



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Research Commons

<http://waikato.researchgateway.ac.nz/>

Research Commons at the University of Waikato

Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.

**BEYOND ROMANCE'S UTOPIA:
THE INDIVIDUAL AND HUMAN LOVE**

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy
at
The University of Waikato
by
CAROLYN STOCK

The University of Waikato
2007

There must be brotherly love, a wholeness of humanity. But there must also be pure, separate individuality, separate and proud as a lion or a hawk. There must be both. In the duality lies fulfillment. Man must act in concert with man, creatively and happily. This is greatest happiness. But man must also act separately and distinctly, apart from every other man, single and self-responsible and proud with unquenchable pride, moving for himself without reference to his neighbor. These two movements are opposite, yet they do not negate each other. We have understanding. And if we understand, then we balance perfectly between the two motions, we are single, isolated individuals, we are a great concordant humanity, both, and then the rose of perfection transcends us, the rose of the world which has never yet blossomed, but which will blossom from us when we begin to understand both sides and live in both directions, freely and without fear, following the inmost desires of our body and spirit, which arrive to us out of the unknown... Lastly, there is the love of God; we become whole with God... the Holy Spirit, the unknowable, is single and perfect for us.

D. H. Lawrence, as cited in De Forest, 1954, p. 183

Abstract

This thesis is a critique of romantic love theoretically premised on the analytical psychology of Carl Jung and the humanistic psychoanalysis of Erich Fromm. The aim of this critique is to explore whether there are grounds for postulating a conception of love beyond the current romantic framework.

As the critique is primarily concentrated at the depth level, romantic love is examined via the medium of Cinderella folklore, with particular focus on Andy Tennant's 1998 film adaptation of Cinderella, *Ever After*. Based on a Jungian approach to the psyche and psychic products, the methodological framework incorporates the three following tools: The tool of interpretation at the subjective level, in which the characters of the Cinderella fairy tale are read symbolically rather than taken to denote literal fictitious characters; the tool of constructive analysis, in which it is argued that romantic love is more than 'nothing but' a boy/girl love story or 'nothing but' a myth depicting patriarchal oppression; and the tool of amplification, in which archetypal similarities between the Christian myth and the Cinderella fairy tale are highlighted.

The central argument of this critique is that while romantic love does not provide a viable model of relatedness if taken and practiced *literally*, the romantic myth nonetheless contains within it the basis for a fuller and richer experience of love and relatedness if read *subjectively*. The rationale for a depth critique of romantic love is based upon the Jungian postulate that phenomena such as dreams and myths issue fundamentally from the unconscious psychic realm, and further upon Jung's recognition of a psychological developmental process he refers to as 'individuation' activated by engagement with the products of the unconscious. A symbolic/psychological reading of romantic love brings to light that romantic desire toward another is an outward manifestation of an inner desire for individual realisation, and is expressive of the individual's own capacity for wholeness. The value of a symbolic reading of romantic love is appreciated if it is conceived that it is precisely individual realisation that forms the basis for what is referred to by Erich Fromm as productive or knowledge-based love, argued here to be the ideal and only firm basis for human relatedness generally and intimate relatedness specifically.

Acknowledgements

To Dr Ted Ninnes and Dr Carolyn Michelle:

Thank you for the guidance and support you have given me throughout this journey of learning and discovery.

You have been the very BEST supervisors! I greatly appreciate the help you have given me.

*Thank you also to Dr Kirstine Moffat,
Violet Stock, France Riddell, Maureen Harte,
and Craig Davie.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Aim of critique	1
The analytical psychology of Carl Gustav Jung	8
Archetypes.....	19
Individuation	22
Jung’s empiricism	26
The humanistic psychoanalysis of Erich Fromm.....	30
Methodological framework.....	40
Interpretation at the subjective level	40
Constructive/synthetic analysis.....	42
Amplification	45
Cinderella folklore: Historical development and <i>Ever After</i>	51
Chapter outlines	64
CHAPTER ONE	67
Cinderella: Identification and the ego.....	68
The Cinderella fairy tale: Individuality and the self.....	78
The centrality of love	90
CHAPTER TWO	98
In defence of spontaneity	110
The ‘right’ way.....	118
Respecting difference.....	126
CHAPTER THREE	133
Oedipus: Wicked or wounded?.....	135
The ‘victim’s responsibility’	144
Symbiotic attachment.....	157
The question of good and evil.....	164
CHAPTER FOUR	176
Soul, persona and differentiation	177
Relatedness beyond romance	195
Mr/Ms. Right.....	206

CHAPTER FIVE.....	214
Home: Origin and destination	215
Productive love: God and idols	229
Self-love: Productive love's undergird	243
CHAPTER SIX.....	253
Fate	253
CONCLUSION.....	268
Appendix	275
References	280

**BEYOND ROMANCE'S UTOPIA:
THE INDIVIDUAL AND HUMAN LOVE**

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy
at
The University of Waikato
by
CAROLYN STOCK

The University of Waikato
2007

There must be brotherly love, a wholeness of humanity. But there must also be pure, separate individuality, separate and proud as a lion or a hawk. There must be both. In the duality lies fulfillment. Man must act in concert with man, creatively and happily. This is greatest happiness. But man must also act separately and distinctly, apart from every other man, single and self-responsible and proud with unquenchable pride, moving for himself without reference to his neighbor. These two movements are opposite, yet they do not negate each other. We have understanding. And if we understand, then we balance perfectly between the two motions, we are single, isolated individuals, we are a great concordant humanity, both, and then the rose of perfection transcends us, the rose of the world which has never yet blossomed, but which will blossom from us when we begin to understand both sides and live in both directions, freely and without fear, following the inmost desires of our body and spirit, which arrive to us out of the unknown... Lastly, there is the love of God; we become whole with God... the Holy Spirit, the unknowable, is single and perfect for us.

D. H. Lawrence, as cited in De Forest, 1954, p. 183

Abstract

This thesis is a critique of romantic love theoretically premised on the analytical psychology of Carl Jung and the humanistic psychoanalysis of Erich Fromm. The aim of this critique is to explore whether there are grounds for postulating a conception of love beyond the current romantic framework.

As the critique is primarily concentrated at the depth level, romantic love is examined via the medium of Cinderella folklore, with particular focus on Andy Tennant's 1998 film adaptation of Cinderella, *Ever After*. Based on a Jungian approach to the psyche and psychic products, the methodological framework incorporates the three following tools: The tool of interpretation at the subjective level, in which the characters of the Cinderella fairy tale are read symbolically rather than taken to denote literal fictitious characters; the tool of constructive analysis, in which it is argued that romantic love is more than 'nothing but' a boy/girl love story or 'nothing but' a myth depicting patriarchal oppression; and the tool of amplification, in which archetypal similarities between the Christian myth and the Cinderella fairy tale are highlighted.

The central argument of this critique is that while romantic love does not provide a viable model of relatedness if taken and practiced *literally*, the romantic myth nonetheless contains within it the basis for a fuller and richer experience of love and relatedness if read *subjectively*. The rationale for a depth critique of romantic love is based upon the Jungian postulate that phenomena such as dreams and myths issue fundamentally from the unconscious psychic realm, and further upon Jung's recognition of a psychological developmental process he refers to as 'individuation' activated by engagement with the products of the unconscious. A symbolic/psychological reading of romantic love brings to light that romantic desire toward another is an outward manifestation of an inner desire for individual realisation, and is expressive of the individual's own capacity for wholeness. The value of a symbolic reading of romantic love is appreciated if it is conceived that it is precisely individual realisation that forms the basis for what is referred to by Erich Fromm as productive or knowledge-based love, argued here to be the ideal and only firm basis for human relatedness generally and intimate relatedness specifically.

Acknowledgements

To Dr Ted Ninnes and Dr Carolyn Michelle:

Thank you for the guidance and support you have given me throughout this journey of learning and discovery.

You have been the very BEST supervisors! I greatly appreciate the help you have given me.

*Thank you also to Dr Kirstine Moffat,
Violet Stock, France Riddell, Maureen Harte,
and Craig Davie.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Aim of critique	1
The analytical psychology of Carl Gustav Jung	8
Archetypes.....	19
Individuation	22
Jung’s empiricism	26
The humanistic psychoanalysis of Erich Fromm.....	30
Methodological framework.....	40
Interpretation at the subjective level	40
Constructive/synthetic analysis.....	42
Amplification	45
Cinderella folklore: Historical development and <i>Ever After</i>	51
Chapter outlines	64
CHAPTER ONE	67
Cinderella: Identification and the ego.....	68
The Cinderella fairy tale: Individuality and the self.....	78
The centrality of love	90
CHAPTER TWO	98
In defence of spontaneity	110
The ‘right’ way.....	118
Respecting difference.....	126
CHAPTER THREE	133
Oedipus: Wicked or wounded?.....	135
The ‘victim’s responsibility’	144
Symbiotic attachment.....	157
The question of good and evil.....	164
CHAPTER FOUR	176
Soul, persona and differentiation	177
Relatedness beyond romance	195
Mr/Ms. Right.....	206

CHAPTER FIVE.....	214
Home: Origin and destination	215
Productive love: God and idols	229
Self-love: Productive love's undergird	243
CHAPTER SIX.....	253
Fate	253
CONCLUSION.....	268
Appendix	275
References	280

INTRODUCTION

Aim of critique

I had originally thought to title this critique *The Pathology of Romantic Love*, and this was the title that appeared on the initial proposal. I found the topic generated considerable interest; everyone I spoke to had an opinion on the subject. In particular, the linking of romantic love with pathology seemed to strike a chord. Although unable to pinpoint exactly why, many of those I spoke with did seem to consider that there *was* something fundamentally wrong with human love relations patterned on romance. Therefore, ‘pathological’ did not seem too strong a descriptor, but rather to resonate as apt. Paradoxically however, while interested in the idea that romantic love may be ‘pathological,’ few seemed to have given serious consideration to or even desired love relations to be governed by anything but romance.¹

As will be noted, the thesis title no longer contains a reference to pathology. When I reflect on this now, I consider that the shift in emphasis from romantic love as pathology to a more teleological orientation occurred, as it were, without my conscious deliberation or intent. It is not that I changed my mind concerning romance’s ‘pathology’; more that the idea somehow became superseded, so that when – six months subsequent to my initial topic outline – I submitted a full research plan, the course before me had fundamentally altered from my initial preoccupation with focusing on what was *wrong* with romantic love and relationships thus premised, to what romantic love, at the level of myth and symbol, might *mean*. This shift in emphasis wholly accords with a Jungian approach to the psyche. As I note below, romantic love has its roots in fairy tale and myth, and as I outline in the section that follows, Jung regards phenomena such as dreams and myths as issuing from the unconscious psyche, and, as such - psychologically meaningful and significant.

¹ I expect that my reader will wish to remind me that feminists have long pointed to the inadequacy of romantically premised relatedness and romantic love per se. However, as I note below, while there has been a noted and welcome increase in what feminist theorists Stacey and Pearce (1995) refer to as ‘non-standard’ relationships, romantic love is still the central impetus fuelling interpersonal relatedness and romantic love is still desired, even by feminists who are opposed to it on intellectual or political grounds. As Stevi Jackson (1995) puts it: “The purveyors of romantic fiction are not suffering a contraction of their markets. Rather they are adapting their plots to suit shifts in sexual mores – but their more assertive, less virginal heroines are still seeking Mr. Right” (p. 60). In sum, while how relationships are constructed/negotiated may have altered significantly, ‘non-standard’ partnerings or relationships are still, for the most part, romantic ones.

My focus here therefore is upon an examination of romantic love at the level of myth and upon the symbolic and hence psychological implications of romantic love as a phenomenon of essentially unconscious derivation. This entails an examination of the archetypal constituents of the romantic myth and romantic stories; archetypes being denoted by Jung (1954) as the fundamental components of the psyche, and myths and fairytales – along with the cultural stories emanating therefrom - being one of the modes or vehicles for their expression. Due to my stated focus, I refer - in relation to my own critique of romantic love - to romantic love as ‘Cinderella’ or ‘romantic mythology,’² or simply ‘romantic love’ or ‘romance,’ rather than ideology/discourse. However, in focusing my critique primarily at the level of myth, I do not overlook or deny the socio-political or ideological/discursive implications of romantic love. It is not a case of either/or myth/ideology or discourse, but rather both/and. I anticipate that there are perhaps two main objections that will be raised against my referring to romantic love as ‘mythology’ and leveling my critique thus. Before proceeding, I will address these expected points of conjecture.

Firstly, romantic stories - whether print or screen adaptations - are considered, aside from their ideological implications, as simply stories that novelists and scriptwriters author or ‘make up.’ I do not dispute that romantic stories are consciously elaborated and that to this extent could rightly be viewed as products of conscious design. However, as I set forth in the methodology section, while romantic stories are consciously adorned or worked, the basic blueprint upon which they are premised and from which they derive is not of *conscious invention*.³ It follows that a theoretical perspective/interpretative approach that recognises and is able to address the archetypal underpinnings of romantic stories/romantic love is required; that is, a theoretical perspective that recognises that romantic stories and romantic love per se are more than simply products of conscious design and intent and therefore more than primarily or *only* ideology/discourse.

² In terms of classification, the Cinderella story falls most clearly within the definition of a folk or fairy tale (see Powell, 2007, pp. 1-13). However, in the main I refer to the Cinderella story by the broader term ‘myth.’ The term myth conveys more cogently than the term fairy tale (which in everyday usage denotes a children’s fable) the impact the Cinderella story has exerted upon the Western psyche.

³ Jung, in a discussion of the idea of God, makes the point that phenomena such as myths and religious symbols issue first and foremost from the unconscious layer of the psyche. Jung (1934) notes that “at some time someone is supposed to have invented a God and sundry dogmas and to have led humanity around by the nose with this ‘wish-fulfilling’ fantasy. But this opinion is contradicted by the psychological fact that the head is a particularly inadequate organ when it comes to thinking up religious symbols. They do not come from the head at all, but from some other place... certainly from a deep psychic level very little resembling consciousness, which is always only the top layer. That is why religious symbols have a distinctly ‘revelatory’ character; they are usually spontaneous products of unconscious psychic activity. They are anything rather than thought up; on the contrary, in the course of the millennia, they have developed, plant-like, as natural manifestations of the human psyche” (p. 805).

The limitations – even ineffectuality – of a purely intellectual or political critique of romantic love has been recognised in feminist theorising; traditionally a site where romantic love has been subject to extensive criticism. Jackie Stacey and Lynne Pearce (1995) who, along with Stevi Jackson (1995), claim that predictions heralding romantic love’s imminent demise are premature and exaggerated (pp. 11-12, 50),⁴ point to the need for a re-evaluation of the feminist stance in relation to romance, noting that the wholesale rejection of romantic love espoused by early feminists (e.g., Simone de Beauvoir, Kate Millett, Shulamith Firestone, Germaine Greer) has not worked. Stacey and Pearce (1995) note that “neither intellectual nor political skepticism seems to save anyone – feminists included – from succumbing to its snares. We may... no longer *believe* in love, but we still fall for it” (p. 12). The observation that romantic love has proven itself impervious to intellectual critique endorses the noted speculation that it may be something other than a product of essentially conscious design and rational intent. Stacey and Pearce (1995) draw attention to the “combined fascination and anxiety” romantic love evokes (p. 10). Likewise, feminist researcher Eva Illouz (1998) refers to romantic love’s “fantasmatic power” (p. 170). In Jungian terms, what these theorists/researchers identify is the romantic myth’s/romantic love’s *irrational nature and numinosity*;⁵ both these factors being characteristic of unconscious products and archetypal activity.

My own questioning with respect to a feminist position which construes romantic love in wholly negative terms is: If romantic love is complicit in the subjugation of women, why is it that within the West the emergence of romantic love as a cultural construct came hand in hand with an increasing focus on the emancipation of women; the emergence of both occurring at approximately the same time?⁶ It is worthy of consideration that the countries

⁴ One of those claiming that romantic love is giving way to consensual or confluent love is sociologist Anthony Giddens. Giddens (1992) sees romantic love as being replaced by a relationship ideal he refers to as the ‘pure relationship.’ The pure relationship “refers to a situation where a social relation is entered into for its own sake, for what can be derived by each person from a sustained association with another; and which is continued only in so far as it is thought by both parties to deliver enough satisfactions for each individual to stay within it” (p. 58). Giddens distinguishes romantic love, which is based on projective identification, with his ideal of confluent love: “Confluent love is active, contingent love, and therefore jars with the ‘for-ever’, ‘one-and-only’ qualities of the romantic love complex” (p. 61). Giddens (1999) sees not only intimate relationships but also friendships and parent-child relationships as needing to more closely approximate the ideal of the pure relationship.

⁵ From a Jungian perspective, to posit romantic love as ‘irrational’ is to denote it as a phenomenon not “*contrary* to reason, but something *beyond* reason, something, therefore, not grounded on reason” (Jung, 1923, p. 774). Numinosity refers to the propensity of archetypal images or ideas to “impress, influence, and fascinate us” (Jung, 1958, p. 847).

⁶ See the final section of this chapter where I point to romantic love forming the basis for intimate relatedness from the late eighteenth century onwards. Huang Mei, author of *Transforming the Cinderella Dream* (1990), comparing the archetypal woman image in Western and Chinese folklore, makes a similar point to that

and cultures in which women are today faring the worst and are victims of the most extreme instances of patriarchal oppression are countries where romantic love is virtually absent and where relationships between men and women are still contracted along conventional lines. Could it be that at some level romantic love – particularly at the level of myth and the depth psychological implications thereof - aids independence? Is there a paradoxical element in relation to the romantic problematic that has hitherto been overlooked and is yet or still largely undetected?

In fact, there is within feminist theorising research suggestive of this. For example, Janice Radway (1984), one of the feminist critics whose work is seen as pivotal in the noted re-evaluation of the feminist stance on romantic love, found in a study of female romance readers that her interviewees considered their reading activity aided their independence and self-assertion in that their reading gave them the opportunity to identify with “strong, fiery heroines... capable of ‘defying the hero’” (p. 54). Radway notes that her interviewees saw romance novels as providing them with “a utopian vision in which female individuality and a sense of self are shown to be compatible with nurturance and care by another” (p. 55). Stacey and Pearce (1995), hinting that romantic love may have its more emancipatory side, make the point that “desire for ‘another’ ... is often symptomatic of discontent with ourselves and our way of life, and a recognition of this can sometimes provide the catalyst for transformation and change. An engagement with the narratives of romance, in other words, facilitates the re-scripting of other areas of life” (p. 13).

A second objection to critiquing romantic love primarily at the level of myth is that it may be considered to situate my critique in a time warp. However, from a Jungian perspective the psyche and the unconscious products emanating therefrom are not static. Jung (1957) refers to the existence of an “unconscious zeitgeist” (p. 584), which he defines as that which compensates the conscious attitude and anticipates coming changes. Hence, there is a ‘spirit of the times’ which marks the processes of the unconscious, just as there is a ‘spirit of the times’ which marks socio-political and intellectual ideas and which distinguishes between what is contemporary and that which is historical. Jung (1931) refers to unconscious products and archetypal activity as being educative and providing balance in relation to cultural trends, noting that “just as the one-sidedness of the individual’s conscious attitude is corrected by

made above. Mei, citing Rowe, asks: “If, as some feminists assert, the stories about docile girls like the Sleeping Beauty, Snow White, or Cinderella help to ‘perpetuate the patriarchal status quo by making female subordination seem a romantically desirable, indeed an inescapable fate’ ... how can we explain the fact that a more rigidly structured and oppressively patriarchal society like that of ancient China produced a lively and disruptive archetype like Madame White Snake?” (p. viii).

reactions from the unconscious, so art represents a process of self-regulation in the life of nations and epochs” (p. 131). Certainly there are many myths that have historical validity only in that they are no longer numinous or ‘alive.’ However, the romantic myth - due to its continued influence and the fascination it exerts - is clearly not in this category but is very much a myth of our times. Jung (1946) notes that “eternal truth needs a human language that alters with the spirit of the times. The primordial images undergo ceaseless transformation and yet remain ever the same, but only in a new form can they be understood anew” (p. 396). In fact, in that psychic phenomena anticipate the future, it could be argued that a mythological reading of romantic love furnishes the means via which the most viable and contemporaneously relevant critique possible can be arrived at.

Feminist theorist Mary Evans (1998) posits romantic love as an ideology that “far from giving individuals a guide to the expression and articulation of emotional feelings... distorts and limits the possibilities of human relationship” (p. 273). I am in agreement with Evans on this point. However, if a distinction is made between romantic love as a model of relatedness and romantic love as myth (i.e., between what romantic novels and romantic love read literally may appear to support and what romantic love at the level of myth might mean if read symbolically), a somewhat different picture might be seen to emerge.

One writer who has noted the intrapsychic dynamics and implications of romantic love is Jungian analyst Robert Johnson, author of *The Psychology of Romantic Love* (1987). Johnson denotes romantic love “the primary psychological problem of our Western culture” (p. xii) and “the great wound in the Western psyche” (p. xii). However, Johnson posits that if we “will understand the psychological dynamics behind romantic love and learn to handle them consciously” (p. xiv), we will “*find a new possibility of relationship*” (p. xiv; emphasis added), both to self and to others (p. xiv). Johnson espouses that “romantic love, if we truly undertake the task of understanding it, becomes... a path to consciousness” (p. xii). The primary difference between Johnson’s argument and my own is that Johnson still sees monogamous partnerships as central to intimate commitment, whereas I propose that a psychological reading of romantic love may form the basis for conceiving monogamy in more symbolic terms. This point is discussed in Chapter Four.

Having delineated my intention to examine romantic love at the level of myth, my central aim is to argue that *while romantic love does not provide a viable model of relatedness if taken and practiced literally, nonetheless, if understood symbolically, the romantic myth contains within it the basis for a fuller and richer experience of love and relatedness.* D. H.

Lawrence (1931/1976) writes that “a book lives as long as it is unfathomed. Once it is fathomed, it dies at once” (p. 4). The same logic applies to myth. I posit that romantic love is not in fact indestructible, as some feminists have claimed (Stacey & Pearce, 1995). Only that romantic love is not yet fathomed. Lewis Mumford (1923) notes that “we cannot put aside old myths without creating new ones... The nearest we can get to rationality is not to efface our myths but to attempt to infuse them with right reason” (p. 301). Jung (1951) similarly espouses that “the most we can do is to *dream the myth onwards* and give it a modern dress” (p. 271). I posit that the way through the impasse romantic love poses is not to disregard it, but to apply oneself to an understanding of it, and this is the intention of this critique.

My rationale for positing that romantic love symbolically read provides the basis for a fuller experience of relationship is based on Jung’s recognition of a developmental psychological process in the psyche that he refers to as individuation, which manifests individually in dreams and collectively in imaginative products such as fairy tales, myths, legends, religious symbols, and art.⁷ Essentially, I argue that romantic love, as a myth containing archetypes that facilitate psychological individuation, is a myth that effects individuation and the realisation of the self; the self referring to the personality as a whole, including its unconscious components.⁸ Jungian analyst Robert Stein (1986) makes the point that “marriage, by binding us to the myth of finding completion through union with another, works in opposition to the soul’s need to be free to pursue individuation wherever it leads”⁹ (p. 182). While ostensibly romantic love is a myth about finding an external Mr/Ms. Right, I argue that romantic love at the level of symbol and meaning is a myth about finding and connecting with one’s inner Mr/Ms. Right. However, to denote romantic love an individuation myth is not to negate the necessity and desire for relationship. To the contrary, it is precisely the realisation of the self that provides the very basis for the authentic expression and experience of relatedness. Romantic love is not pathology, as I first conceived it, but rather potential, pathway, and promise. A myth relevant to our time, alive and pulsing with anticipation.

⁷ Johnson (1987) notes that “though a dream expresses the dynamics within an individual, a myth expresses the dynamics within the *collective* mind of a society, culture, or race” (p. 2).

⁸ NB: Some post-Jungians have adopted the practice of capitalising the word ‘self’ when referring to the self in the Jungian sense of the word and in order to distinguish Jung’s usage of the term from its more general usage (Tacey, 2001, p. 41). While initially I had purposed to adopt this practice, I latterly decided against it. This was primarily an aesthetic consideration. However, besides this, I consider that the context in which I employ the word self throughout this discussion makes it sufficiently clear whether I am referring to the self in the Jungian sense of the word or referring to the self as ordinarily understood.

⁹ NB: Stein is not opposed to marriage. Nonetheless he sees current containers for relationship, including marriage, as inadequate and in need of revision.

In the critique that follows, I examine romantic love through the medium of Cinderella folklore, premising my critique on a Jungian theoretical perspective and employing a Jungian methodological framework. Along with the analytical psychology of Carl Jung, I also draw extensively on the humanistic psychoanalysis of Erich Fromm. Before continuing however, I wish to clarify that what follows is a critique of romantic love employing a Jungian perspective. It is not *the* Jungian take on or critique of romantic love. Aside from the more usually acknowledged subjective factors that colour and nuance one's perspective,¹⁰ I consider my critique also bears the mark of and is influenced by what Jung recognised as the tendency for conscious perception and outlook to be filtered through the lens of one's particular predominant attitude and function type.¹¹ Regarding subjective influence and how differently individuals perceive, Jung (1934a) writes that "it was one of the greatest experiences of my life to discover how enormously different people's psyches are" (p. 285).

As a final word here, during the latter stages of my PhD candidature my study took an unanticipated, though personally meaningful, turn of direction. The result is an extra chapter in which I address the aspect of fate in relation to romantic love and also in connection with wider concerns regarding interpersonal relatedness; particularly concerns over the seeming inevitability of eventually losing, either through unwanted separation and ultimately death, those we love. Of course, the theme of fate is central to the romantic myth and I had intended to address this aspect of romantic love at any rate; though certainly not from the perspective it is now presented. In particular I draw attention to research conducted at the University of Virginia that focuses on the investigation of paranormal processes and phenomena suggestive of the continuance or survival of consciousness prior to and proceeding death. Ian Stevenson (1987), who spearheaded this research in the 1960s, notes that "the evidence... we have suggests that living human beings... have minds, or souls if you like, that animate them when they are living and that survive after they die" (p. 4).

¹⁰ Jung was mindful of the influence of subjective factors. Jung (1951a) notes that our view of the world "is based chiefly on subjective premises, partly temperamental, partly social" (p. 233).

¹¹ Jung (1923) notes that "besides the many individual differences in human psychology there are also typical differences" (p. 1), which significantly influence one's conscious perception. The attitude types Jung draws attention to are those of introversion and extraversion. The function types he highlights are those of thinking, feeling, sensation and intuition. Jung was of the view that the predominant attitude and function type that characterised an individual's psyche resulted in a particular 'psychological type' and that this had a determining bearing on the individual's perception and understanding. For example, Jung viewed the very different interpretation Freud and Adler gave to the same observed phenomena as resulting from the two men's 'type' differences and as being prejudiced in degree. From his critique of the subjective premises and prejudices underlying Freud and Adler's respective psychological systems, Jung (1951a) writes that "in consequence, criticism of the psychological assumptions upon which a man's theories are based becomes an imperative necessity" (p. 236). I take up the discussion of psychological types again in Chapter Two within the context of discussing the parent/child relationship.

While it may seem unusual to include such material here, I would suggest that there are two fitting reasons for its inclusion. Firstly, as I note in Chapter Six, Jung (1963a) intimates in one of the concluding chapters of his autobiography that underlying all his works was a preoccupation with the question of the connection between “the ‘here’ and the ‘hereafter’” (p. 278). As I note in Chapter Six, it stands to reason that anyone engaged with his writing for any length of time should be influenced to some extent by his admitted latent preoccupation. Secondly, as Jungian academic David Tacey (2004) points to, there is considerable evidence pointing to a renewed interest in spirituality generally, particularly among young people.¹² Given that secular ideals are inadequate in addressing what is conceived of as a fundamental human felt need to experience individual affirmation and discover the meaning of one’s existence, Tacey argues for the necessity for spiritual values again being included in our understanding of human experience (p. 3). Finally, I include this material because I am increasingly of the view that our understanding of love and our experience of and relatedness with others is intimately connected with and influenced by our understanding of and attitude toward life and death. Love, like life itself, being a phenomenon that is ultimately mystery.

Having set the parameter for discussion and specified the central aim of this critique, I will now overview Jung and Fromm’s body of writings respectively and the Jungian methodological tools I employ. I will then overview the historical development of Cinderella folklore, focusing on the introduction of the fairy tale into European culture and drawing specific attention to Andy Tennant’s 1998 film adaptation of Cinderella *Ever After*, which constitutes the primary focal point for critique.

The analytical psychology of Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961)

I consider the single most notable aspect of Jung’s body of research, along with the psychotherapeutic approach based thereon, is that Jungian analytical psychology studies its subject matter; at least that is, if the subject matter of psychology is regarded as the psyche

¹² Regarding the spontaneous nature of the rising tide of interest in spirituality, Tacey (2004) notes that “spirituality is by no means incompatible with religion, but it is existential rather than creedal. It grows out of the individual person from an inward source, is intensely intimate and transformative, and is not imposed upon the person from an outside authority or force” (p. 8). Tacey clarifies that what he denotes as the spirituality revolution is not to be confused with New Age thought and practice. Tacey notes that “the New Age, as this term is currently used, is frequently an exploitation of the new public interest in the spirit, rather than a creative response to it” (p. 3). In drawing upon Tacey, I do not mean to imply that Tacey would endorse the views I put forth in Chapter Six. In his book on contemporary spirituality, Tacey does not draw attention to the research I discuss.

itself, also referred to by Jung as ‘soul.’¹³ If the respective “schools of psychology” that have been inaugurated since the inception of the modern study of psychology were likewise focused, there would be nothing at all notable about a psychology that studies the psyche and whose aim is knowledge thereof.¹⁴ However, as I aim to elucidate shortly in a brief historical sketch of the major figures and trends contributing to the development of modern academic psychology, and by way of providing a comparative base in order to delineate the very different intellectual soil in which Jung’s approach to the study of the psyche is rooted, this has not in general been the case.¹⁵ First though, a comment from Jung (1934b) on the state of a “psychology without the psyche” (p. 660) and the ramifications thereof:

We could well point to the idea of psychic reality as the most important achievement of modern psychology if it were recognized as such. It seems to me only a question of time for this idea to be generally accepted. It must be accepted in the end, for it alone enables us to understand the manifestations of the psyche in all their variety and uniqueness. Without this idea it is unavoidable that we should explain our psychic experiences in a way that does violence to a good half of them... (p. 683)

In its scientific form as an academic discipline, psychology’s inception is generally considered to date from 1879 when Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920) set up the first psychological laboratory at the University of Leipzig in Germany (Ettinger, Crooks, & Stein, 1994).¹⁶ While Wundt provided psychology with the accouterments of a scientific discipline, the architecture for the scientific study of the mind had its antecedents in the mechanistic and empirical philosophical outlook that increasingly took force in Western Europe from the seventeenth

¹³ What Jung refers to as psyche has been more generally known as and referred to as soul throughout human history. Jung (1934b) points out that “it was universally believed in the Middle Ages as well as in the Greco-Roman world that the soul is a substance. Indeed, mankind as a whole has held this belief from its earliest beginnings, and it was left for the second half of the nineteenth century to develop a ‘psychology without a soul’” (p. 649). Samuels, Shorter, and Plaut (1986) note that in general “Jung refers more often to psyche rather than soul when discussing the totality of all psychic processes and analysis” (p. 140).

¹⁴ Pointing out that the cause of neuroses is psychic and hence the treatment of neuroses necessitates “psychic methods of treatment” (1932, p. 490), Jung notes that “in the course of the nineteenth century medicine had become, in its methods and theory, one of the disciplines of natural science, and it cherished the same basically philosophical assumption of *material causation*. For medicine, the psyche as a mental ‘substance’ did not exist, and experimental psychology also did its best to constitute a psychology without a psyche” (p. 490).

¹⁵ Along with experimental psychology, Jung (1932) also designates Freudian and Adlerian approaches – which he generally views as rationalistic and reductive methods – as psychologies “without the psyche” (p. 507). More on this below.

¹⁶ While psychology texts credit Wundt with setting up the first psychological laboratory, historian Jacques Barzun (2001) attributes the establishment of the first laboratory to William James at Harvard (p. 659). Schultz and Schultz (1987), while maintaining that the laboratory set up by Wundt was the first of its kind, contradict themselves somewhat by later noting that “in 1875, James secured \$300 from Harvard to purchase laboratory and demonstration equipment for the [experimental psychology] course” (p. 134). However, the probable reason that psychology texts do not attribute the establishing of the first laboratory to James is because of his ambivalence toward psychology as a science and because of his personal dislike for experimentation. As Schultz and Schultz note, James “was never fully convinced of the value of laboratory work in psychology and did not like it personally” (p. 135).

century onwards, and in the experimental investigations by nineteenth century physiologists (Schultz & Schultz, 1987, pp. 17-70). Along with the early contributions of German physiologists Hermann von Helmholtz and Ernst Weber, the psychophysical research of Gustav Theodor Fechner into the relationship between the mind and materiality is widely considered to have provided the experimental psychology Wundt would develop with its originating ideas and experimental techniques of measurement.¹⁷

Establishing scientific credibility, interest in psychology quickly grew, first in Germany and then the United States (Schultz & Schultz, 1987). In Germany, Hermann Ebbinghaus and then Georg Muller experimentally investigated memory and learning (pp. 71-75). Their work considerably widened the scope of psychological research and challenged Wundt's claim that higher mental processes were not subject to scientific experimentation. In the United States, the functionalist school, which emphasised the applied potential of psychology, soon overshadowed Edward Titchener's structuralist school (Ettinger et al., 1994; Schultz & Schultz, 1987). However, while competing opinions accompanied the expansion of the field, and the narrowness and limitations of Wundt's voluntarism and Titchener's structuralism were soon superseded, what unified the various factions through to the early twentieth century was an agreement on what constituted the central subject matter of psychological investigation (Schultz & Schultz, 1987). In a word, psychology was the study of *consciousness*. Schultz and Schultz (1987) note that:

By postulating that the subject matter of psychology was conscious experience, and that psychology was a science based on experience, Wundt was able to avoid discussions about the nature of the immortal soul.... He said simply and emphatically that psychology did not deal with this issue. (p. 69)

However, even the study of consciousness, which might reasonably have been supposed to denote the central justification for a scientific psychology, was to come under attack. In particular, the method of introspection, widely employed to study conscious phenomena, was seen to lack credibility. A number of researchers – influential among them, Edward Thorndike and Ivan Pavlov – believed that psychology needed to adopt greater objectivity (Schultz & Schultz, 1987). In 1910, portending the future direction of academic psychology, American functionalist psychologist James Angell commented that “it seemed possible that the term ‘consciousness’ would disappear from psychology, much as had the term ‘soul’” (as cited in Schultz & Schultz, 1987, p. 193). Just three years later, the

¹⁷ Schultz and Schultz (1987) note that “it was largely because of Fechner's psychophysical research that... Wundt conceived the plan of his experimental psychology” (p. 54) and “with only minor modifications, these methods are still used today in psychological research” (p. 54).

undercurrents of objectivism and mechanistic-materialism were to find their most articulate expression yet. In 1913, in an article published in the *Psychological Review*, founder of behaviorism, John Watson, forcefully made the phenomenal claim that “psychology must discard all reference to consciousness” (as cited in Schultz & Schultz, 1987, p. 202). Overlooking Watson’s position, Schultz and Schultz (1987) note that “the basic tenets of Watson’s behaviorism were simple, direct, and bold. He called for an objective psychology, a *science of behavior* dealing only with observable behavioral acts that could be objectively described in terms such as *stimulus* and *response*” (p. 174). This radical behaviorism, which gained further prominence with B. F. Skinner’s highly influential investigations in operant conditioning, has not stood the test of time; mitigated, most notably, by the cognitive movement of the 1980s. Therefore, while in the nineteenth century those who had eviscerated psychology of its soul faced little resistance, in the twentieth century those who sought to further eviscerate psychology of its mind could maintain only temporary dominance.

Having briefly highlighted, as a necessary comparative base for the proceeding discussion, the significant developments within modern academic psychology, I will now turn to Jung’s connection with Freud and the psychoanalytic movement.

Noting a connection between the diagnostic word association experiments he had been conducting and Freud’s theory of repression, Jung made contact with Freud and met him for the first time in 1907 (Jung, 1963a).¹⁸ From this meeting, a voluminous correspondence ensued. The letters, which were published posthumously, reveal a relationship emitting projection on both sides. In one of the letters, Freud refers to Jung as his “successor and crown prince” (as cited in McGuire, 1974, p. 218). In his autobiography, Jung (1963a) writes that “I regarded Freud as an older, more mature and experienced personality, and felt like a son in that respect” (p. 154). However, despite (or perhaps because of) this intense personal attachment, the strain that began to pervade their association and the eventual break, was, as biographers tend to describe it, “inevitable” (see e.g., Wehr, 1987). While Jung held Freud in high personal regard, he could not, even from the beginning of their association, concur with the centrality Freud placed on the sexual nexus of neuroses. Prior to their association, Jung

¹⁸ Jung (1953) notes regarding the impact of Freud’s work that “when, in the year 1900, Freud wrote the first real psychology of dreams... people began to laugh, and when he actually started to throw light on the psychology of sexuality in 1905, laughter turned to insult. And this storm of learned indignation was not behind-hand in giving Freudian psychology an unwonted publicity, a notoriety that extended far beyond the confines of scientific interest” (p. 3).

had written in the forward to his book *The Psychology of Dementia Praecox*¹⁹ (1907), a tribute to Freud's work, in which he stated that:

In acknowledging the complex mechanisms of dreams and hysteria, this does not mean that I attribute to the infantile sexual trauma the exclusive importance that Freud apparently does. Still less does it mean that I place sexuality so predominantly in the foreground, or that I grant it the psychological universality which Freud... postulates... Nevertheless, all these things are the merest trifles compared with the psychological principles whose discovery is Freud's greatest merit. (as cited in McGuire, 1974, p. xviii)

However, to Freud the sexual theory was not a "mere trifle" as Jung had worded it, but an indisputable article of the psychoanalytic faith. Increasingly, the personal and theoretical differences between the two men mounted. Jung found himself unable to operate within the narrow confines of the psychoanalytic outlook. In Jung's words: "When... Freud announced his intention of identifying theory and method and making them into some kind of dogma, I could no longer collaborate with him; there remained no choice for me but to withdraw" (1963a, p. 162). In 1912, personal ties between the two men were severed with the publication of Jung's book *The Psychology of the Unconscious*. In 1914, their professional association was finally dissolved with Jung's resignation from the presidency of the International Psychoanalytic Association (McGuire, 1974, p. xix).

With the major influences within modern academic psychology and the association between Jung and Freud now in purview, it is possible to highlight the major difference between these two movements and Jung's approach to psychology. While major differences exist on a theoretical level between mainstream academic psychology and psychoanalysis, both systems are in fact rooted in the same intellectual soil: that of seventeenth century mechanistic-materialism (Schultz & Schultz, 1987, p. 315). Along with empiricism and positivism, this mechanistic-materialism, which originated in physics, increasingly came to encompass philosophy, physiology, and then psychology (p. 37). It is a deterministic, cause-and-effect view of the world, which was used first to explain the operation of the physical universe, and then applied to the study of the human body and human mind (p. 19). No less than the structuralists and behaviourists, Freud subscribed to the mechanistic-materialism of his time: the belief that the mind and body were machine-like and that mental events, even unconscious ones, were of physical-chemical or instinctual-biological causation (Fromm, 1947; Schultz & Schultz, 1987).

¹⁹ The name at that time for schizophrenia.

In no way did Jung subscribe to this philosophical outlook. Indeed, Jung regarded what he referred to as scientific materialism – in which nothing was granted substantiality unless it could be physically perceived or traced to physical causes – as merely a reaction against medieval idealism. In Jung’s words: “What or who... is this all-powerful matter? It is the old Creator God over again, stripped this time of his anthropomorphic features and taking the form of a universal concept whose meaning everyone presumes to understand” (1934b, p. 655). The following passage further highlights Jung’s view as to the reactionary nature of an exclusively materialistic position. Jung (1934b) notes that:

If we were conscious of the spirit of the age, we should know why we are so inclined to account for everything on physical grounds; we should know that it is because up till now, too much was accounted for in terms of spirit. This realization would at once make us critical of our bias. We would say: most likely we are now making exactly the same mistake on the other side. We delude ourselves with the thought that we know much more about matter than about a ‘metaphysical’ mind or spirit, and so we overestimate material causation and believe that it alone affords us a true explanation of life. But matter is just as inscrutable as mind. As to the ultimate things we can know nothing, and only when we admit this do we return to a state of equilibrium. (p. 657)

As the foregoing passage makes clear, Jung’s denial of mechanistic-materialism was not an avowal of metaphysics; although Jung (1948) considers metaphysical views to have their place. Nor did Jung (1934b) deny the obvious correspondence and interdependent connection between physiological processes and mental phenomena. Nonetheless, the materialistic bias in which the psyche is denied a substantiality of its own and is reduced to the study of consciousness and behaviour (as in experimental psychology) or to the study of repressed consciousness (as in psychoanalysis) is – in Jung’s view (and as already highlighted) – to postulate “a psychology without the psyche.”²⁰ Jung (1946a) did not believe that empiricism could be subsumed under materialism. Nor did he believe that experience could be adequately accounted for in solely material or physical terms. In Jung’s view, a genuinely scientific attitude was an empirical one encompassing the full spectrum of experienced and observed events and facts; including psychic phenomena such as dreams, and not one in which a bias such as materialism precluded what could be admitted within the realm of investigation.

Having differentiated Jungian psychology from the philosophical undercurrents underpinning modern academic psychology and Freudian psychoanalysis, it is now possible to

²⁰ Jung (1934b) compared the state of psychology during the time he was conducting his research, and which is perhaps still generally characteristic of the field today, to that of “medicine in the sixteenth century, when people began to study anatomy but had not as yet the faintest idea of physiology” (p. 688). Jung notes that “if modern psychology can boast of having removed any of the veils which hid the psyche from us, it is only that one which had concealed from the investigator the psyche’s biological aspect” (p. 688).

proceed with a discussion of the very different body of psychological thought that Jung's analytical psychology constitutes.

