



TEACHING JUNG IN THE UNIVERSITY

DAVID TACEY

La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia

'Perhaps it would not be too much to say that the most crucial problems of the individual and society turn upon the way the psyche functions in regard to spirit and matter.'

(C.G. Jung, 1947/54: 251)

JUNG IN THE ACADEMY

Intellectual knowledge and intuitive experience

As a student at Flinders University in South Australia in the early 1970s, I was exposed to Jung's thought as it were 'off-campus', in books and journals that were not on the curriculum, and in conversations with non-academic individuals. I found his work fascinating and wondered why it was not on any of my university courses, and certainly not included in psychology, philosophy or literature, my three selected disciplines. When I tried to explore this problem from the academic side, I was often met with blank stares of disbelief from lecturers and tutors. My psychology professor informed me that Jung 'had been discredited long ago', and my literature tutor said he was of marginal interest only, and not worthy of a place on an already crammed curriculum. The philosophy lecturer pointed out that Jung condemned philosophy, and spent

considerable effort denying that he was a philosopher, and so the discipline did not owe him any favours.

Exploring this same problem from the other side, I was told by a couple of Jungian analysts who lived in Perth and Sydney that Jung did not belong in the university and is best not taught there. One of the strongest advocates of this view was Marie-Louise von Franz, who wrote to me from Zurich that Jung in the university might degenerate into a 'head trip' (von Franz, 1976). That is, he might become an object of purely intellectual study, and the emotional and psychological process that makes Jung's work meaningful – namely, one's personal encounter with unconscious contents – would be missing. Effectively, this view maintained that analytical psychology in its clinical practice *owned* Jung, and universities could not participate in this ownership, since they could only view Jung externally and superficially, and not from the inside.

Searching through the literature to find explicit statements about the clinical ownership of Jung is a difficult process, and yields few results. Mostly, this problem is expressed in personal remarks and letters and not in the public domain. Andrew Samuels, however, can always be relied on to be outspoken about what others do not divulge. In his Preface to *Post-Jungian Criticism*, Samuels writes:

'Certain analysts say that academics cannot really feel or suffer complex emotions because of their precocious intellectual development, which vitiates empathy and sensitivity. As this character assassination of the typical academic continues, she or he cannot really understand most of the concepts derived from Jungian psychology, because their provenance, and certainly their utility, are matters on which only practising clinicians can rule.'
(Samuels, 2004: xi-xii)

Samuels is a psychoanalyst and a clinical professor who is sticking up for academics, whereas I am an academic who wishes to support the analysts. I agree with Samuels that we cannot bracket out Jungian studies from the university curriculum on the grounds that clinicians have exclusive ownership of this knowledge. However, I tend to agree with analysts who object to the purely intellectual and therefore incomplete deployment of Jungian psychology in a university setting.

In his writings and interviews Jung made many disparaging remarks about universities. In his famous tribute to Richard Wilhelm, Jung scolded the universities and said that due to their 'sterile rationalism' they have forfeited the right to appear as 'disseminators of light' (Jung, 1930: 86). Time and again Jung accuses the universities of lacking the breadth of vision to grasp the meaning of his analytical psychology. Although I appreciate Andrew Samuels sticking up for my colleagues and me, I think that, in this case, his defence of academic culture is misplaced. The so-called 'character assassination' of the 'typical academic', or rather, the *stereotypical* academic, is probably a good thing, and something that needs to occur. We, in academia, would learn more by listening to Jung's attack than by attempting to protect ourselves from it. Many of us are aware of the one-sided nature of academic life, and see the need for change. We are aware that we are not educating the whole person, that the intuitive side of human experience is bracketed out, and much is not being engaged with in our students' lives as well as in the cultures that we attempt to interpret.

Some education theorists are trying to address this problem, including Bernie Neville in Australia and Jack Miller in Canada, but I am not sure that the system is changing. The students want change, but often their complaints fall on deaf ears. Sometimes they use their favourite word, 'spirituality', to describe what is missing in the university system. By *spirituality* they don't mean anything otherworldly or spooky; they are referring to intuition, creativity, spontaneity, pattern-thinking, feeling, emotion, affect – in short the

‘right hemisphere’ of the brain, which seems to be missing in our system. It is not correct to say that ‘subjective experience’ is missing, because there is a great deal of subjective content, especially in the way universities encourage students to introduce their opinions, ideologies and beliefs into the classroom. Since the impact of feminism, universities have been open to the idea that the ‘personal is political’, that is, the personal is valued, necessary and should be included.

Intuitive students as outsiders

However, a certain kind of personal experience is still not included – the right-brain dimension of the subjective is not welcomed into essays or discussions. Academics will ask for proof, for reasons for believing an idea or concept, and if the sources of the idea are merely intuitive, it will be dismissed as arbitrary and without foundation. This is perhaps changing among younger academics who have been exposed not only to the feminist revolution but also to the postmodern revolution. Subjectivity and its intuitive depths is more acceptable to a rising generation of thinkers who have been brought up in a fluid, uncertain and complex world, in which simple answers are distrusted and exploration is welcomed. But the reception of intuitive knowledge into the academy is very much dependent on the personality type of the academic concerned, and whether or not a certain level of ‘negative capability’ has been acquired in his or her development.

Intuitive students have several responses to the rationalism of the academy. One is to shut down their intuition, and play the academic game at a purely cognitive level. This means a large part of them is suppressed and does not come out to play. They sense academic rigidities and this narrows their horizons and range of enquiry. Some become cynical and vow to recommence their more intuitive lives once they have completed their studies and have been awarded their ‘piece of paper’. I have particularly found this to be the case among students who are majoring in the Department of Psychology. They become detached from their studies, speak about psychology as ‘rats and

stats', and just manage to do enough to pass the subjects and graduate, but often with low grades.

