

2015 Personality Lecture 07: Depth Psychology: Carl Jung (Part 02)

72 MIN · YOUTUBE · [HTTPS://WWW.YOUTUBE.COM/WATCH?V=CFHZYSE4VGW](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CFHZYSE4VGW)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CFHZySe4VGw>

SUMMARY

The discussion delves into Carl Jung's concepts of the psyche, particularly the ego, persona, and shadow, illustrating how these elements shape individual identity and behavior. It emphasizes the importance of recognizing and integrating the shadow—our darker impulses and capacities—into our conscious self to achieve a more authentic and balanced personality.

- The ego represents the individual's identity, while the persona is the social mask we present to the world.*
- The shadow encompasses repressed aspects of the self, including darker impulses that can lead to destructive behaviors if ignored.*
- Jung's archetypes suggest that understanding our psyche requires acknowledging both light and dark elements within ourselves.*
- Assertiveness training in therapy often involves confronting the shadow to develop a more robust personal identity.*
- The balance between agreeableness and aggression is crucial for self-advocacy and personal respect.*
- Jung posits that enlightenment requires facing uncomfortable truths about oneself, often involving sacrifice and transformation.*
- The anima and animus represent the gendered aspects of the psyche, urging individuals to integrate traits traditionally associated with the opposite gender.*
- The self is seen as the totality of one's being, encompassing both current identity and unrealized potential, guiding personal growth through trials and transformations.*

So here's how to conceptualize yourself in Yian terms. The part of you that you consider you roughly speaking, Jung considered the ego. And you might think about that as the most individual part of your psychophysiological being. I mean the difference between individual and collective in that sense is that you share very many attributes with other people. Obviously your physical form is very much like that of other people and then you share attributes with other living creatures way back down the phoggenetic chain. And so in that regard, there's nothing specifically individual about you.

But the part of you that you identify with most completely and that you regard as unique, that's the the Yian ego. Now, Jung sort of conceptualized your psyche as a as a I would say as a place I suppose that many spirits could inhabit. And you might think about a spirit from from the Yian perspective as a personality that can inhabit the psyche.

And so like all the psychoanalysts, Jung regarded the psyche as a relatively loose collection of partially

integrated personalities. And each of those personalities had their own perspective, their own thoughts, like their own way of looking at the world. That would be the perspective, their own thoughts, their own emotions, their own habits, their own actions. And those were roughly aggregated into some sort of unity. And that was the that was the ego.

Now ego has a public face. And the public face Jung called the persona. Persona means mask. And the persona is both that part of you that you show to other people instead of the part that you hide. And then also to some degree it might be the form that your ego takes even to you. So for example, if you're a naive person, you might think that your public face is all there is of you.

the the rough difference between the ego and the persona might be conceptualized this way that you know there are things that you think that you won't say in public maybe not even in private some of those things you're pretty aware of and those would be thoughts that are relevant to the ego but not the persona and then some of them you don't even really want to be aware of and Jung would consider those more associated with the shadow Now the shadow, the existence of the shadow.

First of all, you might want to remember that the best way to conceptualize Jung's archetypal constructions is in some sense as metaphors. So you could say that while Jung thought that it was useful to separate up the psyche into persona and ego and then shadow. It isn't that there aren't other ways that it could be broken up. But breaking it up this way is you useful for certain purposes and Jung regarded this terminology as particularly useful from a psychoanalytic perspective and also from a historical perspective. So perhaps the divisions could have be made could be made otherwise and there there are many ways of looking at archetypes but this is sufficiently useful to progress with.

Now people's personas are generally somewhat harmless and somewhat socialized. If you don't know how to act in public you don't have a well-crafted persona. You know, some of you are going to be the kinds of relatively deep thinking intellectuals who think that small talk is nonsense. And uh there's some utility in that thinking because in some sense from a philosophical sense, obviously it's nonsense. But if you don't know how to make small talk, basically what that means is that you have a poorly developed persona. And what that'll mean is that you're not going to do very well at least at the beginning of social in social engagements because you need to be able to convince people that you're basically civilized and social before it's even reasonable for them to go beyond pleasantries with you. And the ability to exchange pleasantries in a relatively benel way in a variety of different circumstances is part of having a persona. And you don't want to denigrate the utility of that because you need it. You know, as you progress in your careers, for example, you're going to be thrust into situations where you don't really know anyone. And the purpose of the gathering is to familiarize a large number of people with one another. And there there's a skill that's associated with that that's somewhat glib social ability.

The unions would say, well, you shouldn't you if you don't have a persona, you're just a disaster. But by the same token, you shouldn't be only persona because one of the possibilities is that the ego can identify with the persona and then the person thinks that they are what they show the social world. And the problem with that, at least from the union perspective, is that um a people are a lot more than the persona. They're a lot more than the

ego. And a lot of the things that make them more than mere persona or more more than mere ego are not necessarily things that are acceptable in casual public gatherings.

So for example, because of your psychophysiological makeup, you all have the capacity for aggression. Now, a lot of you, especially the ones that are more agreeable, you could say that even it's either that that capacity for aggression has been underdeveloped because you've identified with a certain mode of social being, or you could say perhaps to the degree that agreeableness is temperamental that the aggressive tendency isn't as powerful in you as it is in other people.

that might lead you to make judgments like and I'm sure some of you perhaps some some of you who had an angry parent or particularly an angry father have decided at some point in your life that to be aggressive is wrong. To be angry is wrong for example or to be aggressive is wrong. It's morally wrong. One of the things that happens in psychotherapy very frequently though is that people come into psychotherapy for a variety of reasons. Some of them are merely practical. they're having problems in adaptation because their lives have got very very complicated and they really don't know what to do about it.

