two are not that far apart, the ultimate in truth and the disaster of breakdown. Opposites meet. But it takes a delicate touch and prolonged experience to safely move in the narrow path between. It seems as though that part of the western psyche that had been growing drier and drier for centuries was suddenly opened up to water by the drugs. Then there came downpours and inundations of water, precipitously and without context. That water had been desperately needed. But it is also important at such times that people be adequately equipped to handle the new resources. Inundations of water after a severe drought, when proper preparations have not been made, can have more disastrous effects than even the drought period. At one point in American history we experienced this with great pain in certain parts of the country. It is a very appropriate model with important lessons to be drawn for the psyche from the natural world. When large new resources are brought into play it must be done organically, with balance, discipline, and proper preparation. This is particularly true of the "turn-on" psychologies that have come pouring through the floodgates under the name of "humanistic psychology." A much greater depth of knowledge and fullness of experience is required. It is a change in the direction toward which Assagioli and myself have been calling people for many years. But the warning must be given that people who have just learned to swim should not venture into depths where crosscurrents meet. If they do that, what began as joyous enthusiasm will end as disaster.

In order to absorb and utilize the psychic forces that are brought up by psychedelic drugs, it is necessary to understand what the drugs are doing.

symbolic experiences, waking and dreaming, occur without relationship to the person's immediate life situation. And further, they are not only without environmental context, they are also without organic context. Like an undirected rocket, they have simply shot out of the depths without relation to the natural development of personality.

The task then is to bring about a relationship between the overarching organic process of growth and this seemingly rootless irruption of imagery that has entered the world with no appropriate context. This is the principle I have followed whenever I have been called upon to work with young people suffering from the mixture of exhilaration and shock that follows certain types of LSD experiences. I work to get the process of the inner timing of the psyche back into balance with itself. Usually after the intensive internal upheaval that LSD has brought about, it is necessary to focus on the outer level of the young person's life. He needs to have a means of establishing a bridge by which his outer life and his inner experiences can be connected to each other. And that connection must be brought about in a way that is meaningful to him in his own terms.

Such an approach based on the principles of depth and time in the psyche requires patience and a sensitivity to the elusive, inner rhythms of each unique person. It requires time and a special quality of caring. This is not so much a caring for the individual as for the seed in him that is trying to establish its right to grow, and is trying to discover what kind of plant it is to become. If the doctor who is given the task of treating such a person feels that he has neither the time nor the inclination to give that degree of patience and caring, we certainly can understand the position he is in and what his feelings are. We can also understand, then, the alternatives which he chooses and the basis for his decision. It will be much simpler for him to look at the wide divergence between outer life and inner experience from the point of view of pathology. In that case, the diagnosis of "schizophrenia" will immediately suggest itself to him and he will be able to satisfy himself and his colleagues that he knows "what" the condition is. Having spent hardly any time or trouble at all on the matter, he will already have scored a professional point for himself. And we can certainly understand it if a therapist with a heavy practice and the overburdening responsibilities of a clinical institution on his shoulders should decide that the diagnostic approach is the only practical way of keeping things under control.

We would have to understand and be sympathetic with his decision, but it would be difficult for us to rid our minds of thoughts of what then happens to the patient. If, in the rush of modern life he is given the convenient label of "schizophrenia" to describe the discrepancy between outer life and inner imagery which he experiences, how shall the integration of the opposites within him eventually be brought about? Indeed, it cannot be brought about if the condition is viewed as a pathology. It is painful, and it is very disturbing both personally and socially. But it is not pathology. It is as though the raw materials of a mine have been brought up to the surface in their impure, unrefined state. In this condition they cannot be used. But that is not pathology. The task of a constructive, organic therapy is to get these raw inner materials into such a condition that they can indeed be used in the outer world.

This is the heart of the repositioning in psychology that is taking place during these years. It is a movement away from diagnosis by the cold light of pathology in favor of organically nurturing the potentials of persons. That is why, when I was writing The Symbolic and the Real, I felt the importance of making

Following the traditional conception of psychoanalysis that repression is the primary mechanism in the human psyche, the dominant interpretation of psychedelic drugs has been that they relax the repressive apparatus of the psyche. Thus it is held, the psyche is left free to bring up all that it has been holding beneath the surface. This hypothesis is certainly true to a degree, as we observe from the phenomenology of psychedelic experiments. But the release of repressions by no means accounts for the content and intensity of experiences that carry a quality of spiritual awakening. Something else, something much more fundamental than the repressive mechanism seems to be involved.

The hypothesis I have formed about psychedelic phenomena is that two aspects of the psyche are involved in them. One is the symbol-making faculty that operates at the organic depth of the psyche; the other is the time quality of the psyche.

To understand this, we must appreciate the significance of the psyche as basically a manufacturer of symbols, not of representational symbols, but of elemental symbols, symbols that reflect the ultimate ground and nature of the life process. In some way, through their chemical agencies, the psychedelic drugs greatly intensify and speed up the symbol making process at the deep level of the psyche. As a result of whatever it is the drugs do, a large outpouring of symbol formation is brought about. The symbols that are formed in this way are very often of an archetypal, elemental, primordial and historical nature. Such symbols are always latent in the psyche, but because of the speeding up that takes place within the psyche, the symbols are formed and brought to the surface ahead of time.

I mean the phrase "ahead of time" here to indicate that an organic process of growth and inner timing is involved at the core of each individual's life unfoldment. It is a kind of inner psychic clock and it moves forward primarily by symbolic expressions. The psychedelic drugs somehow speed up this psychic clock. In doing this, they bring up en masse from the psychic depths of the person symbolic material that is not integrally connected to his life. It is valid symbolism but it is ahead of time in the sense that it does not yet have a context in the outer life of the person. That is one reason why psychedelic experiences so often involve confusion and disorientation even to a point that approaches schizophrenia. The experiences that occur in this way are symbolic experiences which would have occurred in the natural course of the growth of the person - or their equivalents would have - if the psyche had had an adequate channel for its expression. The rationalistic repression of the spiritual and the symbolic closed the door to that, however.