Others dig in their heels and become dogmatic, asserting their right to believe in this or that religion or esoteric system, such as astrology for instance, and they go into battle against academic culture, often to their detriment. If their intuitive system is defensively bolstered, it can become inflexible and immune to the educational process. Hidden behind a barrier of resistance, their belief is beyond the range of criticism and remains in a primitive condition, not benefiting from the dialectic of critical exchange.

Still other students withdraw from their studies and drop out from university, deciding that it is not for them. If this happens, the university does not benefit from the challenge of intuitive thinking. If the university is to grow and develop, it has to enter into dialogue with the non-rational. If it believes it already has the answers, it is failing as an educational system being no longer open to the new elements that could transform it. It is true that postmodernism has taught academics to be receptive to the Other and to whatever it has to bring. But as we saw with the field of subjectivity, the Other that is capable of being admitted to the academy is heavily determined by the ethos of the time. The Other, for instance, as foreign students, foreign cultures, foreign languages is accepted, but the Other as the non-rational, the intuitive or spiritual side is kept out, unable to be assimilated by the dominant consciousness. To paraphrase Donald Rumsfeld, there are the known unknowns that the system can handle. Then there are the unknown unknowns that remain at the edge, and are governed by taboo. Even an ideology that pretends to embrace the unknown and to accept what has been marginalised is unable to bring everything into its orbit.

Unseen forces and the intuitive vision

Jungian psychology is still far too scary and unknown to be able to be drawn into the centre of knowledge. What Jung does is disturbing to any system of

secular knowledge. He deconstructs and relativises the human subject that seeks enlightenment. Our seeking for knowledge is experienced as primary and secure, but for Jung it is secondary and uncertain. Prior to our seeking, there are forces at work in the psyche that seek us and invite us into a conversation. For Jung, our search for knowledge is impoverished and truncated if we fail to appreciate that there are forces that seek us. We are not only active subjects in a quest for knowledge, but passive objects of forces that hold sway over us, conditioning our minds and limiting what we can know. Jung's is a neo-Platonic challenge to the Aristotelian academy, and his challenge shakes the foundations of the academy to the core. Much like Derrida or Levinas, Jung doubts the solidity of our knowing, and he even doubts the value of our knowing if we fail to discern the forces that shape us.

The real problem Jung poses to the academy is suggested in this passage of his late writings:

'In the realm of consciousness we are our own masters; we seem to be the "factors" themselves. But if we step through the door of the shadow we discover with terror that we are the objects of unseen factors. To know this is decidedly unpleasant, for nothing is more disillusioning than the discovery of our own inadequacy. It can even give rise to primitive panic, because, instead of being believed in, the anxiously-guarded supremacy of consciousness, which is in truth one of the secrets of human success, is questioned in the most dangerous way.' (Jung, 1934/54: 49)

The academy operates mainly in the heroic mode, developing the boundaries of knowledge and science, inspiring the knowing subject with confidence, and presenting the world as a puzzle to be solved. It uses heroic metaphors such as 'conquering' the unknown, 'exploding' myths of the past, and 'extending' its borders. A successful PhD is a work which goes to the frontiers and pushes forward the perimeter of the known world. This, to paraphrase Jung, is one of the secrets of human success. But Jungian thought 'questions' this enterprise

in 'the most dangerous way'. Jung says that to take unseen forces into account induces not only resistance and defensiveness, but primitive panic. He is claiming that forces which cannot be seen or proved are observing us, and to the heroic ego this looks like a paranoid viewpoint that has to be overcome, or a medieval superstition that has to be exposed as unscientific.

What makes the situation of Jungian thought more difficult is that we only gain 'evidence' for the existence of these unseen factors indirectly, via the subjective experience of dreams, fantasies, intuitions, hunches, visions – and these forms of mental activity are viewed as suspect or invalid by an heroic consciousness. Jung's sense of conviction comes from the night side of the psyche, from its lunar or starry aspect, whereas the university is driven by solar knowing that arises from the clear light of day: empirical world, laboratory testing, evidence-based research. The world of solar knowing has the opportunity to open its borders to the wisdom of the night, the knowledge of the unconscious, or it can shut down its borders and declare such wisdom to be mere superstition.

Postmodernism presents the best historical opportunity that has ever occurred to Jungian thought. If the prevailing paradigm can see that its embrace of the Other has to include the subterranean, the intuitive and the non-rational, then Jung is automatically in favour. The poetics of being, and the shadowy forces of psyche and cosmos, are best revealed under the partial, fragmentary and liminal glow of the starry night.

Who trains the teachers?

It is undoubtedly the case that the royal road to gaining knowledge of the unconscious remains psychoanalytic psychotherapy. When, in 1982, I was fortunate enough to win a post-doctoral fellowship to the United States, I elected to work with James Hillman in Dallas. I was not sure at the time just what our relationship would be – I suppose I envisaged some supervisory sessions, and that Hillman would read my current writings and comment

on them. Hopefully, there would be seminars on depth psychology, dream workshops and others writers and analysts to talk to. Neither of us really knew what a 'post-doctoral' relationship meant, or what it might entail. After a month of these arrangements, Hillman admitted that I would probably find going into analysis with him to be more fruitful and rewarding than merely 'talking about' the unconscious in our intellectual meetings. Besides, he said he was getting bored with our exchanges, since we were not working directly with what he called the 'soul' – thus seeming to reinforce von Franz's notion that purely intellectual involvement degenerates into a 'head trip'. I wrote to my sponsors in New York and asked if they would agree to the new arrangement. But I was careful not to use the terms *patient* or *client* in describing my new relationship with Hillman. This would not have met the criteria of the postdoctoral award and did not sound academic enough!