Sometimes they go into psychotherapy because they have very high levels of negative emotion and that can be associated with the first problem. But very often they come into therapy because they're getting pushed around constantly and they really don't have anything that's a sufficiently well-developed personal identity. And generally those that happens by the way most more often with women than it does with men. And that's because women are by temperament more agreeable than men and perhaps also by socialization. Um temperament certainly plays a big role.

Often then the the goal of therapy is assertiveness training. And assertiveness training you could think of as the behavioral psychologist's equivalent to incorporating the shadow. So, you know, you may think, well, it's it's a necessary part of existence to be nice to other people. And there's some truth in that. Not really. It's a very shallow way of looking at the world because nice is not a very sophisticated word. But even if that's the word that you do use, you should also be nice to yourself. And sometimes what that means is that you have to put forward your own wishes and desires in a manner that causes a certain amount of conflict. And in order to to withstand that conflict, you have to have you have to be able to draw on the the sources of aggression that in some sense are are are are a deep part of your your inbuilt set of possibilities. Now, the reason that's necessary in part from a biological perspective is that people are often afraid of engaging in conflict because they're afraid because because because conflict can be real trouble and anger inhibits fear. So, if you don't have a well-developed capacity for well, we could say rage, then you can't overcome your fear and then you can't stand up for yourself and then you're going to get run over. Now, the problem with that is is that if you get run over enough, it'll make you resentful and then that will make you aggressive. Except it'll make you aggressive in sneaky, underground, and somewhat unconscious ways that are much less likely to be productive than, you know, a frank exchange of viewpoints and some conscious negotiation.

So, one of the things I do in therapy for people who need assertiveness training is I get them to pay attention to their resentment. And resentment is often a good avenue into the shadow because first of all, resentment is a

pretty destructive emotion. It's extremely useful emotion but it can be very destructive because it gives rise to well first of all a sense of victimization and second then the underground growth of all sorts of ideas of revenge and vengeance and and also a kind of stubborn non-cooperativeness because who who wants to cooperate when they feel taken advantage of and so part of Jung's idea with regards to the shadow is that obviously the social world wants you to be peaceful and predictable and maybe even easy to get along with. But that doesn't necessarily mean that peaceful, predictable, and easy to get along with are the only virtues because they're certainly not.

And one thing we know about virtues is that if they're taken to too great an extreme, they become vices. And B, they're certainly not the only virtues. You know, there are what you might call darker virtues, so to speak. They're they're more dangerous virtues in some sense because they harness forces that can be very destructive if they're not utilized consciously. And aggression is a certainly an example of that. So here's some fundamental rules about the shadow that you might think about as you move forward through your life. So a lot of times you're going to have to negotiate on your own behalf. And so what that means from the perspective of agreeableness and aggression is that you should be able to stand up for yourself at least as well as you would stand up for someone that you care for. So the problem with the idea of being nice to other people is that it doesn't take you into account. And that's supposed to be an equation even though it's as I said nice is a pretty weak philosophical term. But the fundamental rule is that you should certainly include yourself in the circle of people who deserve respect and care. And that means that you have to be willing to advocate for yourself.

And if you're willing to advocate for yourself and you want to do it, you have to be able to say no. You have to because otherwise you have to say yes and then you can't negotiate. And in order to say no, you have to have armed yourself with strategies and plans that enable you to say no. You can't be dependent. You can't be afraid of potentially searching out new opportunities, etc. You have to be willing to stand your ground. And it's very difficult to do that without drawing on some of the deeper sources of psychological energy that are part of our psychophysiological heritage.

So Jung would say, well, there's the persona and the ego, and you can identify with your persona, and then you're you're you're kind of a shallow puppet of culture. So Pinocchio as the marionette is a persona. Pinocchio himself is an ego, but as a marionette, he's the persona. So anybody who's ideologically possessed, by the way, is a persona, although they're also possessed by the shadow, even though they don't know it. And you can tell when someone's ideologically possessed because you can predict whatever they're going to say once you know a few axioms of their particular ideology. So a given ideology probably has four or five explanatory um axioms like everything is caused by economic disparity. That might be one. Um or success is due to hard work. That might be another. And those are broad enough statements even though they're in opposition to one another. Both of those statements are broad enough so you can virtually explain everything with them.

The problem with it is is that you can predict what the explanation is going to be before you even have to talk to the person. And whenever you're talking to someone and you can predict exactly what they're going to say because they're using some ideologically mediated structure, then you know perfectly well that they've identified with the persona. You also know that they're likely to be possessed by a pretty vicious shadow because

we know that the shadow of ideological possession is repression and death.

So, one of the things that's always interesting about the psychoanalysts is that whenever they see something good, they're always looking for the dark side of it. And vice versa, by the way, whenever they see anything dark, they're looking for the good side of it. And so, they're very unlikely to take anything at face value. And so if someone comes up to you and says, "I stand for some good thing," the thing that you ask if you're psychoanalytically minded is, "Well, what does that mean that you hate?"