That is the sense in which the cumulative history of Western culture is at the root of the tensions that finally burst forth by means of the psychedelic drugs. When the drugs came and were used, the sense of the symbolic and the spiritual was activated in individuals with an intensity that went out of control. All that had been pent up poured out. And not only what had been pent up in individuals. The repressed spirituality of the past several generations of Western culture was let loose by the drugs. That is one reason why young persons could have such large experiences of historical and primordial symbols.

The suddenness with which the symbol making process is set free after being rigidly held back has the effect of confusing the natural time movement of the psyche. Where it had been held back, it now shoots forward with an unnatural thrust. It shoots ahead of its natural, or organic, timing. The result is that the

a distinction between psychoanalysis and the approach of psyche-evoking, not of diagnosing the unconscious parts of the psyche but evoking them.

One psychological concept, the new and fuller understanding of which has played a crucial role in the transition to an evoking psychology is that of the unconscious. In the form in which the unconscious has gained its main usage in the history of psychology, it is primarily a negative concept. It deals with the repressed material, the wishes and fears and guilty memories that people cannot bear to acknowledge and accept in consciousness. This is the aspect of the unconscious that Freud emphasized and that has been used mainly in clinical practice. There is another aspect of the unconscious, however, which Freud called the Id and Jung called the Collective Unconscious, that is not the repressed part but the primordial source of symbols and patterns of behavior. This is the side of the unconscious that has given the dimension of depth to depth psychology.

Even with this large aspect, however, the conception of the unconscious has an inherent negative quality. It is the negative of consciousness. And yet we require a conception of the psychological side of man that will be large enough to enable us to comprehend the full unfoldment of all phases of the life-cycle of human existence. It was with this in mind when I wrote Depth Psychology and Modern Man that I developed the conception of the Organic Psyche. The psyche is a unity that unfolds by the same process of growth that is expressed in all of the natural world; that is to say its potentiality is contained in the seed and unfolds as the life-process proceeds. In this perspective, the life of an individual is a forward-moving unfoldment.

What is unconscious in him may be unconscious because of the repression of painful past experiences as Freud described this repressive process. But to a much larger degree, and in a much more fundamental way, the unconscious as a part of the Organic Psyche contains that part of the individual's experience that has not yet been lived. It is unconscious not because it has been repressed, but because it has not yet been experienced. This means that, from the point of view of psychological time, the important relation of the unconscious is not toward the past but toward the future. The main contents of the unconscious are not the repressions of childhood as Freud emphasized, but the unlived potentials of life which are latent in the seed of personality waiting to be given life expression. The potentials of the unconscious are in the depth of the Organic Psyche waiting to be evoked either by the natural movement of life or by psychological and spiritual techniques that are in harmony with the depth nature of man.

In an organic view of the psyche, two dimensions are of primary importance. One is the dimension of depth. The other is the dimension of time. We must never lose sight of the inner line of continuity in each individual's life. Especially if we take as our model the organic process of growth in the world of nature, the continuity in the growth of individuality is primary. Through the unfoldment of the cycles of life, from childhood through adolescence and maturity, this inner unity is the continuum in which the emergence of a person takes place. Particularly when we bear in mind that the unconscious part of the Organic Psyche is the carrier of the potentials of each individual, as the acorn carries the potentials of the oak tree, we can see that the process of development is an unfolding in the course of time of the life of each individual. This is the organic process by which individuals emerge.

With this perspective, there are specific types of information that we seek in order to assist in the natural process of life growth, and to evoke the

potentials of persons. We seek to get a sense of the span and timing and rhythms of the cycles of an individual personality. We seek to understand the specific patterns of continuity in an individual's existence, the directions in which it is tending, the startings and stoppings it has experienced and what its feeling of life is at the moment.

We seek especially to get a sense of where the individual is in his life at this mid-point of time which is the present moment. We ask: "Where are you in your life? How does it feel now?"

The answers to those questions contain the essence of what a person needs to know. But here we should be at least a little bit sophisticated psychologically, as psychologists seldom are, and least of all, I fear, in their present "humanistic" "turn-on" phase. After all, if a person can really deeply answer the question of where he is in his life, or how it feels to him, he is at a quite advanced level of development. It is the same as answering questions that are often posed in some psychological approaches where the client is asked: "Who are you?" Whatever is given by way of an answer, can only be an expression of a conscious or rational conception of the true situation. The answer can only come from somewhere near the surface because the truths of the psyche occur at a level of consciousness that is deeper than that from which an individual is ordinarily able to speak. Whatever answer he would give would come from the level of rationalization, and to that degree would be irrelevant. On a deeper than conscious level, however, these questions are of the fullest relevance and can be of the greatest use. The important question then is by what means one can draw forth an answer that will come from a level deeper than consciousness.

To make this possible was one of my primary purposes in developing the method of Twilight Imaging as that is described in The Symbolic and the Real. It is also an important factor in the further development of Twilight Imaging for use in the Dialogue House program, especially in various sections of the Intensive Journal and in the group workshop procedures. The general conception of Twilight Imaging lends itself to numerous adaptations. In the Dialogue House program it serves an especially valuable purpose in making it possible to move with relative ease from the non-rational to the rational levels of the psyche. That to-and-fro movement, loosening the mobility within the psyche, establishes a quality of inner flexibility. Then, when there are life-questions we wish to answer, we are able to reach them at a level much deeper than surface consciousness.

When, for example, I wish to pose the question: "Where are you in your life?" I do not let the question remain on the conscious, verbal level. If it were just to be a question rationally posed and rationally answered, that would place it up on the surface of things. Then the person would only be talking about himself, or what he thinks about himself. It would not be an actual entering into and extending of his life. It would not be an evoking of his psyche. To achieve this when I pose the question of where one is in one's life, I also ask the person, individually or in a group, to close his eyes and to let an image present itself, an image inwardly to behold. This image may then be extended so that it takes the individual to the non-rational depths of the psyche where he can feel where he is in his life rather than think about it. This quality of feeling, I should point out, is not an emotional feeling. It is not an emotion of anger or joy or fear. It is rather a feeling into, an inner sensing, of the contents of one's life. It thus has the effect of drawing one onwards in life, stimulating the movement of the psyche within itself. It is not only that a person gets an

idea or an image about his life; an actual enlargement of awareness, an inner sensing takes place. It becomes an ongoing process of evoking awarenesses that had been latent within but that had not been made actual. By doing this, as you can see, when you consider the quality of movement that has thus been created, we have actually started a process of dreaming. It has the active, ongoing quality of dreams. It is moving forward in time while it is placed in the present moment, just as is true of dreams. To work in this way has the additional advantage that while it stimulates and enters the deep level of psychic movement that is carried by dreams, the person remains in full consciousness so that depth awareness and rational discussion can proceed simultaneously.