Jung (1939) delineates the analytical approach to the study of the psyche and also to therapeutic practice as one which takes into account the existence of the unconscious; particularly of what is denoted by Jung as the collective unconscious realm or objective psyche.²¹ As I note later in this section, Jung (1954a) does not overlook the importance of consciousness, but he does emphasise that consciousness and the personal layer of unconscious psychic activity postulated by Freud²² are not the whole of the psyche, but rather that “the foundation of consciousness, the psyche *per se*, is unconscious, and its structure, like that of the body, is common to all” (p. 478). Of course, Jung does not credit himself with the discovery of the unconscious; even the collective layer thereof. Apart from those who, along with Freud, were forerunners in laying the foundation for the investigation of unconscious activity within the domain of medical psychology,²³ Jung (1954) acknowledges that the idea of the unconscious had long been a postulate within philosophic thought.²⁴ However, as Bennet (1966) notes, Jung was of the view that within philosophy the unconscious was an abstract concept lacking immediacy (p. 59). Following those endeavouring to study the unconscious empirically, Jung (1923) notes that “the concept of the *unconscious* is for me an *exclusively psychological* concept, and not a philosophical concept of a metaphysical nature”

²¹ Both Edward Whitmont (1969, pp. 41-42) and Luke Hockley (2001, p. 29) claim that Jung replaced the term ‘collective unconscious’ with that of the objective psyche in his later writings. Whitmont does not provide a reference for this claim, and Hockley gives a reference that refers to an explanatory footnote only and not to a reference by Jung as to a change of terminology. Certainly, Jung uses the term objective psyche. However, it is likely that if he meant this as a replacement term, he would have noted this change in a revision of the *Definitions* section which appears in volume six of his *Collected Works*.

²² Jung (1977) attributes Freud with bringing the idea of the unconscious, which had previously been a philosophical concept, to the fore and making the unconscious a subject for medical science (pp. 252-253). However again, Freudian psychoanalysis and Jungian analytical psychology are premised on very different philosophical grounds. Jung (1954) notes that while Freud was aware of the “archaic and mythological thought-forms” (p. 2) characteristic of the unconscious, for Freud the unconscious “is really nothing but the gathering place of forgotten and repressed contents, and has a functional significance thanks only to these” (p. 2). Jung, emphasising that the unconscious is neither an epiphenomenon of consciousness or limited to a personal sphere, notes that “unconscious contents are on no account composed exclusively of complexes that were once conscious and subsequently became unconscious by being repressed. The unconscious... has its own specific contents which push up from unknown depths and gradually reach consciousness. Hence we should in no wise picture the unconscious psyche as a mere receptacle for contents discarded by the conscious mind” (1931a, p. 125).

²³ Along with acknowledging Freud's not inconsiderable contribution to the study of unconscious processes, Jung (1946a) also credits Pierre Janet, Auguste Forel, Theodore Flournoy, Morton Prince, and Eugen Bleuler as laying the foundation for both his own and Freud's discoveries (p. 129).

²⁴ Jung (1954) acknowledges in particular the philosophers Carus and von Hartmann. Regarding Carus's contribution to the idea of the unconscious, along with his influence on Jung's conceptualisation thereof, Claire Douglas (1997) notes that “Carus depicted the creative, autonomous, and healing function present in the unconscious. He saw the life of the psyche as a dynamic process in which consciousness and the unconscious are mutually compensatory and where dreams play a restorative role in psychic equilibrium. Carus also outlined a tripartite model of the unconscious – the general absolute, the partial absolute, and the relative – that prefigured Jung's concepts of archetypal, collective, and personal unconscious” (p. 23).

(p. 837). Delineating between the personal unconscious and the collective unconscious, and explaining the different nature of these aspects of the unconscious or psyche, Jung (1954) notes that:

A more or less superficial layer of the unconscious is undoubtedly personal. I call it the *personal unconscious*. But this personal unconscious rests upon a deeper layer, which does not derive from personal experience and is not a personal acquisition but is inborn. This deeper layer I call the *collective unconscious*. I have chosen the term 'collective' because this part of the unconscious is not individual but universal; in contrast to the personal psyche, it has contents and modes of behaviour that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals. It is, in other words, identical in all men and thus constitutes a common psychic substrate of a suprapersonal nature which is present in every one of us. (p. 3)

To denote a phenomenon as “collective,” “universal” and “identical in all” individuals as Jung does the collective layer of the psyche is not in keeping with current intellectual trends, in which, as psychoanalytic theorist Stephen Mitchell (2002) points out, cultural specificity is emphasised. However, few people would discount that human individuals share anatomical and physiological features which are characteristically human. Jung, and also Fromm (1962, p. 27), defend the notion of a common psychic substrate. Jung (1954b) notes that:

No biologist would ever dream of assuming that each individual acquires his general mode of behaviour afresh each time. It is much more probable that the young weaver-bird builds his characteristic nest because he is a weaver-bird and not a rabbit. Similarly, it is more probable that man is born with a specifically human mode of behaviour and not with that of a hippopotamus or with none at all. Integral to his characteristic behaviour is his psychic phenomenology, which differs from that of a bird or quadruped.... Because it is a question of characteristically human modes, it is hardly to be wondered at that we can find psychic forms in the individual which occur not only at the antipodes but also in other epochs with which archaeology provides the only link. (p. 435)

While, by the early twentieth century, the word 'psychology' had been in usage for some time,²⁵ Jung (1946a) points to the newness of psychology as a field of enquiry in its own right and as a factor of empirical concern and research; not to say, a factor of general public interest. Rhetorically asking why this is, Jung (1954) notes that it is simply because previously the psyche and psychic phenomena were clothed in religious formula. Expounding on this point, Jung (1931b) notes that:

²⁵ Jung (1946a) notes that formerly psychology “was only the title of a certain chapter in philosophy – that chapter in which the philosopher more or less laid down the law as to what the human soul had to be according to the premises of his own particular philosophy” (p. 127).

Whenever there exists some external form, be it an ideal or a ritual, by which all the yearnings and hopes of the soul are adequately expressed – as for instance in a living religion – then we may say that the psyche is outside and that there is no psychic problem, just as there is then no unconscious in our sense of the word. In consonance with this truth, the discovery of psychology falls entirely within the last decades, although long before that man was introspective and intelligent enough to recognize the facts that are the subject-matter of psychology.... a spiritual need has produced in our time the ‘discovery’ of psychology. The psychic facts still existed earlier, of course, but they did not attract attention – no one noticed them. People got along without them. But today we can no longer get along unless we pay attention to the psyche. (p. 159)

In recognising that the psyche was previously veiled from recognition and that psychic factors were previously projected and mediated via religion, myth or esoteric systems, Jung tends to hold a different attitude to religion and myth than was general among the educated class of his day and remains so today.²⁶ Jung (1931c) argues that the religious sensibility marking the history of humankind should not be considered the product of human fancy, but that religion and myth “owe their existence far more to the influence of unconscious powers which we cannot neglect without disturbing the psychic balance” (p. 728). In thus stating, Jung is not making any value judgement concerning how various religious ideas have been consciously elaborated or politically used. For example, to say that the idea of God or gods exists because it is premised on an archetype (see Jung, 1953, p. 110)²⁷ and hence is a phenomenon of the psychic landscape, is the same as saying that a tree exists as a phenomenon or factor of material reality. How the idea (of God) or the material (of a tree) is used depends on the person using the idea or material phenomenon respectively. The idea of God has been and can

²⁶ However, as Paul Copan and Paul K. Moser note in the introduction to their edited book: *The Rationality of Theism* (2003): “The rumors of God’s death have been greatly exaggerated. Acknowledgment of God’s reality flourishes and multiplies in the academic world” (p. 1).

²⁷ Jung (1953) notes that “the idea of an all-powerful divine Being is present everywhere, unconsciously if not consciously, because it is an archetype” (p. 110). Hence the idea of God is “psychologically true” (see 1940, p. 4). However, in saying this, Jung is not thereby postulating that this is proof of the existence of an objective or physical God. Jung (1956) notes: “We find numberless images of God.... We know that God-images play a great role in psychology, but we cannot prove the physical existence of God. As a responsible scientist I am not going to preach my personal and subjective convictions which I cannot prove. I add nothing to cognition or to a further improvement and extension of consciousness when I confess my personal prejudices. I simply go as far as my mind can reach, but to venture opinions beyond my mental reach would be immoral from the standpoint of my intellectual ethics.... Speaking for myself, the question whether God exists or not is futile. I am sufficiently convinced of the effects man has always attributed to a divine being. If I should express a belief beyond that or should assert the existence of God, it would not only be superfluous and inefficient, it would show that I am not basing my opinion on facts...” (p. 1589). While Jung’s assertion of God images is not attached to any particular dogma or religious creed, Jung does refer here to a God and not gods. However, as Michael Vannoy Adams (1997) points out in a summary overview of the archetypal school – a post-Jungian branch of psychology – Jung, similarly to the archetypal school, privileges polytheism over religious (and by implication, psychological) monotheism. Adams notes that archetypal psychology “is polytheistic (or pluralistic) in orientation. It is not a religion but strictly a psychology. It does not worship the gods and goddesses. It regards them metaphorically, as Jung... did” (p. 110).

be used to oppress people. However, in that a tree can be made into a stick to hit people, so have trees. Hence, how psychic factors and material factors are used is dependent on human action and does not say anything about the respective phenomena in and of themselves.²⁸

In pointing to the psyche as the factor undergirding and giving rise to phenomena such as religion and myth, Jung does not thereby espouse a return to ‘faith’ or ‘belief.’²⁹ Jung (1931c) notes that the fact we can now understand religious ideas psychologically is “a new expression, which may enable us to discover a new way of relating to the powers of the unconscious” (p. 729), and that in order “to gain an understanding of religious matters, probably all that is left us today is the psychological approach” (1940, p. 148).³⁰ Even so, however, Jung (1923) warns against the hubris of imagining that religion and myth and such like phenomena can be intellectualised away without consequence: “We think we have only to declare an accepted article of faith incorrect and invalid, and we shall be psychologically rid of all the traditional effects of Christianity... We believe in enlightenment, as if an intellectual change of front somehow had a profounder influence on the emotional processes or even on the unconscious” (p. 313). Jung’s point is that if religious ideas or cultural myths are repudiated without regard to their meaning, the factors they give expression to will remain “active in our psyche” (1931c, p. 729). This appears a valid contention. I have already drawn attention to the acknowledgment within feminist circles that romantic love has shown itself impervious to intellectual opprobrium. Moreover, as I elaborate in the methodology section, just as the ‘religious’ nature of romantic love is widely commented on by theorists across a spectrum of fields (see e.g., De Beauvoir, 1953; White, 1998),³¹ the Cinderella myth/fairy tale shows remarkable similarity to the Christian myth when critiqued at the level of archetypal image and theme. Hence, there is certainly a case for arguing that rejected in the form of

²⁸ Concerning the moral ambivalence of all archetypes, Jung (1958) notes that “experience shows that the archetype as a natural phenomenon, has a morally ambivalent character, or rather, it possesses no moral quality in itself but is amoral, like the Yahwistic God-image, and acquires moral qualities only through the act of cognition” (p. 845). Moreover, Jung (1934c) postulates that the unconscious “only becomes dangerous when our conscious attitude to it is hopelessly wrong” (p. 329). This latter observation could also be applied to material phenomena. For example, whether or not technology is dangerous likewise rests upon how it is employed.

²⁹ In noting this however, Jung was of the opinion that an analyst should not try to talk a person out of his/her faith (see 1951a, p. 240 for discussion of this point).

³⁰ Jung (1940) continues regarding this point: “That is why I take these thought-forms that have become historically fixed, try to melt them down again and pour them into moulds of immediate experience. It is certainly a difficult undertaking to discover connecting links between dogma and immediate experience of psychological archetypes, but a study of the natural symbols of the unconscious gives us the necessary raw material” (p. 148).

³¹ John Sanford (1980) notes that “while Freud tried to show that religion was a sublimation of sexuality, it is closer to the truth to say that sexuality can be, at its heart, the expression of mankind’s religious urge... the urge to ecstasy and wholeness” (p. 101).

Christianity, the archetypes merely incarnated themselves in different dress.³² Emphasising that myths need to be understood, not disregarded, Jung (1957) asks: “Is it not time that the Christian mythology, instead of being wiped out, was understood symbolically for once?” (p. 521).³³ This is the same argument I make on behalf of romantic mythology.

Due to Jung’s recognition of the historical antecedents pointing to the existence of the unconscious psyche and his extensive study of diverse fields of thought, Jung’s body of research is characterised by a wholesome sense of historical regard.³⁴ In particular, Jung (1963a) acknowledges his debt to alchemy, which he viewed as the historical counterpart of his psychology.³⁵ Significantly, Jung (1940) noticed parallels between alchemical symbolism, which he noted often appeared in the dreams of his patients, and what he denotes as the process of individuation;³⁶ the maturation of personality brought about by the integration of the unconscious components thereof. Emphasising the philosophical character of alchemy (1968, p. 172), Jung (1948a) notes that:

Certainly goldmaking, as also chemical research in general, was of great concern to alchemy. But a still greater, more impassioned concern appears to have been – one cannot very well say the ‘investigation’ – but rather the *experience* of the unconscious. That this side of alchemy... was for so long misunderstood is due solely to the fact that nothing was known of psychology, let alone of the suprapersonal, collective unconscious. So long as one knows nothing of psychic actuality, it will be projected, if it appears at all. Thus the first knowledge of psychic law and order was found in the stars, and was later extended by projections into unknown matter. These two realms of experience branched off into sciences: astrology became astronomy, and alchemy chemistry. (p. 285)

³² Pointing out that the psyche will neither be ignored nor trifled with, Jung (1951) notes that “archetypes were, and still are, living psychic forces that demand to be taken seriously, and they have a strange way of making sure of their effect” (p. 266).

³³ Illustrating that myth does not have to conflict with knowledge or the intellect, Jung (1957) notes that “if, for instance, the statement that Christ rose from the dead is to be understood not literally but symbolically, then it is capable of various interpretations that do not conflict with knowledge and do not impair the meaning of the statement” (p. 521).

³⁴ Jung (1963a) regarded the strongest element of his nature as being “a passionate urge towards understanding” (p. 297). This urge to know and understand is certainly evident in the breadth and depth of research contained in the corpus of writings that constitute his *Collected Works*. Concerning Jung’s educational opportunities, Douglas (1997) points out that “Jung benefited from an education whose extent and thoroughness is rarely encountered today. It was a comprehensive schooling in the Protestant theological tradition, in classical Greek and Latin literature, and in European history and philosophy” (p. 18).

³⁵ Jung (1963a) notes that “the possibility of a comparison with alchemy, and the uninterrupted chain back to Gnosticism, gave substance to my psychology” (p. 196).

³⁶ Jung (1954a), who notes that “the views of the alchemists were derived to a large extent from unconscious archetypal assumptions which also underlie other domains of human thought” (p. 373), identifies the alchemists preoccupation with the stone or lapis as the equivalent with realising – through the process of individuation - what he refers to as the self, and “the moral equivalent of the physical transmutation into gold” as self-knowledge (p. 372). Jung (1968) notes that “as is shown by the texts and their symbolism, the alchemist projected what I have called the process of individuation into the phenomena of chemical change” (p. 564).

Edward Edinger (1972), highlighting perhaps the most far-reaching implication of Jung's work, observes that "he has penetrated to the root source of all religion and culture and thus has discovered the basis for a new organic syncretism of human knowledge and experience" (p. xiii). Similarly, Richard Noll (1997) notes that "one of Jung's strengths... was his remarkable ability to synthesize highly complex and seemingly unrelated fields of inquiry" (p. 102). Jungian past life therapist³⁷ Roger Woolger (1990), also pointing to Jung's synthesizing capacity, notes regarding his personal attraction to Jung's approach that "he seemed to offer a bridge... that allowed the different traffic of psychology, religion, literature, and science all to pass over and do productive business with each other" (p. 7). Jung (1943) recognised the far reaching interdisciplinary implications of depth research, noting that:

Although depth psychology is a discipline in itself, it lurks invisibly, thanks to the fact of the unconscious, in the background of all other disciplines. Just as the discovery of radioactivity overthrew the old physics and necessitated a revision of many scientific concepts, so all disciplines that are in any way concerned with the realm of the psychic are broadened out and at the same time remoulded by depth psychology. It raises new problems for philosophy; it greatly enriches pedagogics and still more the study of human character; it also poses new problems for criminology... for medicine it opens up an unsuspected store of fresh insights and possibilities through the discovery of the interdependence of bodily and psychic processes and the inclusion of the neurotic factor; and it has richly fecundated, less closely related sciences such as mythology, ethnology, etc. (p. 1806)

In overviewing Jung's body of psychological thought thus far, the main point that emerges is that while interest in psychology as a discipline in its own right may be of relatively recent historic import, interest in the psyche itself and its manifold and mysterious manifestations clearly is not. Having reviewed Jung's body of thought in more general terms, I will now turn to a discussion of archetypes and the process of individuation; two key concepts within Jung's body of work that have a direct bearing on the discussion that follows. I will then examine Jung's claim to empiricism.

Archetypes

From a Jungian perspective, what phenomena such as religious symbols, myths, and dreams share in common is that they embody or are vehicles for the expression of archetypal images, ideas or themes. Before continuing, it is necessary to draw attention to the distinction Jung makes between the archetype/s per se and archetypal images or ideas; that is, between

³⁷ Noting his "personal and professional evolution from Jungian analyst to Jungian past life therapist" (1990, p. xix), this is Woolger's own definition of his current role.

form and content. Jung (1954b) notes that “we must... constantly bear in mind that what we mean by ‘archetype’ is in itself irrepresentable, but has effects which make visualizations of it possible, namely, the archetypal images and ideas” (p. 417).³⁸ Empirically regarded, distinguishing between archetypes and archetypal images enables the comparison of similar images across product categories. For example, while the Christian devil and the Cinderella step-mother character are two different archetypal images, empirically they can be inferred to derive from the same underlying form in that they display phenomenological similarity.

It is important to clarify that while Jung regards the archetypes or underlying psychic forms as common and present everywhere, he does not override or negate cultural/racial specificity. Jung (1931c) notes “of course every region of the earth and every epoch has its own distinctive language, and this can be endlessly varied. It matters little if the mythological hero conquers now a dragon, now a fish or some other monster, the fundamental motif remains the same, and that is the common property of mankind, not the ephemeral formulations of different regions and epochs” (p. 718). Again, Jung (1954a) notes that “the unconscious supplies as it were the archetypal form, which in itself is empty and irrepresentable. Consciousness immediately fills it with related or similar representational material so that it can be perceived. For this reason archetypal ideas are locally, temporally, and individually conditioned” (p. 476). Michael Vannoy Adams (1997), clarifying via an example the distinction between the archetype per se and a temporally conditioned archetypal image or idea, notes that:

If Herman Melville had never been in a position to acquire any direct or indirect experience of a whale, he could never have written *Moby-Dick*. Melville could not have inherited that specific image. He might, however, have written a great American novel about the archetypal, or typical, experience of being (or feeling) psychically engulfed (‘swallowed’ or devoured) and then imaged that same form through another, very different content. Jung says that the “Jonah-and-the-Whale” complex has “any number of variants, for instance the witch who eats children, the wolf, the ogre, the dragon, and so on.” The archetype is an abstract theme (engulfment), and the archetypal images (whale, witch, wolf, ogre, dragon, etc.) are concrete variations on that theme. (pp. 102-103)

³⁸ Jung (1954b) makes a comparison with physics, noting that “we meet with a similar situation in physics: there the smallest particles are themselves irrepresentable but have effects from the nature of which we can build up a model. The archetypal image, the motif or mythologem, is a construction of this kind” (p. 417). Explaining the same point of the distinction between archetype as form and archetypal content, Jung (1954c) – comparing the archetype/s to the pattern and behaviour of instincts – notes that “the archetype itself is empty and purely formal, nothing but a... possibility of representation which is given *a priori*. The representations themselves are not inherited, only the forms, and in that respect they correspond in every way to the instincts, which are also determined in form only. The existence of the instincts can no more be proved than the existence of the archetypes, so long as they do not manifest themselves concretely” (p. 155).

Jung (1940) emphasises that he did not invent the idea or term ‘archetype,’ but that the existence of primordial ideas had long been recognised (although variously termed),³⁹ by a variety of thinkers within theology, ethnology, anthropology, psychology and literature.⁴⁰ Delineating his own specific contribution to the development of the idea and theory of archetype, Jung (1954c) notes that “if I have any share in these discoveries, it consists in my having shown that archetypes are not disseminated only by tradition, language, and migration, but... can rearise spontaneously, at any time, at any place, and without outside influence” (p. 153). As referred to earlier, as contents of the collective unconscious psyche, Jung (1954c) regards archetypes as also preforming individual conscious experience and the specific mode of psychic disposition characteristic of human individuals.

In discussing archetypes and archetypal images or ideas, it seems necessary to briefly examine whether there is a relationship between archetype and stereotype. First of all, Jung emphasises that myths and like phenomena originate not from the conscious mind or intellect but from the unconscious or irrational sphere. Regarding myths, Jung (1958) notes that “nothing could be more mistaken than to assume that a myth is something ‘thought up.’ It comes into existence of its own accord, as can be observed in all authentic products of fantasy, and particularly dreams” (p. 836).⁴¹ Similarly, with regard to the derivation of fairy tales, Jung (1948b) notes that “being a spontaneous, naïve, and uncontrived product of the psyche, the fairytale cannot very well express anything except what the psyche actually is” (p. 432).⁴² However, in saying that myths and such like phenomena are of unconscious derivation and in recognising the archetypal determinants and patterns thereof, Jung does not discount, as Luke

³⁹ Jung (1954) notes that the term ‘archetype’ itself, “occurs as early as Philo Judaeus, with reference to the *Imago Dei* (God-image) in man” (p. 5), and that “I only gave an empirical foundation to the theory of what were formerly called primordial or elementary ideas” (1940, p. 89).

⁴⁰ Aniela Jaffe (1970), noting that the word ‘archetype’ is derived from Greek and means original form or ‘prime imprinter,’ points out that the archetype has its origins in Plato’s concept of the ‘idea,’ which expressed a pre-existent order that Plato thought existed behind external phenomena. Douglas (1997), denoting Jung’s position in relation to archetypal theory as neo-Kantian, points out that “Jung credited Kant for the development of much of his own archetypal theory” (p. 22). Douglas, drawing on Jarrett, notes that as a Platonist, Kant “felt that our perception of the world conformed to Platonic ideal forms. Kant argued that reality only exists through our apperceptions which structure things according to basic forms. The way to any objective knowledge thus takes place through Kantian categories” (pp. 22-23). However, as noted, labelling Jung’s position as neo-Kantian, Douglas, drawing on de Voogd and Clarke, notes that in contrast to Kant, in which “his innate categories start from sensory data which are then structured entirely by human intelligence, with Kant concluding that nothing in the mind is of itself real; Jung... starts from archetypes and imagination and does believe in their objectivity as well as in the reality of the psyche” (p. 23).

⁴¹ Jung (1958) continues regarding this point that “it is the hubris of consciousness to pretend that everything derives from *its* primacy, despite the fact that consciousness itself demonstrably comes from an older unconscious psyche” (p. 836).

⁴² As noted, the justification for denoting certain phenomena as being of unconscious derivative is based on the recognition that archetypes can rearise spontaneously at any time or place - for example, in dreams - and are not dependent on transmission via tradition or migration (Jung, 1954c, p. 153).

Hockley (2001) notes, that through the process of being consciously elaborated “all images, even archetypal images, have an ideological dimension” (p. 188). Jung regards the role of archetypes in relation to consciousness as compensatory,⁴³ with their function being to maintain psychic balance. However, the compensatory function of the archetypes is dependent on the willingness of consciousness to cooperate. Jung (1963) notes that “unless the content given you by the unconscious is acknowledged, its compensatory effect is not only nullified *but actually changes into its opposite*, as it then tries to realize itself literally and concretely” (p. 192; emphasis added). For example, rather than attributing blame to the Cinderella fairy tale for engendering stereotypes, the ‘blame’ could be seen to stem from reading stereotypically what is meant to be regarded symbolically.

Individuation

While the most notable feature of Jung’s body of psychological thought is that the psyche is regarded as a factor in its own right, the central concepts of analytical psychology centre around the psychological developmental process of individuation⁴⁴ and the realisation of the self. Here I focus on individuation. In Chapter One, I discuss the self.

Jung (1953) defines individuation variously as the process by which one becomes “one’s own self” (p. 266), “‘coming to selfhood’ or ‘self-realization’” (p. 266), “the experience of the self, and [arriving] at the state of being simply what one is” (1946b, p. 221). In the context of analysis, Jung (1955) espouses that “the best result for a person who undergoes an analysis is that he shall become in the end what he really is, in harmony with himself, neither good nor bad,⁴⁵ just as he is in his natural state” (p. 442).⁴⁶ Individuation is a

⁴³ Concerning the compensatory relationship between the unconscious and consciousness, Jung (1939) notes that “the collaboration of the unconscious is intelligent and purposive, and even when it acts in opposition to consciousness its expression is still compensatory in an intelligent way, as if it were trying to restore the lost balance” (p. 505).

⁴⁴ Samuels, Shorter, and Plaut (1986) note that the term ‘individuation’ “was taken up by Jung via the philosopher Schopenhauer but dates back to Gerard Dorn, a sixteenth-century alchemist. Both speak of the *principium individuationis*. Jung applied the principle to psychology” (p. 76).

⁴⁵ Concerning morality and the moral advantages which derive from an individual learning to listen to his/her own nature and finding “the way that is uniquely right for” him/her (Jung, 1928, p. 125), Jung (1923) notes that “the more a man’s life is shaped by the collective norm, the greater is his individual immorality” (p. 761).

⁴⁶ Jung (1955) considers that the relationship between analyst and analysand should provide “breathing-space” (p. 441) for individual trends. Recognising that “the psychic situation of the individual is so menaced... by advertising, propaganda, and other more or less well-meant advice” (Jung, 1957, p. 534), Jung suggests that “for once in his life the patient might be offered a relationship that does not repeat the nauseating ‘you should,’ ‘you must’ and similar confessions of impotence” (p. 534). Regarding his fundamental respect for the individual, Jung (1946c) notes that “the psychologist believes firmly in the individual as the sole carrier of mind and life. Society and the State derive their quality from the individual’s mental condition, for they are made up of individuals and the way they are organized” (p. 457).

process of differentiation in relation to external social constraints, *and also* in connection to the inner world of the psyche.⁴⁷ Jung (1953) notes that “the aim of individuation is nothing less than to divest the self of the false wrappings of the persona on the one hand, and the suggestive power of the primordial images on the other” (p. 269). I discuss this two-fold aspect of differentiation in Chapter Four.

Jung makes it clear that individuation and individualism are not one and the same thing. And moreover, that while individualism may be in opposition to collective advantage, individuation, correctly regarded, is not.⁴⁸ In fact, individualism, which Jung (1953) refers to as “deliberately stressing and giving prominence to some supposed peculiarity” (p. 267), could be defined as an attempt at pseudo individuation, resulting in pseudo or contrived individuality. In contrast, individuation is not a deliberate attempt to be different, but rather involves genuine differentiation. Jung (1923) notes that this differentiation is “not a particularity that is *sought out*, but one that is already ingrained in the psychic constitution” (p. 761). Individuation is the realisation of the psychic individuality which is “given *a priori* as a correlate of the physical individuality” (p. 755). Jung (1953) notes regarding individuation that:

The idiosyncrasy of an individual is not to be understood as any strangeness in his substance or in his components, but rather as a unique combination, or gradual differentiation, of functions and faculties which in themselves are universal. Every human face has a nose, two eyes, etc., but these universal factors are variable, and it is this variability which makes individual peculiarities possible. Individuation, therefore, can only mean a process of psychological development that fulfills the individual qualities given; in other words, it is a process by which a man becomes the definite, unique being he in fact is. In so doing he does not become ‘selfish’ in the ordinary sense of the word, but is merely fulfilling the peculiarity of his nature, and this, as we have said, is vastly different from egotism or individualism. (p. 267)

The concept and process of individuation is integral to a discussion of relatedness in that it is the very factor that provides the indispensable basis for what Erich Fromm refers to as mature love (see Frommian section). Jung (1946) points to the longing for genuine human contact and contends that social or political affiliations cannot satisfy this need or compensate for its loss. Emphasising that individuation is not opposed to relationship but an integral component thereof, Jung clarifies that individuation involves both intrapsychic integration and

⁴⁷ Differentiation is used here to refer to “the development of the psychological *individual* as a being distinct from the general, collective psychology” (Jung, 1923, p. 757).

⁴⁸ Emphasising that individuation is not opposed to the betterment of social relations, Jung (1953) notes that “individuation means precisely the better and more complete fulfilment of the collective qualities of the human being, since adequate consideration of the peculiarity of the individual is more conducive to better social achievement than when the peculiarity is neglected or suppressed” (p. 267).

interpersonal relationship. However, though Jung (1946) posits that “relationship to the self is at once relationship to our fellow man” (p. 445), he nonetheless emphasises that “no one can be related to the latter [i.e., to others] until he is related to himself” (p. 445). Hence, just as individuation is seen as the process which leads to the expression of genuine individuality, individuation is concomitantly the process which facilitates the experience of integrity-based as opposed to persona premised or unconsciously engaged in relatedness. Marie-Louise von Franz (1964) describes individuation as the process by which those spiritually attuned to one another discover each other. In Chapter Six, I draw attention to what Jung (1977) is said to have referred to as relationships characterised by “the Golden Thread”; the “third kind of relationship” (p. 31), which he postulates is the only category of relationship that lasts.

The meaning of individuation is embedded within Jung’s more general observation of the relationship between the unconscious and conscious realms of psychic experience and in particular of the developmental impact the unconscious appears to effect on ego-consciousness; that is, if its contents are engaged with and integrated.⁴⁹ Jung (1946b) emphasises concerning the individuation process, which he considered in order to fully appreciate one must experience for oneself,⁵⁰ that it is not something that can be arrived at or attained intellectually, but is in effect “a vital happening which brings about a fundamental transformation of personality” (p. 220). Due to the experiential engagement the individuation process necessitates, Jung (1968) points out that the experience is not without danger: “The right way to wholeness is made up, unfortunately, of fateful detours and wrong turnings” (p. 6). Again Jung (1957a) notes that “everything good is costly, and the development of

⁴⁹ Noting the developmental influence and impact the unconscious effects on the conscious attitude, along with pointing to the difficulty – due to individuation not being a wholly rational happening – of adequately explaining the individuation process in purely intellectual terms, Jung (1954b) explains that “psychology... culminates... in a developmental process which is peculiar to the psyche and consists in integrating the unconscious contents into consciousness. This means that the psychic human being becomes a whole, and becoming whole has remarkable effects on ego-consciousness which are extremely difficult to describe. I doubt my ability to give a proper account of the change that comes over the subject under the influence of the individuation process; it is a relatively rare occurrence, which is experienced only by those who have gone through the wearisome but, if the unconscious is to be integrated, indispensable business of coming to terms with the unconscious components of the personality. Once these unconscious components are made conscious, it results not only in their assimilation to the already existing ego-personality, but in a transformation of the latter” (p. 430).

⁵⁰ Jung often emphasises the necessity of experience in relation to psychic phenomena and that one cannot grasp the nature of the psyche via the intellect alone. Jung (1954h) notes that “psychologically one only understands what one has experienced oneself. The concepts of complex psychology are, in essence, not intellectual formulations but names for certain areas of experience, and though they can be described they remain dead and irrepresentable to anyone who has not experienced them” (p. 485). However, Jung does not belittle the importance of intellectual knowing, he merely points to its limitations if conceived of as the sole means for understanding experience. In this respect, Jung (1968) points out that “despite its undeniable successes the rational attitude of present-day consciousness is, in many human respects, childishly unadapted and hostile to life” (p. 74).

personality is one of the most costly of all things. It is a matter of... taking oneself as the most serious of tasks, of being conscious of everything one does... truly a task that taxes us to the utmost” (p. 24). One might reasonably ask: How does one come across the experience to begin with? Like everything associated with the unconscious, there *is* an element of mystery to the process. Overall however, Jung recognised that psychological individuation, like physical maturation, is a natural or organic development. Unlike physical maturation however, psychological maturation tends to proceed only with the willing collaboration of the conscious personality. Jung, who espouses that “the criterion of adulthood does not consist in being a member of certain sects, groups, or nations, but in submitting to the spirit of one’s own independence” (1948d, p. 276), nonetheless observes that “the fact that the conventions always flourish in one form or another only proves that the vast majority of mankind do not choose their own way, but convention, and consequently develop not themselves but a... collective mode of life at the cost of their own wholeness” (1934d, p. 296).

As a final point on the subject of individuation, Jung stresses concerning his observations of an individuation process, as he does in more general terms concerning the psyche as a whole, that the psyche remains largely unexplored and shrouded in obscurity. Jung is hence insistent regarding the provisional nature, not only of psychological knowledge in general, but also of his own contributions. In consequence, Jung was strongly opposed to the premature forming of theory. Jung (1951a) cautions that “our psychological experience is still too recent and too limited in scope to permit of general theories. The investigator needs a lot more facts which would throw light on the nature of the psyche before he can begin to think of universally valid propositions” (p. 236). Jung held the same attitude when it came to the role of the analyst. Jung notes that the analyst “should remember that the patient is there to be treated and not to verify a theory. For that matter, there is no single theory in the whole field of practical psychology that cannot on occasion prove basically wrong” (p. 237).⁵¹ David Hart (1997), who denotes that “to be a ‘classical’ Jungian analyst means not so much to follow and repeat the terminology of Jung, as to embrace the general method of analysis which Jung introduced” (p. 89), points out that this involves “above all, respect for what is encountered; respect for what is unknown, for what is unexpected, for what is unheard of” (p. 89). Jung (1968) notes that:

⁵¹ Jung considered that the essential requirement of the analyst was not so much his/her medical degree, although, of course, technical knowledge was important, but over and above all else the analyst’s greatest asset was his/her human quality.

A scientific term like ‘individuation’ does not mean that we are dealing with something known and finally cleared up, on which there is no more to be said. It merely indicates an as yet very obscure field of research much in need of exploration: the centralizing processes in the unconscious that go to form the personality. We are dealing with life-processes which, on account of their numinous character, have from time immemorial provided the strongest incentive for the formation of symbols. These processes are steeped in mystery; they pose riddles with which the human mind will long wrestle for a solution, and perhaps in vain. For, in the last analysis, it is exceedingly doubtful whether human reason is a suitable instrument for this purpose. Not for nothing did alchemy style itself an ‘art,’ feeling – and rightly so – that it was concerned with creative processes that can be truly grasped only by experience, though intellect may give them a name. (p. 564)

Jung’s empiricism

Throughout his life Jung remained insistent that his study of the psyche was empirical. However, because his claim to empiricism was widely censored by his contemporaries and remains in dispute today, it seems necessary to give momentary pause to examine this claim. For example, Hockley (2001), in a recent application of archetypal critique to film, flatly denies Jung’s empiricism: “Jung was at pains to stress that he regarded himself as an empiricist – which he was not...” (p. 14). Jung, while presenting the Terry Lectures at Yale University in 1937, addressed his audience with a statement typical of the defence he repeatedly made of his work:

Although I have often been called a philosopher, I am an empiricist and adhere as such to the phenomenological standpoint.... I approach psychological matters from a scientific and not from a philosophical standpoint.... I restrict myself to the observation of phenomena and I eschew any metaphysical or philosophical considerations. I do not deny the validity of these other considerations, but I cannot claim to be competent to apply them correctly.... The methodological standpoint of the branch of psychology I represent... is exclusively phenomenological, that is, it is concerned with occurrences, events, experiences – in a word, with facts. (1940, pp. 2, 4)

In 1952, in an article written in reply to Martin Buber’s classification of Jung’s position and research as Gnostic, and acknowledging the “concert of contending opinions” (1952, p. 1502)⁵² his work attracted, Jung refers to a reference to himself quoted in an issue of the *British Medical Journal* of the same year: “Facts first and theories later is the keynote of

⁵² Jung appears to have been in a no-win situation. Scientists were wont to label his discussion of the unconscious and archetypes mysticism or philosophy, while theologians accused him of atheism or psychologism (Jung, 1957a, p. 75; Jung, 1956, p. 1589). Drawing attention to the varying designations by which his work had been labelled, Jung (1952) notes that “I have in my time been regarded not only as a Gnostic and its opposite, but also as a theist and an atheist, a mystic and a materialist” (p. 1502).

Jung's work. He is an empiricist first and last" (p. 1502). Jung goes on to state that this appraisal "meets with my approval" (p. 1502).

Perhaps the main obstacle and primary prejudice against granting empirical status to Jung's work rests on the premise of whether or not one is of the view that the psyche has the same validity as physical reality, as Jung (1957a) claims that it does and therefore is a phenomenon which lends itself to being mapped and its contents documented. Of course, the unconscious cannot be seen. The unconscious is an inference postulated to exist on the basis of certain observed phenomena that point to the existence of an objective psychic realm of activity acting seemingly independently of and beyond the bounds of consciousness; namely the feeling-toned complexes and archetypal images and ideas.⁵³ However, that the unconscious is an inference does not negate it as a scientifically sound postulate. Gravity too is an inference. Jung (1952) notes that "the 'reality of the psyche' is my working hypothesis, and my principle activity consists in collecting factual material to describe and explain it" (p. 1507). Jung further notes: "I have set up neither a system nor a general theory, but have merely formulated auxiliary concepts to serve me as tools, as is customary in every branch of science" (p. 1507). Jung acknowledges that the classificatory terms he uses such as anima/us or shadow to denote empirical psychic image/type categories are mythological, but he insists that he employs these denoters as they accord with the phenomenology of the observed phenomena in a way that abstract clinical descriptors would not. Jung, comparing the empirical nature of his approach with empiricism in general, notes regarding the anima (a category descriptor denoting the image of the feminine) that:

As against the constantly reiterated prejudice that this is a theoretical invention or – worse still – sheer mythology, I must emphasize that the concept of the anima is a purely empirical concept, whose sole purpose is to give a name to a group of related or analogous psychic phenomena. The concept does no more and means no more than, shall we say, the concept 'arthropods,' which includes all animals with articulated body and limbs and so gives a name to this phenomenological group. (1954g, p. 114)

According to his own logic, one could perhaps argue that by being so insistent regarding the empirical nature of his research Jung was compensating for a secret doubt (Jung, 1951a). However, there are two reasons why I consider Jung's claim to empiricism should be taken seriously. First, it was historically necessary that Jung endeavour to put his subject matter on

⁵³ Regarding the point that the unconscious is an inference, Jung (1954) notes that "psychic existence can be recognized only by the presence of contents which are *capable of consciousness*. We can therefore speak of an unconscious only in so far as we are able to demonstrate its contents. The contents of the personal unconscious are chiefly the *feeling-toned complexes*, as they are called; they constitute the personal and private side of psychic life. The contents of the collective unconscious, on the other hand, are known as *archetypes*" (p. 4).

as scientific a footing as it was possible to do so, and he seemed acutely aware of this. Jung was studying phenomena that most of his intellectual contemporaries considered worthless and had rejected out of hand, and he could not have laid claim to being taken seriously had he not submitted, as much as the subject matter under investigation allowed, to the scientific sensibility of his day. But secondly, and more to the point, I think Jung maintained his research was empirical because to his mind and according to the intellectual tradition and understanding of empiricism at the time, it was. Stating that the psyche exists “but not in physical form” (1940, p. 16), Jung argues that “it is an almost absurd prejudice to suppose that existence can only be physical” (p. 16). After all, much of what occupies a great majority of people the most are clearly things that can only be inferred but not seen. For example, one has never seen love, but a great many people put a lot of store by it. Moreover, something denoted ‘love’ can be experienced, and acts attesting to its existence can be pointed to. Addressing the question of Jung’s empiricism, John Dourley (1995) notes that:

Jung stretched the term ‘empiricism’ to include not only all archetypal statements or expressions of humanity including the mythologies, religions and folklore of the world, but to include psychological material drawn from dreams, hallucinations and fantasies of his contemporaries and clients. Such material bore an amazing and empirical, that is demonstrable, likeness to themes in religions and folklore of the past, often no longer living and not known to the dreamers themselves. Thus the data base, if one can use so crude a term, of Jung’s empiricism would include both the world religions and the contemporary nightly dream or waking hallucination. The theoretical ground for the construction of such a data base is that both the living and dead religions and the nightly dream are expressions of the same generative source. If one can thus extend the term empiricism, Jung was indeed an empiricist and his approach, both theoretically and therapeutically, was, indeed, empirical because it was based on the history of archetypal expression and on the personal archetypal experience of those with whom he worked. He sums this up when he writes, ‘My attitude to all religions is therefore a positive one. In their symbolism I recognize those figures which I have met with in the dreams and fantasies of my patients’ (p. 182)

Before closing this section by briefly commenting on the post-Jungian field, I want to clarify a possible misconception that the foregoing discussion may have given rise to; namely, the misconception that Jung had little to say about and little interest in consciousness. Historians of modern psychology, Schultz and Schultz (1987), reviewing Jung’s contributions to psychoanalytic thought, note that: “Dreams and the unconscious, not the conscious world of reason, became his guides in childhood and for the rest of his life” (p. 325). Certainly, as noted, Jung (1943) viewed the recognition of the unconscious to be of revolutionary importance. However, Jung does not relegate consciousness as inferior to the unconscious, nor does he espouse that consciousness assume an attitude of uncritical or blind submission in

relation to the unconscious. Indeed, Jung strenuously cautions against any such undermining or sidelining of consciousness (see e.g., 1942, p. 222; 1956, p. 1588), and in relation to analysis cautioned those working within the field that “we must see to it that the values of the conscious personality remain intact, for unconscious compensation is only effective when it co-operates with an integral consciousness...” (1934c, p. 338).⁵⁴ Perhaps at his clearest concerning why he puts so much store by the unconscious, Jung (1946) notes that “if our psychology is forced, owing to the special nature of its empirical material, to stress the importance of the unconscious, that does not in any way diminish the importance of the conscious mind. It is merely the one-sided over-valuation of the latter that has to be checked by a certain relativization of values” (p. 502). Overall, Jung’s position is one which advocates mutual respect for both:

Conscious and unconscious do not make a whole when one of them is suppressed and injured by the other. If they must contend, let it at least be a fair fight with equal rights on both sides. Both are aspects of life. Consciousness should defend its reason and protect itself, and the chaotic life of the unconscious should be given the chance of having its way too – as much of it as we can stand. This means open conflict and open collaboration at once. That, evidently, is the way human life should be. It is the old game of hammer and anvil: between them the patient iron is forged into an indestructible whole, an ‘individual.’ (1939, p. 522)

In closing, Jung’s key concepts have been both furthered and challenged by those working within the post-Jungian field. Andrew Samuels, who in 1985 coined the term ‘post-Jungian,’ defines the post-Jungian endeavour as that of “correction of Jung’s work and also critical distance from it” (1997, p. 2). While there are factors, both situational and related to Jung himself that have resulted in a certain prejudice against Jungian thought,⁵⁵ Jung’s ideas have still had influence. Samuels (1997) notes that though Jung’s contribution is generally

⁵⁴ At times Jung does refer to the unconscious as displaying an intelligence or purposiveness superior to consciousness. However, on balance, Jung (1948) notes that “if one believes that the unconscious always knows best, one can easily be betrayed into leaving the dreams to take the necessary decisions, and is then disappointed when the dreams become more and more trivial and meaningless.... The unconscious functions satisfactorily only when the conscious mind fulfils its tasks to the very limit. A dream may perhaps supply what is then lacking, or it may help us forward where our best efforts have failed. If the unconscious really were superior to consciousness it would be difficult to see wherein the advantage of consciousness lay, or why it should ever have come into being as a necessary element in the scheme of evolution” (p. 568).

