

Jung's Social Psychological Meanings

GRAHAM RICHARDS^{*,†}

1 Claremont Road, Tunbridge Wells, Kent TN1 1SY UK

ABSTRACT

The latter decades of the 20th century saw C.G. Jung doubly marginalized, both by Psychology's academic establishment, for whom he was beyond the scientific pale, and by critical psychologists for whom he was, to simplify, beyond the ideological one. In this paper, I will suggest that there are two respects in which Social Psychology should reconsider his position. Firstly his own, albeit largely covert, Social Psychology, has affinities with critical Social Psychology; secondly, in the subject matter sense, Jung's own social psychological significance in the mid-20th century and beyond itself requires attention in its own right. Copyright © 2008 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Key words: Jung; analytical psychology; reflexivity; social psychology

In his highly acclaimed recent book *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology. The Dream of a Science* (2003) Sonu Shamdasani has, although far from being an uncritical devotee, made an impressive attempt at relocating C.G. Jung from the periphery to the centre of modern Psychology (note: 'Psychology' when capitalized will refer to the discipline, 'psychology' will refer to its subject matter). His case, to put it at its sketchiest, is that Jung was centrally concerned with, and strove to confront, a number of the core theoretical issues facing any project of creating a 'scientific' Psychology. One of the most central of these is obviously how the relationship between the individual and the social is to be conceived. Jung's apparent marginalization from the discipline's explicit attention since the mid-twentieth century has, on this reading, reflected Psychology's persistent evasion of such matters. It is only those on the 'critical Psychology' and 'social constructionist' fronts who have doggedly striven to redress their neglect over the last two decades. This is ironic since most in these camps share the mainstream hostility towards Jung. Be not alarmed, I am not about to try and add Jung to the multitude of those figures and schools, ranging from Dilthey to Wittgenstein and Marxism to role theorists, who may

* Correspondence to: Graham Richards, 1 Claremont Road, Tunbridge Wells, Kent TN1 1SY UK.
E-mail: gdrichards1941@yahoo.co.uk

[†]Independent Scholar, formerly Professor of History of Psychology at Staffordshire University and Director of the British Psychological Society's History of Psychology Centre.

reasonably be identified as among critical Psychology's or social constructionism's direct intellectual progenitors. On the contrary, that he is not in this list makes his case all the more interesting.

In this brief paper I will first, in the light of a re-reading of Ira Progoff's *Jung's Psychology and Its Social Meaning* (1953), outline the case that Jung's position was a profoundly 'social' one. Secondly, however, I will offer a tentative reflexive exploration of Jung's impact on 'social psychology' in the subject matter sense. My case will be that even if the overt evidence of Jung's having figured in the history of modern Social Psychology is scanty, his reflexive influence on that subdiscipline's subject matter 'social psychology' has been considerable. ('Influence' is of course a problematic catch-all term which really tells us very little about the nature of the relationship between influential and influenced.) The ways in which Psychological discourse has itself reflexively affected the psychological in modernist societies has been a pervasive theme in critical and social constructionist approaches over the last few decades, as well as among recent historians of Psychology (e.g. K. Danziger, 1997; J. Pfister & N. Schnog, 1997; G. Richards, 2002) but here we have an ironic lacuna. Because social psychologists of nearly all camps do not, to put it bluntly, *like* Jung, they have ignored the social psychological effects of Jungian thought itself. But these effects were themselves rooted in a popular understanding of the Social Psychological components and apparent implications of Jung's Psychology, which had particularly strong cultural resonances during the mid-20th century. It is to those Social Psychological components, and how they were read, which we turn first.