I would like to say a few things at this point about the use of dreams. In particular I want to call your attention to the time-structure of dreams. The conception of this has increasingly established itself in my mind over the past several years as the most productive aspect of dreams on which to focus when the goal of the work is to evoke the process of the psyche.

A main reason why the time-structure of dreams lends itself to the active extension of the psychic process is that this structure reflects the movement of the psyche as a whole. In an individual's life, the tendency is for the energies of the psyche to seek to move forward as much as they can. From an energy point of view, the process of life is a forward movement. It is also a movement from within outward. Further, it is a process by which the psyche presents images that appear ahead of time. This is an important aspect of the time-structure of dreams.

The basic trend of the psyche is that it moves forward in time, thrusting itself ahead of itself; and it projects this process forward by means of images. Images in dreams or in waking experiences serve as the vehicles. Further the inner principle of this movement is a dialectic by which the inner life process of the psyche brings up images that carry the concrete possibilities of what may be fulfilled in its outer life. The reason we speak of this process as dialectical is that its inherent nature carries it over into its own opposite. And it is by means of this movement into opposites that the dynamic is provided by which the growth of persons is carried forward.

In this dialectic, images appear in the psyche carrying the possibilities for outer fulfillment. These possibilities can actually be brought to fulfillment, however, only to the degree that they are given shape and form on the outer level. Thus the movement of the energies of the psyche is inherently drawn from inner to outer, from inner image to outer form. The movement goes from inspiration and intuition to artwork and life relationship. The unfolding growth of persons proceeds by means of this dialectic of inner and outer.

A natural and harmonious tension is involved in this dialectic. Sometimes, however, the movement is blocked altogether and cannot proceed at all. The life energies whose inherent drive is to move outward and forward are then totally stopped. Yet they must continue in motion. If they cannot go outward and forward, and yet must continue to move, the only alternate possibility is that the life energies move backward and downward.

This is what does in fact take place. Since the life energies are unable to move forward into the future, they move instead backward into the past.

Since they cannot move outward into the world of conscious activities, they move inward. These two reversals of energy motion become the actualities of the individual's life. The movement of the energies and the contents which they carry are then reflected in his dreams. That is how the time-structure of dreams is brought about.

Dreaming begins in the present moment of a person's life. There are many types of dreams, of course, just as there are many types of conscious mental processes. But the type of dream that is of consequence for the dreamer's personal life is one that displays this time-structure arising out of the dialectic of inner and outer. In the present moment of an individual's life-situation, for one reason or another the movement of life energies is blocked. Not being able to go outward and forward, it goes inward and backward; and this is reflected in the dream. The dream energies go downward and inward because, not being able to proceed on the surface of life, they do have the alternative of exploring below consciousness. And from this deeper-than-rational level, they may draw new resources with which to break past the blocked situation in which they find themselves.

The energies of the psyche not only go downward into the depths; they also go backward into the past. As they are reflected in dreams however, it does not seem that they are drawn into the past primarily because something holds them there. It is rather that the energies are moving into the past as a means of getting access to memories and other life resources with which to overcome the stalemate of the present moment in life. The movement downward and backward into the past involves a process of selectivity. The individual psyche is drawing upon all the resources contained in the depth of its non-conscious levels, the repressed material of past experiences and its still un-lived potentials, in order to find a means of resolving its immediate problem. The principle of selectivity is the focus of the present tension, the point at which the movement of the energies has stalled. But the process by which the selecting is carried through functions in a direct and intuitive way at a deeper-than-conscious level. The psyche moves spontaneously to structure and select the material it requires to meet its present need.

The time-structuring which we find in dreams is a result of this process. The dream itself is brought about by the tension in the immediate situation of the present, the point at which the energies could no longer move forward. But the main content of the dream is contained in the psyche's attempt to draw upon its deeper than conscious resources and to develop an inner point of view with which to resolve its problem. Thus the dream begins by going back to the past, selecting a piece of the past, and spontaneously putting that over into a symbolic form that leads into the present. Having done that, the momentum of the dream easily carries itself forward and projects intimations of the future in its time movement.

It is thus that we often see past, present and future all contained in a single dream. This is its time-structure. It becomes particularly significant, however, once we realize that it is not merely the time-structure of a dream but of the life of the individual as a whole. The dream becomes a reflection in miniscule of the total life process of the person. To perceive the time-structure of the dream, therefore, and especially to feel actively into its movement, has the effect of opening a profound way of entry into the inner process of life unfoldment.

A convenient and brief illustration of this to which you can refer is described in The Symbolic and the Real. There I discuss the dream of a young man who was a graduate student living through a difficult time of uncertainty. In the dream he was at a party where everyone was taking part in a treasure hunt. As part of the game, they were all to leave in search of the treasure, and to return when they found it. The dreamer also went out on the quest. At length he came to a place where there stood a twisted and misshapen tree. On one of the branches of this malformed tree there hung a golden key. The direct understanding was given to him in the dream that this key was placed there to guide him. If he would dig directly beneath it, he would find the buried treasure. In the dream, he followed that advice, finding the treasure and much more as well.

What is the time-structure of the dream? We can see it even in the most general terms. All we have to do is ask the dreamer what his feeling is about his life. To him it has been a misshapen tree. That is the image in which the entirety of his past is expressed. Many times he had started projects, and stopped them before they could come to fruition. As a result, his life had become jumbled and difficult despite the considerable resources of intelligence with which he began. The image of the tree in the dream, then, carried for him a perspective of the entire past of his life. It was a misshapen tree.