Because there's a reasonable probability that even though you think that you're standing for something, that a lot of what's motivating you is the desire to be against something. And that's particularly the case when you're dealing with negative emotions because they're more powerful than positive emotions. So it's one of the things George Orwell who was one of the 20th century's great anti-idologues published a book in the 1940s called *Down and Out in Paris and London* where he went to stay with some coal miners in the north of England and those coal miners man they had a hard life like some of them had to crawl 3/4 of a mile to work in tunnels in the morning in tunnels where they couldn't stand up just to get to work so and then they do their like 10-hour shift in the coal mine digging out coal and then they'd have to crawl back 3/4 of a mile underground, you know, so they they had very very hard lives. And so, you know, Orwell was pretty um unimpressed by the conditions in which they were forced to work. So he wrote an essay for the English Left Book Club and they were that was a socialist publishing house.

But he appended another essay to it where he criticized the socialists who were most likely to read that sort of book as much more oriented towards hating the rich than than loving the poor. That's devastating criticism. And the left book club didn't even want to publish his book, but they ended up publishing. It's become a very famous essay. But it it lays out a general principle. It's like if you have identified with a given persona, which is like a a social machine in a sense, and you think you're all good because of what you think, then you might ask, well, where do all the parts of you that aren't good go? Because unless you think that you're a saint and that everyone who thinks differently than you is Satan himself, then you're missing a chunk of yourself. You're not taking a chunk of yourself into account. And that's the part that is nowhere near as well behaved or as benevolent as you might think or that you actually have any reason to believe, you know. And so one of the things that that has struck me as a consequence of analyzing 20th century history and and often through a union lens is that there's not much evidence that the sorts of atrocities that characterized the Soviet Union um and and Nazi Germany were the result of a few extremely corrupt people at the top of the hierarchy forcing everyone down into slavery and then making them do terrible things. I think that's a very weak explanation. In fact, I think it's I think it's wrong. I think the historical record is quite clear that it's wrong. I mean, in East Germany, for example, onethird of the people were government informers.

So that means if you had a family of six, two of your family members were reporting on you to the government. So when you look at human capacity for destructiveness, if you don't regard yourself as one of the agents of that destructiveness or at least one of the potential agents of that destructiveness, then from the union perspective at least, there's a high probability that you're part of the problem rather than part of the solution. Now, that doesn't necessarily mean that you should be blamed for it because blame has to come from another person and it

isn't obviously clear that like I get to blame you for being potentially violent, that's I think is a complete mistake. But if you if you familiarize yourself with the realm of human capability and then you regard yourself as human, what that means is that you have to regard yourself as a creature that's capable of what human beings are capable of. And human beings are capable of a lot of things and some of them are absolutely wonderful. I mean there's nothing more remarkable than a human being on the planet. I mean people can do amazing things but the downside of that is that we can do absolutely horrible things and it's not obvious that it's only the pathological people who do that in fact it's it's that it's not reasonable to assume that so the shadow for Jung was a very big deal you know and he believed in some sense and this is where the ideas get archetypal he believed that the ideas of of uh the evil twin of the king or the evil twin of God for that matter. So that would be Satan in Christian theology. That was a that was as real a representation of the human and transpersonal human capacity for evil as there was. And he believed that if you looked deep enough into your own foul motivations and if you looked far enough down that you'd be looking so to speak into hell itself and you'd find the main controller of hell deep inside your psyche. So it was no journey for the timid. And Jung also believed that and this is what separates him from a new age thinker because he's often accused of being a new age thinker. New age thinkers tell you things like follow your bliss and you'll, you know, you'll run into utopia, your own counter utopia. But that isn't what the Yians, especially Jung, said about his process of individuation at all. He said that if you follow what's meaningful and you do it honestly, it will take you somewhere you really do not want to go. And until you go there, you'll never be able to climb up higher on the other side. And so that provides a real impediment for enlightenment because for enlightenment there's a price to be paid. And if you look at archetypal representations of the cost of enlightenment, you often find that the person who becomes enlightened has is damaged in some profound way before it happens. So, for example, in the ancient Egyptian stories of Horus and Osiris, Horus loses an eye when he has to encounter Set, who's the ancient Egyptian equivalent of Satan.

So, it's no joke. It's seriously no joke, you know, and it's, you know, one of one of Young's propositions essentially was that the human race will continue to be plagued by phenomena like the outbreak of the genocidal Nazi and Soviet ideologies until people realize that the Nazis and the Soviets are them, that it isn't someone else's problem, it isn't other people who aren't you. It's you.

If you were there, it would have been you. And you might say, well, no, I would have been a hero. It's like, no, probably not because they were rare. And I mean, unless you have real reason to think that you could have done it, then it's safer to think that you couldn't have and wouldn't have. And so then there's a responsibility that goes along with that. And the responsibility is to broaden your capacity of who you are so that you have the possibility of controlling the parts of your psyche that are very dark. Now let me give you some examples of this. So you know there's a philosopher named Rousso and most of you are Roussoians without knowing it and Rousso basically made the following propositions. He said that human beings were basically good but they were corrupted by culture.

So human the essential human nature was good and the corrupting influence was was society. Now that's true but it's only half true. And there's a philosopher named Hobbes who said exactly the opposite thing. He said no human beings are base and violent and uncontrollable and unless we have society structuring their interactions. He was more like Freud structuring their interactions they would be constantly at one another's throat. And then if you think, well, who's right, Rousso or Hobbes?