The obvious starting point for this task is the California-based Ira Progoff's 1953 work. This is especially apposite as it was written at precisely the time when Jung's social psychological impact was approaching its height, and its author was not only a passionate Jungian but, as he mentions in the Preface, had consulted Jung himself on the manuscript: 'To Dr. C.G. Jung my great gratitude is due for his kindness in reading the manuscript in the midst of his many labours and for giving me the benefit of his valuable comments and suggestions' (p.x). [Unpublished correspondence between Jung and Mrs Cary F. Baynes from 1952 and 1955 suggests that while supportive Jung later came to view Progoff as susceptible to 'inflation'. He also appears to have had a spell of analysis with him and in a 1954 letter to Michael Fordham describes him as his 'pupil'. (S. Shamdasani, personal communication)]. The first part of the work provides an accessible synopsis of Jung's theory, concentrating on those aspects of it most relevant to social questions. The second part tackles the topic directly with two extended chapters on 'The Psyche in Society and History' and 'Historical Implications of Jung's Thought'. The latter includes discussions comparing Jung's position with those of Ernst Cassirer, Heinrich Zimmer, Carl Kerenyi and Paul Radin. As a text it is itself an expression of, to use the dreaded word, *Zeitgeist*, of the post-Second World War period and thus of social psychological significance in its own right.

How does Progoff read the 'social meaning' in Jung's work? Unsurprisingly this ultimately centres on the concepts of the 'collective unconscious' and 'archetypes', as well as the nature of 'the psyche'. What emerges is a claim that Jung espouses an essentially 'sociohistorical' view of the nature of 'the psyche', a claim consistent with Shamdasani's elucidation of the extent to which Jung's ideas were deeply indebted (and often avowedly so) to those of, first, C.G. Carus and A. Bastian, and then E. Durkheim and L. Lévy-Bruhl. In examining the relationship between Jung's view of the matter with those of Zimmer, Cassirer, Kerenyi and Radin, Progoff elucidates a number of affinities between their positions and his. One merit of Jung's ideas in Progoff's eyes is that his theory remains

provisional and open to development, serving as a starting point for future work rather than a complete system. As he interprets Jung's position:

Jung avoids the common tendency of psychologists to regard society as merely the plural of the individual, since he realizes that the social quality of man is something inherent in human nature. . . . Man is by his very nature social, he says. The human psyche cannot function without a culture, and no individual is possible without society. By making this his basic assumption, Jung frees himself from the main pitfalls of studying society from a psychological point of view. That is to say, he does not carry over to the study of society interpretations based on the analysis of the human being as an individual. (p.161).

Like Shamdasani he notes that Jung 'has worked out his basic conceptions in the spirit of Durkheimian sociology' (p.161). This means that while Jung, as a professional psychiatrist, 'is interested primarily in the individual; . . . from the larger perspective of the study of man, he regards society as the prior fact. Society and the social experiences of history are ultimately the main suppliers of the contents of the individual psyche' (p.163). The emergence of individual consciousness from the unconscious is thus a parallel, from the psychological side, of the emergence of the individual from social processes on the sociological side. Again as Shamdasani observes, there is thus a kind of (very Jungian!) meeting of opposites here between Durkheimian 'collective representations' and the archetypal forms by which the dynamics of the unconscious psyche manifest themselves in consciousness. Indeed, no less an authority than J. Piaget is quoted by Shamdasani making precisely the same point (Shamdasani, p. 288). It is not this paper's task to rehearse yet again the details of Jung's theory but there are clearly grounds for the, usually ignored, complaint by Jungians that the 'collective unconscious' and 'archetype' concepts have been widely misunderstood.

The 'collective unconscious' refers, in effect, to the psychological side of humanity's universal, genetically determined, neurological character. The operation of this, however, has to take place within specific sociohistorical contexts, which are, moreover, constantly changing over time. It is thus necessary that the demands of the 'collective unconscious' (or 'objective unconscious' as Jung later preferred to call it) become conscious if the individual is to survive and mature in such a setting. In order for them to do so they have to become represented in consciousness and the individual's social world (or natural environment as culturally mediated and construed) is the only source in which such representations or symbols can be found. At this point we can see how 'collective representations' and 'archetypes' can become viewed as, respectively, social and psychological, manifestations of the same underlying process. On the one hand each culture is temporally dynamic and builds up a cumulative 'heritage' of such symbols or representations, on the other, there is a level at which the 'collective unconscious'-cum-'neurological' processes themselves are universal. It is easy therefore to see how, on such a reading, the 'archetypal' forms which their representations take are both culturally unique and yet, to some degree, have an underlying cross-cultural affinity or resemblance. It is also possible to view different cultures as historically divergent in terms of how these representations change ('evolve', 'develop'—as you wish) over long periods of time, without this implying any divergence, at the most basic levels, in humanity's fundamental character.