It is true that I gained much insight into the workings of the unconscious through my experience of psychotherapy. The subjective experience remains a primary window onto the so-called 'objective' psyche. Although I can hardly insist that my colleagues who want to teach Freud or Jung should go into analysis, I do not know how I would have gained the necessary insights for my academic career without the experience of being – let's face it – a *patient* in psychotherapy. I know some of my colleagues do go into analysis, but it is mentioned in hushed and quiet tones, as if a dark secret that should not be made public. Certainly, the whole idea about how academics can qualify themselves to teach Jung in the university has not been discussed at any level, either in the universities or in the training institutes. Many of us are self-proclaimed authorities and this raises ethical and intellectual problems which will have to be dealt with. Even my brush with analysis did not necessarily 'qualify' me to teach Jung, and no one was asked to judge my analysis or determine whether or not it was successful.

An experiment in teaching

After returning to Australia from the United States, I took up an academic post at La Trobe University in Melbourne, and met a colleague in the Philosophy Department, Robert Farrell, who suggested we should join forces and establish a semester course in Jungian psychology. I was based in the English Department, but we conducted our teaching experiment in a program called Interdisciplinary Studies. This seemed like an ideal place to teach Jung, whose work and vision encompass at least eight disciplines, including psychology, classical studies, mythological studies, comparative religion, anthropology, sociology, philosophy, and the history of ideas.

Indeed, one of the reasons why Jung is not taught in the university is because his work does not fit any specific academic discipline. Staff in the Psychology Department are likely to refer to it as Religious Studies, and lecturers in Religious Studies are likely to say it is definitely science and not religion. Philosophers regard the work of Jung as not squarely in the philosophical tradition, and Jung himself often said his work was not philosophy but empirical science. However, the empirical scientists are likely to point out that Jung's work is highly speculative, intuitive, and philosophical. As a doctoral candidate in Jungian studies, I was shuffled back and forth between the English, Anthropology and Psychology Departments and eventually back to English Literature. The psychology professor referred to Jung as a 'literary critic', and thus I incorporated the work into literary studies.

Jung's confinement to the Arts and Humanities is, let us hope, temporary. It is an interesting place for him to be, but he cannot be confined to these disciplines. He is more than myth and literature; he is, or represents, an amalgam of *mythos* and *logos*, story and science. In truth, he does not belong to the Arts faculty or to the Science faculty – he belongs to *both*. He belongs to a university system that does not yet exist, one in which the whole of life is studied and taken seriously. Jung is the scientist *and* artist of life integration. His thinking is organic, holistic, literary and scientific. As such, there is no

ready category for him. He is a scholar in the grand style, and his extraordinary breadth makes most academics feel humbled. Academics are often said to know more and more about less and less, but Jung works in reverse: his momentum is centrifugal, encompassing more fields in a desire to understand complex reality. At one stage Jung wanted to call his discipline ‘complex psychology’, and one can see why.

There is always the grave danger, however, that an intellect such as Jung’s, which seemingly fits everywhere, will be said to belong nowhere. Like God in creation, Jung in the academy can almost be said to be *felt everywhere* and *seen nowhere*. But when integrative sciences finally emerge in our universities, which they must eventually with the rise of ecological and organic thinking, we will find that Jung will discover his place in a new paradigm that will appreciate his synthetic style and encompassing worldview.

Robert Farrell and I called our subject ‘Jungian psychology’, but there was a protest from the Psychology Department that we were encroaching on their territory. I responded to this protest with a brief lecture on the etymology of the word *psychology*, pointing out its true meaning as the *logos of the psyche* or *soul*, and suggesting to the Psychology Department that they had left *psyche* out of the study of human behaviour. The protest was eventually dropped, and we were free to develop our own subject, although it was noted that our growing student numbers was the result of frequent defections from Psychology to Interdisciplinary Studies. In due course, Psychology dropped its antagonism, and decided to include us in its range of subject choices, so that students majoring in Psychology could study Jung as part of their Behavioural Science degree. The popularity of our subject meant we could not be defeated in a university system in which *numbers* mean so much, and so we were incorporated.

As Robert and I designed our subject, we spoke about many things including the objection of Marie-Louise von Franz: How could we do this so that it did

not lose the value and intensity of Jung's vision? Obviously, we could not play the role of *de facto* therapists in the academic setting, and yet we agreed that this subject would need to be *different*. Neither of us had the time, energy, or expertise to engage the students' interior processes, and yet we agreed that we might be able to teach the subject in such a way that the non-rational dimension of life could be incorporated and assumed into the subject.

Educating with psyche

Robert Farrell and I have taught the Jungian course for nearly twenty years, and we feel that we have done so with reasonably good results. I am not talking about results in the narrow sense of high grades, but in the sense of having encouraged our students to engage with the unconscious and to take the non-rational side of their experience into account. We have concluded that the success or otherwise of this teaching depends on the way in which Jung is taught and the attitude of the teacher. A Jungian subject has to be taught with *psychological* intelligence, and this may not be the same as intellectual intelligence, since it involves an emotional component. If the teacher can be open to the depths of the psyche and receptive to its autonomous and living reality, then a certain reverence toward the psyche can be found which prevents the academic experience from falling into a head-trip.

The teacher of Jungian psychology, if he or she is to be effective, has to possess a certain feature, which we would call *vulnerability*. The teacher needs to demonstrate that he or she is open to the unconscious and takes it seriously. This attitude has a pedagogical significance in the same way that a priest or minister, for instance, cannot deliver an effective sermon unless he or she has a firmly developed faith. The teacher of Freudian or Jungian psychology needs to be in a relationship with the unconscious, and in that relationship the grounded, human meaning of the work is to be found. As Jung wrote of the impact of the analyst on the patient: 'You can exert no influence if you are not susceptible to influence' (Jung, 1929: 163). If one is susceptible to the

unconscious, the academic subject does not degenerate into empty intellectualism, no matter how intensely intellectual the teaching style becomes.