First of all, they're both right even though they say the opposite thing. And second, well, you look around the world and you tell me whether there are more Hobbesian states or Roussoian states. And the answer to that's pretty clear. Most countries are disastrous authoritarian dictatorships in which people where people live and suffer. And the places where civilization has become stable enough so that people can live peaceful, relatively peaceful and productive lives are very rare. They're more common than they were in the past. And they seem to be getting more common all the time, thank God. But it's a lot easier to be disorganized and brutal than it is to be organized, productive, and free. So now Jung believed that the shadow is something that kind of comes apart when you when you face it. So it's a blurry black mass in so in in in a sense before you start to differentiate it. And so you can you can tell what the shadow is as far as any one of you is concerned because you you can start to notice how you aren't like you act especially when you act around act around people that you're trying to impress or people whose opinions you think are important to you.

You have to pay attention to it though and you you'll be able to see that there's a distinction between what you say because you're saying something in order to make something turn out the way you want it to turn out and what you actually think. And the shadows at work in two ways there. One way is that it's convincing you that using your speech and actions to manipulate the world in a conscious manner is a good idea and it's not. And the second is that you'll see that there are counter thoughts to what you think.

So if you for example if you find yourself in the position of being too nice to someone maybe it's a boss for example who's bit of a tyrant you know and you don't feel that you're in a position to say anything um in your own defense against his or her bullying tactics. The consequence of that is that you'll think all sorts of dark and dangerous thoughts about that person in your own fantasies when you're not interacting with them. And if you catch a hold of those fantasies and you let them play themselves out consciously, you'll see that they take you to very dark places now or at least to places that you regard as very dark. So Jung's notion essentially is that when you start to uncover those elements of yourself that don't fit comfortably within your ideas about yourself is that you discover things about yourself that are also potentially very useful. It's as if you threw the baby out with the bathwater when you were setting up your personality. So, for example, earlier I talked about people who may have decided very early in their life that they're just not going to get angry.

It's like, well, it's not necessarily something that you want to throw away. It might instead be something that you want to bring within the realm of your personality so that it it can express itself consciously and in an articulated manner. Because without anger, for example, you don't have any power, which basically means that no one needs to be afraid of you. And you might think, well, people shouldn't be afraid of you. And then a union might ask, well, what in the world would ever lead you to believe that?

I mean the distinction between being respected and being feared is not clear but I would say that you don't respect anyone whom you couldn't imagine fearing if they decided to make that their priority. So without the capacity for aggression, you're not going to get any respect.

That doesn't mean that people have to fear you, but it does mean that you have to incorporate your capacity for aggression enough so that they would fear you if you wanted them to. And if you think about it, that makes a lot

more sense from a moral perspective than the argument that you should be nice to everyone. Because if you're nice to everyone because you don't have any choice because you're weak and ineffectual and harmless, then that's not a virtue. That's just you just can't do anything else. You're you're you're harmless by default. And harmless and virtuous are by no means the same thing.

If by contrast you're capable of causing all sorts of terrible trouble and you know it and you know how and then you decide not to do it because you can articulate carefully articulate a different route, well then you have the possibility of virtue because without the capacity to sin so to speak, there's no virtue in not doing it. So, if you're a if you're a young man who feels that sleeping around is wrong, but never has the opportunity to do it, then you can hardly attribute that to your virtue. So, a good union would say, "Well, you're just making a virtue out of a vice."

It's just rationalization. It has nothing to do with with virtue. Now, if you are attractive to people and you decide that that attraction should only manifest itself within certain tight boundaries and that's a voluntary choice. That's a whole different issue. Now, when Jung claims, for example, that you throw the baby out with the bathwater when you're trying to develop and become a socially acceptable personality that happens in a different way as far as he's concerned for each of the genders. And so you one of the prices Jung would say that we pay and that this is a very modern idea in some ways for growing up as a distinctly gendered society is that it's very easy for men to suppress and fail to develop to develop those elements of their character that might be considered classically feminine. And it's difficult for women to develop and express those aspects of their personality that might be classically considered masculine.

And but so Jung believed that nested inside the shadow in some sense were the contraexual capacities. So for example, for a man, given what we know about the temperamental difference between men and women, it may be that men could be more could develop the capacity for true compassion and care if they they could find that ability within what they've thrown out in the shadow. And women, for example, could find the capacity to be aggressive and assertive because that's part of what they threw out during their stage of their course of development because of because of its a priory categorization as inappropriate behavior. Now, that doesn't mean that Jung thought that there was that people should be raised without any gender identity. That issue never came up for him.

He just thought that once you had established a personality that was sufficiently developed to be acceptable socially and functional on the individual level, then you could have the opportunity to expand that personality and to take into yourself elements of of perception and thought and behavior that you wouldn't have had the sophistication to be able to handle at an earlier stage of development.

So, Jung would say perhaps that if you're a male, you have to become masculine before you could become feminine. And if you were a female, the reverse is true. But that if your development only stop stops with a narrow and categorical gender identity, then there are elements that of of of being that you could draw on that aren't at your disposal. And that will make you weak. So the shadow breaks up into the animus.

And the anima is the female inside the male, so to speak, and the animus is the male inside the female. And Jung believed that he could see those partial spirits manifesting themselves in people's behavior. And so he talked about a couple of typical behaviors that he thought were associated either with a possession. So that would be in the case of a man or an animus possession in the case of a woman. And so he would regard if you ever talk to someone who's female who seems to respond to all of your propositions with nothing but argumentation for the sake of argumentation, Jung would regard that as a manifestation of possession by the animus. And if you ever talk to a man who is um irrationally possessed by second rate and futile emotions, then he would regard that as possession by the so and you can see that if you watch for it and if you believe in such things.

Um, the best thing to do when confronted with someone who's animus possessed is just shut up because you're not going to make any headway. Because the point of the argument of an animus inspired argument is to get you to argue, not to win. Because by getting you to argue, the animus wins. So, and then behind those two things, behind the shadow and the anima and the animus, there's a final archetype which is the archetype of the self. And that's Jung believed that the self was what you were as a totality.