Several points may be made about this account. Firstly that in his quest for a comprehensive theory of the mind or 'psyche' Jung appears to have been far more aware of the social dimension than Freud. Secondly, this led him to critique the 'individualist' bias of mainstream Psychology, a point later routine among critical psychologists. Thirdly that

his thinking was far more embedded in European sociological and anthropological traditions than he is usually given credit for. And fourthly that in the 1950s at least his approach was being seriously considered in some quarters, if not mainstream North American Social Psychological ones, as potentially able to yield profound insights into collective behaviour. This last point needs some amplification. As well as Progoff it was during this period that many Christian intellectuals, keen to take Psychology into account, 'discovered' Jung and fell out of love with Psychoanalysis, on which they had been quite keen in the inter-war period (see Richards, 2000). This shift had begun in the mid-1930s in response to the appearance of Jung's *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (1933). Three important factors counted against him however. The first was the continued perception of him as an apostate from Psychoanalysis, which hampered appreciation of the originality of his ideas. The inaccuracy of this perception emerges nowhere more strongly than in Shamdasani (2003). He was developing his ideas autonomously before encountering Freud and his 'party-line' period was short-lived, almost a transient dalliance in the perspective of his long career. The second was suspicion regarding his dealings with Nazism. Again, we need not enter into this fraught issue in detail here but the verdict now has to be that the evidence is at best extremely ambiguous. At any rate a number of Jewish analytical psychologists were prepared to give him the benefit of the doubt (see Maidenbaum & Martin, 1991, *Lingering Shadows. Jungians, Freudians and Anti-Semitism*). The mud stuck nevertheless. (This curiously contrasts with the case of Martin Heidegger, about whose complicity there is no doubt at all, but who is cited frequently and respectfully by post-modernists.) A third factor more directly prevented the socially sensitive character of his thought from becoming fully visible—this was simply that Jung cast himself, professionally, as centrally concerned with the nature of individual psychopathology and the nature of the 'psyche', rather than with social theory as such. His social thought is thus articulated in a scattered and often implicit fashion throughout his writing (see also Odajnyk, 1976). When he does address the social more directly, he can thus be all too easily accused of 'projecting' onto the social categories which properly pertain only to the individual, when in fact those categories, as he conceived them, emerged in the first place from the need to take the social fully into account.

Taking Progoff's reading as broadly accurate, and supported by Shamdasani's account, it is reasonable then to suggest that Jung's theory included a view of the relationship between individual's psychologies and the social context which has a number of points of contact with later critical and social constructionist positions. First there is the primacy of the social and hostility towards individualist theories, which view social psychological phenomena as no more than summations of individual behaviours explicable in terms of individual psychological processes. Secondly, there is an understanding that the content of individual 'psyches' is supplied from non-individual sources and can only be consciously structured in terms of socially available representations and symbols. Thirdly, there is a shared historical linkage with major strands of European sociological and historical thinking, extending in fact as far back as the historian J. Burkhart.

It should be stressed at this point that the aim here has been to clarify the nature of Jung's own position regarding the social, not to endorse or defend it. For what it is worth, the author's perception of Jung is that, for all his universalizing aspirations, he retained much of the traditional Eurocentric world-view, unable fully to escape either romantic 'Orientalism' or colonialist attitudes towards Africans and Australians. (I have discussed Jung's complex and ambivalent attitude towards Africans in Richards (1997) pp. 165–172.) It is also interesting to contrast the early Lévy-Bruhl view of 'primitive thought', with

which Jung was initially quite enamoured, with that of British anthropologists and psychologists such as W.H.R. Rivers, Bartlett (1923) and A. Radcliffe-Brown, or American-based anthropologists like Franz Boas and Margaret Mead, who (excepting Bartlett) had, unlike Lévy-Bruhl, actually had field experience and would have none if it. On gender issues his position similarly possessed a romantic 'equal but different' character which left traditional sex-role stereotyping exalted but fundamentally unchallenged. But it is now time to turn things on their head. Rather than debate how good, bad, wise, foolish, scientific or religious Jung's Psychology was, a more Social Psychologically interesting question is its reflexive social psychological impact, including the impact of the 'collective representation' of Jung himself.