⁵⁵ In terms of situational factors that have impacted on a general prejudice within academic circles against Jung and Jungian thought, Samuels points to the long shadow cast from the fallout between Jung and Freud. In terms of factors related to Jung himself, the most serious criticism raised against Jung is that of expressing anti-Semitic sentiments and being in sympathy with Nazi ideology. When I first came across this criticism of Jung, I was initially surprised and sceptical of the claim that Jung was in anyway connected with and supportive of Nazi ideology. From my reading of Jung’s *Collected Works* to that time, I had formed the opposite impression. However, Samuels, who has extensively researched the issue claims that “the official translation of the English *Collected Works of C. J. Jung* contains several... examples of sanitization” (1993, p. 323). Regarding charges to anti-Semitism, Jung himself strongly denied any such sympathies or involvement. Except to draw attention to this criticism of Jung, I am not informed enough to comment further.

unacknowledged within psychoanalytic circles, “many of the central issues and features of contemporary psychoanalysis are reminiscent of positions taken by Jung in earlier years” (p. 4). I refer to an aspect of post-Jungian theorising in Chapter Four.

The humanistic psychoanalysis of Erich Fromm (1900-1980)

Along with Jung, I also draw extensively upon the work of Erich Fromm. Fromm’s work is particularly relevant to this discussion in that he furnishes a comprehensive critique of the social factors that impact upon the individual and his/her capacity for interpersonal and intimate relatedness. In this section, I draw attention to the primary theoretical influences that shaped Fromm’s thought. I then discuss the aspects of his body of writing that are relevant to this critique, focusing on the model of human relatedness he refers to as ‘productive love.’

Erich Fromm was the only child of Orthodox Jewish parents, and he himself practiced the Jewish faith until the age of twenty-six (Funk, 1982). Fromm obtained his doctorate in philosophy at the age of twenty-two, after which he continued studies in psychiatry, psychology and psychoanalysis. From 1930 to 1965, Fromm held a number of academic posts. His final appointment was at the National Autonomous University in Mexico City, where he taught until 1965 when he became professor emeritus (pp. 3-5). Along with his teaching commitments, his research interests and an extensive literary output, Fromm continued a psychoanalytic practice throughout his career, which spanned over a forty-five year period (p. 5). Fromm was also passionately interested in politics, and co-founded the American peace movement SANE⁵⁶ (p. 5).

In his intellectual autobiography, Fromm (1962) traces the various influences – both personal and intellectual – that contributed to the development of his research interests and what early on in his life would become his supreme goal: “To understand the laws that govern the life of the individual man, and the laws of society – that is, of men in their social existence” (p. 9). Fromm’s work is informed by a broad and seemingly disparate range of intellectual pursuits, which included the study of mysticism and Buddhism (Funk, 1982). However, by far the most significant thinkers Fromm (1962) credits as influencing his work are Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud, who (along with Einstein) he considered – albeit to a lesser

⁵⁶ The Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE) was formed in 1957. The movement is now called Peace Action.

extent in the case of Freud - architects of the modern era. Of Marx and Freud, Fromm (1962) wrote:

I tried to see the lasting truth in Freud's concepts as against those assumptions which were in need of revision. I tried to do the same with Marx's theory, and finally I tried to arrive at a synthesis which followed from the understanding and criticism of both thinkers. (p. 9)

As evidenced by this passage, Fromm's engagement with these thinkers was not merely an appropriation of their ideas, but consisted of a considerable critique. Fromm considered that Freud's scientific study of unconscious processes constituted a fundamental breakthrough in Western thought and was an important corrective to behaviorism, which assimilated rather than distinguished between outward appearance and inward motivation. However, similarly to Jung, Fromm (1962) differed with Freud in terms of the mechanistic-materialistic philosophical base upon which Freud's discoveries were premised, and in which Freud "interpreted the needs of human nature as being essentially sexual ones" (p. 26). Yet while Fromm differed philosophically to Freud, he was never comfortable in being associated with the many new schools of psychoanalysis that appeared in Freud's wake, such as the 'cultural school' or the neo-Freudians. Though maintaining that he was not an orthodox Freudian, Fromm (1964) noted that "I believe that many of these new schools, while developing valuable insights, have also lost much of the most important discoveries of Freud [which]... translated into a new frame of reference... become ever more potent and meaningful" (pp. 12-13). The new frame of reference that Fromm believed would further Freud's discoveries was humanism,⁵⁷ with a focus on the contemporary problems experienced by modern individuals, such as "alienation, anxiety, loneliness, the fear of feeling deeply, lack of activeness, lack of joy" (1992, p. 20).

If Fromm differed in philosophical outlook from Freud, it could be said that he found almost complete accord of spirit in Marx. While disagreeing with a number of Marx's sociological and economic premises,⁵⁸ Fromm nonetheless passionately defends the philosophical aspects of Marx's socialism from what he sees as the widespread falsification of Marx's ideas. Fromm (1961) argues that the "popular picture of Marx's 'materialism' – his

⁵⁷ Fromm (1961) refers to humanism as "a system of thought and feeling centered upon man, his growth, integrity, dignity, freedom; upon man as an end in himself, and not as a means toward anything; upon his capacity to be active not only as an individual but as a participant in history; and upon the fact that every man carries within himself all humanity" (p. 262).

⁵⁸ Fromm (1961) notes that "Marx failed to see the degree to which capitalism was capable of modifying itself and thus satisfying the economic needs of industrialized nations, [he failed] to see clearly enough the dangers of bureaucratization and centralization, and to envisage the authoritarian systems which could emerge as alternatives to socialism" (p. ix).

anti-spiritual tendency, his wish for uniformity and subordination – is utterly false” (p. 3), and that this view rested on the falsification of Marx’s ideas by Stalin “combined with the fantastic ignorance about Marx” (p. 61) existing in the West. Contrary to popular belief in the 1950s, Fromm contends that Marx did not see the individual as primarily motivated by the desire for material gain. Rather, he argues that Marx claimed that the means by which an individual produces determines both his thinking and his way of life. Fromm (1962) argues that Marx’s work constitutes a protest against the subservience of the individual to the economy and that Marx is concerned with the realisation of conditions that allow for the full unfolding of the complete, unalienated individual. The influence of Marx’s philosophical thought on Fromm’s research is evident in Fromm’s concept of the ‘marketing orientation,’ to a discussion of which I now turn.

Fromm’s critique of the social factors that impact upon the individual and his/her capacity for relatedness is embedded within his more general critique of what he refers to as the “marketing orientation”; that is, the ‘social character’⁵⁹ engendered by late capitalism. Like Marx, Fromm considers that the socio-economic/political structure of a given society directly impacts on the character structure of the individuals within that society, and Fromm’s coinage of the term ‘marketing orientation’ derives from Marx’s concept of alienation⁶⁰ (1947, p. 86; 1961, p. 53). Fromm (1947) views the impersonal nature of the commodity and labour market within industrial societies as producing an analogous and equally impersonal ‘social character’ (p. 75). Fromm defines the marketing orientation as “rooted in the experience of oneself as a commodity and of one’s value as exchange value” (p. 76). The individual whose social relatedness is characterised by the ‘marketing orientation’ is concerned neither with the development of his/her individuality nor with pursuing his/her own happiness, but rather is motivated to develop a salable “personality” with which s/he then seeks to attain success (pp. 76-78). Dependent on extraneous forces and – by necessity – overly focused on the opinion of others, Fromm (1947) points to the pervasive insecurity the “marketing orientation” engenders. Having to adjust to the ever-changing “fashion” of the

⁵⁹ Fromm (1956) uses the term ‘social character’ to refer to “the nucleus of the character structure which is shared by most members of the same culture in contradistinction to the individual character in which people belonging to the same culture differ from each other” (p. 78). Fromm notes that it is the function of the social character to “mold and channel human energy within a given society for the purpose of the continued functioning of this society” (p. 79).

⁶⁰ The term ‘alienation’ was first coined by Hegel and later developed by Marx (Fromm, 1961, p. 47). Fromm, who maintains that “alienation as a sickness of the self can be considered to be the core of the psychopathology of modern man” (1962, p. 53), writes that for Marx “alienation in the process of work... is inseparably connected with alienation from oneself, from one’s fellow man and from nature... The alienated man is not only alienated from other men; he is alienated from the essence of humanity, from his ‘species-being,’ both in his natural and spiritual qualities” (1961, p. 53).

labour and commodity market, the main requirement of the individual under the sway of this social character is emptiness; his/her motto: “I am as you desire me” (Fromm, 1947, pp. 80, 85). Fromm (1947) points to the situation in which the individual must deny his/her “self” – indeed preferably not have a “self” at all – in order to fit in, writing that “some roles would not fit in with the peculiarities of the person; therefore we must do away with them – not with the roles but with the peculiarities. The marketing personality must be free, free of all individuality” (p. 85).

Fromm was of the view that the ‘marketing’ social character impacted both on the individual’s relatedness with others generally and his/her capacity for interpersonal and intimate relatedness specifically. In general, Fromm (1947) points to the superficiality characteristic of the ‘marketing orientation’ mode of relating, noting that “when the individual self is neglected... relationships between people must of necessity become superficial, because not they themselves but interchangeable commodities are related” (p. 82). Fromm considered that the superficiality of human relations resulted in an inordinate desire to try and escape the sense of isolation by endeavouring to find warmth and depth in individual love. However, in that “love relationships are only a more intense expression of the relatedness... prevalent in... culture” (Fromm, 1947, p. 82), Fromm critiques that “it is an illusion to expect that the loneliness of man rooted in the marketing orientation can be cured by individual love” (p. 82). Drawing a direct parallel between the economic exchange of material commodities and the ‘economic’ exchange of human or individual worth, Fromm (1962a) notes that:

Modern man’s happiness consists in the thrill of looking at the shop windows, and in buying all that he can afford to buy... He (or she) looks at people in a similar way... ‘Attractive’ usually means a nice package of qualities which are popular and sought after on the personality market. What specifically makes a person attractive depends on the fashion of the time... In a culture in which the marketing orientation prevails, and in which material success is the outstanding value, there is little reason to be surprised that human love relations follow the same pattern of exchange which governs the commodity and the labour market. (p. 10)

Within his wider critique of the marketing orientation and its effect on both social and intimate relations, Fromm (1962a) highlights what he identifies as the “myths” engendered by romantic notions of love. Fromm refers here to ‘myth’ not as denoting something that has symbolic meaning, but, in accordance with the more common usage of the word, to infer romantic love’s falsity or make-believe character. Fromm (1962a) critiques the primary myth of romantic love - the belief that love is something you ‘fall into,’ rather than something that must be learnt. While the primary concern then engendered is finding a specific person to be

loved by, Fromm (1962a) argues that the ‘problem’ of love is primarily that of developing one’s own capacity to love, through productive knowledge and effort. Contrary to the widespread belief that the phenomenon experienced as ‘falling in love’ constitutes the attainment of love, Fromm (1947) argues that this experience provides only a material opportunity to love. In Fromm’s view love can never be *possessed*, it can only be *expressed*. Fromm (1979) contends that love relationships premised on the myths of romantic love tend to progress from the superficial and passive experience of ‘falling in love,’ to the illusion of ‘having’ love when the relationship takes on a formal commitment, as in when the couple marry or move in together. Fromm (1979) notes that in consequence the two often “cease to make the effort to be lovable and to produce love, hence they become boring, and hence their beauty disappears” (p. 53). Premised on the myths of romantic love, which offer no foundation for the development of genuine understanding, relationships often stagnate into an arrangement of mutual ownership, of children, money and property, rather than an arrangement of love.

In contrast to the marketing orientation, Fromm proposes in its stead the ‘productive orientation.’ Fromm (1947) defines the “productive” orientation as “a fundamental attitude, *a mode of relatedness* in all realms of human experience.... Productiveness is man’s ability to use his powers and to realize the potentialities inherent in him” (p. 91). While productiveness, similarly to the individuation process, is the spontaneous unfolding in a psychological sense of that which one is, alienation is conformity to that which one is not. Fromm (1947), again drawing on Marx’s concept of the term, explains alienation as a mode of relatedness in which a “person feels or does what he is supposed to feel or do; his activity lacks spontaneity in the sense that it does not originate from his own mental or emotional experience but from an outside source” (pp. 93-94). In contrast to the general usage of the word ‘productiveness’ as synonymous with activity, Fromm (1947) contends that “compulsive activity is not the opposite of laziness but its complement” (p. 112). Fromm does not regard human nature as characterised by laziness, but rather argues that this idea has been “adopted by ... those who wanted to profit from the activity of others and had no use for productiveness, which they could not exploit” (p. 112). Fromm sees productiveness as an inherent potentiality or faculty and contends that both inactivity and over-activity result when an individual’s natural capacity for productive activity is blocked in some way.

As noted, within his general exposition of the productive orientation Fromm forwards as a mode of relatedness and relationship what he refers to as ‘productive love.’ Pivotal to and

at the very centre of Fromm's concept of productive love and the productive character generally is the espousing of the fundamental importance of the self as the factor upon which love and relatedness is possible. Before proceeding to discuss this point, it is necessary to qualify what Fromm postulates and refers to by the word 'love.' Fromm, while acknowledging that the word love is used to denote any form of desire or interpersonal relatedness in which there is feeling, argues that 'love' should not be used thus arbitrarily but rather should be reserved to denote a specific kind or quality of relatedness (1962a, p. 20). For Fromm, it is not a question of whether one is connected with other people, but of *how* one is connected. And further, if these connections can rightly be referred to as relationships; that is, whether or not 'love,' in a mature sense, is the defining dynamic or characteristic of a given interpersonal connection. Fromm (1962a) notes that "if we call the achievement of interpersonal union 'love', we find ourselves in a serious difficulty. Fusion can be achieved in different ways – and the differences are not less significant than what is common to the various forms of love" (p. 20). Fromm thus makes a distinction between symbiotic union, under which he subsumes various forms of identification with others (including sadomasochistic fusions), and mature or productive love.

Again, Fromm's critique of human relations and specifically of love is embedded within his wider critique of the psychological impact the socio-economic changes accompanying the introduction of capitalist modes of production effected on the individual, and particularly the discrepancy between what Fromm refers to as 'freedom from'/'freedom to,'⁶¹ in which independence and responsibility for oneself is experienced not as a source of strength, but – due to overwhelming feelings of isolation and powerlessness – a burden one wishes to escape.⁶² As I discuss in Chapter Three, one avenue of 'escape' open to the

⁶¹ I explain what Fromm means by 'freedom from/freedom to' in Chapter Three.

⁶² In *Escape from Freedom* (1941) Fromm gives an historical account of the changes that occurred in the modern era as the socio-economic base of society changed from the Feudal system of the Middle Ages to capitalist modes of production. His analysis is concerned with the psychological impact these changes had on the general social character. In particular, Fromm highlights the contradictory and ambiguous situation people experienced as growing individualism replaced the collective consciousness of pre-modern times. On the one hand, people had opportunity for greater freedom and independence (although he argues this freedom was often more apparent than real). Yet conversely, this freedom also brought about a greater sense of isolation. Further, while the external constraints of church and fixed Feudal ties were lessened, anonymous authorities such as public opinion and common sense took their place. Fromm identifies the conflict that occurred as the discrepancy between 'freedom from' – the negative aspect of freedom, and 'freedom to' – the positive aspect of freedom. For freedom to be meaningful, conditions have to be such that allow for the full unfolding and expression of human potentialities. Fromm's central thesis is that the modern individual, faced with the independence afforded by changing socio-economic conditions, yet blocked in his/her capacity to forge relations based on productive love and activity, experiences a sense of overwhelming isolation and powerlessness. This isolation, which is experienced as an unbearable burden, becomes something the individual seeks to escape. On a social level this escape takes the form of submission to an authority or compulsive conforming. On an individual

individual is to forgo independence and off-load responsibility for oneself by fusing with another. Fromm would agree with psychologist Jane Goldberg (1999), who comments that adult attachment needs are often fuelled by an attempt to escape the profound terror of being alone: “The legend of adult love carries with it the suggestion that it will relieve the burden of individuality, that the task of finding ourselves, with its risks and pleasures, is finally over...” (p. 82). It is of note here to again point out the difference between romantic love practiced literally and romantic love conceived symbolically and – as noted in the Jungian section – to again highlight that a literal understanding of romantic love in and of itself and lacking the undegird of the depth element is a perversion of the symbolic meaning thereof; a symbolic reading suggesting that the task of finding ourselves is our own. Fromm (1941) notes that “it is always the inability to stand the aloneness of one’s individual self that leads to the drive to enter into a symbiotic [i.e., masochistic/sadistic] relationship with someone else.... In both cases individuality and freedom is lost” (pp. 158-159). In Fromm’s view, productive love is possible only in the presence of a self and self-affirmation. Distinguishing ‘self premised’ productive love from ‘self-negating’ symbiotic union, Fromm (1962a) notes that:

In contrast to symbiotic union, mature *love is union under the condition of preserving one’s integrity*, one’s individuality. *Love is an active power in man*; a power which breaks through the walls which separate man from his fellow men, which unites him with others; love makes him overcome the sense of isolation and separateness, yet it permits him to be himself, to retain his integrity. (p. 21)

Fromm forwards for consideration as basic elements of productive love the attributes of care, responsibility, respect, and knowledge (1962a, pp. 25-27). Fromm views care as manifesting in an active concern for the growth and well-being of both our self and of others (p. 25). I refer to the attributes of responsibility, respect, and knowledge in the body of this discussion.

In contrast to the mode of relationship prescribed by romantic love – in which the exclusive focus of concern is either entirely with oneself⁶³ or with oneself and one other person – Fromm (1962a) sees productive love as based on “the identity of the human core common to all” (p. 38) individuals and therefore by its very nature inclusive. As I note in Chapter One, this does not mean that Fromm advocates individuals should not form specific erotic love relationships or friendships. Rather, Fromm (1962a) espouses that underlying all relating and part of every human encounter should be a fundamental “productive love”

level, escape takes the form of psychic masochistic/sadistic strivings or destructiveness, either against oneself (as in addictions) or directed toward others.

⁶³ Whitmont (1969) points out that where there is projection “we are in love with our anima or animus as the case may be. That feeling has very little to do with the other person as a person” (p. 62).

premised solely on the experience of our “human core” (p. 38). On this point, Fromm (1962a) maintains that:

Love is not primarily a relationship to one specific person; it is an *attitude*, an *orientation of character* which determines the relatedness of a person to the world as a whole, not towards one ‘object’ of love. If a person loves only one other person and is indifferent to the rest of his fellow men, his love is not love but a symbiotic attachment, or an enlarged egotism.... If I truly love one person I love all persons, I love the world, I love life. If I can say to somebody else, ‘I love you,’ I must be able to say, ‘I love in you everybody, I love through you the world, I love in you also myself.’ (p. 38)

I noted above that at the very centre of Fromm’s concept of productive love is the notion of the fundamental importance of the individual self as the factor upon which love and relatedness are possible. To speak of the individual self is not as unproblematic in today’s intellectual milieu as it was at the time Fromm was writing.⁶⁴ In Chapter One, I defend the notion of there being such a thing as a ‘true’ self. However, as a preliminary point, I am not of the view that the individual is simply the product of cultural conditioning or socialisation. Both Fromm and Jung are opposed to the ‘blank-sheet’ notion of the human being. Fromm (1947) acknowledges that while the individual can adapt even when faced with unsatisfactory environmental conditions, “in this process of adaptation he develops definite mental and emotional reactions which follow from the *specific properties of his own nature*” (pp. 31-32; emphasis added). Fromm points out that were the individual “nothing but the reflex of culture... no social order could be criticized or judged from the standpoint of man’s welfare since there would be no concept of ‘man’” (p. 31). Again, despite the undeniable influence culture has in shaping individual consciousness, I do not consider individual subjectivity to be solely the reflection of upbringing or environment or – in accordance with a poststructuralist definition – the mere constitute of language and discourse. Quite to the contrary, I am rather of the view that subjectivity is the guardian of the individual; that is, the instrument which protects the individual *against* the dictates of culture. By ‘subjectivity’ I refer to that which, expressing itself as ‘I am’ or ‘I feel,’ reacts against external forces and pressures. Existential psychologist Rollo May (1958a) convincingly articulates this point, noting that:

Being is a category which cannot be reduced to introjection of social and ethical norms.... To the extent that my sense of existence is authentic, it is precisely *not* what others have told me I should be, but is the one Archimedes point I have to stand on

⁶⁴ Even at the time he was writing Fromm (1950) drew attention to the fact that “the spirit of the Enlightenment which emphasized the dignity and uniqueness of the individual beyond everything else [was] an idea in contrast to much in the intellectual climate” of his time (p. 98). Fromm’s research and writings span from the 1920s to the late 1970s, with his first major work *Escape from Freedom*, published in 1941.

from which to judge what parents and other authorities demand.... This is not to deny the vast social influences in anyone's morality, but it is to say that the ontological sense cannot be wholly reduced to such influences.... It cannot be said too strongly that the sense of one's own existence, though interwoven with all kinds of social relatedness, is in basis not the product of social forces. (p. 45)

In making final remarks here, I am not sure Fromm and Jung would appreciate featuring together in the same critique. The two men do not appear to have been on good terms. Fromm, particularly, is especially critical of Jung. However, despite a certain antagonism, which on Fromm's side seems to derive from prejudice rather than engagement with Jung's ideas,⁶⁵ the two thinkers' central concepts of the 'productive' character and individuation respectively are essentially similar; although Jung focuses on individuation more as an empirical concept, whereas Fromm forwards the 'productive' character as a philosophical and ethical postulate.⁶⁶ For Fromm, productiveness is the opposite of alienation and is expressive of a mature personality. It is also the basis of integrity-premised love and relatedness. As with Jung, Fromm sees the condition of productivity as being premised on a fundamental respect for and realisation of the particular peculiarity⁶⁷ and individuality of the individual.

In terms of the differences in approach between the two thinkers, I consider that these stem primarily from what both men respectively credit as giving rise to and motivating their interests. In contemplating why the question of "why people act the way they do" (p. 3) was of such paramount interest to him, Fromm (1962) reflects that perhaps people are born "with an inclination for certain questions" (p. 3). However, in the main he points to experiences of a personal nature which he considered shaped his interests; in particular, the suicide of a friend

⁶⁵ Based on Fromm's criticisms, I think it unlikely that Fromm read Jung's writings in any depth. For example, Fromm (1964) writes that "Jung was fascinated by the past, and rarely by the present and the future" (p. 44). No-one who has read Jung, even superficially so, could entertain this view. Jung repeatedly makes reference to the future directedness and teleological function not only of the psyche and psychic products, but also of neurotic symptomology. Fromm (1964) goes so far as to denote Jung as having a 'necrophilous' or death-loving character type; although he qualifies this somewhat by admitting that Jung was simultaneously an extraordinarily creative individual (pp. 43-44). Fromm is also critical of Jung's methodological approach (see 1950, pp. 14-18; For Jung's reply see 1956, p. 1584). While Fromm was not an orthodox Freudian, he was loyal to Freud. Moreover, Fromm was a Jew and although Jung denied being anti-Semitic, he has been widely criticised for what are considered by some as questionable activities prior to and during World War II. It seems likely that both these factors would have made it difficult for Fromm to view Jung's research objectively.

⁶⁶ Fromm (1947) draws on both Aristotle and Spinoza in the development of his concept of the "productive" character. Fromm writes that "the good man for Aristotle is the man who by his activity, under the guidance of his reason, brings to life the potentialities specific of man" (p. 98). Drawing also on Spinoza Fromm writes that "virtue to Spinoza is identical with the use of man's powers and vice is his failure to use his power; the essence of evil for Spinoza is impotence" (p. 99).

⁶⁷ Fromm (1947) points out that "the meaning which the word *peculiar* has assumed is... expressive" of the general disregard for the individual and for individuality that characterises the "marketing orientation" (p. 81). Fromm argues that "instead of denoting the greatest achievement of man – that of having developed his individuality – [the word *peculiar*] has become almost synonymous with *queer*" (p. 81).

of the family when he was twelve, and - on a larger scale – events surrounding the outbreak of the First World War. In contrast, where Jung reflects on what inspired him, he refers primarily to experiences of a numinous nature. Jung had a strong sense of personal fate and described what he did as a task imposed from within. In his autobiography, Jung (1963a) writes that “we are a psychic process which we do not control, or only partly direct” (p. 17).

This difference in emphasis has a bearing on Jung and Fromm’s respective discussions of ‘love.’ While for Fromm love is an art, something which it is the individual’s responsibility to attain, Jung tends to focus more on the irrational – even mysterious – dimensions and implications of love. At one point Jung (1922) describes love as “a force of destiny” (p. 198). Moreover, at times Jung expresses a cynicism concerning love which is absent from Fromm’s writing. For example, though Jung considers Christian love desirable, he questions whether disinterested love is possible. However, despite these differences, both Jung and Fromm emphasise the link between knowledge and love, and particularly, the link between self-knowledge and one’s capacity to know and to understand others.

In terms of my own discussion, I emphasise throughout the importance of love as art. However, I increasingly take an interest in the more irrational dimensions of love. Concerning his conceptualisation of love as a force of destiny, Jung (1922) writes that “we must, I think, understand love in this way if we are to do any sort of justice to the problems it involves” (p. 198). This is increasingly the viewpoint I adopt.

Finally, in emphasis of his point that to love well necessitates effort, Fromm (1962a) contends that despite the deep-seated longing and craving for love, very little real or knowledge-based effort is expended on its attainment: “almost everything else is considered to be more important... success, prestige, money, power” (p. 12). While it is generally appreciated that one must work at one’s career in order to be successful, the same respect for matters of soul, self-development, and relationship seems generally lacking. There is a general tendency to expect relationships to tick over and cause no trouble. Perhaps this accounts for why there is so little discussion of love within academic discourse. Love is regarded as something natural; something we already and innately know how to do. However, Fromm, rightly in my view, conceives otherwise. Fromm (1947) argues that “contrary to all... confused and wishful thinking... while every human being has the capacity to love, its realization is one of the most difficult achievements” (p. 104).

Methodological framework

The methodology employed in this critique of romantic love incorporates the three following tools:

- (1) The tool of Interpretation at the subjective level;
- (2) The tool of Constructive/synthetic analysis;
- (3) The tool of Amplification.

I will overview each of these in turn, making specific reference to the relevance and applicability of each with respect to the critique forwarded here.

Interpretation at the Subjective Level

The primary methodological tool I employ is based on the distinction Jung (1923) makes between interpretation at the objective level and interpretation at the subjective level (pp. 779, 812-813). Explaining the distinction between these two levels of interpretation, Jung (1923) notes that:

When I speak of interpreting a dream or fantasy on the objective level, I mean that the persons or situations appearing in it are referred to objectively real persons or situations, in contrast to interpretation on the subjective level where the persons or situations refer exclusively to subjective factors. (p. 779)

The distinction between interpretation at the objective level and interpretation at the subjective level is premised on the distinction between taking and reading a dream or myth literally and reading a dream or myth symbolically.⁶⁸ Jung espouses that collective psychic products, in particular, should be read according to the latter.⁶⁹ However, while based on a subjective level of interpretation, the archetypal images or ideas in a myth, for example, are not to be taken or read literally, Jung (1952b) nonetheless espouses that a “myth is not fiction” (p. 648).⁷⁰ Whitmont (1969) explains this point, noting that:

The world of myth has its own laws and its own reality.... Taken literally, namely as a description of external things or people, it is certainly not true. The question, however, is whether this is the only way it can be viewed, that is, whether there are not different

⁶⁸ Fritz Perls, the originator of Gestalt Therapy, also advocated that dream images be interpreted subjectively; that is, as pertaining to subjective psychic factors related to the dreamer his/herself (Woolger, 1990, p. 16).

⁶⁹ The reading of dreams is not as straightforward. Whitmont (1969) usefully clarifies that as dreams contain much personal material, not every image they contain will be archetypal or symbolic.

⁷⁰ Jung (1942) notes that “even though mythology may not be ‘true’ in the sense that a mathematical law or a physical experiment is true, it is still a serious subject for research and contains quite as many truths as a natural science; only, they lie on a different plane. One can be perfectly scientific about mythology, for it is just as good a natural product as plants, animals or chemical elements” (p. 195).

kinds of truth... what Jung called *psychic truth* which is the adequate, that is, symbolic, description of inner psychic dynamics and experiencing. The myth's truth is accessible only to the symbolic view. (pp. 76-77)

Johnson (1987) similarly notes that while a myth "is not true in the outer, physical sense... it is an accurate expression of a psychological situation, of the inner condition of the psyche" (p. 2). Jung (1958a) notes of myths, which is likewise true of all psychic products containing archetypal images and ideas, that a "myth is essentially a product of the unconscious archetype and is therefore a symbol" (p. 625). As such, Jung espouses that a myth "requires psychological interpretation" (p. 625).

In order to interpret psychologically, which, as just noted, a subjective and symbolic reading requires, it is necessary to understand the dynamics of what is referred to within psychoanalysis and analytical psychology as projection. Jung (1954g) defines projection as "an unconscious, automatic process whereby a content that is unconscious to the subject transfers itself to an object, so that it seems to belong to that object" (p. 121). Perhaps the first thing to note concerning projection is that it is not a pathological dynamic, but part and parcel of normal and healthy psychological maturation. Whitmont (1969) points out that without the psychological dynamic of projection consciousness could not develop. Jung (1948c), recognising the multiplicity of the personality,⁷¹ similarly points out that to project unconscious contents is normal. If, however, the functional meaning of the psyche's projective tendencies is not recognised and if projection is persisted in, a state of psychological inertia prevails in that the intrapsychic underpinnings of interpersonal difficulties is overlooked. Jung (1948c) notes that "all human relationships swarm with... projections; anyone who cannot see this in his personal life need only have his attention drawn to the psychology of the press in wartime... we always see our own unavowed mistakes in our opponent. Excellent examples of this are to be found in all personal quarrels..." (p. 507).

To apply now the methodological tool of interpretation at the subjective level to the preceding critique and explain in what way I employ this tool: Instead of reading the Cinderella fairy tale and romantic stories as love tales or stories involving literal fictitious characters (i.e., at the objective level of interpretation), I examine the characters and themes as archetypal statements and as symbols of psychological processes. For example, instead of examining the character of Cinderella as denoting a literal fictitious person who is victimised, falls in love with and is rescued by a prince, I examine the character of Cinderella as an

⁷¹ For a discussion of the multiplicity of the personality or psyche see Chapter One.

archetypal image and therefore as a symbol denoting a psychological content and process. As I note in Chapter One, I critique the character of Cinderella and of romantic heroines generally as archetypal images and symbols of the ego. Similarly, based on the same methodological criteria, rather than critiquing the Cinderella fairy tale and romantic stories as tales or stories about finding one's true love and living happily ever after, I examine the Cinderella myth as an archetypal image and symbol of the process of individuation and the realisation of the self. (NB: I explain upon what basis I so denote the theme of falling in love and living happily ever after where I refer to the methodological tool of amplification below).

As noted, an appreciation of the dynamic and function of projection is pivotal in order to understand the psychological ramifications of interpretation at the subjective level and the significance and role of symbols. I have already drawn attention to what is referred to as the numinosity of psychic products and the archetypal images they contain and to the fascination romantic stories continue to exert on the Western imagination. This fascination or numinosity can be seen to rest on the projection of subjective psychic contents resulting in an identification with archetypal images and themes. Whitmont (1969) espouses that "if we want to know the next step along the path toward what we are 'meant to be,' we can look for the thing that attracts" and repels us "at the same time" (p. 62). The myths and stories which are numinous at a particular time and a particular place could be conceived as psychologically telling. For example, in a culture in which people were generally aware of their shadow, a myth containing an archetypal image of a wicked character would presumably not be needed for projection purposes and therefore would not be expected to psychologically appeal. Likewise, nor would a myth depicting happiness in the future (i.e., as something yet to be achieved) be expected to be of fascination within a culture in which most people were generally happy. Regarding projections, Jung (1948c) notes that "detachment can only take place when the imago that mirrored itself in the object is restored, together with its meaning, to the subject. This restoration is achieved through conscious recognition of the projected content, that is, by acknowledging the 'symbolic value' of the object" (p. 507).

Constructive/Synthetic Analysis

The second methodological tool upon which this critique is premised is closely linked with interpretation at the subjective level and is based on the distinction Jung makes between a constructive/synthetic interpretation of psychic phenomena and a reductive interpretation. The distinction between each of these modes of interpretation essentially rests upon what Don

Fredericksen (2001)⁷² points to as the differing ontologies which separate Jung's constructive/synthetic symbolic from Freud's reductive semiotic approach to the psyche. Whereas interpretation at the reductive level regards dream or myth images as signs (i.e., semiotically), interpretation at the constructive level, similarly to a subjective reading, regards archetypal images and motifs as symbols.⁷³

A constructive reading is premised on the postulate that what is communicated to consciousness via the unconscious through dream and myth likely contains factors and information yet unknown to consciousness and therefore is best interpreted symbolically.⁷⁴ Jung, distancing himself from a Freudian approach to the psyche and psychic products, notes that "unlike Freud and Adler, whose principles of explanation are essentially reductive and always return to the infantile conditions that limit human nature, I lay more stress on a constructive or synthetic explanation, in acknowledgment of the fact that tomorrow is of more practical importance than yesterday, and that the Whence is less essential than the Whither" (1930, p. 759).⁷⁵ Jung, emphasising the teleological directedness of psychic activity, was of the view that the unconscious psyche is constantly engaged in contributing to the widening of consciousness and is the germinal matrix of all that is yet to be. Jung (1931c; 1968) considered that the unconscious anticipated future changes in the conscious attitude and was the source from which changes in psychological sensibility issued. Hockley, distinguishing between Freud's reductive and Jung's teleological orientation, aptly notes that "Freud memorably remarked that dreams were, 'the royal road to the unconscious'. A Jungian

⁷² Don Fredericksen and Luke Hockley (cited below) are among a growing number of theorists who are applying Jungian concepts to the study of film. I surveyed the field of Jungian film studies during the early stages of thesis preparation. However, though I draw on Jungian film theorists in this section, I situate my usage of the film text *Ever After* within an historical overview of the Cinderella story (see following section).

⁷³ To interpret an image in a dream or fantasy semiotically is to conceive it as a sign or symptom "of an underlying process" (Jung, 1923, p. 788). The difference between regarding an image as a sign and an image as a symbol is the difference between regarding an image as referring to and standing in the place of something known and regarding an image as referring to and symbolising something unknown respectively.

⁷⁴ Jung (1923) notes that "a symbol always presupposes that the chosen expression is the best possible description or formulation of a relatively unknown fact, which is none the less known to exist or is postulated as existing" (p. 814).

⁷⁵ In the above quote, Jung is referring to Freud and Adler's reductive explanation and treatment of neurosis. In contrast, Jung considered that neurotic symptomology should be regarded symbolically, as an attempt on the part of the psyche at self cure and as having teleological significance. Jung (1949a) regarded that Freud completely overlooked the functional or symbolic value of neurosis, and hence failed to appreciate the compensatory relation between the unconscious and consciousness. However, while Jung was opposed to the solely reductive treatment of neurotic symptomology, he was even more opposed to the reductive method being used to interpret collective psychic products. Jung (1931c) notes that "the Freudian theory of dreams considers, and even explains, the dream... as though it were nothing but a symptom. Other fields of activity are... treated by psychoanalysis in the same way – works of art, for instance. But here the weakness of the theory becomes painfully evident, since a work of art is clearly not a symptom but a genuine creation. A creative achievement can only be understood on its own merits. If it is taken as a pathological misunderstanding and explained in the same terms of neurosis, the attempted explanation soon begins to assume a curiously bedraggled air" (p. 702).

reformulation might be that dreams are the royal road *from* the unconscious, *to* the future” (2001, p. 5).

The essential factor defining a constructive reading or interpretative framework is that of meaning. Samuels (1985) notes that “Jung is critical of the reductive method because the *meaning* of the unconscious product (symptom, dream image, slip of the tongue) is lost” (p. 135).⁷⁶ Jung frequently employs the expression ‘nothing but’ to denote the paucity of a reductive approach to psychic products.⁷⁷ For example, conceiving the Cinderella myth as ‘nothing but’ a boy/girl love story, or – from a feminist perspective – ‘nothing but’ a sign of patriarchal oppression is reductive because the myth’s functional significance is not taken into account; that is, what the myth is teleologically aiming at.⁷⁸ In Jung’s view, the interpretative framework adopted to understand psychic products is pivotal due to the intimate connection between mythology and psychology,⁷⁹ and because *how* one interprets psychic products directly impacts back upon oneself. Jung (1951) notes that:

[Whatever explanation or interpretation we give to archetypal images] we do to our own souls as well, with corresponding results for our own well-being. The archetype – let us never forget this – is a psychic organ present in all of us. A bad explanation means a correspondingly bad attitude to this organ, which may thus be injured. But the ultimate sufferer is the bad interpreter himself. Hence the ‘explanation’ should always be such that the functional significance of the archetype remains unimpaired, so that an adequate and meaningful connection between the conscious mind and the archetype is assured. For the archetype is an element of our psychic structure and thus a vital and necessary component in our psychic economy.... There is no ‘rational’ substitute for the archetype any more than there is for the cerebellum or the kidneys. We can examine the physical organs anatomically, histologically, and embryologically. This would correspond to an outline of archetypal phenomenology and its presentation in terms of comparative history. But we only arrive at the *meaning* of a physical organ when we begin to ask teleological questions. Hence the query arises: What is the biological purpose of the archetype? Just as physiology

⁷⁶ Jung (1953) notes that “certain kinds of psychic material mean next to nothing if simply broken down, but display a wealth of meaning if, instead of being broken down, that meaning is reinforced and extended by all the conscious means at our disposal – by the so-called method of amplification” (p. 122).

⁷⁷ Jung borrows this expression from William James.

⁷⁸ Jung (1949a) notes that “so long as we know only the causality or the historical development of a normal biological or psychic phenomenon, but not its functional development, i.e., its purposive significance, it is not really understood” (p. 1480). Jung was of the view that interpreting archetypal images as symbols and understanding the teleological directedness of the psyche was “of the utmost significance for the further development of Western consciousness” (p. 1480).

⁷⁹ Jungian analyst Adolf Guggenbuhl-Craig (1995) notes that “we live in a scientific age and science sails under the flag of cause and effect. This is adequate for the natural sciences, but not adequate for psychology. According to the psychology of... Jung the psyche is acausal: it is not ruled by causes, and does not follow the law of cause and effect. What makes our psyche, what characterizes our soul, is the fact that this is a part of us which cannot be explained by causality. The psychic reality can only be expressed and approached through symbols, through images and through mythological, symbolical stories. To put it in extreme terms: all psychology is mythology, or: psychology is modern mythology” (p. 65).

answers such a question for the body, so it is the business of psychology to answer it for the archetype. (p. 271)

From a Jungian perspective the collaboration of consciousness in endeavouring to understand and interpret dreams and myths is pivotal if the compensatory function of unconscious products is to be effected. Jung (1931c) emphasises that the fantasy images issuing from the unconscious are “only the raw material, which, in order to acquire a meaning, has first to be translated into the language of the present” (p. 738; see also 1930, p. 760).

Amplification

The third methodological tool I employ is that of amplification. Amplification is the method of comparing archetypal images “to the same or similar images in other sources” (Adams, n.d.) in order to identify parallels and to ascertain what the images essentially imply.⁸⁰

In employing the methodological tool of amplification, it is of note that the character depictions and theme motifs which define Cinderella and romantic mythology are not at all uncommon or unusual. The persecuted character, the contrasexual character, the evil or ‘other’ character, the supernatural or helping character, are all familiar character images that have been reproduced again and again and that form the bedrock of the religions, legends, myths, folklore, literature, film and art of cultures worldwide. Likewise, the theme motifs of being alone, of being victimised, of good and evil forces, of reward and punishment, of the quest for happiness and of being reliant on outside help are again motifs which are familiar. What makes the Cinderella fairy tale or a romance story identifiable as a particular fairy tale type (or, with regard to romance, a particular genre), is not the uniqueness of the character images or theme motifs, but simply the particular image constellation which distinguishes the Cinderella fairy tale or romance stories from other fairy tales or stories which nonetheless contain similar image themes. Again, pointing to the distinction between the archetype per se and a given archetypal image, Jung (1951) notes that “the archetypes are the imperishable elements of the unconscious, but they change their shape continually” (p. 301).

⁸⁰ Michael Adams (n.d.), pointing out that unlike Freud, Jung does not indiscriminately sexualise images, notes that “for Freud, a lock (or the keyhole in a lock) is a vagina, and a key is a penis. On this analogy, the insertion of a key in a lock is an allusion to sexual intercourse. In contrast, for Jung, a lock is essentially a device to prevent entrance, and a key is essentially a device to gain entrance. (In addition, a ‘key’ is, metaphorically, the solution to a problem – for example, a riddle). In analytic terms, ‘locked’ essentially implies that some content (which might or might *not* be a sexual content) has been ‘repressed’ or ‘dissociated’ in the unconscious.”