The dream, however, also gave him a perspective in which to see his present situation. It placed his past experiences in relation to his present life. It said to him that his past failures carried the key and the guidance that were necessary if he were to find the treasure of his life.

In my opinion there is the very greatest significance in the fact that this awareness came to him from the dream as though it were self-evident. No analytical interpretation at all was needed. The inherent movement of the dream carried the meaning. But this meaning was not as an insight to be intellectually gained. It came rather as a feeling of direct participation in the motion of the dream. The dream, as a spontaneous expression of the psyche, carried its time movement onwards. This is the inherent direction of the inner life of the person. It is the direction of life unfoldment that is ordinarily only latent or implicit in the individual's life. But, by means of the dream, it has an opportunity to become explicit and thus express itself in the actualities of life. It is here that the meaning of a dream ultimately declares itself and proves itself.

Now what can we learn from this for our general purpose of developing methods for evoking the psyche within the context of the individual's life as a whole? Of the greatest importance, it seems to me, is that we draw the full implications of the fact that it was because the dreamer felt into the time-structure of the dream that its message and its meaning could come to him so freely and flexibly. It could open out through his participation in it. The extension of the dream could thus be in his life, which is where it is really meant to be. The unity of the dream and the dreamer's life is basic and inherent. But this unity is seldom experienced as a fact. In place of it there is a split, a bifurcation; and it is because of this bifurcation that a unitary process of personal unfoldment so seldom takes place.

The reason for which this bifurcation takes place, breaking into the psychic unity of the dream process, is, in my opinion, that we have been conditioned in this "psychological era" to take an analytical attitude toward our

The movement into the future which completes the time-structure of a dream is what gives dreams their prophetic quality. Very often dreams display a very marked precognitive knowledge. The reason is simply that when the dream appears, a process of growth is in motion; and the dream comes out of the midst of it. It comes out of the organic depth of the psyche, and thus it expresses the past, present, and future of the psychic process all in one. In dreams, the future is often expressed ahead of time. By that I mean that the process of the psyche reveals the direction in which it is moving or seeking to move, and does so before it has actually arrived there. Thus in one sense the dream that indicates the future is ahead of time. In another sense it is precognitive, and persons who learn how to connect their lives to the movement of their dreams have access to an important psychological resource. Dreams can indeed be prophetic for those persons who have established a relationship to the symbolic style of the psyche and have learned to move with it. When one understands that the depth of the psyche speaks in symbols, one will not take dream materials literally. And that, in itself, avoids a major part of the misinterpretations of people who look to their dreams to tell them the future. But those who can move flexibly with the flow of the imagery of their dreams will find that the pathways of intuition have been considerably widened for them.

One other comment I would like to make about the time-structure of dreams concerns the relation of this view of dreams to Freud's original insights. It may help us understand what he saw and what he misinterpreted.

When Sigmund Freud began his study of dreams, he noticed that dreams seem to go back to experiences of the past and to reconstruct these as the contents of the dream. From this observation he inferred that the dream process always had to go to the past because it was caught there. Some traumatic event, some memory that had been repressed constantly drew the dream back to the past. That was how it seemed from Freud's vantage point. It fit also with his diagnostic attitude. It carried the strong implication that when a dream was remembered, that was a sign that there was something wrong in the unconscious, and the dream was calling attention to the problem.

When, therefore, Freud said that "Dreams are the royal road to the unconscious," he was actually saying that he saw dreams as the royal road to the roots of neurosis repressed and buried in the past. Therefore the therapist engaged in the analysis of a dream was like a bloodhound on the scent of an escaped prisoner, his nose to the trail until he ferretted him out of his hiding place and recaptured him. That of course has led to some of the popular fascination with psycho-analysis in novels and motion pictures and has led to the image of the psycho-analyst as a doctor-detective, a sort of Viennese Fu Manchu.

The detective unearthing the past is a quite different type of person than the evoker who is nurturing the seed and drawing it into its future. These are two very different images of the psychotherapist and the nature of the work he is called upon to do. It is the heart of the difference between the psycho-analyst and the psyche-evoker, a difference that hinges on the reasons for which the dream process moves back into the past.

In our perspective the dream process is part of the movement of life energies in the psyche as a whole. It is basically moving forward in accordance with the underlying process of growth in nature. When it is blocked in its forward movement, it goes backward into the past in order to recoup itself, so that it can

move forward again from a new position, with a new momentum, and with additional resources. Thus, the reason that the energies of the psyche move into the past is not because they are "caught" there by a repression. It is not a question of a neurotic or an obsessive pull. It is a question of finding in the storehouse of the individual's past experiences a source of information and ideas with which to meet the problem of the present moment and to move into the future.

Sometimes, in fact, when the movement of the psychic energies is sent back and down by a frustration in the outer situation, it is seeking more than the past experiences of the person's life. It may require access to archetypal material at the transpersonal depths of the Organic Psyche. At such times, the dream process goes first into the personal past and then into the transpersonal depths in search of material with which it can return to the surface of life, meet the problem of the present, and carry its life unfoldment into the future.

These are successive levels to which the dream energies move in their efforts to meet the problems of life and to carry the growth of the person forward. The main task of the psychotherapist as I understand it is that he develop a harmonious relationship with the movement of these energies so that he can go with them in their rhythms, moving backward and downward with them when that is their need, and go forward and outward with them when they are ready to do their work in the world. In order to evoke the seed of the psyche of another human being, one has to be willing to become very malleable oneself, and to move with that psyche in all its cycles and its rhythms, until it establishes an organic connection with the inner principle of its own integral growth. That, at least, is the perspective in which the therapist functions as an evoker in wholistic depth psychology. I think it is fair to say that of all the people working in this field, Assagioli comes as close as any to working in this spirit and direction.

But let me pause at this point so that we can have some questions and share in a discussion.

- - - - -

(We hope to send you a transcript of the Discussion Period later. P.R.F.)