And that's a hard thing to understand, but but you could think about it this way. You could think about the self as the as the total of what you are now plus the total of all those things that you could still be. So it would be you as a reality plus you as potential. And that's a strange idea, right? Because we don't really know how to understand the idea of potential as modern empirical people because potential virtually by definition is not yet manifest and also not a straightforward thing to either measure or conceptualize. By the same token, everybody acts as if they're they have potential, unrealized potential. And so, Jung generated up a category to account for that, which he felt was expressed in all sorts of symbolic ways. So, for example, the wise old man like like the wizards in in the movies that all of you have seen in the last five years, it's always the same wizard. Sometimes it's even the same actor. It's like that's an archetype of the wise old man.

And for Jung, Christ was an archetype of the self as well. And I told you why that was to some degree. And it's partly because the phoenix is also an archetype of the self because the phoenix is something that can die and be reborn. And so the phoenix stands for the part of your personality that can let one thing go. One part of you, which is an alive part, can let that go and burn up, so to speak, so that something new can be born because you very seldom gain something before you let something else go.

That's partly because what you already assume can be the worst impediment that you have to to learning something new. And it's complicated because sometimes what you know worked in the past, you know. So you can think about that maybe you're a perfectly well adapted 11-year-old and you're still acting that way when you're 15. It's like, well, it's hard to let that go because it worked and you put a lot of effort into it, but unless you let it go, the new personality isn't going to be able to manifest itself. So, you have to stop being a child before you can be an adult. And there's a sacrifice that goes along with that. It's also a sacrifice that parents have to make, right?

Because in order for a parent to encourage you to adopt the responsibilities of an individual, they have to allow you as a child to die. And Freud's observation on that phenomena was that many parents and he believed this

was particularly characteristic of mothers because of their tight bond with their children and the dependency that that implies that it was particularly difficult for a mother to let her child die so that an adult could manifest itself in that child's place.

And that's fundamentally in many ways the edyple complex. Okay. So now I'm going to show you some of these things again because the thing about Jung is that it's not easy to understand what he has to say and it's not a simple thing to explain it. And his books are complicated. Although I don't think they're any more complicated than they have to be. Like I don't think Jung is obscure. I think he's just difficult. And then beyond difficult, he's actually frightening. So there's lots of reasons that people don't like Jung. And the fact that he's difficult and frightening are probably the two foremost objections. I think the other thing that happened to Jung that maybe slowed his acceptance as an intellectual was that many of his students were women. like his primary students and the people who developed his ideas, many of the people who identi I um continued to develop his ideas after he died were women and that was perhaps not the most effective way of making headway in the academic world at at the time that he was alive. So let's look at some things. I'm going to show you some things from The Lion King cuz The Lion King shows you archetypes everywhere.

So, let's do this first. Relax.

Okay. So, the first thing that I would like to point out here is that this takes place at daybreak. And daybreak is when the sun reemerges. And from an archetypal perspective, the sun reemerges from a terrible battle that it had with the thing that devours the sun at night and it comes up again triumphant in the morning. And so it's the dawn of consciousness. And that that idea that the sun under goes this battle is associated with the idea that you descend into unconsciousness when you sleep and magically you reemerge from it in the morning and you do that in accordance with the sun. So for you, darkness is a time of unconsciousness and there's a tight relationship between unconsciousness and darkness. And so Jung would say people projected that idea. It was an idea that was they're in their imagination that unconsciousness and darkness were tightly aligned. And so they used their imagination to explain the world and conceptualize the sun in those in those terms of imagination. So that if you analyze the terms of imagination, you can get some understanding into the structure of the imagination. And so that's one of them.

Consciousness and light are the same thing. Illumination, enlightenment, all of those things. And that's because we're primarily visual creatures. And we're conscious during the day. And so this is a new beginning, the new day, which is something that everyone also experiences because sleep washes away the cares of the previous day. Um, and it does revitalize you. We know perfectly well that if you deprive people of sleep for any length of time, it's not good for them. It it it der it derails them entirely, deranges them entirely. So there is a reason that this movie opens with the dawn of the day.

Okay, so there's another recasting of the same idea, right? Except the lyrics also indicated that there was an association between the dawn of self-consciousness and the emergence of the light because the lyrics were when we stepped the day we stepped onto the planet and stepped out blinking into the light. There's a there's a transition from unconsciousness to consciousness metaphor underlying that. And so one of the statements the

film is making or one of the ways that the film is trying to set you up to understand this as a story about the emergence of consciousness into the light. Now you might say well did the filmmakers know all this? The answer to that is A, it depends on what you mean by no, which is really a critical factor in this sort of discussion. And B, well, yes. And the re the way they manifested the fact that they knew it is because they knew when things fit together. So, you know, when you're writing a story or something like that or reading a story, you know, when the story is going well, you think, "Yeah, that makes sense." In fact, you don't even notice it, right?