In the overview of Cinderella and romantic mythology that follows I point to the romantic myth as replacing within Western culture the Christian myth as the source of meaning and transcendence for the general or greater populace. Hence it seems that the necessary place to begin in terms of applying the methodological tool of amplification is with an examination and comparison of the Cinderella myth with the Christian myth: Of Christianity, Jung (1954) notes concerning its numinosity within and influence on Western culture that it found root there because it fitted “in with the existing archetypal pattern” (p. 25).⁸¹ As noted, the same observation could be made of the romantic myth. Were it not in some respect meaningful and compensatory in relation to present day Western cultural consciousness, it would be difficult to account for the fateful attraction it exerts.

On the surface, Christianity and romantic love would appear strange bedfellows; poles apart, in fact. The former is considered by many as having substantiation in historical fact and is the basis of a religion. The latter is a secular ideology; on appearance at least.⁸² However, if the Christian story and the Cinderella story are put side by side and examined at the level of archetypal image and motif, some very pertinent parallels emerge. This is not to say they are identical. Clear differences exist. But first, what do the myths share in common?

The central protagonist in the Christian myth is the Christ figure, the central protagonist in the Cinderella myth is Cinderella. In Chapter One, I suggest that phenomenologically both these characters or figures symbolise the ego.⁸³ The major similarity between Christ and the character of Cinderella is that they both suffer victimisation and persecution. In the Christian myth, Jesus is crucified. In the Cinderella myth, Cinderella is ill-treated and victimised by her step-mother and step-sisters. However, both characters are

⁸¹ Concerning the influence of Christianity on the Western psyche Jung (1954f) notes that “the religious point of view always expresses and formulates the essential psychological attitude and its specific prejudices, even in the case of people who have forgotten, or who have never heard of, their own religion. In spite of everything, the West is thoroughly Christian as far as its psychology is concerned” (p. 771). In this regard, Jung considers that while a Western individual can learn from the religions or thought forms derived from Eastern philosophy/psychology, s/he cannot simply copy or adopt an Eastern way of thinking without reckoning with his/her own historical and psychological heritage: “If our new attitude is to be genuine, i.e., grounded in our own history, it must be acquired with full consciousness of the Christian values and of the conflict between them and the introverted attitude of the East. We must get at the Eastern values from within and not from without, seeking them in ourselves, in the unconscious” (p. 774). Jung’s point that the Western individual has a psychology which is decidedly Christian in character should become clearer when I discuss more specifically the archetypal similarity between the Christian myth and the Cinderella myth below.

⁸² I posit romantic love as secular only according to appearances as I agree with Johnson (1987) who draws attention to the religious implications of romantic love. Johnson notes that “romantic love is the single greatest energy system in the Western psyche. In our culture it has supplanted religion as the arena in which men and women seek meaning.... Romantic love is not just a form of ‘love,’ it is a whole psychological package – a combination of beliefs, ideals, attitudes, and expectations” (p. xi).

⁸³ NB: As I note in Chapter One, while on the whole Jung denotes the Christ figure a symbol of the self, he also points to Christ as representing the ego. See Chapter One for clarification of this point.

also vindicated: Christ is resurrected and goes to heaven; Cinderella wins the love of the Prince with whom she lives happily ever after. Similarly, in both myths there is an evil or wicked character who threatens the ego figure. In the Christian myth, the evil character is Satan or the devil; in the Cinderella myth, the evil characters are the step-mother and step-sisters. Again, phenomenologically both the devil and the ‘step’ characters could be viewed as symbolising, in Jungian classificatory terms, the shadow.⁸⁴ Both myths also depict characters or figures that help the ego character. In the Christian myth, the helping figure is God; in the Cinderella myth the helping figure assumes various forms. For example, in *Ever After*, the helping figure is Leonardo da Vinci.⁸⁵

Identifiable parallels between the Christian myth and Cinderella myth are evident not only in character image, but also in terms of motif imagery. In both myths there is a sharp juxtaposition between good and evil, with ‘good’ ultimately incurring reward and ‘evil’ ultimately incurring punishment. As noted, Christ goes to heaven and Cinderella lives happily ever after; whereas the devil is tormented forever in hell, and the step-mother and step-sisters suffer various dire fates (although in Perrault’s *Cendrillon* the wicked characters are forgiven, and in Disney’s *Cinderella* [1950] we do not learn their fate). Both myths also posit happiness as something abiding in the future and to be attained. Utopia is possible, but only for ‘good’ people.

Another notable characteristic pointing to archetypal similarity is the connection that could be drawn between monotheism and monogamy. In the Christian myth, there is one God and the Christian individual is faithful to one God. In the Cinderella myth there is one Mr/Ms. Right and the romantic individual is expected to forsake all others in order to pledge his/her love to one individual. While marriage may no longer hold the value it once did, monogamy is still the Western norm and it is conceivable that monogamy is rooted in and stems from monotheism.⁸⁶ In a developmental or evolutionary sense this could be viewed as significant.

⁸⁴ Jung (1953) notes that “the devil is a variant of the ‘shadow’ archetype, i.e., of the dangerous aspect of the unrecognized dark half of the personality” (p. 152).

⁸⁵ As noted in the aim section, *Ever After* is the primary Cinderella text I draw upon for the purposes of critique.

⁸⁶ I acknowledge that there have been essentially monogamous cultures that were polytheistic (e.g., ancient Greece and Rome). However what changes with Christianity and is reflected in romantic love is the idea of being able to experience a personal direct relationship either with God or another person. John Boswell (1995) points out that our modern conceptions of love and marriage would have appeared very strange to the Ancient Greeks. Citing the medieval dictum “to love one’s wife with one’s emotions is adultery” (p. xx), Boswell writes that “very few premodern or nonindustrialized contemporary cultures would agree with the contention – uncontroversial in the West – that ‘the purpose of a man is to love a woman, and the purpose of a woman is to love a man.’ Most human beings in most times and places would find this a very meagre measure of human value” (p. xix). In a discussion of the nature of love and marriage, Giddens (1992) notes that “specific to Europe was the emergence of ideals of love closely connected to the moral values of Christianity. The precept that one

Projection onto *one* God or *one* person is the psychological impetus for the individuation and realisation of the individual's *own or one particular self*. Moreover, as I aim to elaborate in the course of my critique, the implication for interpersonal relatedness of the withdrawal of projections and realisation of oneself is that with the basis for relatedness (i.e., the self) residing in oneself, one's capacity for interpersonal relationship is greatly increased.

Before looking at the ways in which the myths differ, it is perhaps necessary to clarify where romantic stories and romantic love fits in this comparative scheme. For example, it may be fairly argued that while in the Cinderella myth there is clearly a wicked figure, this is not necessarily or generally so in a contemporary paperback romance. However, while image depictions of what is judged good and bad or virtuous and sinful may change face in romantic stories, moral juxtapositions and the theme of morality nonetheless remains distinctly present. In romantic stories the shadow character or characters are usually subsumed in the category of the 'other' woman/women; that is, the manipulative woman, the ugly woman, the rejected woman, or simply the competitor for the hero's affection. Expounding the particular brand of morality characteristic of romantic stories, in which, as often as not, good is equated with beauty/success and bad with ugliness/failure, Julius Fast (1971) notes concerning characters in plays and movies that without beauty "a woman is a tragic or a comic figure, an old maid or the beautiful heroine's faithful friend. She's never the one we identify with. If she gets a man, he's the comic interest" (p. 81). If it is recalled that the archetype *per se* provides form only and not specific content, comparative analysis of the Christian myth, the Cinderella myth, and romantic stories respectively indicates that while moral notions of good or bad may change reflecting shifting cultural norms, *morality per se*, like the archetype *per se*, appears not to. Upon examination, romantic stories appear every bit as moralistic and just as much preoccupied with and concerned with 'goodies' and 'badies' as the Christian myth. Similar observations could be made regarding the theme of reliance on outside help. For example, while the image of God may be absent from romantic stories, belief in serendipitous romantic miracles and the theme of fate, whether explicit or covert, remains ubiquitously present.

While, examined comparatively at the level of archetypal image, distinct similarities between the Christian myth and Cinderella myth/romantic stories are apparent, there are nonetheless also differences, which, in terms of prospective and teleological implications, may be just as significant as that which the respective myths share in common. Perhaps the most immediately notable change that occurs with the introduction of Cinderella is that the ego

should devote oneself to God in order to know him, and that through this process self-knowledge is achieved, became part of a mystical unity between man and woman" (p. 39).

character changes sex. As an archetypal image symbolising the ego, Jung critiques Christ as an androgynous figure. As I note in Chapter One, I similarly critique Cinderella as an androgynous figure; that is, as a symbol of the conscious experience of women *and men*. Nonetheless, the change in sex is significant and while within feminism Cinderella has been posited as an oppressed figure, the fact that the ego figure appears in female form could be viewed from an archetypal perspective as a compensatory initiative and corrective to women being historically subsumed under men; that is, archetypally Cinderella may symbolise female emancipation, not female subordination⁸⁷ (see Chapter One for further discussion of this point).

If the Christian myth and the Cinderella myth do not stem from the same germinal source it is hard to account for the archetypal similarities between the two. I do not consider that the parallels between the myths can be accounted as attributable to chance. Rather, Jung's thesis of the activity of archetypes appears far more feasible than the thesis, say, that someone invented the myth to keep women in their place.⁸⁸ As I note throughout, while the surface meaning and practice of romantically premised love may serve to negate the self, subsuming his/her autonomy to another, the depth meaning reads rather differently. In fact, as an individuation myth emphasising the autonomy of the individual, romantic mythology reads at a dynamic level in complete contrast to what it appears on surface. The similarity between the Christian myth and Cinderella myth supports Jung's observation referred to earlier in this chapter that we are greatly influenced by and psychologically dependent on the archetypal realm and if we repudiate one myth another appears in its wake.

Jung does not offer a critique of the Cinderella myth or identify parallels between Christianity and romantic love. However, Jung extensively critiques and analyses at the level of myth and archetype the Christian myth, which – in contrast to the ramifications of the Christian myth literalised – he critiques as an archetype of the self and as symbolically and psychologically mirroring the individuation process. Again, individuation refers to the maturation of the personality induced by the analysis of and engagement with the products and

⁸⁷ As I note below, Jung does not refer to the symbolic meaning of romantic love. Samuels points to a bias on Jung's part that may have accounted for this. Samuels (1985), pointing out that the ego is symbolised in myths as a hero, notes that "the invariable maleness of the hero is to be taken symbolically" (p. 67). Samuels notes that "because of Jung's stress on the personalising of the complexes, his own cultural biases and those of the time, he was content to let consciousness be symbolised by male figures. It does not follow that women are excluded from consciousness or have 'less'. Nevertheless, the dubious idea that consciousness in a woman lies in her 'masculine' side remains" (p. 67).

⁸⁸ As I noted in footnote three, Jung (1934) notes that "the head is a particularly inadequate organ when it comes to thinking up... symbols" (p. 805).

processes of the unconscious psyche (Jung, 1951, p. 270). Regarding the implications of the Christian myth symbolically conceived, Jung (1957) notes that:

...it should not be forgotten that... Christianity holds up before us a symbol whose content is the individual way of life of a man, the Son of Man, and that it even regards this individuation process as the incarnation and revelation of God himself. Hence the development of man into a self acquires a significance whose full implications have hardly begun to be appreciated, because too much attention to externals blocks the way to immediate inner experience. (p. 529)

Jung (1923) acknowledges that in practice Christianity has been noted for its “violation of individuality” (p. 110). The same observation could be made of romantically premised relatedness. Again however, when the symbolic value of myth is not appreciated, the opposite of its intended effect is the unfortunate result. As cited in the Frommian section, in the same way that Goldberg critiques romantic love as a means of evading responsibility for oneself and the development of individuality, Jung argues that the imitation of Christ can be a means of evading the symbolic implications thereof. Jung (1957) acknowledges that it is not easy to follow the Christian maxim to model one’s life upon Christ’s, but he was nonetheless of the view that “it is unspeakably harder to live one’s own life as truly as Christ lived his” (p. 522). It is one’s own individual life and the flowering of one’s own particular self that the Christian myth (symbolically read) affirms. Emphasising this point, Jung (1932) notes that “the modern man does not want to know in what way he can imitate Christ, but in what way he can live his own individual life...” (p. 524). Again, this is the difference between Christianity understood symbolically and Christianity adopted in a literalist sense. Similarly, involvement in romantic relationships can leave one less and less enchanted with the problems associated with intimate connections and with a desire for relationships based on the surer ground of self respect and autonomy, which is the ‘productive’ mode or basis for relatedness argued for here. In fact, it is the problems one encounters and the sense of self injury one feels that can be the very condition which awakens within the individual self care, self knowledge and self discovery.

In employing the methodological tool of amplification I have limited my comparison of romantic love to the Christian myth. I have done so because historians and sociologists point to romantic love as being a distinctly Western phenomenon and to the general usurping of Christianity as the primary source of meaning within the West from the eighteenth century onwards (see next section). However, I want to clarify that to posit Cinderella and romantic mythology as being particularly relevant within Western culture and to Western individuals, or

those under the influence of Western values,⁸⁹ is only to say that the myth is compensatory to the Western attitude and not to imply Western superiority. Jung is often accused of being Eurocentric and elitist. There may be grounds for this view of him. However, in balance, Jung is often particularly critical of Western culture; for example, he compares the West negatively in comparison to Eastern values. Jung particularly points to the discrepancy between technological achievement and ethical development, and to the loss within the West of instinctual awareness resulting in a paucity of experience and a general atmosphere of meaninglessness.

Just as all individuals have dreams, all cultures have shared myths. However, though dreams and myths derive from the same generative source and are predicated on archetypes which are universal, no two individuals dream exactly the same dream, just as no two cultures share exactly the same myths.⁹⁰ Again, the myth or myths that are numinous within a given culture or at a given historical moment are the myths that are compensatory to what Fromm refers to as the general social character (see Frommian section above). Hockley (2001), pointing out that individuation occurs not only at the level of the individual but also at the collective level of culture, notes that “cultures individuate, they become aware of the diversity and opposition within them, and they come to accept their shared, collective unconscious qualities” (p. 43).

Cinderella folklore: Historical development and *Ever After*

The datum for this study is Cinderella folklore. My rationale for employing Cinderella folklore as the object of analysis to critique romantic mythology/ideology is premised both on its longevity as the most popular folk tale/fairy tale worldwide, and its continuing influence as the archetypal constituent of the romance genre (Leach, 1949). Both Huang Mei (1990) and Glenda Hudson (1999) point to the influence of Cinderella folklore in shaping the work of early romance writers, including Samuel Richardson, Jane Austen, Frances Burney and Charlotte Smith. Harlequin Romance, purveyors of contemporary romance novels, continue to keep the ‘once upon a time... happily ever after’ scenario alive, advising their writers to re-create “contemporary fairy-tale plots” (Hussey, 2002).

⁸⁹ As discussed in the following section, while versions/variants of the Cinderella folk tale have been found worldwide and while the earliest known version to date is a Chinese retelling of the tale, it is in the West that the Cinderella fairy tale took root.

⁹⁰ Jung (1943) notes that “every item of psychic experience presents itself in an individual form, even though its deeper content may be collective” (p. 1808; see also 1968, p. 565).

What became known as the Cinderella fairy tale upon its translation into English in 1721 has a long and rich history. In this section, as a prelude to introducing *Ever After* (1998), the primary Cinderella text I focus on for the purposes of critique, I overview the historical development of Cinderella folklore, the introduction of the tale into European culture, and the connection between the Cinderella fairy tale and romantic love.

The earliest complete version of the Cinderella folk tale traced by folklorists to date is recorded in a ninth century Chinese book entitled *YuYang Tsa Tsu*, which – as sinologist Arthur Waley (1947) notes – “might be translated *Miscellany of Forgotten Lore*” (p. 266). The book is attributed to the compilation of a certain Tuan Ch-eng-shih (800-863),⁹¹ a member of an influential Chinese family (p. 226). Tuan concludes his story of *Yeh-hsien*⁹² – that is, the Chinese Cinderella – with an acknowledgement of his source, writing that “the story was told me by Li Shih-yuan, who has been in the service of my family a long while. He was himself originally a man from the caves of Yung-chou and remembers many strange things of the South” (Waley, 1947, p. 229).

The folk tale of *Yeh-hsien* shows remarkable similarity in essential features to European versions of Cinderella. *Yeh-hsien* is a young girl who is treated cruelly by her stepmother after both her parents die. *Yeh-hsien* befriends a fish, which is later killed by her stepmother. *Yeh-hsien* is grief stricken, but is comforted by a man who appears from heaven, telling her to hide the fish’s bones and to pray to the bones for whatever she desires. When the time of the cave festival comes, *Yeh-hsien* is left behind to do chores. After *Yeh-hsien*’s stepmother and stepsister have left for the festival, *Yeh-hsien* adorns herself in a “cloak of stuff spun from kingfisher feathers and shoes of gold” (Waley, 1947, p. 228). At the festival, *Yeh-hsien* is recognised by her stepmother and stepsister and she hurries away, leaving behind one of her shoes. The shoe eventually comes to the attention of the king of T’o-han, who searches for its owner. While there are other details woven into the tale, the tale ends with *Yeh-Hsien* being taken as the King of T’o-han’s chief wife and the stepmother and stepsister being killed by flying stones (pp. 227-229).⁹³

⁹¹ Waley (1947) gives this as an approximate date of Tuan’s life-span only.

⁹² R. D. Jameson (1982), who first translated the Chinese Cinderella in 1932, translates her name as Sheh Hsien. I have used Waley’s translation as he purports to give a more accurate translation. Nai-Tung Ting (1974) notes that the name of the heroine in this version “sounds like Yi Ham (ha:m) in modern Kwantung-Kwangsi dialect” (p. 8).

⁹³ While the first person to draw attention to the existence of Tuan’s *Yeh-hsien* was Japanese folklorist Minakata (Waley, 1947, p. 226; Dundes, 1982, p. 71), it was not until 1932, when R. D. Jameson brought it to the attention of folklorists, that this Chinese version of Cinderella became widely known (Dundes, 1982, p. 71).

While the ninth century version “is indisputably the earliest complete version of Cinderella on record” (Ting, 1974, p. 38), it is certainly not considered by folklorists – or, notably, by Tuan himself – to be the first time the folk tale of Cinderella had ever been told (p. 39). In 1932, R. D. Jameson of the National Tsing Hua University presented a lecture series on Chinese folklore in which he pointed to internal inconsistencies within the ninth century narrative which he believed indicated “signs of some wear and considerable age” (1982, p. 78). Jameson posited that the story was “a popular version taken from oral tradition... influenced by other versions and other stories which were in the consciousness of the narrators” (p. 79). Folklorist Nai-Tung Ting (1974), in a comparative study of Chinese and Indo-Chinese variants of the Cinderella folk tale, speculates on a possible North Vietnamese origin for Cinderella, giving as one of his reasons that “the Cinderella story was believed to have been a real story in North Vietnam as late as the first decade of this century [i.e., twentieth century]” (p. 39). However, Ting (1974) qualifies the hypotheses he summates as to a possible Vietnamese origin, concluding that:

This writer is not maintaining that Cinderella certainly originated in this region. He is merely trying to point out that, with our limited knowledge, such a possibility cannot be ruled out... Unless a thorough search of the ancient literature and oral narratives of many hitherto neglected lands can be made and ethnological problems solved, the indisputable origin of this fascinating tale type... may never be discovered. Because of the traffic – quite heavy by medieval standards – between China, India and the Middle East through many centuries, the development of this tale type is likely to have been quite complex. (p. 40)

Comparative folklorist Archer Taylor (1982) points to the fresh interest in the study of Cinderella folklore that the discovery of the early Chinese version sparked. Along with a number of comparative studies that have focused on the development and diffusion of Cinderella folklore within specific regions, there have been two major cross-cultural compilations. The first of these was undertaken by Marion Roalfe Cox, under the auspices of the English Folk-Lore Society, and was published in 1892.⁹⁴ In all, Cox located and assembled 345 versions/variants⁹⁵ of what she identified as a Cinderella cycle, from Europe, Asia, Africa and America. Included in the study are 23 ‘Hero-tales,’ the term Cox uses to

⁹⁴ NB: Alan Dundes (1982), editor of *Cinderella: A folktale Showcase*, cites this study as having been first “published by the English Folklore Society in 1893” (p. xiii). However, the 1967 reprint of this study cites the original date of publication as 1892.

⁹⁵ Folklorists distinguish between versions and variants of a folk tale. In classificatory terms the tale type indicator for Cinderella proper is AT 510A (see Stith Thompson’s second revision [1961] of Antti Aarne’s tale type index, which was first published in 1910). Variations of Cinderella proper (AT 510A) are referred to as *versions* of Cinderella, while *variants* of Cinderella include folk tales which show similarity to Cinderella proper, such as Catskin, Cap o’ Rushes and Hero-tales.

designate tales in which the central Cinderella role is assigned to a hero rather than a heroine. Cox's study was followed by Anna Birgitta Rooth's *The Cinderella Cycle* (1951), which – incorporating the material already collated by Cox – is based on some 700 versions/variants of the tale. Rooth sought to supplement Cox's study – of which the largest segment consists of European folk tales – by focusing, in part, on Oriental tales.

While versions/variants of the Cinderella folk tale or cycle (as folklorists designate it) have been located in cultures worldwide, it is in the West that the character of Cinderella and the Cinderella folk tale/fairy tale became widely popularised and firmly established within the public domain. It is also in the West that the pattern of love relationship depicted in the fairy tale and concomitantly in romantic literature became the model for human intimacy and the basis for marriage (Greer, 1971, pp. 207-213). Erich Fromm (1962a) points to changing attitudes within the West which accompanied the ushering in of modern society and which saw the rise of romantic notions and expectations in relation to love and marriage (pp. 9-10).⁹⁶ Sociologist Anthony Giddens (1992), distinguishing romantic love from *amour passion* (i.e., passionate love), which has always existed in some form or other, posits romantic love as a Western cultural construct “which began to make its presence felt by the late eighteenth century onwards” (p. 39; see also Illouz, 1998; Shumway, 1998). With the rise of capital, emerging ideals of individualism, and modes of production which enabled the widespread dissemination of the romance novel, romantic love emerges as a new and more immediate focus of meaning, replacing medieval religion (White, 1998). Johnson (1987), in a comparison of Western and Eastern views of and expectations regarding love and marriage, notes that “as a mass phenomenon, romantic love is peculiar to the West” (p. xi). Similarly to Giddens, Johnson notes that while “romantic love has existed throughout history in many cultures... our modern Western society is the only culture in history that has experienced romantic love as a mass phenomenon. We are the only society that makes romance the basis of our marriages and love relationships and the cultural ideal of ‘true love’” (p. xiii). Speculating on why the Cinderella fairy tale did not find widespread acceptance or become

⁹⁶ Fromm (1962a) notes that “in the Victorian age, as in many traditional cultures, love was mostly not a spontaneous personal experience which then might lead to marriage. On the contrary, marriage was contracted by convention – either by the respective families, or by a marriage broker, or without the help of such intermediaries; it was concluded on the basis of social considerations, and love was supposed to develop once the marriage had been concluded” (pp. 9-10). Writing in the 1960s, Fromm continues that “in the last few generations the concept of romantic love has become almost universal in the Western world” (p. 10).

popular in China, Ting (1974) considers that the most probable reason is that a story in which a girl loses her shoe would have been culturally frowned upon (p. 37).⁹⁷

Given the noted influence of the Cinderella fairy tale and romantic ideals on traditional Western conceptions of love, I will now turn to an overview of Cinderella's introduction into Western culture.

The first time that the Cinderella folk tale appears in print in Europe is in Des Periers' *Nouvelles Recreations et Ioyeux Devis*, published in Lyon in 1558 (Jameson, 1982, p. 74; Dundes, 1982, p. 4).⁹⁸ Subsequently Cinderella appears in Italy as *Zezzolla*, in Giambattista Basile's *Il Pentamerone* (1634-1636);⁹⁹ in France as *Cendrillon*, in Charles Perrault's *Histoires ou Contes du temps passé* (1697); and in Germany as *Aschenputtel*, in Jacob and Wilhelm Grimms' *Kinder und Hausmärchen* (1812) (Dundes, 1982, p. xvi; McGlathery, 1991, p. 6). These three collections taken together are regarded by folklorists as Europe's early classics of the tale (Dundes, 1982). Perrault's rendition in particular, which was first translated into English by Robert Samber in 1729, is widely esteemed as the most popular of all the versions of Cinderella (Dundes, 1982, p. 14). However, Lewis Seifert (1996) – focusing on the development of the Cinderella folk tale in France – points out that while the renown of Perrault has eclipsed that of all other French fairy tale writers, there were many other writers who published fairy tales in France between 1690 and 1789 and “both the numbers of republications and critical appraisals of tales confirm that, of all the seventeenth-century fairy-tale writers” Perrault's contemporary, Marie-Catherine d'Aulnoy, “was just as popular if not more so than Perrault in the eighteenth century” (p. 229). Indeed, as fairy tale critics Opie and Opie (1974) note, it is d'Aulnoy's *Finetta the Cinder-girl*, published in the first volume of d'Aulnoy's *Collection of novels and tales* – and not Perrault's *Cendrillon* – that in 1721 first appears in English (p. 119).

From d'Aulnoy – and not as may be supposed, Perrault – also comes the familiar term ‘fairy tale,’ which has replaced the traditional term of folk tale in the English popular imagination (McGlathery, 1991; Opie & Opie, 1974). Max Luthi (1984) defines the ‘folk tale’ as encompassing “only such narratives as have over a period of time passed from teller to

⁹⁷ Ting (1974) explains, noting that “in ancient China, girls often made their own shoes. Even highborn maidens often did the embroidery themselves. Embroidered shoes were thus regarded as very intimate and dearly treasured objects, as they bore the personality traits of their owner and maker.... In popular literature, a girl who had misplaced her shoes often met a tragic end when her shoes fell into wrong hands. Losing a beautiful shoe, an essential and most distinctive motif of 510A [i.e., Cinderella proper] would most likely be frowned on by older people in ancient China, since a young girl should not be encouraged to commit such an indiscretion” (p. 37).

⁹⁸ Dundes (1982) notes that prior to this first literary appearance of Cinderella in Europe, the tale of Cinderella had been extensively referred to in “a sermon delivered in Strasburg in 1501” (p. 4).

⁹⁹ This collection was published posthumously.

teller” (p. x). Luthi also makes a distinction between the ‘book fairy tale,’ within which definition he includes tales which have been edited for printing (such as those of Perrault and the Grimms) and ‘literary fairy tales’ (p. 167), which – like those of the Danish author of original fairy tales, Hans Christian Anderson – “have been freely invented or drastically altered by a particular author”¹⁰⁰ (Opie & Opie, 1974, p. 27). Stith Thompson (1946) contends that the introduction and widespread adoption of the term fairy tale into English has been unfortunate, in that it implies the presence of fairies when most of the tales have no fairies, and also inadequate, in that it fails to satisfactorily define the scope and richness of the folk tale genre. In contrast, Thompson points out that the German term ‘*Marchen*,’ which is employed by most folklorists, accommodates a much broader conception of the folk tale. Thompson (1946) defines *Marchen* as:

A tale of some length involving a succession of motifs or episode [that] moves in an unreal world without definite locality or definite characters and is filled with the marvellous. In this never-never land humble heroes kill adversaries, succeed to kingdoms, and marry princesses. (p. 8)

The Grimm brothers, whose *Kinder-und Hausmarchen* was first published in German in 1812, have the distinction of being considered “among the founders of the modern science of folklore”¹⁰¹ (McGlathery, 1991, p. 7). Opie and Opie (1974) note that:

The Grimms were the first substantial collectors to like folktales for their own sake; the first to write the tales down in the way ordinary people told them, and not attempt to improve them; and they were the first to realize that everything about the tales was of interest, even including the identity of the person who told the tale. (p. 26)

The Grimms certainly were prolific collectors and compilers of the folk tale tradition, collecting and editing – throughout subsequent editions of their original volume – over 200 tales¹⁰² (Zipes, 2000, p. 219). However, Dundes (1982) notes that while the Grimm brothers advocated presenting tales according to circulating oral traditions, they did not always follow this criteria themselves. Further – and contrary to explicit claims made by the Grimms – their informants were predominantly from the middle or upper classes; most of their “more important informants were personal friends or persons known to them through literary circles”

¹⁰⁰ The distinction Luthi makes between ‘book fairy tales’ and ‘literary fairy tales’ is not uniformly followed. Many folklorists subsume all literary forms of the folk tale or fairy tale – edited or originally authored – under the term ‘literary fairy tale’ (Zipes, 1994; McGlathery, 1991).

¹⁰¹ Bronner (1998) points out that “the renown of the Grimms had the effect of motivating others in and out of Germany to produce authoritative, and entertaining, folktale collections” (p. 196).

¹⁰² McGlathery (as cited in Bronner, 1998, p. 195) notes that “eight editions of the original *Kinder-und Hausmarchen* appeared in German during the Grimms’ lifetime, and another twenty-one appeared between 1864 and 1886.”

(McGlathery, 1991, p. 7). To highlight the extent to which the Grimms' tales must be seen as mirroring their compilers' own predilections, McGlathery (1991) notes that:

The Grimms discarded or destroyed the papers from which they worked in preparing their stories for the printer. Only by chance has a copy of a manuscript survived that contains most of the tales they had collected in 1810, two years before the first volume of the *Kinder-und Hausmarchen* appeared. Even this manuscript cannot be considered a transcription of what the Grimms or their informants may actually have heard from their sources. What the manuscript does show is the considerable extent to which the Grimms expanded or otherwise altered the tales between this stage and their publication shortly after.¹⁰³ (p. 8)

The Grimms' combining of similar, yet different, versions/variants of folk tales is evident in their version of *Aschenputtel*; that is, *Cinderella*. Dundes (1982) notes that by the 1819 edition, the "Grimm tale number 21, *Aschenputtel*" – subsequently translated into English by Edgar Taylor in his second volume of *German popular stories* (1826) – had already been "expanded and reworked in the light of three versions from Hesse" (p. 23; see also Bronner, 1998). Illustrative of this combining of tales, Luthi (1984) points to the different conclusions to the *Cinderella* folk tale occurring across different editions of *Kinder-und Hausmarchen*:

Anyone who is put off by the fact that *Cinderella* does not open her mouth when her... doves peck out the eyes of each of the older sisters... should reach for the first edition of the Grimms' tales... No eyes are pecked out; this feature is brought in only in the second edition (1819), following another version of the story from Hesse. (p. 153)

Dundes (1982) argues that while the versions of *Cinderella* furnished by Perrault and the Grimm brothers are the most popular, "they are not necessarily the most authentic in terms of orally circulating versions of the tale" (p. 23). However, to balance Dundes' claim, Opie and Opie (1974) point out that folk tales should not be considered archaeological remains "so scarred by time they have become almost unrecognizable, for this presupposes that they were once whole and perfect, and have ever since been in a state of decay" (p. 17). Folklore by its very nature is a genre subject to constant mutation. Unlike a literary text, the folk tale is not the work of one single author. Rather, folk tales are tailored again and again to reflect the "literary, moral, and cultural tastes of their time" (McGlathery, 1991, p. 6). And while this leaves the genre susceptible to parochial distortions, the reverse thesis must also be

¹⁰³ Bronner (1998) points out that by the publication of their second edition the Grimms had become more forthright concerning their reworking of the tales. However, as Tatar (as cited in Bronner, 1998, p. 192) notes, they still claimed that we "did not add anything from our own resources, nor did we embellish any events and features of the story itself. Instead we tried to relate the content just as we had heard it; we hardly need emphasise that the phrasing and filling in of details were mainly our work, but we did try to preserve every particularity that we noticed so that in this respect the collection would respect the diversity of nature."

considered. As Opie and Opie (1974) remark, folk tales “are as likely to have grown as they became older, as to have shrunk... to have acquired fresh significance... as to have lost it” (p. 17).

While today fairy tales are regarded as children’s stories, when initially introduced in literary form folk tales were directed at an adult readership, and moreover - in that only those who could read had access to them - were for the entertainment of the bourgeoisie (Seifert, 1996; Zipes, 1994).¹⁰⁴ Increasingly however, the wider entertainment value and commercial viability of fairy tales was recognised and the tales were increasingly recontextualised to encompass juvenile interests (Bronner, 1998). Zipes (2000) notes that since the early nineteenth century the Cinderella fairy tale has been the subject of “hundreds if not thousands of literary, dramatic, musical, poetic, and cinematic” (p. 97) adaptations. By far the most popular twentieth century adaptation was Walt Disney’s blockbuster animated film version of Cinderella, first released in 1950. Disney’s influence on the fairy tale genre in general and on the popularising of the Cinderella fairy tale in particular cannot be overstated.¹⁰⁵ James McGlathery, author of *Fairy Tale Romance* (1991), attributes his “acquaintance with fairy tales... like that of many” as mediated “through Walt Disney’s films” (p. ix). Of more significance, and endorsing the earlier point that it is in the West where the Cinderella fairy tale and the romance novel found their home, Chinese author Huang Mei expresses her self-confessed surprise when – while studying at Rutgers University in the 1980s – she became aware that the Cinderella folk tale is possibly of Chinese origin. Mei (1990) recounts: “I was astonished. For me, as for millions of Chinese common readers, Cinderella comes in a Walt Disney cartoon costume and is a totally Western creature” (p. viii). While, as mentioned previously, Perrault’s renown as the central figure in the development of the fairy tale within Europe is now in dispute, it is very unlikely that such a contention will arise in the future as to Disney’s central influence on the fairy tale within the twentieth century. As Zipes (1994) notes:

Disney’s technical skills and ideological proclivities were so consummate that his signature has obfuscated the names of Charles Perrault, the Brothers Grimm, Hans Christian Anderson, and Collodi. If children or adults think of the great classical fairy

¹⁰⁴ Zipes (1994), who points out that when the folk tale came to be produced in literary form “notions of elitism” (p. 74) were introduced, notes that while “numerous critics have regarded Perrault’s tales as written directly for children... they overlook the fact that there was no children’s literature *per se* at that time and that most writers of fairy tales were composing and reciting their tales for their peers in the literary saloons” (2000, p. 380).

¹⁰⁵ Zipes (1994) notes that “to a certain degree, Disney identified so closely with the fairy tales he appropriated that it is no wonder his name virtually became synonymous with the genre of the fairy tale itself” (p. 76).

tales today... they will think Walt Disney. Their first and perhaps lasting impressions of these tales and others will have emanated from a Disney film, book, or artefact. (p. 72)

While Disney's 1950 film version of *Cinderella* was the first time that Disney had introduced *Cinderella* in a feature-length animated film, Disney's interest in *Cinderella* – as in the fairy tale genre in general – had been evident from the very initial stages of his career (Zipes, 1994). As early as the 1930s, Disney had capitalised on the revenue creating value of his fairy tale and cartoon characters, supplementing films with a plethora of books and novelty items and thus further establishing fairy tale fantasy within the public domain (Zipes, 2000).¹⁰⁶ *Cinderella*'s fame, as well as her profitability, continues unabated into the twenty-first century. In 1997, the *Detroit News* “estimated that in the six times *Cinderella* has been released to theatres, 75 million people have seen it, and it grossed 315 million dollars” (as cited in Bronner, 1998, p. 506). Bruce Orwall (2003) of the *Wall Street Journal* reports that Disney's “ ‘princess line’ of themed items based on characters such as Snow White and *Cinderella*... will reach \$1.3 billion this year [i.e., 2003], up from just \$136 million in 2001.”

In a documentary on the making of *Cinderella*, animators who worked at the Disney studio attributed Disney's success to his ability to cater to the public demand for classic story-telling (Arends, 1995). Zipes, who has extensively critiqued Disney's influence on the fairy tale genre, argues that Disney's particular brand of classic story-telling consisted of catering to a securely middle-class American sensibility and reinforcing social and political norms (1994, p. 74; 2000, p. 129). While, as pointed out by feminist critics such as Kay Stone (1975) and Jane Yolen (1982), Disney's *Cinderella* is even more passive than those of Perrault and the Grimms, what is even more evident in Disney fairy tales than the “domestication of women” is the “triumph of the banished and the underdogs” (Zipes, 1994, p. 90). Zipes (1994) points out that Disney manipulated the fairy tale genre in a markedly autobiographical way, interjecting through “self-figuration” (p. 77)¹⁰⁷ his own values and beliefs. Disney came from a lower middle-class background (Zipes, 2000), and – along with an exaggerated emphasis on romance and “true love” – what all of Disney's films celebrate is the great American myth: The myth that success is available to anyone through hard work and dedication.

¹⁰⁶ *Cinderella* (1950) earned the Disney enterprise over \$7 million when it first premiered and thus recuperated losses Disney had suffered due to war-time restrictions (Arends, 1995).

¹⁰⁷ The term ‘self-figuration’ is one that Zipes takes from Donald Crafton. Zipes (1994) quotes Crafton who points out that “the early animated film was the location of a process found elsewhere in cinema but nowhere else in such intense concentration: self-figuration, the tendency of the filmmaker to interject himself into this film” (p. 77).

While Cinderella stands as an icon in her own right, she is also undoubtedly the paragon of romance and the character upon which all her sister romantic heroines are to some extent patterned. In Jungian terms, Cinderella – in character depiction and motif – provides archetypal images which have been reflected and replayed by romance novelists and film writers again and again. Mei (1990) points to the “ever-present passive and innocent heroine in English novels patterned on Cinderella” (p. vii). While current tastes no longer favour a passive or particularly innocent heroine,¹⁰⁸ it is nonetheless so that from Samuel Richardson’s eighteenth century bestseller *Pamela* (first published in 1740), through to present day Harlequin paperbacks, novelists from Jane Austen, Charlotte Bronte and through to Barbara Cartland have capitalised again and again on the same fairy tale formula; a formula for which public demand seems insatiable, as evidenced by sales figures for romance fiction.¹⁰⁹ As noted in the aim section, decades of feminist theorising and significant shifts in moral and sexual mores have not diminished romantic love’s supreme and seemingly indisputable reign: “Against all the odds (social, political, intellectual) the *desire* for romance has survived” (Stacey & Pearce, 1995, p. 11). Displaying, as feminist researchers have pointed out, a remarkable “capacity for mutation” (Stacey & Pearce, p. 11), romantic love simply adjusts to accommodate changing social values. Emphasising that “romance itself seems indestructible” (p. 11), Stacey and Pearce (1995) note that:

While studies like Shere Hite’s... reveal a dramatic increase in divorce, non-monogamy, couples living together outside of marriage, and other ‘non-standard’ relationships (including a noticeable increase in the number of gay and lesbian relationships), the trappings of ‘classic romance’ (love songs, white weddings, Valentine’s day and so on) remain as commercially viable as ever. In terms of its cultural representation too, the popularity of romance appears undiminished. In popular fiction, Hollywood cinema, television soap-opera, and the media in general, the appetite for romance is as gargantuan as ever. (p. 11)

Perhaps the most salient feature that the romance genre derives from Cinderella folklore is the utopian ending (utopian for the couple, that is). Everyone from kindergarten onwards knows that a good romance ends with the promise of ‘happily ever after.’ Harlequin, in terms of their expectations of writers, are unequivocal concerning the necessity for the romance novels they publish to cater to the utopian expectations of their readers. In their

¹⁰⁸ As noted in the aim section, the romance readers Radway (1984) refers to in her study favoured independent “strong, fiery” heroines who could stand up to their male counterparts (p. 54). Yet, even so, as also noted in the aim section, despite changing roles for women and despite a shift in sexual mores, most women/people – including feminists – still seem to desire romantic love and romantic connectedness (Stacey & Pearce, 1995).

¹⁰⁹ In America, romance fiction accounts for “54.9 percent of all popular mass-market fiction sold” and “39.3% of all fiction sold” (“Romance Fiction,” 2006).

writing guidelines they state: “The story must take the reader on an emotional journey, maybe with tears of heartache along the way, but *always* with a positive and uplifting sense of fulfilment” (“Writing Guidelines,” 2002; emphasis added). However, not every novelist has catered to what in romantic mythology/ideology implicitly amounts to an inviolable law.¹¹⁰ Perhaps the most notable exception to this undoubtedly public expectation for utopian fulfilment is Margaret Mitchell’s *Gone with the Wind*, first published in 1936.¹¹¹ What the romance devotee does not want to read after being suspended, for over one thousand pages, in the grip of perhaps the most impassioned and riveting love match of all time, is Rhett Butler – in the face of Scarlett O’Hara’s final realisation and sudden confession of love – coolly disavow, “*My dear, I don’t give a damn!*” (Mitchell, 1936/1974, p. 1010). While Mitchell never intended a sequel, public demand finally won the day. Despite Mitchell’s explicit proscription, which her brother and heir, Stephens Mitchell “honoured until just before his death in 1983” (Taylor, 1989, p. 154), Alexandra Ripley was contracted to produce a sequel.¹¹² Based on the public outcry *Gone with the Wind*’s dystopian ending generated, it seems fair comment that whether Cinderella and all her sister heroines get to marry their Princes is a matter imbued in romantic mythology/ideology with life and death significance. The explicit message of the romance genre – indeed its gospel theme - is that never finding or losing one’s “true love” amounts to never really ‘living’ at all.

While in Chapter One of my critique I refer to the character of Cinderella and the Cinderella fairy tale in a general sense, in Chapters Two to Five the primary Cinderella text I focus on for the purposes of critique is Andy Tennant’s 1998 film adaptation of Cinderella, *Ever After*, which – set in sixteenth century France – stars Drew Barrymore as Danielle (Cinderella). However, as the focus of the critique is to explore what lies ‘beyond romance’s utopia’ the Cinderella texts can carry the discussion only so far and become less central as the discussion proceeds. In Chapter Six, I do not refer to Cinderella texts at all.

As I will be referring to *Ever After* throughout this discussion, I will not elaborate upon the storyline here, but will rather focus on two features of *Ever After* which I consider make it particularly suited to the transition my argument will take from exploring what Cinderella folk

¹¹⁰ Taylor (1989) gives examples of novels that do not conform to a happy-ending model, noting that “novels such as *Great Expectations* and *Villette*, and the experimental open endings of writers such as Henry James and Virginia Woolf... frustrate “popular narrative expectations...” (p. 140; see also Mei, 1990, p. ix).

¹¹¹ An instant best-seller, *Gone with the Wind* “sold a million copies in the first six months; twenty-five million more have sold since then” (Taylor, 1989, p. 1).