DISCUSSION

George Bailin: I know that it is not your intention in any way to discredit the conscious mind however. . . I feel that there is so much potential in what you call . . . let me put it to you this way: is it possible, do you think, to transform a personality so that this hidden material becomes more available so that one is able to live . . . to bring these two levels closer together?

Fromm: Actually, that is the whole nature of this kind of approach. It is to make the depth of the personality accessible to the progress(?) of life, to establish - in Jung's phrase - a relationship of the conscious to the unconscious. When I was speaking of the dialectic of the psyche, that is, that it is a movement inner, it goes down to these deep levels but that the nature of our life requires a movement that goes outer again, takes what it has got from within and makes it into form. And that this movement inner and outer and then back again, that is the nature of our existence; that is the main process. In fact, it seems to me ? was asking me in the intermission about the problems in therapy, about Jungian cases that failed; and essentially my feeling is that weakness from the therapeutic point of view in a Jungian way is where there comes to be a kind of fascination, analytical fascination, with the symbolic contents of the deep level. So that the person becomes engaged in drawing up, writing down, analyzing and making kinds of theories or classifications of the materials of the unconscious; and then the dream process really becomes like smoke that just goes out of the chimney. So my sense of it is, when I speak of this dialectic, is that the smoke that comes out of the chimney is what should be driving the steam engine. The metaphor I would like to use in answer to this part of your question the relation is like going down into the mind and you come up and dig up all the ore. It is what you have got to work with; that is the relation to the depth. Now the process that takes this ore and makes it available as a valuable method is a conscious process; that is where experience and knowledge and discipline come in. And that is the second phase of it, the other part of the dialectic. Or if you take it this way, a person has a dream and in the dream they are out of that deep level, whether it is a sleep dream or not, for instance, I have just finished writing a thing on this. . . .

Ingmar Bergman was interviewed on TV; I didn't see it but I came in one morning to my class at Drew and they were talking about the interview and what they wanted to know was, and this shows how projections go, was Bergman a patient of mine; because he said because what ~~Bergman~~ Bergman said that everyone of his pictures was a dream; not necessarily a sleep dream but maybe one I had in my sleep and then continued in my waking state and he said that actually every picture - this whole sense I have been speaking of - a ~~continuity~~ ^{continuity} of working out of the process; and that one leads to the other. He describes the whole process which I just in my article; I could practically just take it as it is. And what he says is that when he does a film they are like extensions of the dream, which is like this method of imaging out of the dreams which I use. And that is the reason he says, he tries to have the same actors every time because he has to be able to feel comfortable and that they are like part of him. . . they are like figures in his dream. So it is ~~some~~ like one big psyche involved in this. Now in this sense he gets an image, he tells of a dream and then he has the idea to make a film; now that then is taking the thing outside and starting to give it its form, but then there is the sense that the art work has a certain form that is indigenous. It is as if the process starts with the person, a feeling or something he wants, starts the art work outside and it is as if you got a totally new person there. So that art work has its own requirement so that you really have to listen to it and that is where you get a dialogue, and that dialogue is ^{this} dialectic, and that is how the process is.

One of the characteristics of the creative person, I think, is the degree of ridity with which he can go down deep and then come back and work in a conscious ^{actually} way. And ~~actually~~ your really great scientists are people like that - in the depth psychology book I talk about August . . . ? , and the dream experience by means of which he discovered the microstructure of the benzene rings. And also Wolfgang Pauli (?) where he describes it is essentially a religious experience by which the scientist gets some image in himself, a possible hypothesis for understanding the outer world; and that the point where he can get this dimension, this hypothesis, to coincide with objective reality outside, that is of inner and outer, that is a real

religious event.

Eliazur: Is this what ? would call regression in the service of the ego?

Froegoff: No, I don't think so because in this sense it is not yet in the service because it does not really know what it is. It would be like Bergman making his films; why is Bergman making his films? For his ego? It . . . is not, you see. The ego is there when the process is false or artificial. His ego is there to the degree that it is not marked, is where the ego is. But he makes films because an image working in him that is like, say, "How does the temple become a ?" Why? It is an organic process that unfolds and includes these transformations.

Eliazur: That is true, but he makes the film he has to come in contact with the actors and so on to produce it, but then he has to come on a more ego level and he gets his inspiration from the unconscious and in this sense it is in the service of the ego.

Froegoff: Yes, that is right; that then is the process. Maybe I find it a little difficult to feel it with that language.

Eliazur: And another question I would like to ask: you mentioned the social, the interpersonal aspect. Isn't it possible in some instances that interpersonal experience of an intense nature, the person will then get in touch with the deeper levels.

Froegoff: Maybe; and that would be just the sense in which I would say that outer events in our lives have a quality of dream. Of course events like that transcend - really, what I was speaking of is not the interpersonal experience but the interpersonal emphasis. What I was thinking of especially was the kind of group work, and in individual therapy as well, where the whole focus is on "what do you feel about me?", etc. and where you have emotions going back and forth has a certain value in a kind of getting rid of something. What I was trying to say is that a kind of method of activating the deep parts of the psyche, mostly this won't, and that experiences of love and unity and especially of support, of deep support, come out of contact with the other level.

Haronian: I would like to go back to Dr. Eliazur's question about regression in the service of the ego". I think that the main difference between that which is a strictly

psychoanalytical concept, and your Jungian notions, the main difference has to do with your center of gravity, as it were. In the Freudian notion the center of gravity if I may use that expression, is in the ego and the regression takes place in the service of the ego. In your thinking, if I understand it correctly, the center of gravity is in the psyche, which is largely unconscious; and the purpose of the whole process is to evoke from the unconscious and to express as the ~~xxxxxx~~ acorn expresses in the oak tree what was latent in the unconscious; and the ego is merely a tool for the expression (Progoff: a by-product) yes, a by-product. That is why I feel that the center of gravity is one conception as against the other.