You just assume that everything's fine because it makes sense. It doesn't jar you out of the narrative. And so people are perfectly capable, especially if they concentrated on it for long periods of time, of assembling a narrative with images that make sense. Now, they may not know why it makes sense. In fact, if they're actually artists, they don't know why it makes sense because they're they're ex they're expanding their capacity to comprehend and explain things while they're producing what they're producing. They have to be moving beyond what they know because otherwise they're just producing propaganda, you know, and there are elements of many Disney films that sink now and then into propaganda, sort of conscious moralizing, but when the films are really working, they're not doing that at all. And when when when they are consciously moralizing, they're boring very quickly. Plus, they date extremely rapidly.

more than ever. There's too much [Music] Okay, so that's a brilliant piece of film editing there because the the filmmakers sweep your eye along and then make something appear as a revelation and they do it at exactly the same time that the music swells to a climax and that's indicating to you that something of tremendous importance is about to be revealed. And so you see two things here. The first thing you see is what's called Pride Rock, which is a is a roughly pyramidal shape, at least a triangular shape that emerges in the middle of the landscape that actually serves symbolically as the center of the kingdom. Now, you can think about that as a Egyptian pyramid or you could think about it as a dominance hierarchy. It doesn't really matter. It's both of those things. It's also the thing on which the thing that the animals are subjugated to stands, right? Because that's where the king is. And the king happens to be a lion. And the lion is a solar beast. It's always been a solar beast. It's associated with the sun. And it's the king of beasts because it's an apex predator. It's at the top of the hierarchy. And for whatever reason, although obviously the lions in the animated movie are they're not actually lions. It's important to remember that while you're analyzing the film because it's very easy to just think of them as lions, even though clearly they're not.

Now you also see this little character up in the right hand corner, left hand corner and that's Zazoo, right? And Zazu is the eye of the king and so the king is on top of the pyramid but the king's eye is free from the king and it can go where all over the place even where the pyramid can't see. And that's the eye on the top of the pyramid. You've seen that symbol everywhere. No doubt it's the symbol that's on the back of the American dollar bill. And there's a reason for it. Because the eye of the king is not part of the hierarchy. The eye of the king is something that's always free of the hierarchy and can can fly over all hierarchies.

And that's that's equivalent to the thing that could make its way up any hierarchy in some sense. It's also the same as Horus, the the god of vision in the ancient Egyptian stories. Okay. So, there we've got the king and we'll see that he's on top of the rock, which is where the king belongs. He's also in full sunlight, even though that's not

characteristic of any of the other animals. He's got his little bird there that tells him things because the king is someone who pays attention because the king who doesn't pay attention is a tyrant. And then the wind is blowing through the king's hair because the wind is spirit. And so the king is also something that's associated with the everlasting spirit.

Numa. Numa is the breath of air. And it's also the the the essence of life from an archetypal perspective. So to be inspired is like res respiring. To be inspired is to take in spirit. And the kind of spirit that the king takes in is associated with the image of the wind. Now you got to look at his face. You remember before I was saying because the animators do a very good job of this. They gave him a very mature face. And a mature face is something out of which something is coming instead of something into which something is coming. And you'll see that the king Mufasa is always looking like this. He's very intent and focused and and um intimidating. Whereas his son, right up until he becomes um initiated, is like this always. As soon as he becomes initiated, and I'll show you that in the film, his face hardens. And it isn't until his face hardens that he can go back and fight Scar, who's basically a figure of the shadow.

Now, originally, this character Rafiki was going to be one of those typical sort of Disney sidekick buffoons. That didn't work out so well in the narrative, and he ended up as a symbol of the self instead. And Rafiki is obviously a shaman, and he's the part of the psyche that guides its transformation. So, here's another way of looking at the self. It's very interesting idea. So, you know, as you go through life, there's going to be triumphs and then catastrophes. And when there's a catastrophe, the psyche falls apart. And then maybe it gathers its resources back together and pulls itself together. It's going like this. Well, Jung would say the self is what's guiding that process. So, the ego feels it like this. So, that's triumph and catastrophe and triumph and catastrophe or tragedy and comedy. But the self is the thing that's underneath all of it allowing those transformations to take place. And that's Rafiki. And that's why he's associated as well with the sun.

So, and he's a good king because he's in touch with the self. So that makes him not something that's either serving his persona or his ego. But you could say that what he's serving is the a manner of ruling that allows for the appropriate amount of stability and transformation to take place in the kingdom so that it remains stable but also adapting to change. And the king is guided in that by the little bird who tells him what's going on in those places he can't see.

Now that's clearly a Madonna and child image and the reason for that is quite simple. I mean you might think well why would the idea of the Madonna and child which by the way is a far older idea than the Christian representation of it. There's lots of figures of Madonna's and ch Madonna Madonna's and children. Yeah, in ancient Egyptian art, for example, that' be Isis with Horus. Well, the reason that that's an archetype is because any society who doesn't regard the diad of mother and infant as something sacred, which would mean of highest value, is doomed obviously because without that being held as a value, the society will cease to propagate and that will be the end of it. So if society isn't structured so that that's that diad is up among the highest of values then the society has become ungovernably corrupt So you see that Rafiki there just anointed the little king with something that was orange and that was something like the sun. So the idea that the film is expressing is that there's some sunlike substance that's being associated with the with this newborn son of the king and that that's

uh dramatic manifestation of his destiny and an indication that he has to also be in cultured because what Rafiki is doing is a cultural act before he's going to be complete.

now. The sand is also an indication that he's mortal. Now, watch what happens here because the filmmakers, I think they just nail this part. So, they're going to do the sweeping thing again and the music rises to the ultimate climax of the song. And what's happening here is that the self is presenting this the sun. And so it's a it's a presentation of the savior fundamentally. And that's the thing that has just been born. That's the hero. And when the hero is presented and the sun breaks open wide and shines on him, you would call that a synchronous event. And what happens is there's an emotion associated with that which you will feel. And it's at that time that all the animals bow down and they do that spontaneously. And the idea is that there's a hierarchy here and the little boy in the sun is the highest element of the hierarchy. And when that manifests itself and you can see beyond the facade facade to something that's divine behind it, the consequence of that will be a spontaneous bursting forth of awe. And I really think the filmmakers nailed that here.