Being a good Jungian teacher does not involve being anti-intellectual, but rather involves a commitment to the psyche which, if missing, renders the intellectual material hollow. As soon as the teacher conveys a convincing sense that he or she is open to the depths of the psyche, something therapeutic happens in the classroom which is quite uncanny and difficult to describe. There is a shift in climate and focus, a deepening of engagement and, in this context, the learning experience becomes therapeutic. What this attitude allows is a different kind of thinking, one which is not purely external and ideological, but which enables thoughts to appear in a holding, reflective space. Such an attitude enables intuitions to appear, and barely-formed or half-formed thoughts are allowed into the classroom, so that a 'climate of validity' develops which encourages students to be intuitive and thoughtful contributors. This allows hunches, non-rational associations and unusual thoughts to be expressed, and encourages a 'hermeneutics of affirmation' that is frequently missing in purely rational exchanges.

Naturally, the critical faculty must be close at hand, but it does not have to pounce immediately, killing thoughts before they have been born. It is this Winnicottian 'holding' capacity that marks the Jungian subjects that I have taught from other, more typically academic, subjects. Perhaps the truly radical feature of this kind of teaching is that it challenges the clinical notion that such exchanges can only take place privately between analyst and analysand. The Jungian model of analysis is basically a form of *initiation*: in a one-to-one dialogue – hermetic, sealed off from others – an encounter with the unconscious takes place. But the initiatory experience can work, almost as well, in a more public and collective setting, given the right conditions. I do not imagine that the public or group experience can replace the clinical one, but it can supplement or complement it and, perhaps, even prepare the way for it. I have noted, for instance, that a number of my former students have gone

on to become clinical analysts. The point is that public and shared forms need to be found, so that a broader range of people can be allowed to make contact with the subtle and hidden side of our experience.

The religious factor

If, as Jung claims, the individuation process and contact with numinous archetypes is *natural* and does not always have to be artificially induced in analysis (Jung, 1917/1926/1943: 187), there must be numerous ways to engage this process. In the past, there were religious methods to transcend the conscious realm and engage the unconscious, including ritual, ceremonies, liturgy, conversion experiences and worship. In addition, the arts and creativity have always offered doorways into the non-rational side of experience, especially music, poetry and theatre. Romance and relationships are also key avenues into the depths of human nature. In other words, any form of activity that is creative, intuitive or open to the non-rational is a potential location for an encounter with the unconscious.

The increasingly rational nature of modern life has had a destructive impact on traditional forms of transcendence. Typically, the modern person has little or no access to religion, ritual, worship or poetry, and even romance and relationships have become attenuated, commercialised and clichéd. Many of our non-rational outlets have been blocked, devalued or destroyed. This is one reason why, I believe, young adults are looking more to education to provide what was once provided by other means, namely, an engagement with the 'spiritual' dimension of experience. The demise of organised religion, especially in highly educated nations, has put increasing pressure on education to offer some entrée into the transcendent. This is an ironic situation, because education, under the influence of scientific rationalism, is largely responsible for the demise of religion in the first place. The repressed returns, and it returns to secular places that are not prepared to deal with what turns up.

Like it or not, teaching Jungian psychology activates the religious dimension of our lives. When we acknowledge that we are in the presence of something greater than ourselves, something unseen yet which 'sees us' (Jung, 1934/54: 49) we are in the religious domain. We shift from being active subjects who pursue knowledge, to objects of an invisible, autonomous reality. This has to be handled carefully by teachers and students alike. To call into being, or into academic consideration, a numinous and powerful *other*, a life which lives us, is to move directly into the primordial experience of religion. Along with this *invocation* come all the typical problems of religious experience.

The main problem for the teacher is not to identify with the wisdom that is generated by this process. The teacher has to watch his or her reactions, and make sure that inflation does not occur, that he or she does not become the classroom guru, the fount of all wisdom. Obviously there is an inescapable sense of reward and elevation in introducing a sense of spirit into students' lives, but the teacher has to contain this feeling and not allow it to gain the upper hand. As soon as this feeling wins, we lose the educational plot, and our integrity is in jeopardy. It is fine to be an instrument of knowledge, but not to identify oneself with this knowledge and become grandiose.

Contradictory responses to the numinous

For their part, students frequently use Jung's psychology as a way into the numinous, partly because so few avenues are available to them. However, not all students of Jung are desirous in this way. The very rational and the very religious seem to share a certain antipathy toward Jungian approaches to the numinous. The first, the rationalists, may sense something irrational and crazy in any talk of the 'numinous', and strongly defend themselves against it. They will reject the invitation to journey into the numinous, finding it repellent, regressive or even anti-human. The second, the very religious, will often sense a 'rival religion' in the Jungian approach, and remove themselves from it. They tend to say, 'No thanks, I already have my religion and certainly don't need another one'. Not that Jungian psychology is a religion (Gundry, 2006);

rather, it is an approach to religious experience, but fans and foes alike do not always respect this distinction.

But the vast majority of students enrolled in my courses are eager to discover a sense of the numinous in life, world and self. This creates a typical range of problems, including a tendency to *believe* Jung's psychology too readily. Some students want to turn Jung into the religion they never had. This can severely limit the capacity of the student to think critically. Instead, some adopt Jung as a religious system, and use the technical terms such as anima, archetype, Self, collective unconscious, as articles of faith, speaking about them as if they were real objects in time and space, rather than metaphors for processes of the psyche. My role here is difficult, since I see myself performing a double function. First, I introduce students to the range of Jungian terms, and try to speak up for those terms. Second, I have to cut across the literal belief in those terms, and remind students that these are concepts in a theory of mind and, as such, are merely provisional and fluid.