There is little doubt that, regardless of psychologists' own growing doubts and antipathy, Jung's popular appeal burgeoned rapidly after 1945. With Freud and Adler both gone (and Wilhelm Reich gone mad) he was the sole survivor of the group whose views were widely believed to have revolutionized 'scientific' understanding of the human mind four decades earlier, and in doing so wrought major changes in the very language which people used to talk about and understand psychological matters. It was a role Jung himself relished, an individuated incarnation it now seemed of the Wise Old Man archetype itself. His ventures into Gnosticism, alchemy, oriental religions, the *I Ching*, and mythology in general may have upset both experimental psychologists and the radical left, putting him beyond both scientific and ideological pales, but they did his mass appeal no harm at all. Ironically, while psychologists saw his interest in alchemy as a final nail in his professional coffin, some historians of science felt that anyone who could understand alchemy must be a pretty good psychologist. This is evidenced, for example, by the highly respected work of the Newton scholar Betty J.T. Dobbs, and more directly the quantum physicist Wolfgang Pauli's direct relationship with Jung as a combination of collaborator and analysand (Jung & Pauli, 1955; Dobbs, 1983; Westman, 1986). The Routledge (in the US, Bollingen Foundation) multi-volume edition of his collected works was hugely successful and one-off new books such as *An Answer to Job* (1954) and *Flying Saucers. A Modern Myth of Things Seen in the Sky* (1959a) as well as the curious *Synchronicity. An Acausal Connecting Principle* (1955), which included an essay by Pauli, continued to fuel fascination with his ideas. His autobiography *Memories, Dreams and Reflections* set the seal on this in 1962. It should be noted that, in the light of recent research, the last is becoming a very problematic text, largely ghost written by Aniela Jaffé, and with much important material, such as his relationship with William James, not included in the final version (Shamdasani, 2005). One unintended effect of this was again to obscure the role of others than Freud in Jung's early intellectual development.

We might identify two phases of this post-war impact. Until around 1960 one major social appeal was primarily to the 'spiritually' inclined and those interested in the occult and mysticism. (It is worth noting here that at this point—as an F-scale question in Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, & Sanford's *Authoritarian Personality* (1950) indicated—belief in astrology tended to be confined to a rather odd right-wing, anti-scientific, group.) There was also a reasonably strong psychotherapeutic Jungian presence, represented in Britain by people like Michael Fordham and Anthony Storr, which had links with Christian therapists, although was far smaller in scale than psychoanalysis. In its early years Jung figured prominently in the training offered by the Westminster Pastoral Foundation for example, and its first cohort of supervisors in 1973 came from the Society of Analytical Psychology, headed by Michael Fordham (Black, 1991, pp. 32–33). It is a fair generalization that by 1960 Jung had completely replaced James Frazer as the first port of

call for anyone wishing to explore the nature of mythology in a non-hostile spirit—indeed a US paperback edition of Frazer's *Golden Bough* came with a Jung quote blazoned on it. And while Jungian analyses of the aetiology of Nazism were never as thorough or technical as psychoanalytic ones, the idea that somehow it involved an eruption from the German 'collective unconscious' was attractive. This felt more satisfying than either the individualistically couched explanations on offer from the Freudians (who ascribed it to the effects of authoritarian German child-rearing styles being exacerbated by the patricidal Oedipal trauma of losing the Great War) or the Marxist analysis (which explained it in terms of capitalist plotting which got beyond plutocratic control). The 'collective unconscious' interpretation seemed to get nearer the heart of the sheer primal nature of the phenomenon and its quasi-religious character. Jung's (1959) interview with John Freeman on the BBC's *Face to Face* series brought the Wise Old Man into living rooms across the UK and helped consolidate his cultural presence. Whatever the psychologists now thought about him, beyond their ranks he largely retained, even enhanced, his intellectual prestige and was for a while, in Britain at least, probably the best known living psychologist.