[Music] circle of life. [Music] Yeah. So, they hit that pretty hard there. So, there's also a nuclear family thing going on in the background that you might have noticed because of course the little king has a mother and a father. And that's partly because that works better, but also partly because the the archetypal hero is the son of culture and nature. So, okay. So, here's a here's a shadow figure.

here. He's represented here not so much as Simba's shadow, although he's part of Simba's shadow. He's represented as Mufasa's shadow. And so, it's quite a complex idea because what it says is when when a king-like organization grows up, which means any organization, anything that's a hierarchy and that's powerful, there's a shadow element to it that tends towards totalitarianism and tyranny. And that's represented often by the king's evil brother. It's a very common motif in in mythologically based stories. And the king is generally blind to his brother. So often willfully blind, although that doesn't really seem to be the case in the Lion King. It's it is clearly the case that Mu Mufasa underestimates the danger posed by his usually older and smarter brother. It's and and the myths very often make the case that the evil king is the older one and also the one that's more intelligent. And the reason for that is that as far as I can tell is that intelligence is something that can go very wrong if it goes wrong. And one of its big temptations is that it produces models of the world and then falls in love with the models. And when it falls in love with the models, that makes it totalitarian because it believes that its constructions are good enough so that there doesn't need to be anything else. So it eliminates the necessity of the transcendent. And that's definitely a characteristic of any totalitarian system. It says this is everything we need. And then you know if you happen to suffer or if you happen to openly rebel against the system then you're regarded as an enemy of truth and then it's fine to do with you whatever might be done because everything worth doing has already been done.

Now, he's got an interesting facial expression. And it's really worth watching facial expressions in animated cartoons because they're not faces, right? What they are is the consequence of the observations of extremely talented artists about how people's faces configure themselves over very long periods of time. Because these people are highlevel artists. they know what they're doing and so they're able to distill down certain facial expressions to describe a character. Now, this guy's obviously he's whiny.

He's got this super sillious and arrogant voice. So, he's he's he's arrogant beyond belief. And he is also hard done by and resentful. And that's a really good and maybe he has a reason. He's got a scar. Something happened to him that wasn't good. But he's taken on this attitude as resentful victim who really deserves to rule. If only everyone could see how wonderful he was. And then he has all sorts of reasons why the fact that he isn't powerful has nothing to do with his own shortcomings.

Not fair. You see, I shall never be king. And you shall never see the light of another day. And you did your mother ever tell you not to play with your What do you want? I'm here to announce that King Mufasa is on his way. So you better have a good excuse for missing the ceremony this morning. Now look, you made me lose my lunch.

You lose more than that when the king gets through with you. He's as mad as a hippo with a quiver with fear. Now Scar, don't look at me that way. timing. Well, as we can tell, the eyes of the king and Scar are not friends. And that's because Scar doesn't really want to see what's going on. Now, here's an interesting little archetype.

Everything will set up. What about beyond? But I thought can do whatever they want.

Okay, so that's quite interesting. There's a variety of statements there that are very very cool. So one of them is the the kingdom is a bounded place. And so that's playing off the idea of explored territory versus unexplored territory or the known versus the unknown. And the proposition there is that whatever the dominance hierarchy happens to be, it has a limited domain of a limited domain of competence.

And the domain of competence is defined by everything that the light touches. Now, this is actually something that you can notice in your own life. It's it's quite interesting. You'll see that if you move into a new place or a new neighborhood or if you do anything new at all that nothing that you haven't attended to is actually yours. It will it will stay foreign in a sense and unfamiliar to you until you interact with it with a substantial amount of attention. And that's partly because while you're attending to it, which is an act of conscious will, you're you're you're modifying your perceptions and your thoughts and your actions and your emotions to take it into account as a phenomena. And that means that you're competent there. And it takes conscious effort to be competent because you have to practice being competent at a new domain. And until you've practiced being competent in a new domain, it's not yours. And so this clip is showing what's basically an eternal truth, which is that your territory is whatever you've mastered.

And it's demarcated by everything you haven't mastered. And in this particular representation, that's associated with with death. It's also associated in some bizarre sense with paradise because of course Simba encounters the elephant's grave out in no man's land so to speak. But when he runs away across the desert, he also finds paradise. And so there's a paradoxical idea there that the unknown contains death and everything you need to make your life worthwhile.

Here comes thema. I'm a genius. That's genius. It was my idea. Okay. So, you see that cocky? He's a cocky little rat here. Okay. So, he's very confident, but that's egotism. and also persona. Well, it's no wonder he's confident.

He's the son of the king, you know, and the fact is that he has a position of dominance that he doesn't deserve merely because he was born into it and that's made him shallow and arrogant and possessed by a persona. Now, this little figure who is basically an anime figure always knocks him down a peg.

Continually knocks him down a peg. How many of you have seen Groundhog Day? Yeah. Yeah. You remember in Groundhog Day, Bill Murray's character is a real he's a jackass at the beginning. He's very arrogant and he's very unskilled and then he gets stuck in the same day, which is pretty funny because that is what happens to you if you're arrogant and unskilled. You end up in the same damn day. That's not fun. And then in that day, he becomes attracted to this woman who's anime figure. And for for years, as far as the film's concerned, every time he approaches her in his arrogant and clumsy way, she slaps him.