Progoff: Yes, and I think possibly that an aspect, that the point of difference is ^{but} right in your way of describing it; that because of the emphasis it would lead to a different way of relating to the person, and whereas the Freudian would more or less grudgingly concede the value of regression, in this other way a whole sort of way of life would be a means for stimulating that regression and actually feeling that that is what sensitivity is, is what the creative capacity is. And that would be the capacity to actually develop. For example, I think that the word introversion, Jung uses it just to describe a particular type of personality - it is sort of a neutral term. The word introversion is almost like the word neurosis; it is a turning in, it is a sign of introverted person . . . For Freud it is someone ~~xxxxxx~~ and that is sort of the basis of it.

Descriptively, it would be the equivalent, but from the point of view of what one would do then or what one would be trying to do would be a world of difference.

Yaagky (?): Would you extend what you have been saying to the whole area of collective phenomena. . . . (Progoff: like historical myths?) . . . categories of myths?

Progoff: No, my own feeling of this is and my main attempt is to avoid categorizing, and always to try to stay with the actual experience that is happening. For instance, where Jung uses the expression archetype and it seems obvious that what he, the value of it was that he was calling attention to the fact that there are formative principles, patterns, that underlie all the different cultures. They are just part of the nature of the species, like hoarding nuts is in the nature of squirrels, and that

in men, these instinctive patterns are a psychological equivalence. That is what he is saying and these may be patterns of experience like the death and birth in initiation, or the expectation of a messiah, and various other images and patterns, feelings, offerings of sacrifice, and these things that are a part of, the hero for example. It seems to me that the value of Jung working this was that he called attention to the affirmative aspect of these patterns and lay the basis for some sense of unity behind the diverse phenomena; but then, as part of this other aspect that I was speaking of, of the atmosphere ~~that~~ of the deep level of the psyche, and it seemed to me that what he was calling attention to that was most important in these archetypes was a certain quality of human experience, and that the word archetype then should not really be used as a noun but as an adjective; that there is a sort of archetypal level that is transpersonal, universal, and that this is a level of experience which we perceive, and if we see a great tragedy - ~~as~~ O'Neill or Miller - and at a point when something real happens, that is what is touched, whatever it is. Now, when you get to the naming of the archetypes, the making of categories, that is when you get into a whole intellectual field and that is ~~where~~ where Jungian work really lost itself because then, while the goal was to have a way of relation to this deep level, then suddenly the Jungians found that they were all involved in ~~this~~ kind library therapy in which the patient has a dream and then you send them out to follow up that ^{motiv} motive, and you find that you go for Jungian therapy and end up doing research in mythology. And that is all right after all, except that you have taken yourself from the archetypal symbolic level and you put yourself up on the top on the intellectual level; and while it is true that when you work with myths intellectually nonetheless something is stirred underneath, like if you irrigate one field some of the water is going to irrigate the field next to it, so there is something good happens in it but it is really that you had changed the style and the whole focus of the work.

Now, nonetheless, what I was saying is that it seems to me that the emphasis must be on this quality of it, on the archetypal level; then - and Jung's problem was, when he was asked "how many archetypes are there?" and he said "there is no specific number" people then said that that is what we have been saying, that whenever you run

out of an explanation you simply invent a new archetype! In some sense and in certain aspects that was true.

I had a particular concept on this, because I think this is the direction in which you are asking, I felt that this universal archetypal level has in general two kinds of aspects: that there are universal images that come as part of cognition, that is, there are images by which man tries to see the world and ~~with~~ ^{that} these roughly correspond to Emanuel Kant's categories - which would be like Time and Space, etc. and that these basic categories of cognition have all different forms in different periods of culture; it might be Manna, Energy, or whatever. And that aspect of the archetypal level I call "cognitypes", that is, patterns of images used in that way. The other is a type of image that is not for cognition but is to be enacted, that is to be lived out, which would be like the image of the hero, sort of like a Kennedy who has a sort of image working in him and he becomes identified with the image; then he feels that it is like a part ^{power} that is working in him so that he does not wear a coat in winter, nor pull down the bubble top in his car, and he is just a hero and as a hero he dies an untimely death. It is part of the meaning of his life as a hero. And that kind of image one lives out; ? was the image of the bard like the Homeric bard, or a Whitman or a Tager the image of the post-prophet. That kind of image that is lived out in the person's life, the dynstyp, that is the dynaically unfolding image that has a different cultural form in each culture but is an expression of underlying patterns, like the hero.

I have carried that to some length but I have a certain ambivalence because on the one hand I really want to increase the sensitivity to that deep level and this kind of categorization means(?) something to the other. And yet I do feel that we have to go back and forth, like going up and down Jacob's Ladder, and I feel the importance of the intellectual very strongly, but the need at this period of history, is the development of the non-rational, and to have the means of making the non-rational ~~manipulable~~ accessible to the conscious level.

Cosner: Now that we are in the space age we have to say in and out rather than up and down.

Bailin: Did you say before that there is no possibility of self-actualization or activation of all of these potentials, to bring them into consciousness, because the reason I ask that is that my understanding of psychosynthesis is that as the flower of human life there is an activation, there is an actualisation of all of these powers, these dynamisms and they become full blown in some way and I thought that was where you. . .

Prozoff: No, that is why I was glad of the opportunity to speak of this [?]dynatype concept. It has become quite important to me. For example, I gave a paper a few years ago at ~~xxxxxx~~ Eranos and the title of it was "The Man Who Transforms Consciousness" and the subtitle "The Inner Myth of Tillich, Buber and Jung". What I was doing in that paper was describing the life development of Buber, Tillich and Jung and essentially what I found was that Buber and Tillich seemed to bring out the same ^adynatype, namely, what Tillich calls this ^ytheonamous (?) man, the man who speaks the name of god in the world. And if the world is not ready to hear the name of god or to recognise it, he speaks it any way until such time that he shall be heard. And Buber was this, which is the nature of the prophet who goes out into the world with this word and just speaks until it is heard and whether it gets a good social feedback or not he speaks because that is the nature of the image. and then when I spoke of Jung, it seemed to me that he lived quite a different dynatype; that Jung was not the type of man who goes out into the world and speaks the name of God; he is more in the image of the wise old man, like Laotse who goes into the center and stays in his hut and waits by his meditation for the world to come to him. Jung's characteristic image therefore of the Mandala, and really the most important thing is the center of the Mandala, of the circle which was Switzerland in his vision and the center of the world, with him at the center of the world. And that is the dynatype of the wise old man.