The second phase, from c.1961 into the early 1970s, sees a deeper and rather different, more genuinely 'social psychological', penetration of what were understood to be Jungian ideas. In 1972 the most popular exposition of Jungian thought, the coffee-table book *Man and His Symbols*, appeared, with Jung as the first of four authors. Laurens van der Post, a long-time associate of Jung, presented a three-part documentary on Jung in 1975 and in the following year published *Jung and the Story of Our Time* (1976, the US edition seems to have appeared in 1975). These came at the end of a period in which he had been receiving intensive attention from 'counter culture' intellectuals. The British origins of the 'counter culture', to which I am largely confining the discussion here, are complex and multifaceted, but insofar as it was an intellectual movement (which was, initially, to quite a considerable degree) they lay partly in a marriage between the surviving remnants of an often vaguely mystical bohemian artistic subculture (art schools playing a major role) and the appeal of the much publicized Californian 'beat' movement. Having spent their puberty mesmerized by rock 'n' roll, bright middle class adolescents turned in their droves to poetry, jazz, folk music and modern art, fusing this with a more political gut-level opposition to nuclear weapons and the Cold War. As budding intellectuals they were quite indiscriminate, rejecting the established boundaries of academic respectability laid down by teachers and lecturers. Marx, Sartre, Buckminster Fuller, Velikovsky, Suzuki, Marcuse, Kropotkin, Chardin... reading 'outside the syllabus' was *de rigeur*. Both Freud and Jung were, it goes without saying, part of this mix. Partly this was a collective breakout from the pervasive drabness and post-traumatically stressed character of contemporary adult British society and popular culture. Add cannabis and, by the mid-sixties, LSD to the situation and one had a recipe for real social psychological mayhem, soon exacerbated by the Vietnam War and opposition to racism fuelled by the distant US Civil Rights and South African anti-apartheid struggles. Handling this entailed an often quite self-conscious drive towards psychological self-exploration, a quest for a new mode of consciousness, and consequent fascination with madness and psychotherapy. The early motivations for white British experimental drug use were as much epistemological as hedonistic (although, given the enjoyability of the methodology, the distinction is not entirely clearcut). It was in this context that Jung's appeal was dramatically boosted and drew ahead of Freud's.

There were several reasons for this. A major one was the non-reductionist character of Jung's Psychology, an account which did not seek, as Freud's apparently did, to subvert the

meaningfulness of mythology, dreams, mystical experience, religious symbolism and so forth by recasting them as no more than, at best, 'sublimations', of personal infantile sexual fantasies. The fact that mainstream 'scientific' Psychology by then had little time for Jung further reinforced his standing at a time when Psychology, now dominated by US approaches was being widely seen as politically compromised and (rightly or wrongly) identified with behaviouristic projects of behavioural control. His 'outsider' status, and the subjects he was prepared to tackle (which, as we have noted, included alchemy and flying saucers, as well as astrology and the *I Ching*) proved an irresistible attraction. In particular his account of astrology in *Aion* (1959) was possibly a major source of its alternative-culture appeal, especially his exegesis of the notion of an impending 'Aquarian' age soon succeeding the present 'Piscean' one. The present author would in fact go so far as to assert, pending proof to the contrary, that it was indeed the immediate source of the 'Dawning of the Age of Aquarius' concept.

One important component of his later work was his extensive treatment of non-European mythologies and religions which seemed to provide an accessible route for their understanding and appreciation. By seeing them as culturally specific modes of archetypally symbolizing what were actually universal features of the dynamics of the human collective unconscious Jung was felt to be bridging the cultural gulfs which were dividing humanity. His work affected the academic study of mythology more broadly, most notably the work of Joseph Campbell (e.g. Campbell, 1960, the first of a monumental series) and he also corresponded with and knew Mircea Eliade, albeit Eliade's path was essentially his own. Asian, African and Native American belief systems were no longer incomprehensibly exotic and alien, but offered alternative modes of experiencing the world and exploring the psyche. At a more popular level the highly successful Thames & Hudson series of large lavishly illustrated paperbacks on mythological topics was thoroughly infused with the Jungian spirit (e.g. Cook, 1974). The icily heroic and dourly stoical Freudian vision of *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1930) simply could not compete in this cultural climate. Within psychotherapy the Jungian notion of 'individuation' also gelled in with the prevailing stress on 'self-realization' and 'actualization' now dominating the mushrooming alternative therapy movement. The role Jung's 'individuation' concept played in determining the character of this movement greatly needs more historiographic attention than it has so far received. Progoff himself certainly became a major figure on the American alternative therapy scene publishing works such as *The Cloud of Unknowing* (1957) and *The Symbolic and the Real: A New Psychological Approach to the Fuller Experience of Personal Existence* (1963).