So there's one scene in the movie where I think it lasts for about 30 seconds. And it's nothing but clips of her slapping him probably 30 times. At that point, you've seen him go through the same day in the continually painful way that he does. And she slaps him in those longer clips. And after a while, the filmmaker gets tired of that and just shows you nothing but the slaps. you know, eventually he's brought so far down as a consequence of being stuck in the same day and continually being slapped that he falls completely apart, right? Then he tries to kill himself.

One of the very comical things about that movie is that that doesn't work either. He just wakes up in the same day again. And you know what that means in some sense is that if you're too damn stubborn to change, you will keep running into the same thing over and over continually. And that's why you're in the same day because you won't let go of it. And that might drive you even to question the value of your own being.

But that's also not a very useful adaptive strategy, you know. And it isn't until he starts to take his rejection seriously that he starts to actually build some real character, right? And then he starts paying attention to the day and finds out that there's all sorts of things that he can do during that day to make it rich and meaningful. And as soon as he does that enough and becomes an expert at it, poof, he gets out of the the day. the same horrible day. And so that horrible day is also a representation of the tyranny of the state because the state is something that's static. So anyways, Nella, she's genius. It was my idea.

Yeah, but I pulled it off with me. Oh yeah, me up. Yeah. And well, they're not paying attention. They end up in the shadows outside the kingdom. So, here's here's an image of Scar transforming himself essentially first into Hitler, but because there's a lot of Nazi imagery in this in this particular clip, but also into a satanic figure. At the end you'll see he's associated with the cresant moon. So he turns into the horn demon of the night essentially.

Now you can see that's all images of hell. Obviously sick as you are. My words are a matter of pride. It's clear from your expression. We are talking. See, one of the things that happened to people like Stalin, for example, is Stalin had nothing but contempt for people and he thought all they ever did was lie. Well, what happened to Stalin is that he he became surrounded by people with to whom he could demonstrate contempt and who never did anything to him except lie. Because the reason for that was they were so terrified of him that they would never tell him the truth about anything. And so he got into this spiral, which is kind of the spiral of the of a

paranoid psychopath, where I distrust you so badly and set things up so that you'll be punished so hard if you ever deviate from the appropriate line that you'll do nothing but lie to me. And so then I'm fully justified in my contempt. It's sort of it's like Peter Pan in some sense, king of the lost boys. It's like, well, who do you want to be king of? Well, the route that Scar took, which is the negative archetype, the shadow route, means that he's king, but you know, he's king of hell and all he's got are these brainless minions. And so, you know, he's king of people he wouldn't want to associate with. It's not exactly a it's not exactly an attainment.

You you you may remember or you may not remember that or may not know that Hitler of course set up the worst the biggest meeting arena that the world had ever seen for the Nuremberg Nazi party rallies and there's there's something to see. They were filmed quite brilliantly in a film called Will to Power. I think that's what it's called. Linen Riffen Stall. And what Hitler has arrayed in front of him are blocks of thousands of soldiers everywhere as far as you can see in absolutely perfect uniformity. And that's the idea because if you're already right, nothing has to be different. Everything can be the same as the perfect thing. The problem with that is you're not right and things have to change. And Hitler, he was a master of the use of fire as well and also put his displays on at night. And so he took all the Luftwaffe's aircraft spotting uh spotlights, which were huge, massive lights, maybe they must have been 20 feet across, and he had them all lined up behind him on the stage, and they would shine miles up into the sky. And so he would address these thousands and thousands of people in this nighttime ritual with a curtain of light behind him that was several miles high. It was an unbelievably powerful pageant. And the people who made this film are drawing on on that to produce these images.

You will get a sniff without me. Prepare for the cool tenacity of simply the kingdom [Music] I am prepared.

You know, and modern people will say things like, well, the idea of hell is just a superstition. But then you watch this and it makes sense. And then you think, well, hell is where Satan himself rules and nothing happens but the bodies burn in death. And that's exactly what happened during the Holocaust. And so thinking that these sorts of archetypal ideas are superstitious is it's extraordinarily foolish and naïve because they represent possibilities of being that continually manifest themselves and everyone knows about them. So you know the the the implicit idea here is that if you take the path that Scar took which is one of resentment and deceit as well as arrogance which are three major motiv major major shadow motivators then you'll end up at best ruling over hell and it's no joke like it's not a superstition. The stories are trying to tell you something that that his mode of being is the pathway to predation and that and that the things that happen there are so terrible and so deep that the only way you can really express them is using the kind of imagery that we've come to associate with religious and religious imagery in a sense is imagery that cannot be made more powerful.

That's what makes it archetypal. It's like a limit. You can't go past it in terms of the representation. And so when you represent the ultimate destiny of evil as eternal hell where all the bodies burn forever and there's nothing there except demonic chatter that's about as far as you can go in terms of your capacity to represent something but it's representing something. So and you can say well it's an eternal place. Well that's because this possibility is always there. It never goes away. It's always there. And that's also what makes it archetypal.

And you know that because otherwise you wouldn't be able to understand the story and everyone knows it.

Otherwise, this story wouldn't be I still believe it's one of the top 10 grossing films of all time. So obviously it makes sense. Okay. Well, I'd like to show you a lot more, but but I can't. [Applause] So, we'll see you Thursday. I'm going to post some sample questions on the website very soon. Tonight, possibly tomorrow morning, possibly somewhere around there. So, check it out and you'll get some sense of what the exam's going to be like.