^{if}
Now, /your dynatype is to be the hero or the John Kennedy, then you do not live to be a wise old man; and I say that very seriously, in the sense that there are inherent patterns in the image that wants to unfold; that the squirrel hoards its nuts and other animals don't do that. Ther^(?)fore, the conclusion I came to in this is that each dynatype, each image, has a characteristic style of unfoldment -

like the dying of an early death or the various things that go with artists and poets - this kind of psychic sensitivity, with the oracle type, or the healer type, that there are physiological things that go with that but I do not have the temperament to get involved in but I have hunches in this direction. And that further, in regard to Jung, and this is where I was ~~hinting~~ planting a bombshell because I was speaking in Jungian country, that when a person has the wise old man ~~dynatype~~ has a style of life development that is based on being at the center of the circle, not like the prophet, and that then for him everything is in the harmonization of opposites; and that, therefore, Jung's process of the individuation which he gave out as a sort of universal theory is true of the dynatype of the wise old man whose life is a balancing of the opposites, a harmonization. That is the reason that I felt when I worked that out I suddenly understood why I felt that Jung's dynamic sense of the unconscious, and Jungian work, was not dynamic, that it does not really lead to creativity, that the only creative person in Jungian psychology is Jung; and that the reason for it is what he was had his system, the structure of the system, the integration of opposites was valid to the wise old man and length of days and staying in the center but was not valid, for example, for the woman whose dynatype was to be the nurturing mother or the man whose dynatype is to be an artist who may spend his whole life in Jungian therapy trying to be a wise old man. This is indicated, I sort of soft pedalled that at the time at Erance, that was back in 1966, . . . but I have been sort of holding my fire on enlarging the plump(?), but that is the essential feeling I have to understand the particular system. In a way that is not to negate ^{the} a man, it is not to limit Jung at all, it is that Jung was not a prophet and by that he was a prophet in some sense of opening up a whole style of vision of awareness. But he was not a prophet in the way of "the prophet" as a type of man who goes out and speaks in holy words; Buber was or Tillich.

There was a problem in Jung's life: the use of the word "inflation" which you will notice he has in his system, showing that the great problem is inflation which is that if a person identifies with the archetype, the way he experiences that - as you remember in his biography he tells of where people tell him that he was really a

poet or that he should be an artist or that he should really go out and spread the word among the people; and he took that as people wanting him to identify with the archetype of the Saviour. He said that is like Schweitzer. He said "if you want people to bow down to you, you become a doctor and you go to Africa; then people would bow down to you" and that was his view of Schweitzer; and that is what he would have been doing if he had followed what his followers wanted him to do. But I think the reason was that would have been an impossibility; it would have been against his nature to go forth with a doctrine, because that was not his dynatype.

Eliquis: How would you picture the dynatype of Freud and Adler?

Brogoff: I have the idea that Freud got confused at his dynatype and that really he was a creative writer, and that he, like a good Jewish boy, became a doctor. And I think that that is the reason that he spent his whole life struggling, but he never really felt at home in himself as a medical doctor; and it really did not work as a doctor and that is why he says at the end - that thing Otto quotes - that Otto Rank quotes - about whitewashing the negro, you can't really change people because it didn't work, the analytical way did not work. And that is ~~why~~ why, after all, when he is working on Leonardo and his is involved in literature (Eliquis He was more of a philosopher than a writer) ^{If} /His dynatype was that of the philosopher he could not have stuck with what he did, no. From my point of view, the imaginative qualities are what attracts him to me. (Haronian: He could take that quite as an insult.) Well, that is how I see it - the creative thing in Freud but after all it was as if he started to be a doctor and couldn't quite stomach it or that he could have lived it through without a breakdown just as an MD, as an ordinary MD. It is like the thing in Jung; Jung could not stay as an MD. His whole analysis of how he started as an MD and after becoming an MD becomes a psychiatrist, after internal medicine he becomes a psychiatrist, and then becomes a psychoanalyst, tries to succeed in the psychoanalytical association and then becomes Jung. And around the time he is becoming Jung, around 1911, he thinks he is destroying his life and he has these very split dreams - when Fromm and the others reviewed his book they said well, we always expected that Jung was

schizophrenic, and now we know," and that is the gist of what they could learn from it, that just those dreams at that time were just an instance of what I was saying that when the life energies are moving out and are stymied then they move back down downward in time - he had these dreams of Siegfried jumping from mountain to mountain and all these dreams that are of the deep past which is not just the personal past but also the historical past that gets activated in that dimension of the psyche.

Hilton: To try and relate something of what you have been saying to what Assagioli writes in his book, this "atmosphere of the deep level of the psyche" that you spoke of, would you think that this is equivalent to what Assagioli speaks of as the ~~super~~ supra-conscious?

Frogoff: Yes, but I always wonder why he has to call it "super". I kind of feel that I feel something in Assagioli as if he had a foot in each side of history, and that he is in the nature of a connector; that he is like a man who had two distinct visions "one was in the terms of the conventions of what the medical point of view had, another was a vision of more of the symbolic dimension that would have involved him in occult philosophy and mysticism. And he really saw two kinds of truths and he had to have a way to make both of these truths available to each other, and I think that is why it seemed natural for him to use the terms like "synthesis" which is actually in a sense has an implication of analysis which is part of the historical situation that Assagioli comes from; his characteristic, that he could not be content with analysis, therefore the next step was synthesis. The feeling that I have is that to synthesise after analysis is like a main step, but that if you start with the vision of synthesis, if you start not with analysis but with synthesis, if we assume has lived this, then if you start with the vision of synthesis then you can have a more integral way, what I would call a more holistic way. And this is what excited me in Jan Christian Smuts, his idea of holism in evolution, that there is a natural process working in nature which is the formation of wholes and that the process of evolution is a movement towards ever more sensitive and ever more complicated units, and that the ultimate of that is the human species at this point but ^{MAN} what ~~plan~~ is still in the process of forming wholeness; and that actually, what he understood when he spoke of this as a