The social manifestation of Jung's impact was dramatic, although rapidly diverged from anything resembling a formal 'Jungianism'. Although the details have yet to be unravelled there can be little doubt that his high cultural profile and the popularity of his work among 'alternative' or 'counter' culture intellectuals served as a *catalyst* for the 'psychedelic' explosion of the mid-1960s. The reading offered here in relation to Britain is however consistent with that given by E.S. Taylor (1999) regarding the United States. Jung-plus-LSD was a potent combination and Timothy Leary himself included a 'Tribute' to Jung in Leary et al. (1976) *The Psychedelic Experience: A Manual based on the Tibetan Book of the Dead*. More curiously I discover that Henry A. Murray, a friend of Jung and one of his few fans among major US psychologists, wishing to take a mescaline trip in order to maintain credibility with Aldous Huxley at the unlikely venue of the 1961 XIVth International Congress of Applied Psychology in Copenhagen, turned to Leary, his Harvard neighbour, for the wherewithal. He then opened the session on 'Psychology and

International Affairs' with a detailed account of the ensuing 3 hour trip (Murray, 1961). The 'spiritual' became an exploration of the 'archetypal' contents of the mind. This was not a party-line Jungian programme of course. It was simply that Jung had provided a set of concepts for understanding 'what was going on' and a safety net for restoring order when things got out of control. This could be deployed as much for interpreting events in the outside world as for those in the 'inner' one. As things progressed (or regressed!) many abandoned both Jung and the drugs in favour of other techniques, often throwing the Jungian ladder away and accepting non-European religious systems on their own terms. But Jung provided the starting point.

What also needs noting is the covert role of Jungian thought in facilitating some of the more mystical forms taken by the late 1960s–early 1970s feminist revolution, in which 'the Goddess' was reinstalled and the feminine 'archetypes' generally re-affirmed. The fervour with which this could be done soon moved things beyond the somewhat patronizing and patriarchal 'equal but different' flavour of Jung's own expositions. Even so, his background presence was a crucial factor in providing a resource for empowerment. Jung's 'Anima' concept also enabled radical males to support this, and both the pressure to 'get in touch with the feminine side' and the shift to androgynous style in popular music were manifestations of this. The variety of forms which feminism has taken is a topic which now needs some serious historiographic unravelling. This is not my job for several reasons but I do of course recognize that many feminist writers, such as Sheila Rowbotham (1973) were coming from a much more Marxist direction, while Freud continued to frame the work of Jean Baker Miller and the existentialist Simone De Beauvoir strand lies in the background of much of the more recent post-modernist and critical versions. And yet the Greenham Common protest of the 1980s, as a paradigm example of radical feminism in action, was surely a far more 'Jungian' affair, involving much self-conscious, if only semi-serious, ritual chanting, magical manouvres and similar white witchery. And the 'Earth Mother' was a common role in early female hippiedom.