This can create emotional and pedagogical difficulties in the classroom, as some students sense that I 'don't really believe' what I am teaching. The *converts* to Jungian psychology do not like my intellectual insistence that the terms are metaphors and not necessarily realities. They definitely want them to be *real* and sometimes accuse me of not being Jungian enough! References to the philosophy of knowledge, and to the problem of the reification of concepts, are often not enough to dissuade them from a certain kind of rigid belief. I have accepted that such belief may be a necessary phase that some have to go through, because the awakening of spirit seems to demand that they believe literally in the system that provides them with a glimpse into transcendent reality.

Contact with the numinous, with what is infinite and *Other*, is fraught with reactions, resistances, defences and enthusiasms. The stability of the ego is relativised and threatened by the realisation that it is not master of its house.

Some students give away their ego authority too readily, while others defend against the *Other* as if from hostile attack. The numinous calls for a response and the educated ego of the West often responds through resistance and denial. It is dismissed as an *illusion* by the rational mind, or viewed as a reified *object* by those who have come under its spell. Either way, presenting a balanced apologetic to students can be difficult. What emotions will the numinous arouse? How will it impact upon their present beliefs and attitudes? By the time most academics have reflected on these questions, they have realised that the task is daunting, and it is best not to bother. As one academic said to me, 'To teach Jung is to look for trouble'.

Jung writes of the capacity of the unconscious to paralyse our critical faculty and hold us in its power (Jung, 1928: 262). As mentioned, it is not uncommon for students to fall under Jung's spell, before they reach a more mature relationship to his ideas (Tacey, 1997). But reaching this mature level can be difficult and time-consuming. It is hard to be objective about Jung, if one is responding through a *complex* and not through the mind. It may take some time for the mind to catch up, because the complex works automatically and conditions our responses before the mind has a chance to think it through.

Rudolf Otto argues that the numinous inspires dual responses such as fascination and repulsion:

'These two qualities, the daunting and the fascinating, now combine in a strange harmony of contrasts, and the resultant dual character of the numinous consciousness, to which the entire religious development bears witness, is at once the strangest and most noteworthy phenomenon in the whole history of religion.' (Otto, 1923: 31)

Otto describes the numinous as a paradoxical *mysterium tremendum et fascinans*. Some are drawn to it with overwhelming desire, and others are repelled by it with an equal and opposite force. Fear and fascination of the numinous

are both found in student responses to Jung and become difficult pedagogical issues. Do we have the capacity to deal with these responses in the university? Generally not, but if we are able to identify an emotional response as soon as possible, the teacher may have a chance to dialogue with it. In my experience, uncritical adulation is more common than hostile rejection. This can be contained by the teacher, but other staff members are likely to point to this problem and announce that the Jungian subject produces disciples rather than critical students. This may increase the prejudice that Jungians are part of a 'worldwide cult' (Noll, 1994: 3).

Jung seems to act as a trigger for what I have called the *spirituality complex* of the secular West (Tacey, 2004). Once this complex is activated, it asks for objects of belief, and Jung is a likely target for such projections. But, after the student has become adjusted to the life of the spirit, he or she often finds their way to religious, mythological, or cosmological symbols, and Jung is let off the hook. Then Jung can be returned to reality, and seen as an inspired but limited investigator of the psyche, rather than a god or idol. In technical terms, Jung acts as a transference object while we are sorting out our relationship with spirit. Studying and reading Jung activates our need to believe, which we previously did not know we had because this knowledge was withheld by the secular ego and rendered unconscious.

TEACHING STYLES

Towards a taxonomy of Jungian studies

What follows is a serious but semi-humorous account of various teaching styles in university programs on Jungian studies. Over the past twenty-five years, I have travelled extensively to witness first-hand how other academics are dealing with the challenge of teaching Jung. In every case, the success or otherwise of our efforts seems to be determined by our approach to the numinous. If we ignore *spirit* and the numinous, as is sometimes found in

academic study, we are not teaching Jung properly. Rather, we are excluding the essence of his approach, which relates to the numinous (Tacey, 2006b).

But how do we, in the post-Christian West, in a university system governed by secular values, make the numinous convincing and present? How do we point to its existence without indulging in the reification of its 'reality'? How do we handle our personal cynicism toward the unseen dimension? Just as importantly, how do we educate ourselves to become critical of the numinous, rather than fall for it with unthinking devotion? How can we avoid dualisms and complexes when we step into this realm? How can we teach Jung's work when we do not yet have the cultural and religious forms to understand it?

I have discerned four main approaches to the teaching of Jung. Each could be seen to be governed by a particular 'god' or archetype. I am sure that there are more than four, and I have left others out, but this, at least, will set the ball rolling toward a taxonomy of Jungian Studies:

1. Fitting in or Conforming ruled by the Father, Senex, or Old Man
2. Updating or Reconstructing ruled by Hermes, the Trickster
3. Transforming or Overturning ruled by Dionysus, the Reveller
4. Keeping Pure or Standing Still ruled by Disciple and Acolyte

As with all taxonomic categories, these styles are almost never found in pure form. As one sketches out these archetypal styles, they invariably become somewhat clichéd and stereotypical, but we have to take that into account.

Fitting in or conforming

Here, the desire is to fit Jung into the university system, rather than to challenge the system by advocating new knowledge. Analytical psychology under this influence sets itself the task of conforming to prevailing standards, expectations and assumptions. The keyword for this approach is 'respectability'.

The aim is to show how *respectable* Jungian psychology is, ‘if only’ academic scholars took the time to understand the nature of Jungian thought. If scholars sat and reflected, they would see that the exclusion of Jung from the academy has been based on a misunderstanding. This approach is rational, cool, and collected; it is non-combative and diplomatic. It seeks to demonstrate the validity of Jungian psychology by fitting it alongside other theories and knowledges.

Its aim is also to demonstrate that the exclusion of Jung has been based on misconceptions: Jung is not a mystic, but a sound and worthy scientist of the more difficult reaches of mind. These depths are not ‘mystical’ but are accessible to scientific analysis that is properly attuned to the mind’s deep structures. This approach emphasises his scientific credentials, his career as a leading-edge psychiatrist, his philosophical education, and his empirical approach to mental illness and social problems.