possible next science, what I understand a depth psychology would be is quite in accord with what Assagioli says and that is that the next science of man will not call for a medical style of treatment but what Smuts would call a ~~personology~~ personology. And that is a method of theory and discipline to bring about the sense of the wholeness of the person; and wholeness then, that wholeness does not mean bring in all the possibilities together; it does not mean the well rounded person who is intuitive and intellectual and everything; wholeness means rather an inner integrity, a kind of integrating unifying principle that is unique and individual with each species and with each individual, so that wholeness in this sense would be for the person who has the hero dynatype to live his life dangerously and to die young - that is wholeness. And for the wise old man dynatype to live in seclusion, work on his books, and spend his life in this interpret way, and that is his wholeness. And for each the life possibility of the inner image, of the inner myth in that sense to have the sense of what the image is (telephone interruption at this point. Ed.) This is a very important principle to me for it makes all things possible; otherwise even though Jung would say there is no systematic principle, in principle there is one basic pattern that all persons must work out; you have got to work out your shadow ~~side~~ in relation to your anima or animus, you have to work out your persona, you have to get all the pairs of opposites balanced and so on. Well, it takes a pretty long life to do that and it takes a lot of possibilities and very special kinds of situations; it makes a lot more sense to be doing that if you are a man who has an historical psyche that is deeply activated and has the capacity of coming into relationship with it; if, on the other hand, as you mentioned Frank when we were coming down about some of the characteristics of the women who had lengthy interviews with Jung or some of the other leading Jungians in Zurich. If you are woman who has some ~~type~~ difficulty in finding a way to be a mother would be in relation to her children or to a man or you have problems like that that are closer to your dynatype . . . , and if you spend you rtime in therapy/trying to work out a balanced relationship of archetypal images, you may very well spend a whole lifetime just like spinning out there, and you may then use the analytic structure, the intellectual structure,

as ~~is~~ a certain prop which keeps you going from going up into the clouds but it does not enable you to find yourself. And that is really the essential criticism, even the slight implication I made in the talk caused a certain degree of upset when I was there; I may go there again - I have a long talk to give at Eranos, but will cause more upset. But I feel that it is a very basic point that the essential goal, not just of therapy but of the experience of wholeness, is to get in touch with the principle in ourself in our psyche or in our seed or in the essence of our potential whole in Sauts' way, get in touch with that inner principle so that it can unfold itself - whatever it is. Then people say suppose your image is to be a Hitler, well, in the world of nature one has to be whatever one has to be, and if the man arises whose dynotype is to be like a Robin Hood or a brigand, we wouldn't have capitalism if people had (hadn't ?) the dynotype of brigandry or piracy. I can cite many non-psychological authors for that but there is a style of personality - I put the question not in private therapy but in certain kinds of groups, you ask them "Suppose you were born of the same racial stock but several hundred years earlier". For example, I gave a workshop and went around the group and asked that question. One man was a physicist, another man was an engineer and he said that he would be a tinkerer, he just like to solve problems. Or, I did this work with the medium Eileen Garrett she is Scotch Irish, and I asked her what she would have been if she had been born 1,000 years ago - what I wanted to ask was suppose that she had been born before christianity then she said "Oh I should have been sitting on the trees, sniffing entrails. And it is quite clear - the druid, an oracle, and actually, I think that a lot of the women - or male or female - who you come across with this clairvoyance, mediums, and who for many years have ~~been~~ been "just eccentrics" are now sort of "in". That is part of the transformation that is happening; but these people, if they had been born in another period of history, with that dynotype, they would have had a social role and the culture would have had a place for them, and then their witchcraft or whatever, and all those things that had no place in a rational type of society, would have a very good place in the other.

For example, suppose you are an intuitive type, the contemplative type, if

you had been born in the 12th century in France you would do fine, if you were born in 19th century Chicago you are in for trouble. There is a lot in this, you see, the relation of the seed image with the outer time; there is a certain inner situation on the possibility and an outer one; and that is ~~more~~ ^{where}, in a certain sense, we all have to ponder the question of individual destiny, which seems like a chance factor - why one person has luck or fortune, which after all, was a major concept in some cultures; that there is a certain, - it is not a mystique, it is not a charisma which is also a by-product for when the dynotype is strong charisma goes with it. Actually, if you take these life studies - at Drew, one of the seminars, is a course on creative persons - and I have them choose a creative person and get as familiar as they can with the whole inside of their life and then I raise the questions and they have to identify with the person and say how they felt, if they had to make a decision about their work - joining the priesthood or becoming a scientist or any of these things. And one of the things that comes out is when they study, for example, one person took Norman Vincent Peale, and one of the things that was interesting was how frightened Peale was about getting up and giving a speech when he was a young man; how at a certain phase the very thing that aspect of the dynatype that would eventually be the strength, the strength of the dynatype, at one phase would be very weak; and in another phase, in the development of it, strong. One has to have a sense of the patterns of development of the image, and sometimes, of course, the person will make a choice of a life work, for example, because of the influences of the environment - the father, let's say, was a first rated lawyer who never became a doctor so he has a need to become a doctor and fill out his father's un-lived life, whatever it may be.

I call that the environmental self and that is another derivative image. If he tries to unfold that environmental image he can never really get into touch with his source of strength because it is like the tree, if it is rooted in the earth, can grow but if it is a derivative, a reflected image, there is no dynamic root. I have a sense that when a person makes a choice of work on the basis of an image that is not rooted in his own dynatypal nature then it is not organic, and then he has always got things going against him because if he is rooted in the thing that he is supposed

to be it just kind of happens naturally because the growth process can work. And that may have the aspect of fortune or charisma. And after all, quite a lot - when a person starts on one path,--like when you asked me about Freud, I said I thought he was not meant to be a medical doctor, and he wasn't, and he really got out of it in a very neat way. There are also young men who go into medicine and find that it is not their field they have a life crisis until they work their way out. And all kinds of difficulties can happen; he worked his way out in a very harmonious way. When you think of it the collective psyche was very ingenuous.

- end of discussion -