What is important to stress here is that these developments were *not* so much visible evidence of Jungian processes at work (and thus vindications of his theory) but self-conscious exploitations and explorations of the possibilities offered by structuring experience in Jungian terms. It is not being claimed that Jung was the only factor in play—Robert Graves's *White Goddess* (1948) and an indiscriminate fascination with all things occult, mythological, astrological and mystical were patently involved too. What is being claimed though is that Jung's role was somewhat deeper than these others; a catalyst facilitating this very fascination and enabling its expression to take quasi-modernist, radical and revolutionary forms. This contrasts with the generally anti-modernist, medievalist, nostalgia-ridden and ethereally retreatist forms which previous similar waves of interest had taken, from 19th century Pre-Raphaelite and Tennysonian Arthurianism into the post-Great War period. While the inter-war situation was in some quarters already moving a little beyond this, as exemplified in T.S. Eliot's *The Wasteland* (1922), the broad appeal of works such as Margaret Murray's *The God of the Witches* (1931) and Jessie Weston's *From Ritual to Romance* (1920) still lay in invoking a ruefully yearning and melancholy sense of some mysterious, magical, past. This was reinforced by the rapid and popular expansion of archaeology during this period under the aegis of well-known figures such as V. Gordon Childe, Flinders Petrie and Arthur Woolley. Vaughan Williams's wonderful *Variations on a Theme of Thomas Tallis* perhaps captures it best. (It is from this context that Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings* must be understood as emerging.) If not always anti-science, this was at best ambivalent towards it.

There was nothing anti-science about the alternative culture however, though much that was opposed to the agendas and directions it was taking. Science Fiction was, after all, part of the mix. In a curious way it succeeded in genuinely achieving something like that reconciliation between science and religion which Christian intellectuals had been desperately hankering after for over half a century. And after all, Jung purported to be sailing under the scientific banner, however far he had drifted from the main fleet.

If in some respects the alternative culture was the final act in the Modernist drama, it also then signalled its demise by adopting what might be called a 'synchronous' rather than 'diachronic' position regarding the archetypal and mythological. The past was all available *now*, everything was on the menu, the great progressivist momentum of Modernism was dissipating, like a river debouching from steep mountains onto a flat plain. While the main river continued its relentless flow, the decades since have seen repeated attempts at controlling its actual course or diverting some of it to irrigate a wide variety of alternative agendas. (One might elaborate endlessly on this metaphor invoking stagnant swamps, dredging attempts, dam-building and ox-bow lakes etc.) This 'synchronous shift', the hallmark of post-modernism, was also in part a Jungian move, for besides seriously discussing, with Pauli's support, the concept of 'synchronicity' itself, the atemporal reality of the past in the collective, or 'objective', unconscious, was a central tenet of his theory.

I must leave other European and North American societies for others to ponder (as E.S. Taylor has begun doing for the United States), but as far as British social psychology in the subject matter sense is concerned, the argument here is that Jung's presence—both as writer and symbol or 'collective representation' in his own right—was a major factor in determining some core features of the massive change in the psychological character of British culture inaugurated during the 1960s. This is not the same thing as saying the culture itself became in any sense 'Jungian', Jung's role was, to reiterate, primarily that of a catalyst for, and psychological resource for handling, the chaos attending the birth of that new mode of subjectivity which may loosely be called 'post-modernist'. But that is also not the same thing as saying that, when it began to proclaim itself in the late 1970s, 'Post Modernism' as an intellectual movement was directly drawing on the Jungian tradition. It was as a social psychological factor, not Social Psychological one, that Jung's role was played out.

A final question is then raised, why the enduring hostility towards Jung among post-1965 born academic critical and post-modernist psychologists, exceeding anything felt towards Freud? It is surely not just the absence of a Jungian Lacan. Merely to pose the question risks triggering a stream of invective. He is seen as patriarchal and sexist, as religious or mystical, as politically suspect, as covertly racist and as a 'totalizing' theorist (as well as a bad and confusing writer). Well, yes to some extent, but no more so than a host of other far-less despised figures of his generation. More to the point, he has himself become a sort of 'archetypal' collective representation among critical and post-modernist psychologists, a symbol of the psychologist who embodies just these traits, and thus of everything they oppose—their 'Shadow' in fact. But if that is the case there is even more reason for confronting his social psychological significance head on and submitting his case to honest scrutiny. As this paper has tried to indicate there are sufficient grounds for doing so, both regarding the character of his own Psychology and the social psychological importance of his pervasive cultural presence and enduring appeal beyond academia.