¹¹² Apparently Stephens Mitchell finally gave in to pressure to allow for a sequel when he became aware that the copyright for *Gone with the Wind* would expire in the year 2011. Rather than risk a sequel not approved of by the Margaret Mitchell Estate, Stephens thought it better to commission a sequel himself (see Taylor, 1989, p. 154).

lore/romantic love at the level of myth might mean, to an examination of what may lie ‘beyond romance’s utopia.’ A scene summary of *Ever After* is included as an appendix.

Firstly, although in many respects a classic film adaptation of Cinderella, alongside and running parallel to the traditional story elements (e.g., the juxtaposing of good/bad characters, the victimisation of the Cinderella character, the ball, and the lost shoe), the screenwriters (Susannah Grant, Andy Tennant and Rick Parks) also introduce a theme from the tradition of Western utopian thought. The utopian theme running throughout *Ever After* is first introduced into the film when Danielle’s father gives her a copy of Sir Thomas More’s *Utopia* just before he dies. While the theme of utopia is drawn upon and further developed throughout the story, what I consider of especial note is the way in which the story closes. Upon Danielle and Prince Henry’s reconciliation, the narrator (the Grand Dame, played by Jeanne Moreau) concludes: “*And while Cinderella and her Prince did live happily ever after, the point is... that they lived!*” Admittedly, the play on words is only slight. Nonetheless, the narrator’s emphasis on “*the point is... that they lived,*” has the effect of hinting at the possibility of and potential for something beyond a closed and statically defined romantic “happily ever after” ending. Moreover, there is even the suggestion – admittedly again, markedly subtle – that happiness or well-being is not something given or attainable via a romantic connection, but rather something that one must work at and find for oneself; that is, something that is one’s own responsibility: In Frommian terms, something that is attainable only through one’s own productive activity and effort.

The second feature of *Ever After* which makes it particularly suited to this analysis is that the film makes an initial step toward ‘humanising’ characters within the story – other than Cinderella – who are not usually identified with. For example, as I draw attention to in Chapter Three, there is a brief scene of identification between Danielle and Baroness Rodmilla (the stepmother), in which Baroness Rodmilla tells Danielle that her mother had treated her cruelly also. In a brief summary review of *Ever After*, Heidi Anne Heiner, who identifies the film as her favourite Cinderella adaptation, comments: “I appreciated the screenplay’s hints at why Cinderella’s stepmother... is so hateful to her” (2002). Hence rather than the division between good/bad characters being clear cut, the question of good and evil (i.e., of morality), is problematised somewhat. This ‘humanising’ of characters is very different, for example, to Disney’s *Cinderella* (1950), in which the character of Cinderella is good and *only good*, and the character of the stepmother is in contrast *only bad*. This more usually depicted uncritical juxtaposition and unequivocal divide between good/bad characters is exemplified in a

comment made by Disney animator Kimball Wards: “Lucifer [i.e., the cat] is a mirror of the villainess stepmother and the good guys are Cinderella, of course, and the mice. So you have those two conflicting sides – which are very important to the story” (Arends, 1995).

Not only the stepmother character, but even more so, the Prince character (Prince Henry) is presented by the screenwriters of *Ever After* as warm and accessible and as a character able to be known. While in most Cinderella adaptations the Prince is merely the person who ‘rescues’ the Cinderella character and on whom her happiness rests, this is not how Prince Henry is depicted. When interviewed by Jessica Shaw (1998) for *Seventeen* magazine, actress Drew Barrymore commented that *Ever After*’s Prince Henry “is not a person you meet at the ball who is a complete mystery up until then and a complete mystery after.” Likewise, Dougray Scott, who plays the character of Prince Henry in the film, commented in the same interview: “This prince has a story and a complex family history... you watch this character change and grow through the film.” While I have referred to the ‘humanising’ of characters, Fromm (1964) would denote that in *Ever After* the characters are presented dynamically; that is, the characters are portrayed in such a way that a connection can be made between the experiences and forces shaping and motivating behaviour and subsequent character and behavioural patterns.

In closing, it seems of especial note here to draw attention to the ethos early Chinese compiler Tuan Ch’eng-shih (800-863 AD) attributed to the folk tale. Similarly to Jung, who considers art as having a compensatory and educative role, Waley (1947) notes that:

Tuan... values the strange stories he tells not as literature nor as exotic samples of human fantasy, but as contributions to our knowledge of the hidden powers and influences that are all the time at work behind the stolid façade of everyday existence. (p. 227).

In introducing Jung and Fromm respectively, I have highlighted the concepts of individuation and productiveness. These two concepts provide the basis for postulating a mode of love and relatedness ‘beyond romance.’ Within the context of this discussion the difference between romantic ‘love’ and a more robust or mature capacity for relatedness is defined as the difference between connections that are based or contracted upon the abnegation of the individual self, and those premised upon self-knowledge, self-integrity and self-realisation.

It is important to highlight again that in emphasising the centrality of the self as the basis of relatedness, I am not thereby advocating individualism. The difference between individualism and individuation is the difference between trying to attain individuality at the

level of ego-attainment and engaging in the process of becoming one's true self via the path of self-knowledge. Hence, while individualism tends to alienate, individuation (rightly conceived) is the very factor that provides a solid foundation upon which genuine knowing of self and others is possible.

While I am postulating romantic love as inadequate in terms of providing a viable model for intimate relatedness and relatedness in general, it is recognised that romantic projections and attachments are part and parcel of the process of individuation. In Chapter Five, I point to Sanford's observation that the process of knowing self and others is something each individual must discover and work through for his/herself, and romantic attachments provide a context for such discovery. As pointed out in the method section, the psychological dynamic of projection (so characteristic not only of romantic attachments, but all human encounters), if understood, aids psychological growth and the development of consciousness and hence contributes to the quality of relatedness.

The value of examining romantic love at the symbolic/psychological level is based upon the recognition that the pattern for a mode of relatedness 'beyond romance' is contained within a symbolic reading of the myth of romance itself. Again, in positing the Cinderella and romantic myth as an individuation myth, I am not arguing against relatedness. Once the symbolic and psychological implications of romantic love are appreciated, friendship is still friendship, attraction is attraction, fate is fate, and love is love. However, it is argued that the nature of relatedness after symbolic comprehension and psychological maturation is different to the nature of relatedness before this occurs.

Chapter outlines

In Chapter One, within the context of examining the character of Cinderella as a symbol of the ego, I explore what the individual who identifies with her character is identifying with. One of the factors I draw attention to is the ego's sense of incompleteness and felt need for connection to something or someone outside of its narrow orbit. I posit that this need is an expression of the ego's desire to experience the self. However, as this is often unrecognised, the self is projected. Romantic relationships provide one context within which this projection occurs. I point to Jung's contention that the individual must come to a realisation of the self within, but that this is only possible if external projections are withdrawn and an introjection takes place. In this chapter, I also discuss the 'self,' embedding this

discussion within wider intellectual understandings of the individual. I argue that while the Jungian self may be a multiple self, it is not constructed or conceived as the discursive effect of culture. In the final section of this chapter, I examine some of the antecedent factors within Western culture that could account for why genuine self-love and expression (as argued here, a fundamental component of productive relatedness) seems so rare.

In Chapter Two, I discuss the parent/child connection and its impact upon adult relatedness. I engage in this examination from the starting point of comparing Cinderella with the step-sister characters, and pose for discussion whether Cinderella can be viewed as the only victim in the fairy tale. Many theorists point to the close affinity between the parent/child relationship and romantic attachments, noting that the romantic search is often an attempt to recreate the parent/child constellation and secure for oneself father/mother affirmation and protection. In this chapter, and again in Chapter Five, I posit that adult relatedness must be contracted upon emancipation from paradisaical fantasies and is not the site where one can expect compensation for one's childhood.

In Chapter Three, I discuss different facets of shadow that each in various ways impact upon the ability to relate well. I critique Freud's interpretation of Oedipus and draw attention to the more recent focus within psychoanalytic theorising upon Oedipus' victimisation. However, I argue that being a victim and being innocent or good are not one and the same thing. This point is important because, as I discuss, unless the individual becomes conscious of and takes responsibility for victimisation, s/he is in grave danger of perpetuating violence. I illustrate this point in a critique of the step-mother character. I also discuss symbiotic attachment, which – in contrast to productive relatedness - is defined as fusion without integrity and is premised upon sadomasochistic dynamics. In the final section, I argue that the same absence of shadow that characterises the ego figure in the Christian myth is continued in the Cinderella myth, and further, that being blind to one's shadow aspects is detrimental in terms of experiencing wholeness, both individually and in one's relationships.

In Chapter Four, in a critique of Prince Henry I highlight as part of the process of individuation and as a prerequisite for productive based relatedness the necessity for the ego to seek differentiation, both in relation to material reality and also in relation to the unconscious or psychic realm. In section two, I discuss 'relatedness beyond romance.' Drawing on sociologist Anthony Giddens critique of the changing nature of intimacy, I compare the sociological perspective with the archetypal perspective forwarded here. In section three, I examine the romantic ideal of there being a Mr/Ms. Right. Interpreted subjectively, I posit

that the romantic desire to find one's 'true love' is an expression of the ego's desire for self-realisation.

In Chapter Five, I discuss different facets of productive love, employing Fromm's distinction between the biblical 'God' and 'idol' symbols to delineate between productive based relatedness and romantically premised relatedness respectively. The primary emphasis in this chapter is upon the realisation and integrity of the self as the basis for productive love. In this chapter I also discuss the negative impact that remaining symbiotically attached to primary caregiver figures has in terms of being able to relate on an adult level.

Finally, in Chapter Six, with the view of posing for consideration one possible explanation for what is popularly understood as fate and is imaged as such within Cinderella and romantic mythology, I draw attention to investigations conducted at the University of Virginia examining the question of whether there are any grounds for the notion that consciousness exists prior to birth and survives death. I briefly comment on the implications of such investigations in terms of relationship discourse.

CHAPTER ONE

In the introduction to their collection of classic fairy tales, Iona and Peter Opie (1974) note that the magic in fairy tales “lies in people and creatures being shown to be *what they really are*” (p. 11; emphasis added). “The beggar woman at the well is really a fairy, the beast in ‘Beauty and the Beast’ is really a monarch, the frog is a handsome prince, the corpse of Snow White a living princess” (p. 11). Of Cinderella, Opie and Opie (1974) note that despite her menial position:

Cinderella is in fact her father’s heir... she has as much right by position and birth to be at the ball as have others who have been invited, and no fairy godmother was required to make her beautiful. Her clothes only, not her features, are transformed by the magic wand... and the courtier who comes from the palace searching for the unidentified guest recognizes her beauty despite the shabbiness of her attire, and urges she should be allowed to try on the glass slipper. (p. 11)

Opie and Opie (1974) continue their critique of Cinderella, noting that the transformation from kitchen hand to belle of the ball is not in fact a transformation at all, but rather “a disenchantment, the breaking of the spell” (p. 14). In their view, Cinderella, similarly to other fairy tales, is not a story of wishes coming true, “*but of reality made evident*” (p. 11; emphasis added). Thus, Opie and Opie (1974) note that:

With Cinderella... we have not only a girl who is worthy of becoming a princess... but a girl who is being supernaturally *prevented* from becoming a princess. When her situation is closely examined, particularly with the aid of parallels from different countries, she is seen to be under enchantment not when she is in her beautiful state, for that is her natural condition, but when she is in her *kitchen state*. (pp. 12-13)

Opie and Opie’s critique that in fairy tales characters are more than they appear to be - that is, that the true identity of a fairy tale character is often masked, lying latent behind the façade of outward appearance or imprisoned due to a curse or oppressive circumstances - provides a useful initiating point for the discussion that follows. Similarly to Opie and Opie, who note that behind the beggar woman is a fairy, behind the beast is a monarch and behind the frog a handsome prince, Jung posits that *behind the ego is the self*. Jung (1923) notes that “the fundamental subject, the self, is far more comprehensive than the ego...” (p. 623). Moreover, in the same way that the fairy, the monarch, and the handsome prince are who they have each been all along and who they are revealed to be once their respective enchantments are broken, Jung (1923) posits the self as the *a priori* “psychic structure of the subject prior to any ego-development” (p. 623). Jung (1963) notes that:

There is in the unconscious an already existing wholeness, the ‘homo totus’ of the Western and the *Chen-yen* (true man) of Chinese alchemy... the greater man within, the Anthropos, who is akin to God. This inner man is of necessity partly unconscious, because consciousness is only part of a man and cannot comprehend the whole. But the whole man is always present. (p. 152)

Opie and Opie’s positing that in fairy tales *reality is made evident* and fairy tale characters become *what they really are* is very similar to what Jung claims of individuation and the self. By engaging with the task of individuation, *reality is made evident* and through the realisation of the self the individual assumes or embodies his/her true identity. Jung (1946b) posits that “if we perseveringly and consistently follow the way of natural development, we arrive at the experience of the self, and at the state of being simply what one is” (p. 221).

In this chapter, I employ the methodological tool of interpretation at the subjective level to critique the character of Cinderella as a symbol of the ego and the Cinderella fairy tale in its entirety as a symbol of the self. In the final section of this chapter, I discuss the centrality and importance of love (referring here to ‘love’ in general), and focus in particular on the question of why the expression and experience of love at the level of social practice seems so rare within Western culture.

Cinderella: Identification and the ego

In the Cinderella fairy tale, the Cinderella character is the heroine figure. She is the character readers and viewers are most likely to identify with.¹¹³ Though, in thus stating, it is necessary to qualify that audience reception research shows that readers/viewers can identify with characters other than the main protagonist/s (Michaels, 1986; Fiske, 1989). In the Introduction, I noted that in *Ever After* (1998) the step-mother character is humanised to some extent. The more dynamically characters are presented, the more likely they are to also elicit audience attention and sympathy.¹¹⁴

¹¹³ I use the term identification as it is employed within psychoanalytic literature. However, the term ‘identification’ has been subject to much theorising within the field of film studies. In *Engaging Characters: Fiction, Emotion, and the Cinema* (1995), Murray Smith argues that the term identification is too broad and conflates processes which, while similar, should nonetheless be viewed as distinct. Smith proposes the more nuanced term ‘engagement’ to account for the way in which spectators identify with characters. Where, in the Introduction chapter, I have used the descriptive “humanised” to account for why in *Ever After* characters who are not usually identified with evoke identification, Smith would use the term ‘alignment.’ Alignment occurs through having subjective access to characters and is one of the levels of engagement which Smith sees as comprising a structure of sympathy and context for identification.

¹¹⁴ I explain what I mean by dynamic character presentation in Chapter Three.

Although clarifying that reader/viewer identification cannot be taken as given, hero/ine or central protagonist characters nonetheless retain numinosity as the figures that readers/viewers are most likely to identify with. Marc Davis, one of the animators who worked on the production of Disney's *Cinderella*, posits Cinderella as "somebody that you feel for" (Arends, 1995). Madonna Kolbenschlag (1979) describes Cinderella as a character who "at the personal and psychological level... evokes intense identification" (p. 72). Opie and Opie (1974) say of Cinderella that she is a character "who we are certain represents ourselves" (p. 11). Luthi (1984), commenting on the role of fairy tale hero/ines in general, writes that "the fairytale hero/ine stands at the center of the stories; it is with them that... listeners, readers, and narrators *identify*" (p. 134; emphasis added).

The ability of hero/ine characters to evoke reader/viewer identification has also been noted by theorists concerned with the ideological implications of romantic love. Janice Radway (1984), whose study of romance readers I highlighted in the Introduction, found that her interviewees rated being able to establish emotional identification with a central romantic heroine as one of the primary requirements of a "good" romance novel (p. 98). Highlighting the importance of identification between the reader and the romantic heroine, Radway notes that "the focus never shifts for these readers away from the woman at the center of the romance" (p. 83). Indeed, Radway found that her interviewees' identification with the romantic heroine was so absorbing that the readers lived "through the reading experience as the heroine" (p. 159). Radway also found that her interviewees identified with other characters within a romance novel only vicariously through the experience and emotions of the romantic heroine. Radway notes that "men are rarely valued for their intrinsic characteristics but become remarkable by virtue of the special position they occupy vis-à-vis the heroine" (p. 83).

While it may be assumed that as heroines, Cinderella characters/romantic protagonists attract the identification of female readers/viewers only, this does not appear necessarily so. Barbara Clendon, a New Zealand book-shop owner and romance mail-order distributor, told reporter Eleanor Black (2002) that "the people who read romantic fiction are just as diverse as the books themselves" (p. G2). Dorothy Evans, a salesperson of romance fiction and the principal participant in Radway's study of romance readers, commented that she suspected that many of the men who came to her store, supposedly to buy romance novels for their wives, were in fact purchasing the paperbacks for themselves. Reporter Graham Reid, who in 2004 interviewed retiring Auckland Professor of political studies Barry Gustafson, reports that

when he commented on Gustafson's substantial collection of books (which also contained a number of romance paperbacks), Gustafson glanced nervously behind him and confessed that "he enjoys picking up a Mills & Boon" (p. A28). Reid cites Gustafson as saying that he "likes the strong narrative" and that romance novels "are reasonably well written" (p. A28). While statistics suggest that most readers of romance novels *are* women (Radway, 1984), that both Evans' male customers and Gustafson showed some embarrassment in admitting their interest in romance fiction suggests that getting accurate statistics on the number of men who are consumers of romantic entertainment may not be easily forthcoming.¹¹⁵ Though, in citing the above comments, the more general point I wish to make is that in terms of attracting viewer identification the sex of the central protagonist within a given narrative/film genre appears to be less important than the fact that s/he *is* the hero/ine figure.

Thus far, I have highlighted that hero/ine or central protagonist characters tend to attract reader/viewer identification. This point provides the basis for the subjective reading that follows.

As noted in the Introduction, in psychic products, including fairy tales, psychic contents (complexes and archetypes) take on the character of a personality (Jung, 1931f). Employing the methodological tool of interpretation at the subjective level, the various characters of the Cinderella fairy tale are read symbolically as dynamic or living empirical images of psychic archetypes or processes. Andrew Samuels (1985) points out that, based upon his comparative research, Jung considered that ego-consciousness found cultural expression in the figure of the hero: "The larger-than-life nature of the hero stands for man's aspirations, and his various struggles and conflicts aptly express the uneven course of human existence" (p. 66).

From the perspective of a subjective reading, the tendency of readers/viewers to identify with the hero/ine character (in the Cinderella fairy tale, with Cinderella), is premised upon the hero/ine character's numinosity as a symbol of the ego; as noted, Cinderella is a character "who we are certain represents ourselves" (Opie & Opie, 1974, p. 11). The hero or heroine character is easily identified with and attracts identification because as an image or symbol of the ego s/he is psychologically recognisable and familiar.

Again, from the perspective of a subjective reading, the failure of readers/viewers to identify with characters other than the hero/ine, or to experience other characters only

¹¹⁵ Eleanor Black (2002) notes that New Zealand statistics for readers of romance are difficult to come by. Black reports that American sales of romance fiction for 2000 "totalled US\$1.37 billion (\$3.16 billion)" (p. G2). More recent figures for annual sales of romance fiction in the US is \$1.2 billion ("Romance Fiction," 2006).

vicariously from the perspective of the hero/ine character, is based on the premise I drew attention to in the methodology section - that while we identify with what we are familiar with and conscious of, we project what we do not know and are unconscious of.¹¹⁶ Unless we are aware of the shadow aspects of our personality we are unlikely to identify with a shadow character, such as the step-mother character.¹¹⁷ Similarly, unless we have achieved a sufficient amount of autonomy, we are unlikely to identify with a character who, like the Prince, exudes confidence and self-sufficiency. From a subjective psychological perspective, the tendency to identify with the character that symbolises the ego, and to fail to identify or to dis-identify with a character that, for example, symbolises the shadow, is a direct reflection of Jung's recognition that on the whole the individual identifies only with the ego or conscious aspect of his/her personality; that is, only with a partial aspect of his/her psychic self as a whole.¹¹⁸

Before examining what can be inferred from an analysis of Cinderella as a symbol of the ego, it seems useful for the purpose of elucidation to highlight the connection Fromm (1941) notes between viewer identification with a film or story character and viewers' subjective experience. Within the context of discussing the pervasive sense of powerlessness engendered within the greater European populace due to the outbreak of World War II, Fromm cites the immense popularity of Mickey Mouse pictures during the 1930s and 40s. Fromm (1941) highlights that in the Mickey Mouse pictures the one theme is that of something little being "persecuted and endangered by something overwhelmingly strong, which threatens to kill or swallow the little thing. The little thing runs away and eventually succeeds in escaping or even harming the enemy" (p. 132). Fromm maintains that the Mickey Mouse pictures could not have attained such widespread popularity unless they touched upon something close to the spectators' own emotional experience. In drawing a connection

¹¹⁶ Jung (1931f) notes that "everything that is unconscious in ourselves we discover in our neighbour, and we treat him accordingly" (p. 131).

¹¹⁷ It is perhaps necessary to comment here that even a person that is conscious of his/her shadow side is unlikely to want to identify with a shadow character. However, s/he is likely to understand a shadow character and to be less judgemental and more sympathetic. Translating this into everyday experience, a person that is conscious of his/her own shadow aspects is less likely to be judgemental of others. S/he is all too aware of his/her own shadow side. The more self-knowledge an individual has acquired (self-knowledge referring to knowledge not only of the ego, but the personality as a whole), the greater capacity s/he has to understand and empathise with others.

¹¹⁸ Though, in making this observation, it is of note that there is a vast difference between the static character depictions characteristic of early literary and film renditions of Cinderella and the dynamic and much more psychologically nuanced casting of character in *Ever After*, in which not only Cinderella, but also the Prince character and to a lesser extent the step-mother character and King character are also humanised and therefore presumably also able to elicit identification. It seems reasonable to infer that the shift from static to psychologically dynamic character presentations is indicative of and reflects increased psychological awareness on a cultural scale generally.

between the popularity of the Mickey Mouse theme and viewer identification, Fromm accordingly contends that it is evident that the “little thing threatened by a powerful, hostile enemy is the spectator himself; that is how he feels and that is the situation with which he can identify himself” (p. 132).

In the same way that Fromm attributes the popularity of the character of Mickey Mouse to the character’s psychological mirroring of the subjective experience of viewers, it is likewise possible to infer that the character of Cinderella and the characters of romantic heroines in general retain popularity not so much because they entertain, but primarily because they reflect at the level of the psyche the subjective psychological experience of those within Western culture to whom romantic ideology still retains its numinosity. Critiqued subjectively, Cinderella as a hero/ine character symbolises the ego and, as Fromm noted of the Mickey Mouse character, is identified with as ‘*the spectator him or herself.*’

Critiqued subjectively, what then does Cinderella as a symbol of the ego represent? And more to the point, what is the individual who psychologically identifies with her character identifying with? In what follows, I examine in relation to ego experience the central Cinderella themes that storytellers and film makers continue to highlight. These are Cinderella’s *abandonment*, Cinderella’s *goodness*, Cinderella’s *victimisation*, and Cinderella’s *longing for happiness*.¹¹⁹

The ego as abandoned. In most versions/variants of the fairy tale, Cinderella suffers abandonment as a child due to either one or both her parents dying. While the ego may not experience abandonment in this way, the fear of being abandoned is a common one, and it is likely that everyone experiences some degree of abandonment at some point. In relation to the experience of abandonment, I would like to suggest that the ego would not be afraid of being abandoned and could not experience abandonment were the ego not by definition incomplete. Moreover, it is the ego’s sense and experience of its own incompleteness that makes it susceptible to projection or - to employ a more apt descriptor - to worship. In fact, while there are many definitions of ego that could be proffered, I am of the view that the ego’s susceptibility to and capacity for worship is its defining characteristic. Transference, falling in love, religious devotion, fan or hero/ine worship or fanatical adherence to an ideal are all manifestations of the ego’s felt need for, dependence upon, and desire to be connected to something or someone outside its narrow orbit; that is, of the ego’s desire for

¹¹⁹ I am not postulating that the themes Cinderella represents are necessarily an accurate portrayal of the objective circumstances of viewers, but rather that these themes – in eliciting identification – can be inferred as reflecting at some level viewers’ *perceived subjective experience*.

transcendence.¹²⁰ The political and social philosopher William Godwin is quoted as saying: “There is nothing that the human heart more irresistibly seeks than an object to which to attach itself” (as cited in Evans, 2003, p. 1), seemed acutely aware of this. From a Jungian perspective, what the ego seeks and what is behind all the ego’s fantasies and striving is desire for the self, even though the ego may not recognise this. However, the ego can only experience the self to the degree worship becomes realisation, or in psychological parlance, projections are withdrawn and the contents they symbolise introjected. Jung (1956) denotes introjection as “the realization that the self lives in you and not in an external figure separated from and different from yourself” (p. 1638).

The ego as good. As Jung notes of the Christ symbol, read subjectively Cinderella is a symbol without psychological shadow.¹²¹ Jung (1957) notes the proclivity, characteristic not only of the micro ego but also the ‘macro ego,’ to project shadow and – blind to one’s own shortcomings or the shortcomings of one’s group - to find fault or to see evil in one’s opponent. However, while Jung (1931f) contends that most people tend to be less good than they imagine themselves to be, to denote the ego unaware of shadow does not *necessarily* mean that an individual will have a positive image of him/herself. Jung (1959b) notes that “exceptions to this rule are those... cases where the positive qualities of the personality are repressed, and the ego in consequence plays an essentially negative or unfavourable role” (p. 13). In this case, what is repressed or shadow is one’s ‘good’ qualities. However, whether one views oneself in predominantly positive terms or as bad and inferior, the point is that the ego’s perspective of itself tends to be limited and distorted. In this regard, Jung (1959b) notes of ‘self-knowledge’ that “it is manifestly *not* a knowledge of the nature of the ego” (p. 251), but encompasses knowledge of the personality as a whole, which necessitates an understanding of and recognition of shadow. Concerning how difficult this is, Jung (1959b) notes that:

The shadow is a moral problem that challenges the whole ego-personality, for no one can become conscious of the shadow without considerable moral effort. To become conscious of it involves recognizing the dark aspects of the personality as present and real. This act is the essential condition for any kind of self-knowledge, and it

¹²⁰ Fromm (1992) notes that “it should be remembered, as one looks at man’s existence as a whole, that the adult is not so different from the child in his helplessness toward the forces that determine his life. He is much more aware of them and of how little he can do to control them, and his helplessness is on an adult level. But, in a certain sense, this helplessness is not less than that of the child. Only the full unfolding of all his potentialities can enable him to face his objective helplessness while not seeking shelter in the ‘paradise phantasy’” (p. 41).

¹²¹ While overall Jung denotes Christ a symbol of the self, he notes that “the Christ-symbol lacks wholeness in the modern psychological sense, since it does not include the dark side of things but specifically excludes it in the form of a Luciferian opponent” (1959b, p. 74). I critique Jung’s reference to Christ as a symbol of the self in the section that follows.

therefore, as a rule, meets with considerable resistance. Indeed, self-knowledge as a psychotherapeutic measure frequently requires much painstaking work extending over a long period. (p. 14)

The ego as victim. Like abandonment, the experience of victimisation is one that perhaps everyone can identify with at least to some degree. Commenting from the perspective of his experience as a psychoanalyst, Fromm (1947) notes that “there is less reason to be puzzled by the fact that there are so many neurotic people than by the phenomenon that most people are relatively healthy in spite of the many adverse influences they are exposed to” (p. vii). In order to point to the pervasiveness of victimisation, I could draw upon any number of statistics. However, I will include just one. Jonathan Glover in *Humanity: A Moral History of the Twentieth Century* (1999) cites that it is estimated that 86 million people were killed in war between 1900 and 1989 (p. 47).¹²² This figure in itself is so staggering that it is incomprehensible.¹²³ However, any consideration of the human tragedy these deaths represent must also factor into the equation the immeasurable grief inflicted on the family and friends of those killed; and particularly the suffering of children. Fergal Keane, who in the wake of the genocide of Tutsis by Hutus in the mid-1990s,¹²⁴ visited Rwandan orphanages for children who had witnessed their parents hacked to death (as cited in Glover, 1999, p. 121), recounts “there were little boys and girls who had literally died of sorrow, withdrawing from everyone and refusing to eat or drink, until they finally wasted away” (p. 121). There are no words to describe the horror of a world in which little children should be so traumatised that they should literally ‘die of sorrow.’

Remaining with the theme of victimisation but changing the tenor somewhat, it is Cinderella’s victimisation that has been the main focus within feminist critique. Madonna Kolbenschlag (1979) notes that “we know that for the Prince we should read ‘Patriarchy’” (p. 75). Marcia K. Lieberman (1986) contends that the psycho-sexual dynamics of fairy tales as they have been reproduced for a Western sensibility and in which female heroines are invariably cast as passive and submissive have served “to acculturate women to traditional

¹²² Glover (1999) cites this figure from the 1989 edition of *World Military Expenditures*.

¹²³ Glover (1999) makes the important point that technology has been the factor in the scale of deaths in twentieth century war, noting that “the decisions of a few people can mean horror and death for hundreds of thousands, even millions, of other people” (p. 3). Glover rightly points out that “it is a myth that barbarism is unique to the twentieth century,” noting that “the whole of human history includes wars, massacres, and every kind of torture and cruelty” (p. 3). The twentieth century then is not to be seen as more barbaric than other periods of history. Rather, the enormous numbers of deaths and casualties are a reflection of the greater technological means to effect such widespread destruction.

¹²⁴ Glover (1999) notes that “Genocidal killing of Tutsis started in 1994 after Juvenal Habyarimana, the (Hutu) President of Rwanda, was killed in a plane crash. The Tutsis, probably unfairly, were blamed” (p. 120).

social roles” (p. 185). Karen E. Rowe (1986) states that “fairy tales perpetuate the patriarchal *status quo* by making female subordination seem a romantically desirable, indeed an inescapable fate” (p. 209). In the late 1970s, Shulamith Firestone (1979) argued that love “is the pivot of women’s oppression today” (p. 121). This same view is expressed more recently by Joan Forbes (1995), who contends that “much of women’s subordination to men can be understood as mediated through ideologies of romance and romantic love” (p. 294).

On the whole, feminist critiques of romantic love are based on an objective level of interpretation; that is, upon a literal reading of the myth. As noted, I do not dispute the ideological implications of romantic mythology. However, critiqued subjectively, I posit that the character of Cinderella symbolises the victimisation of the ego or individual, whether male or female; not the victimisation of a particular sex. Radway (1984) notes that in American culture “women are valuable not for their *unique personal qualities* but for their biological sameness and their ability to perform that essential role of maintaining and reconstituting others” (p. 208; emphasis added). I think Radway is right that women are not valued for their unique personal qualities, but I think it fair to ask whether the vast majority of men are valued for their unique personal qualities either. It is worthy of reflection that by becoming romantically involved, men are likewise placed in the role of having to maintain others; traditionally this was expressed in the role of provider, which I do not consider has been the enviable position it has perhaps been made out to be.¹²⁵ The majority of men are not employed in jobs in which their unique person is respected or in which they are given latitude for autonomy. Further, the circumstances and opportunities for the majority of men are such that the life of the Prince (i.e., of prosperity and success) is not open to them, despite their efforts.¹²⁶ Hence, while women have unquestionably suffered due to romantically premised ideology and the social expectations traditionally accompanying monogamous commitments, so too have men. It seems likely that the majority of men have more in common with and therefore can more readily identify with the victimised Cinderella than with the powerful Prince. Read subjectively, I posit that ‘the victim’ Cinderella symbolises is the *individual*,

¹²⁵ Kolbenschlag (1979) writes that “from the earliest years of consciousness the little boy thinks of himself as a potential *worker*. The little girl will more likely think of work as an adjunct to something else, to a *relationship*” (p. 77). This critique is somewhat dated now. However, I fail to see how a little boy thinking of himself as a worker is any less stereotypical or any less oppressive than a little girl thinking of herself as a relational being. In both cases the person’s individuality is subsumed to social roles. The argument is meant to proceed that this type of stereotyping produces men who get the best of both worlds, and women who *only* get to be in a relationship, and not a good one at that. But if women lose out by sacrificing autonomy for connectedness, men equally lose out by sacrificing their need and desire for relationship in order to cater to the considerable pressure they are under to subscribe to the dictates of success.

¹²⁶ Giddens (1993) points out that the common sense belief that anyone in capitalist societies can be successful if they will only work hard enough is largely based on myth (p. 241).

which is hidden and suppressed beneath traditional gender norms reinforced by a literal as opposed to symbolic reading and understanding of the romantic myth and romantic love.

Having posited Cinderella as a symbol of the ego's victimisation, I clarify that just as Cinderella is only one of the characters in the fairy tale as a whole, the ego is only part of the self. Hence, victimisation – along with the other Cinderella themes I examine here – constitutes only part of an individual's experience. As noted, critiqued in its entirety the Cinderella fairy tale can be read as a symbol of the self and hence as a symbol of the ego's capacity for emancipation and individuation.

The ego's longing for happiness. Terry Eagleton (1996) posits that what we all want, and what Fromm (1966) contends few people historically have attained to and experienced, is *simple human happiness*. In Disney's *Cinderella* (1950), the narrator recounts that despite her oppressive circumstances, "through it all Cinderella remained ever gentle and kind; for with each dawn she found new hope that some day her dreams of happiness would come true." As noted, a utopian ending is expected. If the central Cinderella or romantic protagonist does not get to live happily ever after, readers/viewers feel betrayed.

While, as noted by Eagleton, happiness may be what everyone fundamentally wants, utopia as a macro goal is one of those classical notions or Enlightenment norms generally rejected by proponents of postmodern thought. Writing from a Marxist perspective, Eagleton (1996) admits that to pretend Marxism is still a viable political reality would be intellectually dishonest. However, Eagleton, specifically addressing his postmodern interlocutors, contends: "It is just that it would be a good deal worse than dishonest... to relinquish the vision of a just society, and so to acquiesce in the appalling mess which is the contemporary world" (p. ix).

If one reads Fromm's writings, one can almost feel the pulse of utopian instinct and passion throughout. Fromm is clearly a utopian thinker. However, Fromm is realistic about whether happiness – either for the individual or at the social scale - is attainable. First of all, regarding the role of utopian thought in general, Fromm (1947) notes that "utopias are visions of ends before the realization of means, yet they are not meaningless; on the contrary, some have contributed greatly to the progress of thought, not to speak of what they have meant to uphold faith in the future of man" (p. 39n).¹²⁷ However, though in his credo, Fromm states: "I

¹²⁷ The word utopia was coined by Sir Thomas More, with his publication of the same name in 1516 (Schaer, 2000). While it is generally thought that utopias are unique to Western thought, Lyman Tower Sargent (2000) points out that some form of utopian thought has been found in "every culture that has ever been studied" (p. 8). There is a problem of definition with the term utopia and the way in which it has been employed that Jacques Barzun points. Barzun (2001) argues that since the word utopia – which means 'no-place' in Greek – in

believe in the perfectability of man” (1962, p. 182), he qualifies this statement, noting “but I doubt whether he will achieve his goal, unless he awakens soon” (p. 182). Fromm’s position is that the attainment of happiness both for the individual and at the socio-political scale is possible, but that its realisation is dependent on human intelligence and human effort.

While there is certainly much that is beyond the ego’s or individual’s control, I am in agreement with Fromm that whether or not happiness is achievable is to a large extent dependent on human effort. To draw an analogy, if an individual desires to be proficient at playing the piano, this goal is both achievable and unachievable. Given the individual has a modicum of talent, the goal is achievable if the individual enrolls in piano lessons, if s/he arranges access to a piano, and if s/he practices regularly. However, if the individual does not take lessons and does not practice, desire cannot translate into realisation. This is not because the desire was never realisable in the first place, but solely because the individual did not match vision with the necessary effort to bring it about. Leon Blum asks the question: “The human race had the wisdom to create science and art; why should it not be capable to create a world of justice, brotherliness and peace?”¹²⁸ (as cited in Fromm, 1956). It is instructive on this point as an example of perseverance to note that Thomas A. Edison, inventor of electric light, is said to have commented: “I’ve not failed. I’ve just found 10,000 ways that won’t work” (Moncur, 2005). I agree with Eagleton that just because humankind has *not yet* created a world of justice and peace, is no reason to give up on or abandon the project altogether.

Read subjectively, the Cinderella myth with its utopian focus on a ‘happily ever after’ affirms the ego’s utopian instinct, which Paul Tillich (1973) posits as innate. Moreover, as intuited by the Lebanese philosopher Kahlil Gibran, the hope of a better future is endowed with moral implications. Couched in poetic terms, Gibran (1972) espouses: “In your longing for your giant self lies your goodness and that longing is in all of you” (p. 60).

Having examined the themes Cinderella symbolises in relation to ego experience, in the following section I discuss the self and individuality.

all languages has been used to describe what their authors consider ideal states and happy societies, these writings should rather be referred to as Eutopias (i.e., literally ‘good-place’ in Greek) (p. 117).

¹²⁸ It is of interest that Blum, similarly to Jung, attributes the source of creative ideas and future developments as deriving from a primordial source. Blum continues: “The human race has produced Plato, Homer, Shakespeare, and Hugo, Michelangelo and Beethoven, Pascal and Newton, all these human heroes whose genius is only the contact with the fundamental truths, with the innermost essence of the universe. Why then should the same race not produce those leaders capable of leading it to those forms of communal life which are closest to the lives and the harmony of the universe?” (as cited in Fromm, 1956).

The Cinderella fairy tale: Individuality and the self

While, as I begin by noting, the discovery of the unconscious has been employed as a premise for postulating ‘the death of man’ as Michel Foucault once famously coined it,¹²⁹ I aim to argue in this section that it is the unconscious psyche which gives individuality and its claims irrefutable foundation.

Walter Truett Anderson (1997) notes that the “calling into question the idea of *any* self as a stable, continuing entity apart from its own fleeting descriptions of itself” (p. 42)¹³⁰ is part of a global identity crisis that has many scientific and intellectual antecedents (p. 68). Denoting the self “the psychologist’s stock in trade” (p. xiv), Anderson cites Freudian psychoanalytic theory, which is “built upon a mental trinity of id, ego, and superego” (p. 69), as one of the intellectual antecedents which helped pave the way for a “much more radically decentered view of the self...” (p. 69). Citing Freud’s contribution to modern thought, Anderson (1997) notes that:

Freud’s concept of the unconscious was one of the most powerful new ideas brought into the world in the twentieth century, and one that – even though it has now faded to the status of everyday jargon – we still have not fully assimilated. Freud knew how historically important his contribution was. In an oft-quoted lecture he immodestly described his work as a blow to human vanity equal to those that had been dealt already by the discoveries of Copernicus and Darwin. Copernicus had shown that our Earth is not the center of the universe; Darwin had revealed us to be descended from the animal kingdom; and Freud (said Freud) ‘[sought] to prove to the ego that it is not even master in its own house, but must content itself with scanty information of what is going on unconsciously in the mind.’ (pp. 69-70)

Historian Keith Windschuttle (1994) – in a critique of Foucauldian theory – contends that it is the hypothesis of the unconscious which has given grounds to anti-humanist ideas which postulate as illusive values such as the autonomy of the individual and individual agency. Windschuttle (1994) notes that:

From a humanist perspective, the individual is a free agent who normally weighs up the issues confronting him and makes his own, rational decision about what to do. The anti-humanist rejects this as naïve, for it omits the dimension of the unconscious. The

¹²⁹ Keith Windschuttle (1994) notes that this declaration by Foucault appears in *The Order of Things*, published in 1966. Windschuttle notes that Foucault meant by ‘the death of man’ that humanist philosophy, which endorses the idea of the individual subject, “had now been overthrown” (p. 124). However, Windschuttle points out that Foucault was inconsistent in his employment of the phrase. In response to criticism (most notably by Ferry and Renaut) Windschuttle notes that Foucault eventually claimed that “the real meaning of ‘the death of man’ was that ‘man does not exist and never did’” (p. 135).

¹³⁰ Anderson (1997) notes that “this ‘decentered’ view is particularly popular among poststructuralist French intellectuals, and it usually takes the form of denying that the speaking subject – the ‘I’ of our personal consciousness – really exists at all” (p. 42).

concept of the unconscious... has allowed anti-humanists to proclaim that the entire humanist tradition has been wrong to assign to the conscious mind the central role in the functioning of a human being. They believe that the unconscious is the dominant influence on behaviour and thought, and that we must abandon the assumption that purposive action is consciously directed. Hence, we must reject our belief in the autonomy of the individual subject. (p. 124)

While, as argued by Windschuttle, the discovery by depth investigators of an unconscious realm and unconscious activity may have been employed to support theories which posit individual identity and individual agency illusive, neither Jung nor Fromm conceive of the unconscious in this manner nor employ the discovery thereof to this end. As noted, in what follows, I make a case for the opposite thesis; that is, that it is the discovery of the unconscious psyche and recognition thereof that provides the very basis for a more complete understanding of the individual and individuality.

Anderson (1997) points to some of the descriptors for the self employed by postmodern theorists: “The multiple self, the protean self, the decentered self, the self-in-relation” (p. 226). However, though taking into consideration Eagleton’s caution that “postmodernism is such a portmanteau phenomenon that anything you assert of one piece of it is almost bound to be untrue of another” (1996, p. viii), what all postmodern descriptors of the self appear to share in common is that they are premised upon the notion or postulate that the self is *constructed*. Before continuing, I want to make the point that regardless of the descriptor employed, to denote the self constructed is in effect to purport a ‘no-self’ theory. To say that the self is multiple, decentered, or discontinuous may sound less theoretically confrontational than to say that the self is a fiction or the self does not exist, but it is a more benign way of saying the same thing. If the self is constructed; if it is merely effect, then it is nothing in and of itself. Moreover, it is of note that while the basis for the intellectual rejection of the self and individual autonomy may be founded or premised upon the idea of the unconscious, it is the role of culture in constructing identity – not the unconscious psyche – which postmodern theorists tend to emphasise.