Archetypally, this approach is ruled by the senex or old man, in its creative aspect (accommodating and including) and negative aspect (manipulating and controlling). This approach teaches the ‘nuts and bolts’ of Jung, without indicating that the work is ultimately about self-transformation. Students are given academic information, but not the tools to engage in self-transformation. The brighter students complain about the dryness and aridity of this approach, once they find out more about the field. The drying-out effect of this approach is part of the long-standing opposition that many analysts have to bringing Jung into the academy. Divorced from the mystery dimension of the unconscious, is ‘knowledge about’ Jung useful? Can Jung be understood without the kind of experience we gain from the encounter with the numinous? As a slogan reads on the walls of the Jung Institute in Zurich, ‘A little Jung is worse than none at all’.

Ironically, in our desire to include Jung in the academy, we have to be careful that we are not ‘excluding’ him – or his essential message – all over again.

If our pedagogical style is too narrow, we are not including enough of his work. If I can use a metaphor from physics, it is as if we are trying to pull a single particle into the university, only Jung is not a particle, but a wave of vast extension.

This is an emotional and pedagogical problem of the *senex* archetype. The *senex* (in men and women) thinks of itself as being important and in control. It won't risk the self-disclosure that transformation demands, since it involves contact with the *anima* or *animus*, the revealer of the inner life. The more identified the teacher is with the *persona*, the more unconscious and distant the *anima/animus* will be. To teach the art of transformation demands that the teacher shows that he or she is vulnerable to the numinous and receptive to the soul. We stand before the sacred not as someone in control, but as someone who receives. If the teacher is not prepared to risk the controlling stance, to let the guard slip, to show vulnerability, there can be no teaching with soul. As Jung once said of Freud, he was not prepared to 'risk his authority', and as a result he 'lost it altogether' (Jung, 1961: 182).

The other problem with *senex* pedagogy is that in its conservative interest in scientific standards, empirical evidence, rational proof, it fails to see that the academy has been radically transformed by postmodern knowledge. Many of the old academic ideals, such as objectivity, precision and exactness in scientific method, have been overturned by postmodern thought and feminist theory, at least in the social and human sciences, if not in the exact sciences. To some extent, the image of the academy that the *senex* holds no longer exists. This is because the trickster Hermes, the central archetype of the postmodern era, has got into the academy and turned things around (Neville, 1992).

Updating or reconstructing

Hermes governs the second teaching style I have discerned, although Hermes can outwit himself. The emphasis in this approach is on 'reconstructing' Jung in light of progressive discourses that have taken place in the social sciences,

arts and humanities. If *respectability* is the keyword for the senex, here the overriding concern is *updating*. Unlike the senex, Hermes is neither respectable nor dignified, but he is certainly wily, proficient and fast-moving.

Hermes is the fleet-footed messenger who moves between worlds, and he brings to the Jungian world messages from other knowledges, and introduces Jungian concerns to worlds that have never before been interested in Jung! His concern is with potential connections and creative dialogues. Hermes, the trickster, adopts the view that an unreconstructed Jung cannot be admitted to the academy. Whatever 'Jung' may signify to Jungians, he has to be reconstructed before he can be authentically brought before the university. This style may be paradoxical: it may even side with the established views of the academy, and argue against 'Jung' in his unreconstructed form. This approach may be embarrassed by unreconstructed Jung, and seek to differentiate a 'post-Jungian' from an earlier, classically 'Jungian' position.

Whether this approach is post-Jungian or not is a matter which has never been discussed. Most people accept this appellation at face value, but I think it needs to be questioned – and doubted. An argument could be made that the so-called post-Jungians are either non-Jungians or pre-Jungians. The 'post-Jungian' approach seeks to re-read Jung with current views in mind, often critical of the ways in which *classical* Jungian thought falls short of contemporary values. It critiques the Jungian work, especially in terms of the 'big three' preoccupations of the academy: class, gender, race. It seeks to revise Jung's metapsychology and his philosophical underpinnings in an effort to bring these into line with contemporary thought and social/political theory. This approach might employ as its credo: 'reparation works best in the open', and it enjoins scholars and critics alike to enter into dialogue with 'post-Jungians' in a mutually enriching work of cultural reconstruction.

But with all this fancy footwork and adaptation to contemporary concerns, essential elements of the Jungian opus are not addressed. What happens to

the numinous? Where is the divine in the psyche, in gender, in race? With the emphasis mainly on the socially constructed nature of gender, race and class, it has not been easy to affirm the presence of the divine in what is read as a relativistic and ever-shifting social landscape. The gods are viewed as one of the more embarrassing features of Jungian thought. Sometimes, a post-Jungian scholar will gesture to a feminist-pleasing ‘Goddess’ (but never a patriarchal God), in the hope that this addresses the need for numinosity. This approach often says: we will redeem Jung’s psychology, but not bother about his (largely Christian) theology, which is stale and unfashionable.

But this won’t do. The trickster outwits himself at this point. Jung’s religious attitude is *not* an added extra, an *optional* element that we can do without. We cannot just say his religion is a residue of his conservative Swiss-German-Christian nature and leave it at that. Radical ‘post-Jungians’ have never known what to do with Jung’s religiousness, except to make excuses for it, or to deflect attention to other issues, such as his alleged anti-Semitism. Moreover, in the contemporary university such left-wing Jungians find no intellectual support for Jung’s religiousness, since religion is usually relegated to the *right-wing* of politics (Schmidt, 2005). Leftist intellectuals, whether Jungian or not, still do not know what to do with religion, other than hope it will go away.