As an historian of Psychology I have always insisted on the dual character of Psychological theories and practices (Richards, 1987). They can be understood in their own terms, but are psychological phenomena in their own right as well. As such they are also

social or cultural phenomena and thus part of Social Psychology's subject matter. Whether or not one likes the Psychology in question thus becomes irrelevant. In the present case, to twist the reflexivity yet further, these points must necessarily apply not only to the Jung case itself but to the general hostility towards Jung among critical and post-modernist psychologists both personally and in their own Psychologies. We are not out of the fly bottle yet.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks to Sonu Shamdasani and Simon Schaffer for their help with this paper.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Science Editions.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1923). *Psychology and primitive culture*. New York: Macmillan.
- Black, D. (1991). *A place for exploration: The story of the Westminster Pastoral Foundation 1969–1990*. London: Westminster Pastoral Foundation.
- Campbell, J. (1960). *The masks of God*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Cook, R. (1974). *The tree of life*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Danziger, K. (1997). *Naming the mind. How psychology found its language*. London: Sage.
- Dobbs, B. T. J. (1983). *The foundations of Newton's alchemy or "the hunting of the Greene Lyon"*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Eliot, T. S. (1922). *The wasteland*. New York: Boni & Liveright.
- Freud, S. (1930). *Civilization and its discontents*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Graves, R. (1948). *The white goddess: A historical grammar of poetic myth*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Jung, C. G. (1933). *Modern man in search of a soul*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Trubner.
- Jung, C. G. (1954). *An answer to Job*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Jung, C. G. (1959). *Aion: Researches into the phenomenology of the self*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Jung, C. G. (1959). *Flying saucers: A modern myth of things seen in the skies*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Jung, C. G. (1962). *Memories, dreams and reflections*. London: Collins.
- Jung, C. G., & Pauli, W. (1955). *Synchronicity: An acausal connecting principle*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Leary, T., Metzner, R., & Alpert, R. (1976). *The psychedelic experience: A manual based on the Tibetan Book of the Dead*. New Jersey: Carol Publishing.
- Maidenbaum, A. & Martin S. A. (Eds.). (1991). *Lingering shadows: Jungians, Freudians and Anti-Semitism*. Boston & London: Shambalah.
- Murray, H. A. (1961). Prospect for Psychology. In G. S. Nielsen (Ed.), *Psychology and international affairs. Can we contribute? Proceedings of the XIV International Congress of Applied Psychology. Volume 1*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Murray, M. A. (1931). *The god of the witches*. London: Sampson Low, Marston.
- Odajnyk, V. W. (1976). *Jung and politics: The political and social ideas of C.G. Jung*. New York: New York University Press.
- Pfister, J., & Schnog, N. (1977). (Eds.). *Inventing the psychological: Toward a cultural history of emotional life in America*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Proffoff, I. (1953). *Jung's psychology and its social meaning: An introductory statement of C.G. Jung's psychological theories and a first interpretation of their significance for the social sciences*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Proffoff, I. (1957). *The cloud of unknowing*. New York: Delta.

- Progoff, I. (1963). *The symbolic and the real: A new psychological approach to the fuller experience of personal existence*. New York: Julian Press.
- Richards, G. (1987). Of what is history of psychology a history? *British Journal for the History of Science*, 20, 201–212.
- Richards, G. (1997). *'Race', racism and psychology: Towards a reflexive history*. London: Routledge.
- Richards, G. (2000). Psychology and the Churches in Britain 1919–1939: Symptoms of Conversion. *History of the Human Sciences*, 13, 57–84.
- Richards, G. (2002). *Putting psychology in its place: A critical historical overview*. London: Routledge.
- Rowbotham, S. (1973). *Woman's consciousness, mans' world*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Shamdasani, S. (2003). *Jung and the making of modern psychology: The dream of a science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shamdasani, S. (2005). *Jung stripped bare by his biographers, even*. London: Karnac.
- Van der Post, L. (1976). *Jung and the story of our time*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Westman, R. S. (1986). Nature, art, and psyche: Jung, Pauli, and the Kepler–Fludd polemic. In B. Vickers (Ed.), *Occult scientific mentalities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weston, J. L. (1920). *From ritual to romance: Arthurian literature and the grail legends*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Copyright of *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* is the property of John Wiley & Sons Ltd. 1996 and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.