Jung would not dispute the idea of the multiplicity of the self or psyche. Jung observed that at both the personal and collective level the ego inhabited a psyche “peopled” by complexes and archetypes.¹³¹ Hence, noting that the psyche displays a marked tendency

¹³¹ Jung (1937) notes that “the difference between archetypes and the dissociated products of schizophrenia [i.e., complexes] is that the former are entities endowed with personality and charged with meaning, whereas the latter are only fragments with vestiges of meaning – in reality, they are products of disintegration. Both, however, possess to a high degree the capacity to influence, control, and even to suppress the ego-personality, so that a temporary or lasting transformation of personality ensues” (p. 254). However, while Jung refers in this

toward dissociation, Jung (1937) did not conceive of the unconscious as a homogeneous structure (p. 252). Nor is it likely Jung would have taken issue with the postmodern idea of the self as discontinuous. While in temporal time Tuesday follows Monday, week after week, in continuous and predictable cycle, Jung (1950) noted that the psyche is not subject to temporal or spatial restrictions.¹³² For example, we can be thinking about what we are going to cook for dinner and in the next instance remember a conversation with a friend ten years ago. In the dream state, we can remember events of the previous day or intuit a happening months in the future. Yet recognition of the personality's multiplicity was not viewed by Jung as grounds for rejecting the notion of any self-coherence at all; certainly not grounds for denying individual identity or evading the responsibility of individual agency. Jungian analyst Sherry Salman (1997), pointing out that for Jung the idea of multiplicity is contained within and circumscribed by the recognition of psychic unity and directedness, notes that:

Jung conceived of a psyche having many important structures and centers of gravity, concurrently self-regulating, dissociative, and striving toward order through the Self. Since the psyche is dissociable by nature, its assimilation by the ego is a never-ending process. Jung perceived a yawning gulf between the ego and the unconscious, a gulf that is sometimes bridged but never eradicated, and his formulation included the idea of forever dissociated 'irredeemable' pieces of psyche. *But within this seemingly chaotic system there is also order: the Self, the structuring, teleological force behind development and symptomology, the destiny and mystery factor in psychological process.* (p. 63; emphasis added)

Fromm, similarly to Jung, far from conceiving of the unconscious as grounds for rejecting or negating the idea of an individual self, notes that the chief aim of psychoanalysis is "to know oneself" (1994, p. 45). Fromm (1994) notes that "psychoanalysis is not only a therapy, but an instrument for self-understanding. That is to say an instrument for self-liberation, an instrument in the art of living, which is... the most important function psychoanalysis can have" (p. 46). Even more to the point, Fromm (1992) notes that "the understanding of my own unconscious and its incompatibility with my conscious image of

quote to complexes as dissociated products "observable in psychopathology" (p. 253), he also points out that complexes and the tendency of the psyche to split is fundamentally "a normal phenomenon" (p. 253). Jung (1937) notes that "it need not be a question of... schizophrenic alterations of personality, but merely of so-called 'complexes' that come entirely within the scope of the normal. Complexes are psychic fragments which have split off owing to traumatic influences or certain incompatible tendencies" (p. 253). Regarding archetypal components of the personality not yet assimilated, Jung notes that "the behaviour of *new* contents that have been constellated in the unconscious but are not yet assimilated to consciousness is similar to that of complexes.... Like complexes, they lead a life of their own so long as they are not made conscious and integrated with the life of the personality" (p. 254).

¹³² Jung (1950) notes that the empirical proof of the non-spatial and non-temporal quality of the unconscious "is the occurrence of so-called telepathic phenomena" (p. 249). While Jung notes that such phenomena "are still denied by hypersceptical critics" (p. 249), he points out that "in reality they are much more common than is generally supposed" (p. 249).

myself – is precisely the discovery that gives psychoanalysis its importance as a radical step in man’s *self-discovery and toward a new form of sincerity*” (p. 34; emphasis added). For both Jung and Fromm, the unconscious is not a grave in which to bury the individual, but the fertile soil nourishing his/her unfolding and flowering. Far from legitimating the heralding of the death of the individual, the unconscious psyche is the very factor that above all validates individual existence and provides the condition for a fuller and more authentic experience of selfhood. Pointing to the role of the unconscious in guarding the individual from influences inimical to his/her authenticity and protecting him/her from artificiality, Jung (1964) notes that:

Messages from the unconscious are of greater importance than most people realize. In our conscious life, we are exposed to all kinds of influences. Other people stimulate or depress us, events at the office or in our social life distract us. Such things seduce us into following ways that are unsuitable to our individuality. Whether or not we are aware of the effect they have on our consciousness, it is disturbed by and exposed to them almost without defense.... The more that consciousness is influenced by prejudices, errors, fantasies, and infantile wishes, the more the already existing gap will widen into a neurotic dissociation and lead to a more or less artificial life, far removed from healthy instincts, nature, and truth. (p. 49)

Before commenting directly on the Cinderella fairy tale as a symbol of the self, I will continue my defence of the unconscious as the grounds for a more complete understanding of the individual and experience of individuality within the context of commenting on a dream I had while endeavouring to come to terms with postmodern intellectual conceptions of the individual or self and my own fundamental concerns regarding these conceptions. Regarding the dream, as is often the case, I did not understand its meaning at the time. However, when I looked at the dream again a few weeks subsequent to having it (I had written it down at the time), it seemed to me that it related to the concerns regarding the fate of the individual within much intellectual discourse I intuited but was unable to formulate or articulate in purely rational or intellectual terms. Jung (1931d) notes that “there are numerous instances of an intellectual problem, unsolved in the waking state, being solved in a dream” (p. 299). As I am employing a dream as a medium of critique, I will pause momentarily to comment on dreams and their interpretation in more general terms.

Fromm (1951) posits “that the ability to be puzzled is the beginning of wisdom...” (p. 3). If one takes account of one’s dreams, one will be confronted with much that puzzles. Dreams are irrational phenomena (again, irrational referring to something beyond reason, not contrary to it). They share this in common with the individual, who – as Jung (1957) notes – is also an “irrational datum” (p. 498). Yet it is the ‘irrationality’ of dreams and their

mysterious quality that endows them with healing efficacy and makes them particularly suited to the vital role they play in supporting individuality and guarding subjectivity. Dreams cannot be fathomed in some ‘one-size-fits-all’ manner.¹³³ If so treated, their essential meaning is lost. Jung (1934a) notes that:

...when we consider the infinite variety of dreams, it is difficult to conceive that there could ever be a method or a technical procedure which would lead to an infallible result. It is, indeed, a good thing that no valid method exists, for otherwise the meaning of the dream would be limited in advance and would lose precisely that virtue which makes dreams so valuable for therapeutic purposes – their ability to offer new points of view. (p. 319)

Because dreams are highly individual and ‘irrational’ in nature, Jung forwards general principles for their understanding only. These are: Dreams can be taken as having a meaning; dreams play a compensatory role in relation to ego-consciousness;¹³⁴ and many dreams are best interpreted subjectively. Jung (1934a) notes that “one should never forget that one dreams in the first place... of oneself” (p. 321). For example, an individual may dream of a family member or work colleague, thinking that the dream refers to and is an objective picture of the person featuring in the dream, when in actuality the individual is dreaming of and being shown an unknown aspect of his/herself projected onto the other person.¹³⁵ Overall however, Jung’s guiding principle was this: “So difficult is it to understand a dream that for a long time I have made it a rule, when someone tells me a dream and asks for my opinion, to say first of all to myself: ‘I have no idea what this dream means.’ After that I can begin to examine the dream” (1948, p. 533). Jung was wholly opposed to “routine recipes such as are found in vulgar little dream-books” (p. 543), espousing that “stereotyped interpretation of dream-motifs is to be avoided” (p. 543).

¹³³ Jung (1964) notes that “no dream symbol can be separated from the individual who dreams it, and there is no definite straightforward interpretation of any dream. Each individual varies so much in the way that his unconscious complements or compensates his conscious mind that it is impossible to be sure how far dreams and their symbols can be classified at all” (p. 53).

¹³⁴ Regarding the compensatory role of dreams, Jung (1964) notes that “the general function of dreams is to try to restore our psychological balance by producing dream material that re-establishes, in a subtle way, the total psychic equilibrium. This is what I call the... compensatory role of dreams in our psychic make-up” (p. 50; see also 1953, p. 274).

¹³⁵ Jung (1934a) gives the following case examples: “I remember two instructive cases: one of my patients dreamed of a drunken tramp who lay in a ditch, and another of a drunken prostitute who rolled about in the gutter. The first patient was a theologian, the second a distinguished lady in high society. Both of them were outraged... and absolutely refused to admit that they had dreamed of themselves.... The subtle process of self-knowledge often begins with a bomb-shell like this. The ‘other’ person we dream of is not our friend and neighbour, but the other in us, of whom we prefer to say: ‘I thank thee, Lord, that I am not as this publican and sinner.’ Certainly the dream, being a child of nature, has no moralizing intention; it merely exemplifies the well-known law that no trees reach up to heaven” (p. 321).

In the above comment on dreams and dream interpretation, I have referred to dreams that have personal significance. While the difficulty of interpreting one's own dreams must be acknowledged and while a particular interpretation cannot be proven,¹³⁶ dreams can – as noted – shed light on intellectual problems. It is in this latter capacity that I forward and comment on the following dream:

I was with two others in uniform. We were trying to escape. We knocked on a lady's door. The house was flash. It had pink stairs. We wanted to go through her house to access the beach which was behind her house. The woman was suspicious of us. She asked us our names. We lied. We wrote names on her blackboard that were false. We were climbing over her back wall. I climbed over; one of my companions also. But then I realised that we had taken off our jackets to climb the wall and that they had our real names on name tags in the pockets. I signalled to the last person to climb over the wall that we must get our uniforms. I woke.

In the dream, my companions and I were trying to escape. The woman in the dream could be understood to represent what we were endeavouring to escape from. The woman personifies materialistic values.

The beach that we were trying to access could be viewed as a symbol of the unconscious.¹³⁷ Within the context of this dream, it represents what materialism excludes; that is, those things which due to their incompatibility with the values of twenty-first century materialism and rationalism is repressed and hence forms in the unconscious a compensatory shadow. My companions and I were wanting to escape the narrow definition and conditioning of our lives and were in search of those values that society excludes; we were in search of a fuller and richer experience of life.

In the dream my companions and I nearly achieve our goal. We manage to get past the woman and over the wall to the beach. However, it seems we had been so intent on escaping we had not actually planned what we were going to do once we arrived at our desired destination. In one respect the beach conjures up romantic notions of liberation and freedom. But the sea can also be very dangerous; as can the unconscious. We merely achieved what Fromm refers to as “freedom from” or negative freedom (see Chapter Three for further discussion). We had no capacity and no resources to realise “freedom to”; the positive form of freedom that would enable us to productively benefit from our encounter with the unconscious. It is of note here that at no time does Jung advocate the abandonment to the

¹³⁶ See footnote 266 for further discussion of this point.

¹³⁷ While within Jungian psychology there are no fixed meanings with respect to symbols, Jung (1948b) nonetheless writes that “the sea is the favourite symbol for the unconscious” (p. 406).

unconscious that in this dream we seem to be pursuing. As noted in the Introduction, Jung repeatedly emphasises the dialectical relationship between consciousness and the unconscious.

When the woman in the dream asked us our names, we lied. We wrote names on her blackboard that were false. In reflecting on the dream, I initially could not fathom why the woman should have a blackboard in her house. The woman's house was decorated tackily (e.g., the pink stairs). Nonetheless, the blackboard did not seem to fit with the general décor. However, the blackboard – symbolising the various ways in which society “schools” the individual – could be understood as the very foundation of the woman's whole life. The woman personifies the type of lifestyle that uncritical acceptance of societal values produces and the woman could only relate to people through the medium of the blackboard. The woman required us to write our names on the blackboard. We did not introduce ourselves personally. Being unable to relate directly to her we naturally and unavoidably assumed false identities. Further, the woman's lifestyle created an enormous shadow. Just behind her house was the beach; that is, access to the unconscious. But the woman was not at all interested in exploring the beach. We had to climb over a wall to access the beach, there was no door or pathway to it. The woman's house and lifestyle blocked access to the unconscious, in the same way that present day societal and intellectual values block access to all but a superficial experience of life. I think the dream, in highlighting the falsity we had to assume in relation to the woman by writing false names on her blackboard, legitimates the attempt to find freedom from the socially “schooled” lifestyle the woman personifies.

However, while the dream legitimates the desire to escape schooled or socially conditioned falsity as symbolised by the blackboard and personified by the woman, it does not endorse or legitimate an idealistic escape from all constraining influences per se; as symbolised by our real names being embedded in uniforms. When I first woke from this dream I still felt the emotion of fear that I felt in the dream when I realised how important it was for us to take our jackets with us. Since the dream was then vivid in my mind, I thought that the emotion I felt was due to my fear of being caught. It was obvious that the woman was going to search through our belongings. However, upon reflection, it occurs to me that the deeper and more unconscious reason I felt so afraid was not because I was afraid of being found out but rather because I was afraid of becoming lost. If, however, the constraints upon the individual are not only social ones as symbolised by the blackboard, what other constraints are there? What do the uniforms symbolise?

My understanding of the ‘uniform’ symbol as opposed to the ‘blackboard’ symbol is this: It is ‘uniform’ of the human condition that there are constraints on individual freedom, but I venture that these constraints are first and foremost of an extramundane nature.¹³⁸ Moreover – and I consider this the fundamental point of the dream - unlike ‘blackboard’ constraints, ‘uniform’ or extramundane constraints are not inimical to individual unfolding and individual flowering, but rather support and provide the very basis for individuality without which – as Jung (1957) words it – the individual “has no other ground under his feet except the pavement” (p. 506). I will endeavour to explain.

Jung (1957) notes that it is a “psychological fact that the life of the individual is not determined solely by the ego and its opinions or by social factors, but quite as much, if not more, by a transcendent authority” (p. 509). In determining whether the individual is a discursive effect or product (i.e., a social construction), it is of note that the physical, emotional, intellectual, and constitutional characteristics with which individuals are born are not socially determined, but seem rather to be determined by and related to extramundane factors associated with fate (i.e., with mysterious factors beyond our capacity to comprehend). While social factors and influence are part of the ‘uniform’ constraints the individual is subject to and while societal conditions interact with the extramundane factors that impact upon the individual’s life, it nonetheless appears that the social is subsumed under the extramundane and not the extramundane under the social. The social can only impact upon the individual inasmuch as there *is* an individual, and the individual is not merely the product of socially conditioned forces but is rather an irrational phenomenon of nature with a potential individuality which pre-exists the societal conditions s/he encounters. As noted, Jung (1957) emphasises the irrational nature of the individual, noting that “the individual... as an irrational datum, is the true and authentic carrier of reality, the *concrete* man as opposed to the unreal ideal or ‘normal’ man to whom the scientific statements refer” (p. 498).

I consider the reason Jung’s body of work is so affirming of the individual is that in its account of the unconscious, it is a body of thought that recognises and affirms the irrational

¹³⁸ The extramundane refers here to the irrational factors of experience associated with the psyche and psychic realm. Concerning the existence of the extramundane and the reality thereof, Bernard Haisch in *The God Theory* (2006), notes that: “You cannot get away from the preexistence of something, and whether that is an ensemble of physical laws generating infinite random universes or an infinite conscious intelligence is something present-day science cannot resolve, and indeed one view is not more rational than the other. One might argue that one view is supported by evidence and the other is not. I would agree one hundred percent. The evidence for the existence of an infinite conscious intelligence is abundant in the accounts of the mystics and the meditative, prayerful, and sometimes spontaneous exceptional experiences of human beings throughout history. The evidence for random universes is precisely zero. Most scientists will reject that former type of evidence as merely subjective, but that simply reduces the contest of views to a draw: zero on both sides” (p. xi).

and extramundane factors of life and experience, and in so doing recognises the foundations of individuality and therefore the individual him/herself. Noting that the individual is estranged from him/herself when s/he “succumbs to the collective mentality” (1957, p. 507), Jung points out that “it is possible to have an attitude to the external conditions of life only when there is a point of reference outside them” (p. 506). It is the extramundane that provides this point of reference. Regarding the position of the individual without extramundane undergirding and defence, Jung (1957) notes that:

If statistical reality is the only one, then that is the sole authority. There is then only *one* condition, and since no contrary condition exists, judgment and decision are not only superfluous but impossible. Then the individual is bound to be a function of statistics and hence a function of the State or whatever the abstract principle of order may be called. (p. 506)

However, as Jung empirically substantiates, statistical or social reality is not the only reality. Jung (1957) notes that:

It is not ethical principles, however lofty, or creeds, however orthodox, that lay the foundations for the freedom and autonomy of the individual, but simply and solely the empirical awareness, the incontrovertible experience of an intensely personal, reciprocal relationship between man and an extramundane authority which acts as a counterpoise to the ‘world’ and its ‘reason’.... the individual will never find the real justification for his existence and his own spiritual and moral autonomy anywhere except in an extramundane principle capable of relativizing the overpowering influence of external factors. (pp. 509, 511)

To postulate that it is the extramundane that provides the basis for individuality necessarily forces into the discussion the question of God, since in the mind of perhaps the majority of people the extramundane and an anthropomorphic God are inextricably linked. I want to clarify that while Jung himself considered the existence of God a fact,¹³⁹ he in no wise forces this belief on others. Further, ‘belief in God’ – and, in particular, adherence to a religious creed or the following of religious dogma - is certainly not considered by Jung

¹³⁹ In his autobiography Jung (1963a) writes that “God was, for me... one of the most certain and immediate of experiences” (p. 70). In an interview in 1955 with English journalist Frederick Sands, Jung stated that “all that I have learned has led me step by step to an unshakable conviction in the existence of God. I only believe in what I know. And that eliminates believing. Therefore I do not take His existence on belief – I *know* that He exists” (1977, p. 251). However, in his scientific writings, Jung clearly stays within the bounds of what is empirically verifiable, distinguishing between the archetype or image of God and a theological understanding of God which, as Jung (1960) notes, assumes “that the metaphysical *Ens Absolutum* is meant” (p. 17). At one point, Jung (1944) states that “I talk about ‘God’... with the same right as humanity has from the beginning equated the numinous effects of certain psychological facts with an unknown primal cause called God. This cause is beyond my understanding, and therefore I can say nothing further about it except that I am convinced of the existence of such a cause, and indeed with the same logic by which one may conclude from the disturbance of a planet’s course the existence of a yet unknown heavenly body. To be sure, I do not believe in the absolute validity of the law of causality, which is why I guard against ‘positing’ God as cause, for by this I would have given him a precise definition” (p. 1471).

prerequisite in order to experience the extramundane. In fact, Jung (1957) states that formulaic adherence to a religious creed “does nothing to give the individual any foundation” (p. 509), and he was of the opinion that his formulations would “not please either the mass man or the *collective believer*” (p. 510; emphasis added). What Jung does espouse as the necessary prerequisite of individuality is a “subjective relationship to certain metaphysical, extramundane factors” (p. 507), and a “conscientious regard for the irrational factors of the psyche and individual fate” (p. 514). Jung refers to this as the religious instinct or religious attitude. Again however, Jung uses the word ‘religion’ in a definite way. Jung (1957) notes that “a creed gives expression to a definite collective belief, whereas the word *religion* expresses a subjective relationship” (p. 507).¹⁴⁰

To link the discussion back into wider intellectual discourse regarding the individual: Windschuttle, whom I referred to earlier, notes that Foucault’s reference to the ‘death of man’ was a direct allusion to “Nietzsche’s proclamation of ‘the death of God’” (1994, p. 124). If God is understood as a symbol of the extramundane and a symbol of the self, rather than in relation to a dogma or creed, positing the ‘death of God’ inevitably leads to positing the ‘death of man’; that is, to a ‘no-self’ ideology.¹⁴¹ From a subjective/psychological perspective, the God symbol is psychologically important because it symbolises the goal of individuation; the realisation of the self.¹⁴² Jung (1959b) notes that “as the highest value and supreme dominant in the psychic hierarchy, the God-image is immediately related to, or identical with, the self, and everything that happens to the God-image has an effect on the latter” (p. 170). And moreover: “...*the destruction of the God-image is followed by the annulment of the human personality*” (p. 170).

In considering whether God – either literally or symbolically - can be postulated dead just by proclaiming so, it is of note that postmodernism is not a ‘God’-less ideology. Jung (1957) notes that in dictator regimes the state replaces God, and comments “that is why... the socialist dictatorships are religions and State slavery is a form of worship” (p. 511). I do not

¹⁴⁰ In order to clarify terminology, what Jung refers to as creed, Tacey (2004) denotes as religion; and what Jung refers to as religion or the religious attitude, Tacey denotes as spirituality. Hence, what Jung refers to as ‘religion’ is more popularly referred to today as spirituality, which – in current usage – denotes a personal, as opposed to collective or dogmatically premised, relationship to extramundane factors.

¹⁴¹ To posit ‘God’ a symbol is not to imply that God is nothing but a symbol (see Jung, 1956, p. 1589).

¹⁴² Concerning the relation or identity between the individual and the God symbol, Jung (1963) notes that “it is the rooted conviction of the West that God and the ego are worlds apart. In India, on the other hand, their identity was taken as self-evident. It was the nature of the Indian mind to become aware of the world-creating significance of the consciousness manifested in man. The West, on the contrary, has always emphasized the littleness, weakness, and sinfulness of the ego, despite the fact that it elevated one man to the status of divinity. The alchemists at least suspected man’s hidden godlikeness, and the intuition of Angelus Silesius finally expressed it without disguise” (p. 131).

wish to imply a parallel between dictator regimes and postmodern theory; I merely wish to point out that if rejected in one form, God (as a symbol of the extramundane and a symbol of the self) reappears in another. Postmodernism declares itself against grand narratives, but imposes one (if not more) of its own; namely the grand narrative of the almightiness of culture. In medieval religion, a superego God was accorded all agency and privilege. In postmodern theory, culture is the ‘Almighty.’ When the symbolic implications of ‘God’ are not taken into account and when the individual does not have a subjective relationship to the extramundane, what is accorded value as ‘God’ changes, but the fate of the individual is the same. The individual is posited powerless and insignificant. I consider that until it is recognised that God or the God symbol cannot be done away with and that, in any case, even were it possible, killing God is not in the best interests of humanity, humankind will perpetually make of God a superego figure: Jung (1954e) notes that:

So long as the self is unconscious, it corresponds to Freud’s superego and is a source of perpetual moral conflict. If, however, it is withdrawn from projection... then one is truly one’s own yea and nay. The self then functions as a union of opposites and thus constitutes the most immediate experience of the Divine which it is psychologically possible to imagine. (p. 396)

I say that killing God is not in the best interests of humanity because, as the dream indicates – and differently to ‘God’ projected as a superego figure - the ‘uniform’ extramundane constraints do not limit the individual or individual expression, but provide the very basis for it. ‘God’ is only limiting when unconsciously projected, and God *is* projected (i.e., every person has a God or gods), if and to the extent the self is not realised and the individuality of the individual lies latent and yet undiscovered. Both Jung and Fromm recognise that the religious instinct is innate.¹⁴³ That is why any ideology that denies the existence of God or the reality of the extramundane becomes a religion in itself; that is, it inevitably becomes what it denies. If the individual’s innate religiosity is not employed in the service of his/her life, the religious forces of the individual are “swallowed up” (1957, p. 511) - as Jung words it – along with his/her individuality in some collective object or endeavour. What Jungian psychology both in theory and practice seeks to do is to reclaim the individual’s instinctive religiosity from a collective or alienated goal and channel this instinct for meaning and wholeness in the service of the individual’s self realisation; that is, in the service of the

¹⁴³ Fromm (1947) points out that the “need for a system of orientation and devotion is an intrinsic part of human existence” (p. 58), and argues that while the content of an individual’s particular religion may differ, the basic need from which it stems does not (p. 57). As Fromm notes, “all men are ‘idealists’ and are striving for something beyond the attainment of physical satisfaction” (p. 58).

individual's individuality.¹⁴⁴ Jung (1957) contends that “were not the autonomy of the individual the secret longing of many people it would scarcely be able to survive the collective suppression either morally or spiritually” (p. 529). It might be added that were not the autonomy of the individual rooted in the indestructibility of the extramundane that this longing would scarcely be able to survive the oppressive influence of intellectual theories which – in a one-sided fashion - emphasise the ubiquitousness of culture and so side with the collective mentality against the individual. Such theories are ultimately dystopian. They reckon without the extramundane and therefore can decenter the individual out of existence without qualm. Yet – as Jung (1957) observes – “the individual human being... in the end will assert his claims” (p. 516).

Having defended the notion of individuality in more general terms, I want finally to draw the discussion back to the Cinderella fairy tale in its role as a symbol of the self. In section one of this chapter, I postulated and examined Cinderella as a symbol of the ego. Here, I point to the Cinderella fairy tale in its entirety as a symbol of the self. Jung (1959b) notes of the Christ symbol¹⁴⁵ that:

Monophysite dogma has a noteworthy psychological aspect: it tells us (in psychological parlance) that since Christ, as a man, corresponds to the ego, and, as God, to the self, he is at once both ego and self, part and whole. Empirically speaking, consciousness can never comprehend the whole, but it is probable that the whole is unconsciously present in the ego. (p. 171)

This is one of the few places where Jung refers to Christ as symbolising, in part, the ego. On the whole, Jung critiques the Christ figure as a symbol of the self; though acknowledging that this is problematic in that the Christ figure lacks shadow. As I note at greater length in Chapter Three, the shadow – as an unavoidable aspect of the personality - causes difficulty only when projected or repressed. Recognised and integrated, the shadow is a vital aspect of the self or the personality as a whole. Jung (1959a) notes that “anyone who perceives his shadow and his light simultaneously sees himself from two sides and thus gets in the middle” (p. 872).

¹⁴⁴ In an interview with Georg Gerster just a year before he died, Jung (1977) commented that “we have been so convinced by science how nugatory a human life is, and contemporary history has indeed demonstrated before our eyes how human lives count for nothing. And the individual is so utterly convinced of his nothingness that he makes no effort to get anywhere with himself, to develop himself inwardly in any way. It is too hopeless, the individual is nothing, and it is naturally a false view that the individual is nothing. The individual is the vessel of life. Every individual is the bearer of life, and life is borne only by individuals. It does not exist in itself, there is no life of the millions. That is nonsense, but millions of individuals are vessels of life and for each of them the problem of the individual is the whole problem” (1977, pp. 460-461).

¹⁴⁵ Christ was not the only symbol Jung critiqued as symbol of self. For example, “Hiranyagarbha, Purusha, Atman, and the mystic Buddha” (1950, p. 248) are other figures Jung points to as symbols of the self.

I noted in the Introduction the parallels between Christ as a symbol and Cinderella as a symbol. However, unlike Jung in his treatment of the Christ figure, I make a distinction between Cinderella and the Cinderella fairy tale in its entirety. As noted, I have subjectively/psychologically read the former as a symbol of the ego; whereas I critique the latter as a present day psychic archetypal image of the self; the self denoting psychic totality and wholeness.¹⁴⁶ I consider this to accord empirically with the phenomenological facts. Cinderella is only one out of many characters in the fairy tale and from a subjective perspective symbolises only a partial aspect of the psyche as a whole; whereas the Cinderella fairy tale in its entirety tells a coherent story both manifestly as well as psychologically. Read subjectively/symbolically, the Cinderella fairy tale contains all the usual archetypes that, via the process of individuation, facilitate the realisation of the self: The shadow archetype (the 'step' characters), the contrasexual or anima/animus archetype (the Prince character), and the mana personality or wise old man archetype (the fairy godmother figure). Again, the purpose and meaning of individuation that is activated by engagement with these archetypes is the realisation of the self: "The realization, in all its aspects, of the personality... the production and unfolding of the original, potential wholeness" (Jung, 1953, p. 186). From a Jungian perspective the self is conceived both as who we already are and what must be attained. Jung (1953) notes that: "The beginnings of our whole psychic life seem to be inextricably rooted in this point, and all our highest and ultimate purposes seem to be striving towards it" (p. 399).

In closing this section, Jung (1959b) considered that the archetype of the self was the most important archetype for the contemporary individual to understand (p. 422). From a Jungian perspective, in order to understand this archetype it is necessary to acquire a symbolic attitude; that is, the ability to discern the meaning of messages from the unconscious psyche that arrive via dreams and myths. That is why *how* romantic love is read and interpreted is of such consequence. In the following quote, Jung, along with making the point that the realisation of the self is something that must be achieved, points to the collective facet of individuation. Jung (1953) notes that:

... the self has somewhat the character of a result, of a goal attained, something that has come to pass very gradually and is experienced with much travail. So too the self is our life's goal, for it is the completest expression of that fateful combination we call individuality, the full flowering not only of the single individual, but of the group, in which each adds his portion to the whole. (p. 404)

¹⁴⁶ I wish to clarify that I am not postulating that the Cinderella fairy tale is *the* archetype of the self; rather, recalling the distinction between the archetype per se and a given archetypal image, I am postulating and critiquing the Cinderella fairy tale as one particular archetypal image of the self, of which there are also many others.

The centrality of love

*Whatever happened to the values of humanity,
Whatever happened to the fairness and equality,
Instead of spreading love, we're spreading animosity,
Lack of understanding leading lives away from unity,
That's the reason why sometimes I'm feeling under,
That's the reason why sometimes I'm feeling down,
It's no wonder why sometimes I'm feeling under,
Gotta keep my faith alive
Til love is found...
Where is the love?*

Black Eyed Peas, 2003

In one of the most successful popular songs of 2003,¹⁴⁷ the Black Eyed Peas, an American hip-hop band, powerfully pose the question: *Where is the love?* The song is not about romantic love. Rather, it is a song which questions a world in which oppression and victimisation are the daily fare of global humanity. Raising issues of political hypocrisy, terrorism, racial segregation, media irresponsibility, weapons of mass destruction, and the pervasive suffering of the world's children, the song talks about a love that is human in character, which, unlike the self-centred antics and exclusiveness of romantic love, is both inclusive and socially conscious: "*If you only have love for your own race, then you only leave space to discriminate, and to discriminate only generates hate; and when you hate you're bound to get irate...* ".

However, to ask the question: *Where is the love?*, necessitates also asking the question: *What is love?* As noted, the Black-Eyed Peas seem to be suggesting that love is a phenomenon that would enable the world to be humanly safe. In contrast to romantic love, the Black Eyed Peas seem to be envisioning a quality of love which reaches beyond the realm of the immediate and familiar and challenges an extension of the concept of "family" to include humanity as a whole. Jonathan Glover (1999) likewise espouses this conception of human solidarity. Glover argues that if we are going to prevent in this century a re-enactment of the atrocities that marked the twentieth century, we need to cultivate moral resources that extend beyond our immediate sphere of influence. Glover (1999) urges that:

It is right to emphasize honesty in relationships, generosity to friends, warmth towards children, doing work that is creative, and being disposed to like people.

¹⁴⁷ *Where is the love?* was the second biggest selling single of 2003.

This close-up focus is adapted to the lives of most of us, *but on its own, it is too limited*. We are not only parents, friends, and neighbours. We are also part of the human species as it struggles to escape from its brutal history. (p. 41; emphasis added)

The questions *Where is the love?* and *What is love?* are ones that occupy a central place in Fromm's writings. In answer to the question: *Where is the love?* Fromm's answer is that it is a rare phenomenon in Western culture. In Fromm's view, human or productive love is so rare that there are many people "who have never seen a loving person, or a person with integrity, or courage, or concentration" (1962a, p. 84). In answer to the question: *What is love?* Fromm, as noted, makes a clear distinction between romantic and symbiotic manifestations of love and "productive love." Fromm (1947) maintains that productive love finds its justification on the premise of a fundamental acknowledgement of the universal identification of our *humanity*.

If the type of love Fromm is advocating is rare in Western culture – indeed, rare generally - why is this so? Fromm (1947) writes that "in spite of the universalistic spirit of the monotheistic Western religions and of the progressive political concepts that are expressed in the idea 'that all men are created equal,' love for mankind has not become a common experience" (1947, p. 107). Historically, the primary institution within Western culture that has been seen to concern itself with the problem of "love for humankind" has been the Christian church. Indeed, one would expect that with a Christian heritage of faith in which the command to "love one's neighbour as oneself" is second only to the primary command to love God, love at the level of social practice within Western culture would have become widespread. However, generally speaking, this has not been so. Why is this?

In examining this question I aim to argue that it is perhaps within the Christian idea of love for others itself that we happen upon the single most important reason why love at the level of social practice within Western culture is so rare. While the biblical New Testament command is to "love one's neighbour as *oneself*"; the Christian church has traditionally emphasised the importance of loving God and others, while simultaneously negating the importance of *loving oneself*. Indeed, in both Luther and Calvin's teachings to love oneself is synonymous with selfishness and is a manifestation of the worst hubris. The individual's only virtue is in obedience; in his/her willingness to deny his/herself. Mill (1869/1996) points out that in Calvinistic theory, human nature is considered so "radically corrupt, [that] there is no redemption for any one until human nature is killed within him" (p. 62).

But why should it matter whether a person loves his/herself, so long as s/he treats other people decently? And further, what can an analysis of a Christianity that most people no

longer subscribe to contribute to a discussion of the contemporary problem of love? In the first place, I aim to argue that the issue of whether a person considers his/herself and his/her life of fundamental worth, and indeed the question of whether a person *loves* his/herself, is of *singular* importance in determining the question of whether s/he can love at all. In fact, as Fromm (1962a) repeatedly points out, if a person does not love his/herself, then s/he *cannot* love others. It simply is impossible! Certainly, an individual can do any manner of good deeds. A person can *appear* loving without having love for his/herself, but s/he cannot *be* loving. Fromm (1947) is unequivocal on this point, writing that:

... not only others, but we ourselves are the ‘object’ of our feelings and attitudes; the attitudes toward others and toward ourselves, far from being contradictory, are basically *conjunctive*... this means: Love of others and love of ourselves are not alternatives. On the contrary, an attitude of love toward themselves will be found in all those who are capable of loving others. (p. 134)

In drawing attention to the fact that the prerequisite for loving others is the ability to love oneself, it becomes clear that the traditional emphasis that the Christian church put on the individual’s essential sinfulness and depravity, particularly during the period of the sixteenth century Protestant Reformation, actually undermined the capacity for the individual to honour the Christian command to “love others.”¹⁴⁸ Historian Jacques Barzun (2001) points out that it has been said of Calvinism that it “makes every man the enemy of every other, as well as his own” (p. 35). But again, of what relevance is this today? In fact, Fromm (1947) maintains that there is a direct line of influence between the meaning of love as understood within Christendom (and particularly as disseminated through the Protestant Reformation) and the problem of love - or rather its lack - within Western culture today. Fromm (1947) makes the argument that while with the development of modern society, secular values increasingly replaced spiritual ones, nonetheless the “doctrine which declares selfishness to be the arch evil and love for others to be the greatest virtue is still powerful” (p. 124). This doctrine is particularly evident in the admonition directed toward children, which is still common today: “Don’t be selfish!” (1947, pp. 131-132). Indeed, as I discuss in the next chapter, the amount of altruism adults generally expect of children is astounding; and as I shall point out, more than a little hypocritical! Fromm (1947), in making the claim that the “spirit” of medieval Christianity still influences our modern consciousness, writes that:

The view of man held by Calvin and Luther has been of tremendous influence on the development of modern Western society. They laid the foundations for an attitude in

¹⁴⁸ Janov (1970) notes that “surrender of the self seems to be part of the Judeo-Christian ethic in which we surrender ourselves to a deity in the name of love” (p. 278).

which man's own happiness was not considered to be the aim of life but where he became a means, an adjunct, to ends beyond him, of an all-powerful God, or of the not less powerful secularized authorities and norms, the state, business, success. (p. 126)¹⁴⁹

Yet, as Fromm (1947) also points out, to say that Western consciousness still suffers under the residual influence of a Christian doctrine that proclaims that taking care of one's own interests is synonymous with selfishness is to present a one-sided view. Along with the taboo against selfishness, is also the contradictory – indeed completely opposite – Western ideal to look out for number one; to look out for one's own interests and to keep one's own advantage foremost. Fromm (1947) writes that “as a matter of fact, the idea that egotism is the basis of the general welfare is the principle on which competitive society has been built” (p.132). How does the contemporary individual cope with this contradiction, and these conflicting ideals? Fromm (1947) notes that:

The result is that modern man *lives* according to the principles of self-denial and *thinks* in terms of self-interest. He believes that he is acting in behalf of *his* interest when actually his paramount concern is money and success; he deceives himself about the fact that his most important human potentialities remain unfulfilled and that he loses himself in the process of seeking what is supposed to be best for him. (p. 140)

The failure of modern culture lies not in its principle of individualism... not in the fact that people *are too much concerned with their self-interest*, but that they are *not concerned with the interest of their real self*; *not in the fact that they are too selfish, but that they do not love themselves*. (p. 143)

So far in this section, in attempting to address the contemporary problem of love, I have focused on influences within the Christian tradition, which, since the dawn of the Modern era,¹⁵⁰ have been seen as having an impact on modern consciousness. In so doing, I have drawn attention to the discrepancy between a Christianity that traditionally has preached the importance of loving others and yet has simultaneously undermined this precept by not

¹⁴⁹ No doubt Fromm drew on the work of German sociologist Max Weber, and English Socialist R. H. Tawney in drawing a connection between the Reformation and the spirit of capitalism. Barzun (2001) writes that neither Weber's nor Tawney's critiques have “stood up to criticism” (p. 37). He argues that “capitalism long antedates the Protestant revolution” (p. 37) and that both Luther and Calvin denounced the capitalist enterprise, and so cannot be seen to have encouraged or influenced its rise. Nonetheless, Fromm's contending that there is a link between the spirit of the Reformation and that of capitalism in terms of the individual regarding his/herself and his/her happiness as an appendage first to spiritual and then to material goals seems valid enough. It is true that Luther argued for Christian liberty in the sense that the individual could approach God directly instead of through the intermediary hierarchies of the church (Barzun, 2001). In this sense Luther could be seen as aiming to promote the freedom and happiness of the individual. Nonetheless Luther also – in a seeming contradiction - denied that the individual had free will and added as a counterpart to his claim that “‘a Christian man is a perfectly free lord, subject to none’ ... [that] ‘a Christian man is a perfectly dutiful servant of all, subject to all’; that is, to the secular society ruled by princes” (as cited in Barzun, 2001, p. 6).

¹⁵⁰ In speaking of the Modern era I am referring to the period beginning around AD 1500 (Barzun, 2001, p. 48).

adequately addressing the necessity of self-love. However, it cannot be supposed that this religious heritage has been the only shaper of contemporary Western consciousness. Barzun (2001) rightly points out that culture is made up of many strands. Within the Modern era, alongside the ascetic ideal of self denial, has also been the competing – or at least mitigating and balancing – influence of humanism¹⁵¹ as expressed through the exponents of Renaissance and Enlightenment thought. Mill (1869/1996) writes that “there is a different type of human excellence from the Calvinistic; a conception of humanity as having its nature bestowed on it for other purposes than merely to be abnegated”¹⁵² (p. 63; see also Fromm 1947, p. 15). The claims of humanism, and particularly humanism’s respect for the individual, have been recently defended by Graham Good (2001).

In arguing for a conception of love ‘beyond romance,’ and within the context of a subjective/psychological reading of the romantic myth, one of the aims of this thesis is to argue that “productive love” – in obverse to the traditional Christian emphasis - is possible only if an individual is able to love his/herself. In this vein, I argue that *love and respect for the individual are in fact synonymous: That where there is respect for the individual, there will be love and where there is love, respect for the individual will be present.* Perhaps nowhere has the claim of the individual been more artfully or passionately defended than by Mill in his political treatise *On Liberty* (1869/1996). In Mill’s view, respect for the individual and conditions which allow for the free development of individuality are the very basis of human well-being and happiness and are the primary ingredients of social progress (p. 57). In emphasising this point, Mill writes that “a people, it appears, may be progressive for a certain length of time, and then stop: when does it stop? When it ceases to possess individuality” (p. 71). Writing in the mid-nineteenth century, Mill deplored what he saw as a societal trend toward the repression of the individual and the general indifference toward the claims of individuality, and warned that should such regressive trends continue the effect on Western culture would be devastating. Jung (1957), writing a century later, likewise recognised this trend and expresses concern, noting that “one could almost go so far as to assert that the

¹⁵¹ Barzun (2001) notes that “the term *humanist* was first applied by German scholars of the early 19C to writers who in the 14C and 15C rejected parts of the immediate past in favor of the culture they perceived in the classics of ancient Rome. They were particularly keen about the Latin style of these classics” (p. 44). Barzun credits Petrarch (1304-1374) as the earliest Humanist.

¹⁵² Though, in making this point, the distinction between humanism and Christianity cannot be seen as clear cut. Barzun (2001) writes that “one must not overlook opposites and contradictions. [Early] humanists were not indifferent to religion... Those called Humanists today may rule out the divine and make Man the measure of all things, but Petrarch, for one, remained deeply religious” (p. 51). Both Fromm (1961, p. 262) and Eagleton (1996, p. 129) note that humanism and religious faith are not necessarily antagonistic.

valuelessness of the individual in comparison with large numbers is the one belief that meets with universal and unanimous assent” (p. 524). Mill (1869/1996) argued that:

If it were felt that the free development of individuality is one of the leading essentials of well-being; that it is not only a co-ordinate element with all that is designated by the terms civilisation, instruction, education, culture, but is itself a necessary part and condition of all those things; there would be no danger that liberty should be undervalued, and the adjustment of the boundaries between it and social control would present no extraordinary difficulty. *But the evil is, that individual spontaneity is hardly recognised by the common modes of thinking, as having any intrinsic worth, or deserving any regard on its own account.* The majority, being satisfied with the ways of mankind as they now are... cannot comprehend why those ways should not be good enough for everybody; and what is more, spontaneity forms no part of the ideal of the majority of moral and social reformers, ... [but is rather seen as an] obstruction to the general acceptance of what these reformers, in their own judgment, think would be best for mankind. (p. 57; emphasis added)

In postulating respect for the individual and love one and the same thing, it is of note that while in general the symbolic or psychological implications of the romantic myth and romantic love are not understood, nonetheless there has been recognition that the “romantic fantasy” is far more a search for the affirmation of oneself than it is about knowing and caring for another person. Radway (1984) makes this point clear, noting that “the romantic fantasy is... not a fantasy about discovering a uniquely interesting life partner, but [is] a ritual wish to be cared for, loved, and validated in a particular way” (p. 83). This aspect of the romantic myth accounts, at least in part, for the projective quality that invariably accompanies romantic relationships, and the subsequent blurring of distinctions between subject and object that routinely occurs. But what is the “particular way” that the seeker of romance wants to be cared for? Primarily, the person seeking romance is seeking an outlet for the expression of his/her essential self; the person is seeking the affirmation of his/herself as an individual.