Jung’s work seems to call for a religious *left* that does not yet exist on campus. The religious scholars in the university, few as they are, are often very conservative. The major exception to this rule is Western-style Buddhism, which seems to be politically progressive. Most progressive thinkers like to typecast Jung as irredeemably conservative and stuffy, but the implications of his psychology are radical (Tacey, 2006a). Certainly, as mentioned, the spiritual dimension of Jung cannot be trifled with; it is integral to his thought, and any discourse that does not place it centre-stage is not Jungian, not even post-Jungian.

Transforming or overturning

The third approach focuses on the numinous dimension, but often has little to say about social and political themes, and little concern for academic traditions. Its interest is in the inner life and the cultivation of soul. An exception to this rule is where Jungian visionaries suddenly decide that the outer world has ‘soul’, and behave almost as religious converts to political and social realities (Hillman and Ventura, 1993).

Transforming or overturning is iconoclastic and rebellious. Its tutelary deity appears to be Dionysus, the god who loosens and transforms, who gleefully overturns prevailing morality in order to bring a larger world to birth. Dionysus accepts that the work of bringing Jung into the university is a subversive act, i.e. a counter-cultural enterprise. He is not interested in conforming Jung to existing cultural or academic paradigms, but in challenging the models of knowledge that have kept Jung out of the academy. His concern is not with *respectability* or *updating*, but with *revolutionising* the system.

The third approach likes to employ language that flies in the face of the academy, using terms like ‘soul’ and ‘spirit’ that the academy considers obsolete. I know a Jungian teacher who gave a staff seminar on the gods and goddesses of the psyche, and some of his colleagues left the room. The revolutionary approach often decides that the academy ‘lacks soul’, that it privileges knowledge but not wisdom, that it is repressive toward what counts, that it avoids an encounter with ultimate questions. This approach is inspired but is also what Jung would call ‘inflated’. But whether arrogant or inspired, it fails to see that the academy has been secular for many years, and if it wants to bring the numinous into the system, it has to be tactful and present an appropriate apologetic for the gods.

Scholars of the third approach frequently scorn what is current and contemporary and often devalue these concerns as merely fashionable. They dislike the contemporary and are in love with antiquity. Their models of how to live

are often pre-modern, ancient or primordial. Favoured sources of inspiration are the Florentine Renaissance, the Perennial Philosophy or Medieval Alchemy – which tend to look like hocus-pocus to the modern university. The third approach believes that a primordial truth can be found, and this is an inspiration for championing such traditions as alchemy, shamanism, Neoplatonism, metaphysics and wisdom literature.

Scholars who follow this way have difficult and often lonely careers. They are generally not liked by their colleagues (apart from a few close associates), and develop ill feeling and rivalry in the workplace. They may exacerbate the problem by their repeated criticisms of mainstream knowledges. Because they celebrate soul and spirit they are often given a high profile by the media, and this rubs salt into the wounds of their colleagues, who can be beset by envy. However, such teachers are often highly successful with students, who view them as inspired prophets on campus. They form the ‘Dead Poets Society’ of the Jungian academic world, but they often get too entangled in the emotional currents and sexual complications of students’ lives. The senex persona is dropped in the name of ‘soul’, but sometimes propriety and professional boundaries are dropped as well.

Keeping pure or standing still

There is also a purist approach, and this group tries to have as little to do with the intellectual life of the academy as possible. They do not stir the pot like the Dionysian soul-makers. They hope that if they confine themselves to a Jungian bubble, the rest of the intellectual world will evaporate. They are suspicious of postmodernity, do not like Derrida or Foucault, ignore the post-Freudians, never quote Freud, and try as hard as possible to keep themselves pure for Jung. Their job is to inform people about Jung – a kind of information bureau on campus. They might gently scan the history of ideas to find parallels to Jung, emphasising such figures as William James and Spinoza, but never engaging in quarrels, fights or vigorous intellectual debates.

I can't think of an archetype that governs this approach, because it is not passionate enough to warrant an archetype or instinct. But I can think of a stereotype: the disciple or acolyte. This style, as Jung observes (Jung, 1928: 260) is secretly identified with the master, and hides this identification under a mask of subservience to his teachings. Such teachers do not talk about Jung's scientific research, but about his 'findings', as if they are commandments written in stone or brought down from on high. The problem with this approach is that it is not doing Jung any favours. It is keeping him hermetically sealed off from the world, away from the critical debates, making him almost gloriously irrelevant to intellectual life.

Teachers in this mode often behave as converts and their students are sometimes expected to become Jungians, rather than critical readers of Jung. Students rightly complain that this approach is claustrophobic, although it may suit the kind of student who is looking for something to believe in. Teachers in this mode are not always liked by their colleagues, who see them as priests or nuns of an esoteric sect. Often this style is short-lived, because it is sometimes a phase that people go through, a moment in which they fall in love with the numinous as revealed by Jung. This tendency of the work is savagely, and at times unfairly, attacked by Richard Noll (1994). However, Noll at least does the Jungian field the service of making this propensity a public and political/intellectual issue.

Once again, this problem is largely a religious issue. How to incorporate the numinous in the secular academy? Jung evokes and stirs a spirituality complex; some reject him out of hand, others revere him as a prophet. Converts do not know how to gain the necessary critical distance, since criticism is viewed as a transgression or heresy, further signs that our spirituality complex has been activated. If Jungian purists are incapable of genuine criticism, their colleagues will argue that they are indoctrinating students, making them incapable of living politically aware and astute lives. This sets up the conditions for fundamentalism and intolerance, and arguably education should work in

the opposite direction. The Jungian cult on campus never lasts more than about three or four years, because the Dean moves to close it down and lack of connection to the academic mainstream proves fatal.