In my view, no-one has captured and expressed the central nexus of the romantic search more succinctly than Psychologist Arthur Janov. Janov (1970), who developed a treatment for neurosis he terms Primal therapy, defines love as “the free expression of the self” (p. 275) and as “letting someone be what they are” (p. 272). Janov, in drawing a connection between love and the affirmation of oneself, writes:

Why is the search for love so universal? Because it is the search for the self that could never be. More precisely, the search for that special someone who will let you be you. Since so many of us have had our feelings ignored or crushed, we end up doing what we don't feel. The early marriages, quick romances... derive from the inner frustration and desperation to feel *through* others. The search seems endless because few people really know what they are looking for. (p. 279)

The advantage of a subjective/symbolic reading of Cinderella and romantic mythology is that it makes explicit what it appears the individual at the level of fundamental intent desires; that is, affirmation of his/her individual self and individuality. In that the Cinderella fairy tale contains archetypes which promote self-knowledge and individuation, a symbolic or psychological understanding of romantic mythology facilitates this. Again, this is not to negate the importance of relationships, which are in fact indispensable to the individuation experience. However, without a firm sense of oneself as oneself, there is no real basis for relationship; the 'relationship' can consist only of projection and the vicarious experience of self at the expense of the other. Moreover, without a fundamental sense of oneself as oneself, romantic relationships – which, differently from parent/child relationships, are meant to be between adults¹⁵³ - can be traumatic. Janov (1970) perceptively comments that “rarely should the loss of a lover in the present produce such catastrophic results as attempted suicide unless that loss reflected a deeper, older loss from one’s youth [i.e., the loss of self]” (pp. 279-280).

In this chapter I have critiqued Cinderella as a symbol of the ego and the Cinderella fairy tale in its entirety as a symbol of the self. I have drawn attention to the themes the character of Cinderella images - abandonment, goodness, victimisation, and the longing for happiness - and suggested that the individual who identifies with a Cinderella or romantic heroine character is identifying with these aspects of ego experience. In discussing the self, my main aim has been to argue that the justification for there being such a thing as a 'true self' rests upon recognition of the extramundane and what Jung refers to as the irrational factors of experience. Again, while notions such as the multiple self or the discontinuous self are not incompatible with a Jungian perspective, the notion of the self as constructed is. Finally, I have pointed to historical and religious factors that have influenced Western ideals concerning what constitutes 'loving' behaviour. In particular, I have highlighted the negative consequence of viewing love of self and love for others as contradictory.

In the next chapter, I examine Cinderella (the ego character) alongside the step-sisters (within the Cinderella fairy tale, shadow characters) and posit for discussion whether Cinderella can be considered the only victim within the fairy tale. I also discuss childhood experience and its impact upon the individual's capacity to participate in adult relatedness.

¹⁵³ While noting that the expectation within romantically premised relationships is that the individuals involved are adults and hence each partner has only limited responsibility for the other and is at liberty to leave, I point out in Chapter Two that romantic relationships are in fact very much like the parent/child relationship and a parent figure is what many individuals – even as adults – still seek.

CHAPTER TWO

In Sue Birtwistle's (1996) film production of Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, Elizabeth Bennet perceptively remarks to her sister Jane that their mother, who has taken a sudden liking to the disagreeable and arrogant Mr. Darcy, would perhaps not find him so handsome were he not so rich.¹⁵⁴ Applying analogous logic to the character of Pamela, the romantic heroine in Samuel Richardson's eighteenth century romantic best-seller of the same name (1740/1962), it is likewise justifiable to speculate that perhaps Pamela would not appear to her master so "good" or so virtuous, were it not for the fact – as the reader is repeatedly reminded – that she is also "a very pretty wench" (p. 5). Highlighted in these two fictional examples are the basic politics or "morality" characteristic of traditional romantic ideology, whereby a woman's greatest asset is seen to be her physical beauty and a man's greatest asset his status and wealth.

Yet despite the fact that romantic heroines within romantic entertainment are invariably cast as possessing an exceptional or particular beauty, this is nonetheless counterbalanced by a compensatory – though admittedly subtle - tendency within romantic entertainment to also problematise beauty as a physical, or solely physical, attribute. Regarding the supremacy of beauty as the signifier of morality, Marcia Lieberman (1986) contends that in fairy tale literature beauty is regarded "as a girl's most valuable asset, perhaps her only asset" (p. 188), adding that beauty is often associated with "good-temper and meekness" (p. 188). Lieberman also writes that ugliness and ill-temper are likewise linked, citing the Cinderella fairy tale as a prototype of this kind of stereotyping (p. 188).

This is certainly so in Disney's *Cinderella* (1950), and in fairness to Lieberman's argument, it is Disney's film rendition of Cinderella which undoubtedly has had the most influence on Western imagination. But it is important to point out that in English translations of Perrault's *Cendrillon* and the Grimm's *Aschenputtel*, this seemingly self-evident pretty-good/ugly-bad dichotomy is by no means so dividedly clear.¹⁵⁵ Admittedly, in *Cendrillon* (1982), Cinderella is described as being "a hundred times handsomer than her sisters" (p. 16). But the step-sisters, who are described as cutting "a very grand figure among the quality" (p. 16) are by no means ugly. In *Aschenputtel* (1982) the step-sisters are described as "pretty and

¹⁵⁴ This dialogue between Elizabeth and Jane, adapted for film, is not found in Austen's original literary text of *Pride and Prejudice*.

¹⁵⁵ I have referred to the versions of *Cendrillon* and *Aschenputtel* as reproduced by folklorist Alan Dundes in *Cinderella: A Folklore Showcase* (1982). This book is the third volume in the Garland Folklore Casebooks series.

fair of face” (p. 24), and later when they are trying on the gold slipper as having “pretty feet” (p. 28). What is centrally juxtaposed within *Aschenputtel* is not the difference between Cinderella and her step-sisters’ physical appearance, but the difference in their moral character. While Cinderella is “devout and good” (p. 23), her step-sisters – though pretty – have “ugly and black” hearts (p. 24).

I noted that constructed within the paradigm of romantic morality it is unlikely that Richardson’s Pamela would be considered by the fictional Mr. B. so innocent and pure were she not also endowed with considerable physical appeal. However, the opposite argument – that a fairy tale or romantic heroine would perhaps not be considered so desirable were she not also in possession of a particular morality – can likewise be argued. I say a “particular morality” because it is evident that what is considered moral in any given cultural milieu is the product of the dominant social mores and moral sensibility of that time. Romantic ideology has clearly emancipated itself from its early close affinity with a puritan model of Christian morality, yet – as noted in the Introduction – this does not mean that romantic love is an ideology devoid of morality. Within romantic ideology moral notions of good and bad or right and wrong, although subject to mutation (see Stacey & Pearce, 1995), nonetheless remain. The film *My Best Friend’s Wedding* (Hogan, 1997) provides a particularly good illustration of this point. At the beginning of the film my sympathy is with Julianne (Julia Roberts) and I hope that Michael (Dermot Mulroney) will realise he is still in love with his best friend and choose her. However, as soon as Julianne resorts to foul play in an effort to secure her end, deceitfully interfering with Michael’s plans to marry Kimberly (Cameron Diaz), my sympathy is no longer with her. Her physical attractiveness cannot redeem or compensate for her unfavourable moral actions. I do not mean to suggest that my reaction to the film is one that all viewers will share. However, the fact that filmmakers across a variety of genres continue to produce films in which “good” characters are ultimately vindicated would seem to indicate that mainstream viewers still like to see the “good” characters win.

Yet I think there is something much more to the point about what could be viewed as the moral sensibility which underpins romantic ideology, and which is fundamentally connected to a subjective reading. As I aim to illustrate shortly, drawing upon for examination a recent romantic film, the morality romantic ideology seems to privilege is one based on a distinction between the person who assumes a romantic persona and therefore plays according to the rules of a game, and the person who from his/her own centre of individuality has the capacity to know and to relate to another person *as* a person. It is a morality based on a

juxtaposition of true versus false, real versus unreal, and authentic versus conditioned. While superficially romantic ideology seems to espouse a face value and rather characterless morality, examined at a more fundamental level romantic ideology contradictorily is seen to privilege a mode of morality in which the beautiful character is the one who is true or real and the ugly character the one who is false or unreal (see e.g., Herskovitz, 1998; MacGuire, 2001; Luketic, 2001; Adamson, 2001).

One recent film which highlights the distinction between the person who is his/herself and the person who plays a role particularly well is the Cinderella themed film *What a Girl Wants* (Gordon, 2003). In this film the main Cinderella theme consists of a young girl's search to find the father she has never known. I will comment shortly on why I still consider this film to fit within the romance genre; indeed why, paradoxically, I consider it particularly suits the genre. First however, a brief synopsis of the storyline. Daphne, the main character in the film, has been dreaming of and wanting to meet her father for all of her life. Her father, Lord Henry Dashwood, has not been aware of the fact that he has a daughter, and so when at seventeen Daphne arrives unannounced to meet him, his predictable and ordered world is suddenly turned upside down. At first Daphne remains true to herself, behaving in the manner characteristic of and consistent with her personality. However, increasingly she comes under the pressure of having to live up to the expectations of being the daughter of a prominent public figure. At this point in the film, Henry says to Daphne:

Listen Daphne, part of the burden of being a member of this family is that there are certain codes of behaviour that one is expected to observe. If one is not seen to conform then, ah well... then it becomes... Listen, I very much enjoyed our time together yesterday, really and truly I did... It's just that these are very difficult circumstances and... you, as my daughter, have to...

Daphne cuts in: "I have to change. It's ok, I get it! I'm a Dashwood too right?" Henry replies: "Yes. Yes you are!" The changes in Daphne are not to everyone's liking. During this time Ian, Daphne's boyfriend, whom Daphne meets in England just prior to meeting her father, says to her: "What happened to the old you, the real you?" On another occasion Ian tells her: "Just call me when Daphne re-inhabits your body." The situation comes to a head at Daphne's coming out party. Daphne is wearing a beautiful dress and the tiara her grandmother has given her. As she walks down the stairs, Henry goes to meet her, and says: "Daphne, you look..."; "Different?" Daphne interjects. Daphne looks stunning, but she no longer feels beautiful. She just feels lost. This is evidenced in the events of the evening. Daphne is suffering from what the individual always suffers when forced to play a role: alienation from

his/herself and therefore from the only basis upon which s/he can connect with others. Due to the interference of Glenys and Clarissa (Henry's fiancée and her daughter), the shadow figures in the film, the party does not go well and Daphne leaves, upset. Henry follows her, telling her to wait. Daphne answers: "No! I'm done waiting, Henry." She then explains:

You know, when I was little every birthday I'd get all dressed up and I'd wish: if I was good enough that you would come and find me. And now here I am in the most beautiful dress I could ever imagine and you're here... But you know what I miss now? I miss being me! I've finally realised that that is enough.

Daphne returns to New York. However, faithful to formula, the story ends happily when Henry realises that Daphne is more important to him than his political aspirations.

Henry goes to New York, where he tells Daphne:

I came because I have something very important to say to you... What it comes down to is: I love you Daphne... I'm so sorry; I wouldn't change you; I wouldn't change anything about you; I wouldn't change one hair on your head, not for anyone...

The film ends with Daphne saying: "It was my own happily ever after...". While a romantic sub-text is played out between Daphne and her boyfriend Ian, the main Cinderella theme – as noted – is played out between Daphne and her father. While this may seem to disqualify the film from being classed in the romance genre, I rather think that the film is a more accurate portrayal of what romantic desire and the search for romantic love in fact is *because* the storyline is played out between a child and parental figure; that is, the search for unconditional love. Many theorists highlight the similarities between romantic love and motherly or parental love, and point out that the romantic dream is often motivated by the wish to find in another the all-encompassing indulgence and protection that parental love – in its ideal form – is seen to afford (De Beauvoir, 1953; Evans, 1998; Goldberg, 1999). Radway (1984) notes that the romance novel promises that "needs for fatherly protection, motherly care, and passionate adult love will be satisfied perfectly" (p. 149). As argued in Chapter One, romantic love is primarily the search for the affirmation of oneself, and as such, a search for the type of love that should be afforded the individual in childhood. If childhood needs for the affirmation of the self have not been met then this leaves the individual psychologically wounded and with unfulfilled longings that s/he cannot help but project onto a significant other. Inasmuch as the individual wants to live, s/he will search endlessly for the kiss that will awaken his/her slumbering soul.

However, this need for the affirmation of oneself becomes problematic within the context of adult erotic relationships, especially if a partner is expected to fulfil the role of

substitute parent. I discuss this point in Chapters Three and Five. In *What a Girl Wants*, Ian – rightly, I think – refuses to participate in Daphne’s game playing. Ian wants a relationship with Daphne, but when Daphne tries to be someone else in order to fit in and to win her father’s love then the very basis upon which she can build a relationship with Ian is undermined. This appears to illustrate that the capacity for the type of intimacy sought in adult relationships must be predicated on first achieving psychologically the type of self-knowledge and individuation the romantic myth promotes symbolically; although this self-knowledge is perhaps primarily accomplished within the context of romantic relationships and in working through romantic love’s inevitable projections and illusions. Again, the desire to be loved is inextricably linked with the individual’s longing and need to be his/herself, and adult or productive based love relationships can be said to begin where romantic love leaves off. Because present social conditions are not conducive to the development of the individual, and psychological individuality is so extraordinarily difficult to aspire to, it is likely that in present day society adult love is in fact a relatively rare phenomenon.¹⁵⁶

If the morality that fundamentally underpins romantic ideology is one that privileges the individual who *is* over the individual who *acts*, then Anne of Green Gables’ monumental question: “Which would you rather be if you had the choice – divinely beautiful or dazzlingly clever or angelically good?” (Montgomery, 1937, p. 18) becomes redundant. While the entertainment industry continues to reproduce romantic novels and romantic films depicting stereotypically beautiful heroines and stereotypically successful heroes, the morality that nonetheless emerges from a symbolic reading of romantic ideology, and that forms the basis for love relationships beyond romance, is one that is premised on this moral distinction between individual spontaneity and conditioned falsity. In a love beyond romance, surface and depth merge and our perception of beauty is transformed. To be so becomes more important than appearing so. In the context of human relationships, in a paradigm beyond romance there are no ugly people; only false ones. Further, romantic ideology’s idealisation of attributes such as physical beauty and success (what Fromm refers to as one’s commodity value) is perceived as a compensation for the lack of completeness and meaningfulness the individual experiences in his/her life. The more authentic the individual’s experience of his/herself and of others is, the less compulsive is the demand to expect either from oneself or of others unrealistic perfection.

¹⁵⁶ Jung (1953) writes of individuality that “in order to discover what is authentically individual in ourselves, profound reflection is needed; and suddenly we realize how uncommonly difficult the discovery of individuality in fact is” (p. 242).

Having posed for consideration the true versus false or real versus unreal moral distinction that fundamentally underpins romantic ideology, my initial aim in this chapter – before introducing the main body of discussion - is to critique the step-sister characters in a preliminary discussion of the shadow archetype. Again, as the perspective I am taking is a subjective one, I examine the step-sister characters as shadow aspects of the character of Cinderella, and by inference (in that, as critiqued in Chapter One, Cinderella in her subjective role symbolises the ego), as shadow aspects of the individual. (NB: It is necessary to point out that while the focus of this critique is subjective, there is nonetheless unavoidably and rightly a constant interplay between a subjective and objective level of interpretation. For the sake of clarification it is often necessary to separate out a meaning objectively - as is the case below - before the subjective psychological meaning I am aiming at can be made explicit). In what follows, I am fundamentally concerned with questioning why the step-sister characters are ugly – or rather, as situated in the context of the foregoing discussion, why they are false – and from this question, in examining the conditions that might be seen to contribute to the development of individual falsity. In order to address this question it is perhaps expedient to examine the Cinderella fairy tale to assess whether Cinderella and the step-sister characters’ circumstances differ in any significant way and if so, whether these differences of circumstance might legitimately be viewed as influential in terms of shaping the characters’ different personality traits.

In *Cinderella* (1950), no reference is made to Cinderella’s mother. However, we infer that Cinderella’s mother has died because Cinderella’s father is introduced as a widow gentleman. Cinderella’s father is described as kind and devoted. In contrast, Cinderella’s step-mother is described as cold and cruel and as being “grimly determined to forward the interests of her own two awkward daughters” (1950). No information is given regarding the step-sisters’ father. Critiques of the Cinderella fairy tale invariably highlight the very difficult circumstances of Cinderella’s upbringing in comparison with the ease of life experienced by her spoiled step-sisters, and it is not often that any examination is made of or any consideration given to the circumstances and upbringing of the step-sisters. However, even with the very limited information given in *Cinderella* about the parentage of Cinderella and the step-sisters, it is possible to speculate that the early childhood experiences of Cinderella and the step-sisters fundamentally differ. Cinderella is the victim of her step-mother’s cruelty, but we are told that prior to her father’s death her father loved her devotedly and provided for her. By all accounts Cinderella’s early years were happy ones. Again, we do not know anything of the

step-sisters' early years. We are not told whether their father died or whether he abandoned his children; or conversely whether the step-mother simply left him taking the children with her. However, even without this information it is not presumptuous to speculate that the step-sisters' early years have not been happy ones. The step-sisters are described as awkward. Unless physically deformed, children who are raised in healthy and happy environments with plenty of fresh air and freedom to play are not usually awkward; or at least not so noticeably so that an introductory description would draw attention to the fact. And while we do not know anything of the step-sisters' father, their mother's character – which Jung would describe as being marked by a distinct and destructive “will to power” (see Jung, 1946a, p. 222) - is unmistakable. The step-sisters may be spoiled, but they are certainly not loved.

While in *Cinderella* (1950) the different circumstances of Cinderella and the step-sisters early childhood experiences are only subtly apparent, in *Ever After* (1998) the different situational factors impacting on Danielle and her step-sisters is marked. After the opening narration, *Ever After* begins with Danielle's nurses dressing her in expectation of her father's arrival with his new wife and step-daughters. As Danielle is being dressed her friend, Gustave, arrives, and Danielle - ignoring her nurses' protestations that her father Auguste will be arriving any minute - runs off to play. Danielle's father arrives home to the welcome of the entire household, who are standing on ceremony to receive their Master's new family. Maurice, the head-servant, greets Auguste saying: “Welcome home, monsieur? I see you have brought us a Baroness.” Auguste replies: “I've brought you an entire household, Maurice.” Looking around, he adds: “But I seem to be missing a daughter?”

Just after Rodmilla and her daughters step out of their carriage, Danielle – who has mud all over her new dress - arrives. “Papa!” Danielle cries, and runs straight into her father's arms. Her father, hugging her warmly, laughs, saying: “Look at you, just as I left! I wager your friend Gustave's around here some place.” Danielle replies: “No... I slaughtered him.” Her father, spotting Gustave who is also covered in mud, laughs again and says: “Well, so you did!” He adds good-naturedly: “I had hoped to present a little lady... Well, I suppose you'll have to do.” He places Danielle down in front of him and, introducing her, says: “Danielle, may I present the Baroness Rodmilla and her daughters: Marguerite and Jacqueline.”

From the look on Rodmilla's face it is immediately apparent that should either of her two daughters have made so imprudent an entrance on so formal a gathering she would have had something other in mind than the warm welcome Danielle has received. Rodmilla – her superficial gentility only just masking the disdain she clearly feels - surveys the little girl

standing before her and addresses Danielle saying: “Hello Danielle, at last we meet, your father speaks of nothing else.” Addressing her own two immaculately groomed daughters – it is certain they have not been playing! – Rodmilla instructs them: “Ladies, say hello to your new step-sister.” Displaying impeccable manners, Marguerite and Jacqueline curtsy and in unison address Danielle: “Mademoiselle.”

As with Cinderella, the early circumstances of Danielle’s life have clearly been happy despite the fact that her mother died in infancy. Indeed, it would seem that until the age of eight, Danielle leads a paradisiacal existence. The relationship depicted between Danielle and her father is one of warmth, acceptance, and unconditional love. Danielle’s father does not rebuke Danielle because she arrives late or because her dress is dirty. He is merely glad to see her. Danielle shows no sign of having been rejected or humiliated by her father before. Danielle’s father is not a symbol of fear to her. He is not the cruel patriarch. Quite to the contrary, it is clear that Danielle’s father has provided not only for her existence, but – through loving her – he has fathered her humanness and individuality also. Later, when Prince Henry asks Danielle why she likes books so much, she replies: “I guess it’s because when I was young my father would stay up late and read to me... I would fall asleep listening to the sound of his voice.” Danielle feelingly adds: “I would rather hear his voice again than any sound in the world.” In fact it is clear that “his” voice – the memory of it and the hope of it – is still alive within her. Despite the abrupt and tragic change of circumstances that the death of her father brings, Danielle – having experienced love - has an immediate and unshakeable love of life.

While Danielle speaks often of her father, Marguerite and Jacqueline never refer to theirs. Certainly this could indicate that their father was not particularly cruel. Yet at the very least Marguerite and Jacqueline’s lack of interest in their father gives rise to the speculation that he was either ineffective or absent. The girls clearly do not miss him. Again, as in *Cinderella*, we are not given details of the step-sisters’ early childhood. Yet again, as in *Cinderella*, the stepmother character – in this case, Rodmilla – is a cold and calculating woman. In many respects Marguerite and Jacqueline are spoilt; particularly Marguerite. Yet, as with the step-sisters in *Cinderella*, they are not loved. They are conditioned to conform and are brought up on such formulas as: “A lady of breeding ought never to raise her voice any louder than the gentle hum of a whispering wind.” And when Jacqueline complains that the dress she is trying on to wear to the masquerade is too tight and that she cannot breathe, Rodmilla piously edicts: “If one cannot breathe, one cannot eat!” Rodmilla clearly aims to

further her social position through her daughters, and her interest in her daughters is motivated by this intent. “Here I am a baroness,” boasts Rodmilla, “and Marguerite shall be Queen.”

It is perhaps of note in passing to consider that inasmuch as Auguste’s untimely death is a tragedy for Danielle, it is also a tragedy for Marguerite and Jacqueline. Danielle is clearly the apple of her father’s eye. Yet when - upon their arrival - Marguerite and Jacqueline step down from their carriage, Auguste’s countenance is alight with delighted pride. Auguste is a kind man and a responsible one. There is little doubt that he intended to exact in full the obligations his new marriage committed him to, and would have considered it his duty to provide for Marguerite and Jacqueline and to love them in the same way in which he has fully and freely provided for and loved Danielle. Auguste’s death is a tragedy for Marguerite and Jacqueline in that upon his death, their chance of knowing genuine love perhaps for the first time in their lives is snatched away from them almost in the instant that it is bestowed.

In *Ever After* (1998), the step-sisters (played by actresses Megan Dodds and Melanie Lynskey) are by no means lacking in physical attractiveness. The producers of *Ever After* were clearly not intending to make any distinction between the characters’ physical attributes. What *is* clearly distinguished is the difference between Marguerite’s moral deceitfulness and Danielle’s social conscience, and also – supporting the argument I have already made – between Marguerite’s falseness and Danielle’s authenticity. Marguerite does everything right and everything wrong at the same time. Due to her mother’s influence, Marguerite knows how to *behave* like a lady, but in character she is not a lady at all, and it is obvious that Prince Henry views both her falseness, and also – when it is later revealed – her moral deviousness, with contempt. In contrast to Marguerite, Danielle refuses to swoon and flatter Henry; yet despite her unorthodox behaviour she captivates him. When Henry and Danielle get lost in the forest and Danielle climbs a tree to ascertain their bearings, Henry exclaims: “You swim alone, climb rocks, rescue servants! Is there anything you don’t do?” And when Danielle, in a moment of self-reflection, laughs and apologises saying: “I am sorry my mouth has run away with me again”; Henry reassures her: “No, my lady, it is your mouth that has me hypnotised.”

In both *Cinderella* and *Ever After* there is the marked dichotomy between good and bad characters which is characteristic of all renditions of the Cinderella fairy tale. In *Cinderella* this dichotomy is portrayed both in the physical appearance of the characters and in their moral natures. In *Ever After* the good/bad distinction is a moral one both in terms of conventional morality and also in terms of the true versus false, or real versus unreal, dichotomy I have drawn attention to. As noted, my initial aim in examining the differences in

circumstance between Cinderella/Danielle and the step-sister characters was to examine whether their character differences could be viewed in any way as attributable to differences of situation. Indeed, it would seem that the early childhood experiences of Cinderella and the step-sisters are markedly different in terms of situational influences. As highlighted, while almost without exception it is Cinderella who is critiqued as the subject of victimisation in the Cinderella fairy tale, upon examination it would appear that Cinderella is not the only victim in the Cinderella fairy tale; not even the main one. In *Ever After*, as in *Cinderella*, Danielle's early experiences have given her a love of life that her sisters do not have and it is this love of life and spontaneity which enables her to ultimately find happiness despite Rodmilla's ill-treatment.

While I have examined the step-sister characters at the objective level as separate from the character of Cinderella in order to understand the differing situational influences the characters are subject to, critiqued at a subjective level of interpretation the step-sister characters are seen as representing symbolically the shadow aspects of Cinderella's own personality and, by inference, the shadow aspects of the individual. Commenting on Jung's definition of the shadow archetype, Stein (1973) notes that the "shadow refers to all those rejected and repressed aspects of the personality; it contains infantile, inferior and morally reprehensible tendencies, *but it is also the carrier of many rejected, natural, life-promoting impulses*" (p. 59n; emphasis added). Here, Stein rightly points to the moral ambiguity which is characteristic not only of the shadow archetype, but of all archetypes,¹⁵⁷ also noting that when "the child must hide or repress his own uniqueness... these qualities become incorporated into the shadow" (p. 59).

I discuss the shadow archetype in detail in Chapter Three. Having here offered a preliminary introduction to the shadow archetype, my focus in this chapter is on examining the parental influences that impact upon children's personality development. Such a discussion is pivotal to critique of romantic love, since like the Cinderella and step-sister characters, the child's first relationship with parent/s or primary caregiver/s impacts significantly on his/her future relationships and chances of happiness. In view of the importance and impact of the parental relationship on the individual's adult relationships, I discuss here the necessity of protecting the child's spontaneity, the necessity of respecting the child's difference, and the importance of teaching the child how to think, rather than what to think. However, before turning to these points of discussion, I introduce educationalist A. S. Neill, whose work I draw

¹⁵⁷ See Jung, 1949b.

upon extensively in what follows. In that Neill espouses a philosophy of education premised on immense respect for the person of the child, Neill's work fits with the central argument concerning romantic love; namely the argument that at the symbolic level romantic love affirms individuality and selfhood.

A.S. Neill (1883-1973), who in 1921 founded Summerhill school, was perhaps the most radical educationalist of the twentieth century. In establishing Summerhill, Neill's aim was "*to make the school fit the child* – instead of making the child fit the school" (1968, p. 20). Neill (1953), who considers that most children are born into a "life-disapproving atmosphere" (p. 19), was fundamentally concerned with the happiness of children and insisted that freedom facilitated this. Neill (1968) writes: "My motto for the home, in education as in life, is this: *For heaven's sake, let people live their own lives*. It is an attitude that fits any situation" (p. 119). At Summerhill, which is now run by his daughter Zoe, children do not have to attend lessons. They are free to learn, or not to learn - as the case may be - and work at their own pace, pursuing their own interests. Neill (1968) was of the view that making active children sit at desks learning subjects that did not interest them was harmful and counterproductive. Neill (1953) was completely opposed to what he refers to as the "hell" way of dealing with problem children. In Neill's view, if children are "loved and free they become good and honest" (1953, p. 87). However, despite Neill's radical defence of children's freedom, it is clear to anyone who engages with Neill's work that he was neither a sentimentalist, nor an idealist. Neill's writings are not abstract theories, but rather result from over forty years of living and working with children; that is, they are the result of practiced hands on experience.¹⁵⁸

It is necessary to distinguish Neill's work from the progressive schools movement, which Neill (1953) saw as being run by idealists (pp. 97-101). Fromm (1962b) writes of Neill's work that it is "of great importance because it represents the *true* principle of education without fear" (p. xii). Fromm also defends Neill's work from being classed along with progressive education generally, writing that "parents and teachers have confused true nonauthoritarian education with *education by means of persuasion and hidden coercion*. Progressive education has been thus debased. It has failed to become what it was intended to be and has never developed as it was meant to" (p. xi).

In drawing on Neill's work, I do not do so presuming that nothing has changed since the early to mid-twentieth century in which Neill was working with children and writing about

¹⁵⁸ Neill (1953) writes that "I have not spent the last forty years writing down theories about children; most of what I have written has been based on observing children, living with them" (p. 7).

them. It is certain that in general children today, at least among the educated populace, are treated far more liberally and raised with much more permissiveness than the children of Neill's generation were subject to; in theory at least. However, it is important to make a distinction between permissiveness and freedom, and to point out that they are not the same thing. Neill does not argue – and neither do I – that children should be allowed to do anything they like. The freedom that Neill argues for – and which I too argue for in this chapter - is the freedom for children to be *themselves*. But freedom is not licence. Neill considers that it is this distinction between freedom and licence that most people cannot grasp. Neill (1968) argues that if a parent thinks that his/her child should “be allowed to paint the front door with red ink on the grounds that he is thereby expressing himself freely,” then that parent “is incapable of grasping what self-regulation means” (p. 105). However, while Neill (1968) contends that letting a child have his/her way at the expense of other people is detrimental to the child, Neill nonetheless unwaveringly maintains that “the function of the child is to live his own life – not the life that his anxious parents think he should live,” and that “all this interference and guidance on the part of adults only produces a generation of robots” (p. 27). There can be no doubt that in practice achieving a balance between freedom and licence is a somewhat precarious endeavour. Yet it is just this balance that Neill throughout his writings skilfully aims at.¹⁵⁹

In the presentation of the material that follows I have supplemented the discussion with incidents from my own personal observation. Aside from providing a context for the points made, I have done so because it is within the context of personal observation and my reflection on this experience that my thoughts about the following issues have been formed. It also occurs to me that the subject matter on the topic of child raising that has made the most impression on me has been when either a parent or educator has reflected upon his/her own practical experience and interactions with children. I think this is primarily because such reflections aim at understanding children in the context of their total personality, rather than providing the type of knowledge that pedagogic or scientific studies aimed at understanding

¹⁵⁹ Jungian analyst Robert Stein (1973) makes much the same argument that Neill makes concerning the destructive consequences for the child's well-being of being born into a life disapproving atmosphere. Denoting the “anti-life force” children encounter ‘the negative parent archetype’ (i.e., the equivalent of the Freudian superego), Stein notes that the negative parent archetype “is a force which is never accepting of him [the child] as he really is, always demanding that he be other than he is. *This is the Superego* and it is the *Negative Parent* because the positive parent gives sensitive care and protection to all growing things, allowing them to unfold slowly and naturally, never attempting to force or bend them to its will” (p. 176). Stein, again arguing similarly to Neill, notes that “we know that the development of consciousness, the humanization of man, demands that some restrictions be placed upon the instincts. But this does not mean that Nature must be squashed and forced to be something other than it is” (p. 176).

only isolated aspects of children's experience are able to provide. Defending a more personal style of intellectual engagement, Fromm (1994) makes the point that if philosophy "talked more *ad personam*, that is to say more in reference to what the philosophy means in my life and in your life, then... critical thinking would... be much more obviously a field of great personal significance" (p. 169).

In defence of spontaneity

When one of my nephews was five, I had a telephone conversation with him in which I ended the conversation by saying that I was looking forward to seeing him the following weekend when he visited. My nephew replied emphatically: "Well, we're *not* actually coming to *see you!* We're coming to see *Nana*, who gave us *Easter-eggs!*" I was greatly amused and would have laughed. However, I knew this would not be appropriate. I cannot remember exactly what I said, but something to the effect of: "Oh yes, of course you're coming to see Nana." As it happened, my nephew - along with his sister and mother - did visit the following weekend. By this time, he seemed as happy to see me as I was to see him.

Had I been offended at my nephew's honest admission, I consider that I would have been displaying a gross want of maturity. In fact, the decision that my sister-in-law and the children would also visit me when they were in Hamilton visiting their grandmother - my sister-in-law's mother - had only been arranged with my sister-in-law just prior to my talking to my nephew. Therefore, my nephew, not yet aware of this change in arrangements, set the record straight; and rightly so! They were *not* coming to visit me, they were coming to see their Nana, who - and, of course, of singular importance at age five! - had sent the children Easter-eggs the previous day.

Fromm (1941) writes of small children that they have "an ability to feel and think that which is really *theirs*" (p. 260). While this is certainly so, I have nonetheless observed many instances in which children's ability to feel and think for themselves was actively negated.

A number of years ago, I was invited for lunch to the home of a couple whom I knew little more than at the level of acquaintance. The couple was in their early thirties, and at that time had only one child, Geoffrey,¹⁶⁰ a two-year-old. I cannot now remember anything about the meal-time conversation, but I expect that the time must have passed pleasantly enough, and in due course I made to leave. I expect that I would never have had occasion to recall this

¹⁶⁰ NB: Names have been changed.

visit had I not – when bidding my hosts farewell – also happened to make a gesture of farewell to Geoffrey. When I said good-bye to Geoffrey, whom his father Paul was holding, he simply turned and buried his head in his father’s shoulder. In my opinion, this was perfectly normal behaviour. I was certainly not offended. However, it was immediately apparent that in Paul’s eyes, Geoffrey had committed some gross sin. At first the situation was merely embarrassing, with Paul insisting that Geoffrey acknowledge me. However, within the space of a minute or so this otherwise innocuous happening had escalated into a spectacle of outright distress. Paul coaxed Geoffrey in an increasingly threatening way. I insisted it was fine and tried to leave. And Geoffrey, still buried in his father’s chest, refused to do anything at all. In Paul’s view, Geoffrey’s behaviour was unacceptable. Paul took Geoffrey into a room just to the side of the foyer and beat him with a stick. While this was going on his mother tried to assure me that this was all a perfectly normal state of affairs. In fact, I had not said anything, but perhaps she could read from my face what I thought of the situation. I was finally able to leave.

This is the worst incident of its kind that I have personally witnessed. Yet in some respects this incident merely represents an extreme instance of types of behaviour I have observed as being rather common place; that is, behaviour such as coercion and force. If an adult talks to a young child and the child simply stares, in my view this is perfectly normal and acceptable behaviour. The child should not be coaxed to reply; certainly not forced to. If a two-year-old excitedly runs back and forward, bringing all his/her toys to show you and in his/her exuberance happens to crash a book down on your lap with a bit much force, this is not the crime of the century, for which an official apology is necessary. Nor, if a young child reaches to be picked up and you oblige, should s/he be told that you really do not want to hold him/her, or a crying youngster be told by his/her parents that other people in the room think him/her a very bad child. Nor should a child be told that the police will be called if s/he does not behave. However, by far the most common parental expectation of the young child is the insistent demand that s/he have manners. It always amuses me in a sad sort of way that the very parents who are so insistent that their child say “please” and “thank you” will talk disparagingly of their neighbours within the child’s hearing. What does the child learn from this? Perhaps superficial manners, but certainly not genuine respect.¹⁶¹

Neill (1968), who distinguishes between manners and etiquette, considers that what most children are taught is a form of etiquette which Neill describes as “the veneer of

¹⁶¹ In *On Education* (1960), Bertrand Russell writes that “the child must not see people he respects committing unkind or cruel actions. If the... mother speaks rudely to the maids, the child will catch these vices” (pp. 110-111).

manners” (p. 172). In contrast to etiquette which permits gossip and is concerned with the observance of outward rules and behaviour, Neill (1968) contends that good manners are the expression of loving-kindness in the deepest sense of the word. Manners thus understood are premised on a quality of character that prohibits the wounding of another, and are the expression of “genuine good taste” (p. 172). Neill did not think that manners could or should be taught in parrot-like fashion and he did not approve of children being forced or even encouraged to say ‘Please’ or ‘Thank you’ (p. 173). Neill maintains that children “who say ‘Please,’ and ‘Thank you,’ and ‘Excuse me, sir’ may have very little real concern for others” (p. 175). Neill (1968) notes that:

Artificial manners are the first layer of hypocritical veneer to be dropped under freedom. New children generally show marvelous manners – that is, they behave insincerely. In Summerhill, in time, they come to have good manners – real manners, for in Summerhill we ask for no manners at all, not even a ‘Thank you’ or a ‘Please’. Yet again and again, visitors say, ‘But their manners are delightful!’ (p. 174)

Brazilian educationalist Paulo Freire is of the same mind as Neill with regard to the teaching of manners. In drawing a distinction between love and the pathology of love, Freire (1976) writes that “I cannot... force my children to say ‘Good night’ if they do not wish to. I will never impose on them anything in the name of civilization thinking that I love them in doing so” (p. 227). Neill (1968) argues for a sense of proportion and sanity in the treatment of children and contends that “by continually correcting children, we make them feel inferior. We injure their natural dignity” (p. 147).

The central issue here is that of protecting the child’s spontaneity; that is, the child’s essential aliveness and the right of the child to relate to the people s/he comes in contact with and the world around him/her in a manner congruent with who s/he is. Fromm (1941) says of spontaneity that it is “one of the most difficult problems of psychology” (p. 258). It is such a difficult problem because once spontaneity is lost it is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to reclaim. The young child does not need to be *taught* how to live, nor even taught how to relate.¹⁶² The child has a natural and insatiable interest in the people and objects around him/her. Rather, the child needs to be *allowed* to live. There is a major difference between these two attitudes. Only the parent or educator who has faith¹⁶³ in life can allow the child the

¹⁶² Psychoanalyst Izette de Forest (1954) writes that “the child needs no lesson in loving, as the seed needs no lesson in growth. The plant can be counted upon by the skillful gardener to reach full bloom if given space and air and nourishment. So does the child in its health and happiness answer the mother’s devoted care” (p. 186).

¹⁶³ Fromm (1947) writes that it is important that “the significant persons in a child’s life have faith in these potentialities [i.e., to love, to be happy, to employ reason, etc.]. The presence of this faith makes the difference

freedom to be what Neill (1953) refers to as one's "sincere self" (p. 98). Fromm (1941) writes that "the suppression of spontaneous feelings, and thereby of the development of genuine individuality starts very early... with the earliest training of the child" (p. 241); spontaneity is substituted with "superimposed feelings, thoughts, and wishes" (p. 242). Neill (1968), who likewise draws attention to how early the child's natural life impulses are interfered with, rails that:

It is almost incredible that ignorant doctors and parents should dare to interfere with a baby's natural impulses and behaviour, destroying joy and spontaneity with their absurd ideas of guiding and moulding. It is people like these who begin the universal sickness of mankind, both psychic and somatic. Later school and church continue the process of disciplinary education that is anti-pleasure and anti-freedom. (pp. 162-163)

A couple of years ago I attended a university social function where I saw a man there break off a piece of the bread roll he was eating and offer it to a little girl – approximately two-years of age – standing next to him. The little girl looked up at the man for what seemed a considerable length of time, but was perhaps only about eight or nine seconds. She then slowly reached out and took the piece of bread from him. I am aware that this less than ordinary event is by no means newsworthy. Yet observing unnoticed this simple exchange, it appeared to me that this encounter was animated with a quality of magic. Neither the man nor the little girl said anything. The man did not hurry the child in any way, but allowed her time to decide what she wanted to do and to respond in her own way. The encounter was magical because it was profoundly human. In a literal sense it was merely the exchange of food, but in a symbolic sense it was a genuine act of human giving and receiving and therefore of human love. It occurs to me that few of our encounters with other people have this human quality. Had the little girl's parents been nearby at the time, it is likely that they would have endeavoured to mediate the encounter in some way: "Take the piece of bread; say 'Thank you.'" Such mediation is unnecessary and in many cases damaging. The child who is continually told what to do and how to react loses confidence in and connection with his/her own ability and unique manner of relating. The conditioned child becomes the dull and suppressed adult. It is little wonder that many adults suffer from what Susan Jeffers (1991) refers to as the inner 'chatterbox,' a contemporary take on the Freudian superego: "I always say the wrong thing"; "I offended her"; "Why can't I do anything right!" When an individual

between education and manipulation. Education is identical with helping the child realize his potentialities. The opposite of education is manipulation, which is based on the absence of faith in the growth of potentialities and on the conviction that a child will be right only if the adults put into him what is desirable and cut off what seems to be undesirable. There is no need of faith in the robot since there is no life in it either" (p. 209).

loses the capacity for spontaneity s/he also loses the capacity for mystery and the ability to relate in a truly human way. Encounters thus become perfunctory and lifeless. It is impossible to love when one is afraid of saying or doing the wrong thing.

Spontaneity is the precondition for individuality and therefore the precondition for productive relatedness. If the capacity for spontaneity is broken in a child, s/he becomes a stranger to his/herself and therefore a stranger in the world. The natural inclination of the growing child to assert him/herself as an “I am” being is lost. Progressively the conditioned child moves from expressing him/herself as “I am” to fearfully asking “Who am I?” It is then that the child becomes a being for others, which is the fate of most individuals. Genuine spontaneity is as rare as is authenticity.¹⁶⁴ The consequence of this is that genuine relationship is also rare. It cannot be otherwise when the individual – the very basis of human relationship – is undermined.

It may be supposed that if the individual retained spontaneity, s/he would be indiscriminate in his/her relating with others. In fact quite the opposite is the case. Jung (1934d) writes that “children are not half as stupid as we imagine. They notice only too well what is genuine and what is not” (p. 286). Likewise, Fromm (1941) notes that children “still dislike somebody ‘for no good reason’ – except the very good one that they feel the hostility, or insincerity, radiating from that person” (p. 243). However, Fromm (1941) also notes that during the process of ‘training’ in which the child is taught to be uncritically friendly and to like people “this reaction is soon discouraged” (p. 243). Fromm (1941) notes that “it does not take long for the child to reach the ‘maturity’ of the average adult and to lose the sense of discrimination between a decent person and a scoundrel” (p. 243). The child knows that the emperor has no clothes. Only the conditioned adult can be led to believe that perhaps he does.