Diversity and experimentation

These four approaches cannot be pinned down to particular personalities in the world today, but rather represent leanings or biases in the teaching of Jung. The first approach seeks to *conform*, the second to *reform*, the third strives to *transform*, and the fourth seeks merely to *inform*. It is sometimes the case that the one academic will experience elements of all four styles and approaches. Basically, they can be reduced to two larger categories: one and four are static styles, while two and three are dynamic. Number one is the static and number two is the dynamic form of adjusting to the academic world. Number three is the dynamic form and number four the static form of adjusting to the numinous.

Hostility between various camps and teachers could be attributed largely to these differing styles. The fast-moving trickster finds the disciple or acolyte to be static and uninteresting. The trickster finds the senex boring, but may be too diplomatic to say so. The senex finds the trickster to be slippery and deceitful, and the transformer is seen as exhibitionistic and narcissistic. The Dionysian transformers find all other types to be superficial and defensive, and speak of the 'spirit of Jung' in proclaiming their authority to revolutionise. The purists argue that all the other styles are in danger of losing the plot, and they ask that the focus be returned to the *Collected Works*.

Sometimes transformers push the system too far and are in danger of losing their jobs. The university might decide that soul-makers are actually trouble-makers and that it can get on better without them. Transformers can reinvent themselves more modestly as updaters or reformers, where they can hold down their jobs, and where passions are cooled by the need to enter into dialogue with contemporary concerns. The acolytes are also nudged onward

to new styles, partly due to criticism from others, since the university will not tolerate an exclusive bubble world for very long. A Jungian information booth is best dealt with by the various Jung clubs and not by universities.

But the field is new and still being born. There will be other styles to discover and more problems to elaborate. We must expect this diversity in Jungian studies and, if possible, hold the tension between conflicting positions. The recent establishment of an International Association for Jungian Studies, which focuses on the teaching of Jung in university and college contexts, will do much to provide a forum for discussion and critical reflection on teaching styles, pedagogical issues, and the meaning and purpose of Jung in the university. Readers are invited to consult the website, which can be found in my list of references.

In conclusion, we serve Jung best not by turning his work into a fixed ideology, but by playfully deconstructing it for the new era. We have to deconstruct his ideas about society, politics, gender, race, class, but in so doing we cannot afford to *eradicate* the numinous to suit the needs of a secular academy. The task is to engage in a resacralising project, even as deconstruction is underway. To use one of Jung's key phrases, we have to 'dream the myth onward' (Jung, 1940: 76). As we move the work into the academy, we have to avoid the various pitfalls, including getting stuck in the senex and leaving out the soul, becoming intoxicated by updating and leaving out the numinous, becoming identified with the soul and condemning the world, or being stuck in a ghetto and ignoring the intellectual tradition. These problems are not unique to Jungians. They are found wherever the numinous raises its head in a secular context.

REFERENCES

- Forbes, Scott (2003) *Holistic Education*, Brandon, VT: Foundation for Educational Renewal
- Gundry, Mark R. (2006) *Beyond Psyche: Symbol and Transcendence in C. G. Jung*, New York: Peter Lang
- Hillman, James and Ventura, Michael (1993) *We've Had a Hundred Years of Psychotherapy, and the World's Getting Worse*, San Francisco: Harper Collins
- International Association of Jungian Studies, a worldwide organisation established in 2002 to promote teaching and research in Jungian studies in the universities. For further information, consult: www.jungianstudies.org
- Jung, C.G. (1917/1926/1943) 'On the Psychology of the Unconscious', in *The Collected Works*, Vol.7, 1953/1966
- Jung, C.G. (1928) 'The Relations between the Ego and the Unconscious', in *The Collected Works*, Vol.7, 1953/1966
- Jung, C.G. (1929) 'Problems of Modern Psychotherapy', in *The Collected Works*, Vol.16, 1954/66
- Jung, C.G. (1930) 'Richard Wilhelm: In Memoriam', in *The Collected Works*, Vol. 15, 1966
- Jung, C.G. (1934/54) 'Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious', in *The Collected Works*, Vol. 9, 1, 1959/68
- Jung, C.G. (1940) 'The Psychology of the Child Archetype', in *The Collected Works*, Vol.9, part 1, 1959/1968
- Jung, C.G. (1947/1954) 'On the Nature of the Psyche', in *The Collected Works*, Vol.8, 1960/1969
- Jung, C.G. (1961/1995) *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, London: Fontana Press
- Miller, Jack (2000) *Education and the Soul: Toward a Spiritual Curriculum*, Albany: State University of New York Press
- Neville, Bernie (1992) 'The Charm of Hermes: Hillman, Lyotard and the Postmodern Condition', *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 37, 2, 337-353
- Neville, Bernie (2005) *Educating Psyche*, Melbourne: Flat Chat Press
- Noll, Richard (1994) *The Jung Cult: Origins of a Charismatic Movement*, Princeton University Press
- Otto, Rudolf (1923) *The Idea of the Holy*, ed. John W. Harvey. London: Oxford University Press, 1958
- Samuels, Andrew (2004) 'Foreword', in eds James S. Baumlin, Tita French Baumlin, and George H. Jensen, *Post-Jungian Criticism: Theory and Practice*, Albany: State University of New York Press
- Schmidt, Leigh Eric (2005) *Restless Souls: The Making of American Spirituality*, San Francisco: Harper Collins
- Tacey, David (1997) 'Jung in the Academy: Devotions and Resistances', *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 42, 2, 269-283
- Tacey, David (2004) *The Spirituality Revolution: The Emergence of Contemporary Spirituality*, Hove and New York: Brunner-Routledge
- Tacey, David (2006a) *How to Read Jung*, London: Granta Publications
- Tacey, David (2006b) 'The Role of the Numinous in the Reception of Jung', in eds Ann Casement and David Tacey, *The Idea of the Numinous: Contemporary Jungian and Psychoanalytic Perspectives*, Hove and New York: Brunner-Routledge
- von Franz, Marie-Louise (1976) personal letter to David Tacey, August 22