This point is of note because while I argue throughout this thesis for the necessity of treating people – all people, regardless of who they are – lovingly, I do not argue that a person either can or should like every person s/he meets. It is in fact possible to treat a person lovingly without liking him/her. Human love is based on the humanistic maxim: “There is nothing human which is alien to me” (Fromm, 1994, p. 100), and on the understanding that we are all in part responsible for and influenced by the collective shadow. Only the person who lacks self-knowledge would presume, like the Biblical Pharisee, to declare: ‘I thank thee God

¹⁶⁴ Fromm (1994) writes that “what people and especially analysts today ought to learn first of all is to see the distinction between authenticity and façade.... Most people do not see the difference between façade and the authentic, although unconsciously they do” (p. 103).

that I am not as other men are'¹⁶⁵ (Luke 18:11, Authorized King James version). Loving ourselves and others means that we understand, for example, that the person who is always angry is most likely that way because s/he is also deeply hurt. Therefore we choose to react with compassion toward that person rather than with judgement. Nonetheless, this does not mean that we ignore our spontaneous subjective feeling reactions toward other people;¹⁶⁶ nor does it mean that we can or should form a close relationship with every person we meet. Indeed, for the sake of our own integrity, we must not! The person who cannot discriminate, who trusts too quickly or easily, will likely find him/herself with friends that s/he has little in common with and engaged in a web of social interactions that drain his/her energy and undermine his/her integrity.¹⁶⁷ Thus, spontaneity, far from causing a person to relate indiscriminately, rather seems to act as the guardian of individual and relational integrity.

Respecting the spontaneity of a child means allowing the child the full expression of feelings. Janov (1970) writes that children should be allowed:

... to say what they want to say in the way they want to say it. This means allowing them to complain, to be loud and exuberant, to criticize, to sass... Children should be allowed to express themselves because feelings belong to them; they may not break furniture or the dishes because those belong to the family. But a child isn't likely to be destructive in a physical way if he can be verbal about it. (p. 279)

Distasteful as it is to the parent whose child must be seen to be 'good,' children must also be allowed to be selfish. Fromm (1947) argues that the admonition: 'Don't be selfish!' essentially means do not love yourself or be yourself and "becomes one of the most powerful ideological tools in suppressing spontaneity and the free development of personality" (pp. 131-132). Children often become projects both in a literal and in a psychological sense. A project in the sense that the parent tries to mould the child into being 'somebody,' and a project in the psychological sense of being a projection of the parent's own shadow aspects. Perhaps on this point of selfishness more than in any other respect parents need to examine

¹⁶⁵ As Jung (1954b) points out "the 'man without a shadow' is statistically the commonest human type, one who imagines he actually *is* only what he cares to know about himself. Unfortunately neither the so-called religious man nor the man of scientific pretensions forms any exception to this rule" (p. 409).

¹⁶⁶ In the context of discussing the impact of the superego, or what is referred to by Jung as the negative parent archetype, Stein (1973) makes the important point that one should not "avoid or ignore such emotions which tell you you despise the very existence of a particular person or that you experience another as a truly virtuous enlightened being. These are spontaneous, personal and subjective judgmental reactions which must not be confused with the Negative Parent. In fact, the Negative Parent can not tolerate a spontaneous, irrational reaction unless it can be rationally justified and objectively validated" (p. 178).

¹⁶⁷ Fromm (1962a), in discussing the practice of the art of loving writes of the necessity of developing concentration and of avoiding bad company, clarifying that "I do not refer only to people who are vicious and destructive; one should avoid their company because their orbit is poisonous and depressing. I mean also the company of zombies, of people whose soul is dead... of people whose thoughts and conversation are trivial; who chatter instead of talk, and who assert cliché opinions instead of thinking" (p. 82).

whether they in fact are able to practice what they preach. For example, would the parent who makes his/her child share his/her toys really consider indiscriminately lending his/her car to other people?

Stephen Covey (1989), in his book *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*, recounts an incident in which he arrived home to his three-year-old daughter's birthday party to find her clutching all the presents she had been given and refusing to share them with the other children (p. 38). Covey says that the first thing he noticed was the many other parents there who were witnessing his daughter's selfish display. Covey (1989) writes: "I was embarrassed, and doubly so because at the time I was teaching university classes in human relations. And I knew, or at least felt, the expectation of these parents" (p. 38). Covey recounts that at first he asked his daughter to share. She refused. Covey then tried to reason with her. She still refused. Becoming embarrassed at his lack of influence, Covey says he tried to bribe her. When this did not work, Covey resorted to threatening her. As this did not work either, Covey simply took some of the toys from her and gave them to the other children (pp. 38-39). However, reflecting on this incident Covey (1989) writes that:

Perhaps my daughter needed the experience of possessing the things before she could give them. (In fact, unless I possess something, can I ever really give it?) She needed me as her father to have a higher level of emotional maturity to give her that experience. But at that moment, I valued the opinion those parents had of me more than the growth and development of my child and our relationship together. I simply made an initial judgment that I was right; she should share, and she was wrong in not doing so..... Had I been more mature, I could have relied on my own intrinsic strength – my understanding of sharing and of growth and my capacity to love and nurture – and allowed my daughter to make a free choice as to whether she wanted to share or not to share. (p. 39)

Covey's reflections are important as they highlight the fact that in order to allow children spontaneity adults need to relate toward children responsibly. In fact, unless adults are adults, children cannot be children. As noted in the Introduction, Fromm (1962a) identifies responsibility as one of the primary attributes of productive love. Fromm (1962a) writes that while responsibility is most often associated with duty "in its true sense... it is my response to the needs, expressed or unexpressed, of another human being" (p. 26). Janov (1970), who also highlights this aspect of responsibility, points out: "After all, you can let someone be himself by ignoring him, but response to another is an integral part of love" (p. 272). Janov (1970) writes that in the early years of a child's life responding to the child means "a great deal of holding and fondling" (p. 273), and that "physical contact is a *sine qua non* for children" (p. 273). Janov's wife, Vivian (1973), writes that:

There is... a whole school of pediatricians, psychologists, and unfeeling parents who have given babies the magical quality of being cunning, power-mad schemers who must be taught discipline and self-control from the moment they are born. I believe the baby will be content, relatively pain-free, undemanding, and unspoiled if you *always* pay attention to the cries that say 'I need.' (p. 199; emphasis added)

Neill (1968) likewise is adamant on this point, forcefully stating that “one fundamental truth should be written out in every nursery: *Baby must not be allowed to cry himself out.* His needs must be attended to every time” (pp. 161-162). While physical affection and an open, loving response toward the baby and child is important, the growing child also needs to experience increasing emotional and intellectual stimulation within the context of interpersonal relationship. Fromm (1994), drawing on studies of schizophrenic patients by Harry Stack Sullivan and R. D. Laing, writes that:

... the family which produces schizophrenics, is not a particularly vicious family. It's not a family in which the child is particularly mistreated. It is a family of absolute boredom, of absolute emptiness, of lifelessness, of no genuine relation of anyone to the other, which starves a child of his need for personal contact. (p. 63)

Stressing the importance of providing for a child's emotional development, Fromm (1994) maintains that what many people overlook is that the need for interpersonal interaction and stimulation is equally important and continues much longer than the original need of the child for physical contact. Throughout his writings, Fromm develops a theory of motivation based on the distinction between a biophilous and necrophilous orientation (see e.g., 1964, pp. 37-61). He distinguishes these two modes of orientation as being the difference between the “love of life” and the “love of death” (pp. 37-61). Fromm maintains that one of the greatest needs of the child is to be around people who have a biophilous orientation toward life.

Accordingly, Fromm (1964) writes that:

Among the specific conditions necessary for the development of biophilia... [are] warm, affectionate contact with others during infancy; freedom, and absence of threats; teaching – by example rather than by preaching – of the principles conducive to inner harmony and strength; guidance in the ‘art of living’; stimulating influence of and response to others; a way of life that is genuinely interesting. The very opposite of these conditions furthers the development of necrophilia: growing up among death-loving people; lack of stimulation; fright, conditions which make life routinized and uninteresting; mechanical order instead of one determined by direct and human relations among people. (pp. 51-52)

In closing this section, I cite the following incident furnished by Bertrand Russell involving an interaction with his son. What I particularly like about Russell's views on how adults/parents/educators should treat and relate to children, and which is reflected in the

following recount, is that Russell displays a keen sense of the responsibility incumbent on adults/parents in relation to children I have highlighted. Russell (1960) maintains that “the child has no important function to perform in relation to his parents. His function is to grow... and so long as he does so a healthy parental instinct is satisfied” (p. 109). Here he recounts:

When my boy was two years and four months old I went to America, and was absent three months. He was perfectly happy in my absence, but was wild with joy when I returned. I found him waiting impatiently by the garden gate; he seized my hand, and began showing me everything that specially interested him. I wanted to hear, and he wanted to tell; I had no wish to tell, and he had none to hear. The two impulses were different, but harmonious. When it comes to stories, he wishes to hear and I wish to tell, so that again there is harmony. Only once has this situation been reversed. When he was three years and six months old, I had a birthday and his mother told him that everything was to be done to please me. Stories are his supreme delight; to our surprise, when the time for them came, he announced that he was going to tell me stories, as it was my birthday. He told about a dozen, then jumped down, saying, ‘No more stories today’. That was three months ago, but he has never told stories again. (pp. 109-110)

The ‘right’ way

Psychiatrist M. Scott Peck (1998) writes that in his youth, and based upon his observation of the adults he knew, he had thought it inevitable that as people grew older they also became more rigid and more set in their ways; more convinced about the ‘rightness’ of their opinions. However, Peck writes that his perception about the inevitable equation between growing older and rigidity changed considerably when at the age of twenty he stayed for the summer with celebrated author, John P. Marquand, who at the time was in his sixties. Peck (1998) recounts that:

Three or four times a week he and I used to argue late into the night, and I could actually win some of these arguments. I could *change his mind*. In fact, I saw him change his mind as a result of one thing or another several times a week. So it was that... I came to the extraordinary awareness that this man had not grown old mentally. In fact, if anything, he had grown younger, more flexible, developing more rapidly from a psychological standpoint than most adolescents. And for the first time in my life I realized that we do not have to grow old mentally. Physically, yes.... But mentally, spiritually, no. (p. 181)

It is parents or primary caregivers who first introduce a child to the wider world. Under optimal conditions, the child’s natural interest in everything around him/her is mediated by the adults s/he comes in contact with in such a way that the child’s experience and knowledge of the world is increasingly widened. The child’s interest is thus matched with an

ever increasing knowledge of his/her wider surroundings. In this way, the parent takes the hand of his/her child and places it into the hand of life itself. This of course presupposes that the adults upon whom the child is relying to mediate his/her experience of the world and of life are themselves alive and growing people who have themselves developed the capacity for productive relatedness. However, it would seem that the quality of open understanding required for productive relatedness is in fact relatively rare. Peck (1998) recounts that a mentor of his once said to him: “Ah Scotty, an adult is a marvelous thing!” (p. 181). Peck comments that what he meant by this is “that an adult is a creation to marvel at; there are so relatively few of them” (p. 181).

Thus it happens that rather than facilitating the child’s understanding of his/her environment and of life that parents and educators often relate to children in a manner that in fact narrows and limits their capacity to learn and to know. Peck (1990) points out that in the eyes of children parents are godlike figures. Peck accordingly notes that “when parents do things a certain way, it seems to the young child the way to do them, the way they should be done” (p. 20). The child encounters the parents’ ‘teaching’ having no basis or experience for comparison. Therefore, the child is essentially defenceless against the prejudices and biases of his/her parents. Further, the child is influenced not only by what the parent overtly teaches, but more so by the parent’s covert attitudes and actions (see Jung, 1951). Peck (1990) elaborates this point, noting that:

If a child sees his parents day in and day out behaving with self-discipline, restraint, dignity and a capacity to order their own lives, then the child will come to feel in the deepest fibres of his being that this is the way to live. If a child sees his parents day in and day out living without self-restraint or self-discipline, then he will come in the deepest fibres of being to believe that that is the way to live. (pp. 20-21)

The essential point here is that children are often taught by the adults around them *what* to know rather than *how* to know. It is unfortunate, but hardly surprising, that many people grow up learning a particular ‘right way’ of thinking and living. This ‘right way’ can extend from the simplest things such as the ‘right way’ to do the dishes to more fundamental issues such as the ‘right’ religious convictions. It is unlikely that many parents sit down with their children and rationally explain to them why they hold certain views or convictions. It is unlikely that the parent who has a Christian world view would say to his/her children that s/he adopted this point of view for certain reasons but that many people, including people from other cultures, think differently, and that the children are free to form their own opinions. In fact, it is unlikely that a parent who has decided religious or political convictions would even

consider it his/her responsibility to introduce children to other views and ways of thinking. It is unlikely primarily because there are few people who themselves critically assess their own particular beliefs, thoughts, and values. Therefore they see no reason why other people, and particularly their children, should even think to question what to them is self-evident. More often than not the child is expected to unquestionably and uncritically adopt his/her parents' point of view.

Fromm (1970) notes that learning often makes the individual "more rather than less blind" (p. 27). Mill (1869/1996) speaks of the "magical influence of custom, which is not only... a second nature, but is continually mistaken for the first" (p. 9). Mill writes that "the world, to each individual, means the part of it with which he comes in contact; his party, his sect, his church, his class of society" (p. 20). However, Mill (1869/1996) highlights the irrationality of merely seeing the world from the narrow perspective of one's own encounter with it and of simply adopting pre-existent points of view, noting that:

[The individual] devolves upon his own world the responsibility of being in the right against the dissentient worlds of other people; and it never troubles him that mere accident has decided which of these numerous worlds is the object of his reliance, and that the same causes which make him a Churchman in London, would have made him a Buddhist or a Confucian in Peking [sic]. (p. 21)

The problem is not what an individual's particular views and beliefs are. Mill (1869/1996) ardently defends the right of the individual to practice liberty of thought in every sphere of engagement. Rather, the central issue is the manner in which the individual holds his/her point of view. It is more a question of attitude than a question of content. If the individual holds rigidly to his/her point of view, if s/he has the attitude that my way, this way, our way is *the* right way, then this attitude effectively blocks him/her from further learning and growth. The individual thus conditioned becomes static and spiritually dead. Fromm (1956) writes that if the individual is to develop as a human being "he must continue to be born" (p. 198). This capacity for emotional and intellectual regeneration necessitates openness to experience and the willingness to continually examine and when necessary revise one's picture of the world. For the individual who already knows everything and whose way of life is 'right,' the world increasingly narrows. For the individual who views his/her life as a pilgrimage of discovery, everyday is new and rich with possibilities for learning, growth, and transformation. Peck (1999) contends that the inability or failure to think "isn't just a problem, it is *the* problem" (p. 25).

Any survey of historical and contemporaneous affairs is more than enough to convince even the most sceptical that the inability to appreciate other people's points of view results in unimaginable suffering. Multitudes of people have been - and in some parts of the world, still are - put to death merely for happening to disagree with the spirit of their age. Jung (1934b) draws attention to how deeply entrenched the prejudice against new ideas is and the degree to which thinking for oneself is censored, noting that "to think otherwise than as our contemporaries think is somehow illegitimate and disturbing; it is even indecent, morbid or blasphemous, and therefore socially dangerous for the individual" (p. 653). Jung (1952a) further notes that "naturally every age thinks that all ages before it were prejudiced, and today we think this more than ever and are just as wrong as all previous ages that thought so" (p. 861). While much of the persecution against thought has been and is rooted in religious intolerance, education – as noted - does not necessarily make a person less dogmatic. David Tacey (1997) points out that:

Some of us in the secular academy like to imagine that the university is a place where beliefs and systems of belief are chased away, and where objectivity and detachment reign supreme. Of course, this is simply not true. Because while belief *per se* is not encouraged, there are theologies inside our theories, and articles of faith underpin most of our intellectual positions. (p. 269)

Mill is of the view that even if the whole of humankind were agreed on a particular issue and only one person held a different view, then that one person's viewpoint should nonetheless in no ways be suppressed. Mill (1869/1996), elaborating this point further, notes that:

But the peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is, that it is robbing the human race; posterity as well as the existing generation; those who dissent from the opinion, still more than those who hold it. If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth: if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error. (p. 19)

I quoted Peck (1999) above who asserts that the failure to think well is not only *a* problem, but *the* problem. I agree with Peck as to the seriousness of this issue. Yet in my view there is a much more fundamental concern at stake. I would rather argue or further argue that *the* problem lies centrally not so much in our failure to think well but in our failure to *love well*, and in the privileging of the intellect over feeling.¹⁶⁸ Fromm (1963) makes the pivotal point that thought in and of itself can never satisfy our need and desire to know; in particular,

¹⁶⁸ Neill (1968) writes that "textbooks do not deal with human character, or with love, or with freedom, or with self-determination. And so the system goes on, aiming only at standards of book learning – goes on separating the head from the heart" (p. 38).

thought can never answer the ultimate questions and concerns of life. Fromm (1963) thus writes that “full knowledge of man by thought is impossible... full ‘knowledge’ can occur only in the act of love” (p. 197). Fromm (1962a) further notes that “if the right thought is not the ultimate truth... there is no reason to fight others, whose thinking has arrived at different formulations” (p. 59). Fromm (1962a) distinguishes between Aristotelian logic and paradoxical logic and points out that although there are strands of the paradoxical logic which distinguishes Chinese and Indian philosophical thought within Western philosophy, in the main Western thought has been influenced by Aristotelian logic. Fromm (1962a) notes that:

Since one expected to find the ultimate truth in the right thought, major emphasis was on thought, although right action was held to be important too.... The idea that one could find the truth in thought led not only to dogma, but also to science. In scientific thought, the correct thought is all that matters, both from the aspect of intellectual honesty, as well as from the aspect of the application of scientific thought to practice – that is, to technique. In short, paradoxical thought led to tolerance and an effort toward self-transformation. The Aristotelian standpoint led to dogma and science, to the Catholic Church, and to the discovery of atomic energy. (pp. 59-60)

More important by far than teaching a child what to think is the necessity of showing the child by example how to relate. As already argued, this necessitates respecting the child’s spontaneity. However, the child also needs to learn by example from the adults s/he comes in contact with. In *How to Win Friends and Influence People* (1981), Dale Carnegie recounts learning what he considered an invaluable lesson while attending a dinner party shortly after the end of World War 1 (pp. 115-116). Carnegie writes that during the course of the evening a gentleman referred to a quote which he claimed came from the Bible (p. 115). Carnegie knew that the quote did not come from the Bible but was rather a quote from Shakespeare and therefore he made no delay in correcting the gentleman. The two men argued the point, finally appealing to Dale’s friend; a Shakespearian expert. Dale’s friend kicked him under the table and said: “Dale, you are wrong. The gentleman is right. It *is* from the Bible” (p. 116). On their way home Dale reproached his friend: “Frank, you knew that quotation was from Shakespeare” (p. 116). His friend replied:

Yes, of course... But we were guests at a festive occasion... Why prove to a man he is wrong?... Why not let him save his face? He didn’t ask for your opinion. He didn’t want it. Why argue with him? (p. 116)

The biblical Apostle Paul contrasts knowledge with love and writes that “knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth” (1 Cor. 8:1). Jung, in speaking about truth, also draws attention to the necessity of displaying charity, which he claims is “the greatest of all virtues” (1958a, p. 779). Jung writes that truth “speaks in many tongues, and that if we still cannot see

this it is simply due to lack of understanding” (p. 779). In the biblical proverbs of Solomon a wise person is defined as someone who “uses knowledge aright” (Prov. 15:2). Fromm (1947) quotes Plato who cautions against the indiscriminate use of knowledge, writing that “... there is far greater peril in buying knowledge than in buying meat and drink” (p. 13). In all these passages knowing is perceived not only as a function of intellect but primarily as a function of character.¹⁶⁹

In Chapter One I argued that respect for the individual and love are synonymous phenomena. Within the context of this discussion it is likewise possible to postulate that where there is respect for the individual, there will also be truth. Rollo May (1958) rightly observes that “when we are dealing with human beings, no truth has reality by itself; it is always dependent upon the reality of the immediate relationship” (p. 27).

In summarising this section I want to define my position by saying that in speaking of knowledge or truth I am neither postulating that there is any such thing as *the* truth, nor am I advocating uncritical relativism. In my opinion the notion of truth with a capital ‘T’ is untenable due to the fact that knowledge and truth cannot be seen as static but are rather dynamic concepts.¹⁷⁰ In an oft-quoted passage, Kahlil Gibran (1972) writes of children that “you may give them your love but not your thoughts, for they have their own thoughts” (p. 13). Fromm (1994), in envisaging a culture conducive to human well-being, comments that he could not give a fixed blueprint of such a society because “in new circumstances new things arise in detail, [and] thus also our knowledge changes and in some ways increases every day” (p. 75). Jung (1953) notes that “there are things that are not yet true today, perhaps we dare not find them true, but tomorrow they may be” (p. 201). Therefore truth must be understood in this dynamic sense if we are not to inflict on each other and particularly on children ideologies that restrain rather than cultivate the thoughts of tomorrow; the thoughts that are becoming.

Yet in arguing for the necessity of being open to the opinions of others I am not thereby licensing a purely relativistic stance. It is not true that every opinion is as good as the next just because someone happens to think it. Fromm (1994) argues that critical thinking should be on the side of life and promote individual and social development. Openness to

¹⁶⁹ I belatedly came across the following passage from Fromm (1962) in which he categorically states this point: “I believe that to recognize the truth is not primarily a matter of intelligence, but a matter of character” (p. 180)

¹⁷⁰ Stein (1973) notes concerning the psyche that as against the superego the “truths and wisdom of the soul are always in response to the conditions of the time, to the needs of the moment. Above all, the eternal truths which the soul reveals are never rigid – they are always alive, always undergoing subtle changes and transformations. The soul itself is always dynamic and transforming” (p. 174).

others' opinions allows the individual opportunity for continual growth. However, this in no wise commits the individual to relativism.

While reflecting on this issue, I viewed a BBC broadcast documenting the Taliban rule of Afghanistan from 1996-2001 and while doing so decided to give the viewpoint – proposed by some proponents of postmodern thought – that no comparative judgement between cultures and cultural beliefs and practices can be made (Simpson, 2002).¹⁷¹ As I watched the documentary I tried to think whether what I was viewing was merely different from conditions within my own culture, or whether what I was viewing could be perceived as comparatively worse. In sum, I wanted to examine for myself whether I had any grounds for thinking that there were social or cultural conditions that could be conceived of as better or worse and on what grounds I could justify making such comparisons. The documentary presented footage of a number of horrific scenes, including filming of a woman being beaten because, as presenter John Simpson explained, “she had shown her face.”

It is my view that societal conditions within a country such as Afghanistan are not just different from conditions within New Zealand society, they are in fact fundamentally worse. In saying this I am not overlooking the fact that Western cultures are pervaded by human rights abuses on a number of levels and engage in their own more covert forms of oppression. I certainly do not think Western cultures the “good guys” in the drama of global affairs. Yet despite this I am still of the viewpoint that a country which legitimises the beating of a woman – or anyone for that matter – on some point of religious law or custom is not just different from a society in which a citizen's basic human rights are protected by law; *it is worse*, and worse not just in this respect, but fundamentally so.

In terms of my argument this presents somewhat of a conundrum: In one respect it could be said that the argument that it is both impossible and wrong to make comparative

¹⁷¹ Keith Windschuttle (1994) notes that “cultural relativism sees other cultures as legitimate in themselves – equal but different – no matter what the content. The idea of underlying values, common to all humanity, is seen as nothing but a myth of European culture and an oppressive imposition on those with different ways of life” (p. 60). Cultural relativism has long antecedents. One discipline in which the term and concept has been used is anthropology. However, a distinction has been noted between cultural relativism and moral relativism and the point made that the former does not necessarily equate to or justify the latter. Anthropologists George Marcus and Michael Fischer (as cited in “Cultural relativism,” 2006) point out that “when the principle of cultural relativism was popularized after World War II, it came to be understood more as a doctrine, or position, than as a method. As a consequence, people misinterpreted cultural relativism to mean that... all value systems, however different, are equally valid. Thus, people came to use the phrase ‘cultural relativism’ erroneously to signify ‘moral relativism.’” Evaluating the concept of cultural relativism as employed by postmodernists, Eagleton (1996) notes “in its post-imperial phase, and in a supposedly multicultural society, the system can no longer plausibly claim that its values are superior to those of others, simply – key postmodern term – different. There can be no real comparison between two sets of values, since this would presume a third sort of rationality within which they could all be encompassed, which is part of what is being denied” (p. 40).

judgements between cultures is an argument that in fact is premised on the very point I have been making in this section; that knowledge or truth is furthered when we consider and respect ways of thinking different to our own. The argument not to judge a culture by one's own standard or to make comparative judgements between cultures could thus be considered as an argument in the service of human respect. It is also an argument that is premised on the intellectual reactionary condemnation of and distancing from European colonisation.

Certainly both these premises for arguing for a relativistic stance are commendable. Yet while I have argued for the necessity of being open to ways of thinking different to our own, my main argument has been that knowledge and love must stand in tension with and balance each other, and that knowledge must be in the service of life. While the call for relativism meets the first criterion in that it supports and seems to embody the commendable quality of being open to the viewpoints of other people, it does not – in my opinion – meet this second, and equally important, criterion. Taken out of the abstract and transposed into the realm of the literal, what in fact does the argument that there is no point of reference outside of culture actually mean and what does it legitimate? In the event that a family member of someone who held this opinion happened to be found in possession of alcohol in an Islamic country in which alcohol consumption is illegal, and then had to suffer the consequence of what a law court might consider the appropriate retribution for this “sin,” it is almost certain that notions of human rights and of there being such a thing as better or worse in terms of culture would come into play. Following the principle of productive love, if this is so for a family member or a friend, then surely it also applies to those we do not know. As argued in Chapter One, pre-existent to culture is the living life-force entity that the human child *is*, regardless of which culture the child is born into.

Further, while Western intervention in the affairs of other countries has predominantly – and wrongly - been in terms of self interest and in many instances can be seen to have exacerbated the oppression other countries suffer,¹⁷² does it therefore follow that there is never legitimation on the grounds of humanitarian concerns to intervene in the affairs of another country? Surely a genuinely free people would not tolerate the type of human rights violations which are everywhere apparent in the world today. Mill (1869/1996), who ardently defends principles of liberty, nonetheless writes that “despotism is a legitimate mode of government in dealing with barbarians, provided the end be their improvement, and the means justified by actually effecting that end” (p. 13). Mill's view is certainly not one that is considered

¹⁷² A recent example of this is the widely criticised war waged within Iraq.

politically correct by today's standard; but then is politically correct and humanly correct the same thing? Who in fact wins when culture is reified to the realm of the untouchable? Certainly not the individual, which in the context of the main argument of this thesis is the same as to say certainly not love and certainly not life. Paulo Freire (1996) points out that "a situation of violence and oppression" (p. 40) dehumanises not just the victim, but his/her oppressor also: "Both are submerged in this situation, and both bear the marks of oppression" (p. 40).

I have dwelt considerably on this example in order to highlight the danger of separating thought from praxis. Fromm (1981) writes that "the philosopher who follows reason is a citizen of the world; man is his object – not this or that person, this or that nation. The world is his country, not the place where he was born" (p. 49). Certainly the viewpoint that it is wrong to judge another culture from a point outside of that culture is one that a person has every right to express and that is worthy of respect. Further, when understood as a reaction against the oppressive practices of self-interested colonisation, it certainly is an argument that has merit and that needs to be taken into account. This clarified however, it is necessary to qualify that in the same way that spontaneity should not licence silliness, neither should respect for the opinions of others commit one to a position of wholesale relativism.

Respecting difference

I once met a young mother who was the friend of an acquaintance of mine, and who as circumstances occasioned I happened to spend one morning with. I have not met the woman since and as quite a few years have now passed, would probably not recognise her if I did happen to meet her again. The woman had a six-month-old baby. In the course of the conversation, the woman spoke to her baby saying: "You're going to play the organ, aren't you!"... "You're going to be an organ player just like your granddad!"... "You're going to learn the organ before you learn to walk!" I gathered that the child's grandfather had attained some small renown at a local level for his organ playing. I looked at the young baby this woman was bouncing up and down on her knee, and felt a tremendous wave of sorrow for him. Even if by some miraculous chance of fate this child was musically predisposed, chances were that his mother's clearly indomitable will on the matter would stifle, even kill, any natural musical inclination within him. However, even worse was the more likely prospect that the child was not musically gifted at all and that he would have no interest in his mother's

projected passions. What if the child wanted to play rugby, or was interested in constructing model aeroplanes, or simply wanted to play? What then?

Jung (1946a) draws attention to how common the type of situation I have just described is. Commenting on a particular case in which a mother, who wanted her daughter to be a prodigy, had forced her daughter's intellectual development at the expense of her emotional growth, Jung (1946a) writes that:

Nothing is more stunting than the efforts of a mother to embody herself in her child, without ever considering that a child is not a mere appendage, but a new and individual creature, often furnished with a character which is not in the least like that of the parents. (p. 222)

Jung (1946a) elaborates further that parents who burden their children with their unfulfilled ambitions and force them to follow pursuits for which they are not suited show a lack of capacity to view their children realistically and show no consideration for their children's individual particularity. Jung maintains that the worst thing about this situation is that such parents often consider themselves to be acting in the best interest of their child/children. However, Jung (1946a) argues that the forced and conditioned child is not "given a grain of real love" (p. 222), but is rather the victim of his/her parent/s' egotism. Jung's comment that the child whose individuality is not respected is not given a grain of real love is of especial significance to the argument of this thesis, since Jung here directly equates respect for individuality with "real love."

Neill (1968) maintains that "you cannot *make* children learn music or anything else without to some degree converting them into will-less adults" (p. 27; see also Vivian Janov, 1973, p. 203). Fromm (1970) draws attention to the wider societal factors that impact upon the parental pressure children are often subject to, particularly in terms of educational and career choices, pointing out that because of the child's "social and economic function, the goal of his education is ordinarily not his personal happiness – i.e., the maximum development of his personality; it is rather his maximum usefulness in contributing to... economic and social needs" (p. 102). The child must be a success and is expected to reach an educational and employment level either congruent with or in excess of his/her station in life. In contrast, Neill (1968) considers the happiness of children the chief priority, and writes that "my own criterion of success is the *ability to work joyfully and to live positively!*" (p. 41).¹⁷³

¹⁷³ Neill (1968) thus maintains that "indifferent scholars who, under discipline, scrape through college or university and become unimaginative teachers, mediocre doctors, and incompetent lawyers would possibly be good mechanics or excellent bricklayers" (p. 39).

The fundamental point of this discussion is that of respect. Like the attribute of responsibility discussed earlier in this chapter, respect is another quality which Fromm (1962a) identifies as characteristic of productive love. Fromm (1962a) writes that:

Respect is not fear and awe; it denotes, in accordance with the root of the word (*respicere*, to look at), the ability to see a person as he is, to be aware of his unique individuality. Respect means the concern that the other person should grow and unfold as he is. Respect, thus, implies the absence of exploitation. I want the loved person to grow and unfold for his own sake, and in his own ways, and not for the purpose of serving me. (p. 26)

Respect necessitates the capacity to see a person objectively.¹⁷⁴ In contrast to the woman referred to above who arbitrarily preordained her child's future, Fromm (1941) argues that "organic growth is possible only under the condition of supreme respect for the peculiarity of the self of other persons as well as of our own self. This respect for and cultivation of the uniqueness of the self is the most valuable achievement of human culture..." (p. 264).

While it is damaging to a child's individuality and organic development to force him/her to participate in some activity that s/he has no wish to – such as playing an instrument or learning a sport - it must further be pointed out that it is likewise damaging to ignore the request of a child to participate in some particular activity. It cannot be expected that every parent can afford some of the more expensive activities a child may wish to participate in. However, children's requests should be acknowledged and treated with respect. It is far less damaging to a child for a parent to explain honestly the reason why s/he is unable to meet a particular request, or to discuss with the child different means by which the opportunity s/he desires could be arranged either at that time or in the near future, than to say an outright no. It is not generally true that a child wants to do a certain thing just because one of his/her friends does it; and is this such a bad reason anyway? It is more likely that the child has recognised through his/her interactions with others a latent talent that s/he does in fact have the potentiality to develop.

If, after introducing a child to various experiences or pointing out different opportunities, a child shows no inclination to develop any particular gifting, then the parent should let the child be. The father who wants his child to play rugby because he always wanted to and never had the opportunity should remember that it is *not* the child's duty to make up for the parent's disappointments. If a child is thus forced then s/he will also lose out

¹⁷⁴ Fromm (1962a) defines objectivity in relation to the practice of love as "the faculty to see people and things *as they are*... and to be able to separate this *objective* picture from a picture which is formed by one's desires and fears" (p. 85). See Chapter Five for further discussion of objectivity.

on the opportunity to pursue those interests which are his/her own. In this respect, parents must come to terms with their own unlived life and not project it onto their children.¹⁷⁵ Neill (1968) makes this same point, yet insightfully adds that while:

... the parent wants the child to become what he or she has failed to become... there is more to it than that: every repressed parent is at the same time determined that his child shall not get more out of life than he, the parent, got. Unalive parents won't allow children to be alive. (p. 145)

I have argued thus far that children's individual interests and preferences should be respected. However, as Jung (1923) points out, "besides the many individual differences in human psychology there are also typical differences" (p. 1). It follows that children and individuals in general require respect not only in terms of their particular individuality but also in terms of the way in which people differ from one another in a constitutional sense. Jung distinguishes between introverted and extraverted personality types and writes that "we see how the fate of one individual is determined more by the objects of his interest, while in another it is determined more by his own inner self, by the subject" (p. 2). Jung (1923) further observes that "since we all swerve rather more towards one side or the other, we naturally tend to understand everything in terms of our own type"¹⁷⁶ (p. 2). Jung points out that in the context of interpersonal relations, the failure to comprehend the constitutional differences between ourselves and others leads to misunderstanding and engenders discord. Besides the demarcation Jung draws between extraverted and introverted personality types, Jung (1923) also found in the course of his analytical experience that people further tended to show predominance in terms of one of four psychological functions (p. 4). Jung classifies these psychological functions as those of thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition (p. 4).

Fromm (1994) likewise highlights the necessity of taking into account the constitutional differences which characterise individuals. Drawing attention to how early the constitutional differences of the individual become manifest, Fromm (1994) writes that:

Let us say a very sensitive mother, somebody who is a little shy, gets a boy who is aggressive, a little crude – and you can see that also at the age of eight weeks: that's

¹⁷⁵ It is perhaps well to note that unfortunately children are victims not only of what the parent consciously demands by way of projection, but more so of what parents unconsciously project. Jung (1923), in commenting comparatively on Carl Spitteler's *Prometheus and Epimetheus* and Goethe's *Prometheus* by way of commenting on the type problem within poetry, highlights how children are forced to unconsciously bear the unlived life of their parents when he notes that: "The resemblance between the Prometheus of 'Pandora' and the Prometheus of Spitteler ends here. He is merely a collective itch for action, so one-sided that it amounts to a repression of eroticism. His son Phileros ('lover of Eros') is simply erotic passion; for, as the son of his father, he must, as is often the case with children, re-enact under unconscious compulsion the unlived lives of his parents" (p. 307).

¹⁷⁶ Patrick Mullahy (1955), in overviewing Jung's typology, notes that Jung postulates that as "the relation of the unconscious to the conscious is compensatory; a consciously extraverted person is unconsciously introverted" (p. 157). Of course this is so vice versa also.

his temperament with which he is born. And she can't stand that child... she couldn't stand a person later on with his qualities... (p. 55)

It is equally possible to surmise that a baby with an introverted personality type may experience a mother with an extraverted personality type as an object of distress.¹⁷⁷ The mother may be particularly attentive and do all the right things, and yet the baby experiences the mother and the loudness and busyness of the home environment as disturbing and threatening. The baby's constitutional type necessitates quietness and gentle handling. Instead the mother handles the baby boisterously. The mother feeds the baby while listening to the radio at full volume. The telephone is constantly ringing and there are always visitors. None of these things are disturbing to the mother. This is her environment. She is able to do three things at once, and - unable to tolerate the confinement of staying at home - wants to be out and about. The mother does not understand what appears to her as her baby's unreasonable irritability and unnecessary crying. Fromm (1994) writes that "some parents are just allergic to a certain type of children" (p. 55), and that "it is... a fiction to assume that it's one's own child, therefore it would be born as a child which is sympathetic to one" (p. 56). Likewise, it must be equally true that some children are allergic to a certain type of parent. In the same way that Jung (1948c) argues that "the greatest mistake an analyst can make is to assume that his patient has a psychology similar to his own" (p. 498), so also it is possible to postulate that one of the greatest mistakes a parent can make is to assume that his/her child has a psychology similar to his/her own. Mill (1869/1996), who also emphasises that different persons require different conditions if they are to experience well-being and happiness, writes that:

The same mode of life is a healthy excitement to one, keeping all his faculties of action and enjoyment in their best order, while to another it is a distracting burthen, which suspends or crushes all internal life. Such are the differences among human beings in their sources of pleasure, their susceptibilities of pain, and the operation on them of different physical and moral agencies, that unless there is a corresponding diversity in their modes of life, they neither obtain their fair share of happiness, nor grow up to the mental, moral, and aesthetic stature of which their nature is capable. (p. 68)

¹⁷⁷ Psychoanalytic theorists Mitchell and Black also comment on constitutional factors in the parent/child relationship that impact on the child's experience and happiness or unhappiness. Drawing on Edith Jacobson's contribution to psychoanalytic theory, Mitchell and Black (1995) note that "because experience is *subjectively* processed... there is no such thing as simply 'good' mothering, in some objective sense, only mothering that *feels* good to this particular baby. Issues of temperamental predisposition (e.g., an easily frustrated infant), fit or misfit (e.g., a calm baby and an excitable mother), affective matching or mismatching (e.g., a happy baby and a depressed mother), and the mother's capacity to sense and respond to her baby's changing developmental needs – these will all be crucial in determining what affect is elicited in the infant at any given time..." (p. 50); "A parent whose caregiving style might be quite effective with one child might encounter enormous difficulties with another. Parenting, in this view, is shaped in the context of the inherent temperamental features of both parent and child. In this way, nature is built into nurture from the beginning" (p. 211).

Respecting the child's difference means allowing the child to make his/her own interest and later career choices. It also necessitates an awareness of the ways in which people constitutionally differ from one another. I referred earlier to Neill (1968) who postulates that the fundamental truth of every nursery should be that a baby must not be allowed to cry him/herself out. Perhaps another fundamental parenting principle could read thus: *The right of design is not mine!* Fromm (1994) posits that "the problem is not to create a norm for people to be the same but to create a norm that the full flowering, the full birth, the full aliveness should be in each person regardless what particular 'flower' he is" (p. 77). Fromm (1941) also contends that failure to allow for individual particularity tends to engender unhappiness and shame: "Whether or not we are aware of it, there is nothing of which we are more ashamed than of not being ourselves..." (p. 262).

In closing this discussion of the parent/child relationship and the impact of parental attitudes and treatment, Samuels (1989) points out that within psychoanalysis the issue of the impact of childhood and past experiences on personality development is a controversial topic (p. 15). There seems no question but that parental treatment of children is pivotal to well being. However, though Jung considered parents' reactions to children important, and in treating children with psychological difficulties looked first to the family constellation, Jung - as noted in the Introduction - rejects the notion that the infant is born a blank sheet (1954c, p. 151; 1931c, p. 719; see also Woolger, 1990, p. 315), and hence that the environment is the sole factor or player influencing fate (1931c, p. 720).¹⁷⁸ Consequently, although not downplaying the oft-times negative impact that parents have on their child/ren's psychological well-being, Jung nonetheless makes a distinction between a particular individual's parent/s and the image the individual has of his/her parent/s, which, in Jung's view, is influenced - at least in part - by the pre-existent parent archetype in the child's psyche (1946b, p. 212n; 1953, p. 293).¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁸ Jung (1931c) notes that "if the human psyche consisted simply and solely of consciousness, there would be nothing psychic that had not arisen in the course of the individual's life. In that case we would seek in vain for any prior conditions or influences behind a simple parental complex. With the reduction to father and mother the last word would be said, for they are the figures that first influenced the conscious psyche to the exclusion of all else. But actually the contents of consciousness did not come into existence simply through the influence of the environment; they were also influenced and arranged by our psychic inheritance, the collective unconscious" (p. 720).

¹⁷⁹ Noting that he forwarded the term 'parental imago' to counter the assumption that it is the real parents who are solely responsibly "for the parental complex," Jung (1953) notes that "the simple soul is... quite unaware of the fact that his nearest relations, who exercise immediate influence over him, create in him an image which is only partly a replica of themselves, while its other part is compounded of elements derived from himself. The imago is built up of parental influences plus the specific reactions of the child; it is therefore an image that reflects the object with very considerable qualifications" (p. 294).

In recognising the individual's complicity in the circumstances of his/her fate, Jung tends to advocate self-responsibility, putting the onus for change squarely in the individual's charge (1968, p. 152).¹⁸⁰ As I discuss in Chapter Six, Jung's distinction between contents acquired consciously and those attained a priori via the preconscious or unconscious (1954c, p. 151), anticipates and is compatible with the investigations of Ian Stevenson and his co-researchers into the nature of the soul and with what they identify as a possible third explanatory factor in the nature/nurture or genetics versus environmental problematic.

Finally, Jungian analysts such as Thomas Moore (1994) and Adolf Guggenbuehl-Craig (1995) make the point that for all the potential problems associated with the parent/child relationship, the strength of the relationship and of 'family'¹⁸¹ in general is that it provides the ground for individual affirmation and hence is the condition par excellence for the nurture and development of soul.

In the introduction to this chapter I questioned whether Cinderella can be viewed the only victim within the Cinderella fairy tale. I posit for discussion this same question in Chapter Three in a critique of the step-mother character.

¹⁸⁰ In Chapter Five I discuss the necessity of becoming one's own father/mother. Assuming responsibility for one's childhood is part of this process.

¹⁸¹ Neither Moore nor Guggenbuehl-Craig define or refer to family in a traditional sense or privilege the nuclear family.

CHAPTER THREE

If Cinderella evokes identification, the step-mother character tends to procure the opposite effect. In Perrault's *Cendrillon*, the step-mother is "the proudest and most haughty woman that was ever seen" (Dundes, 1982, p. 16), who employs Cinderella "in the meanest work of the house" (p. 16). In the Grimm brothers' *Aschenputtel*, the step-mother takes away Cinderella's clothes, dresses her "in an old grey smock" (Dundes, 1982, p. 24), and uses her as a scullery maid. In Disney's *Cinderella* (1950), the step-mother is introduced as "cold, cruel and bitterly jealous of Cinderella's charm and beauty...". The step-mother abuses and humiliates Cinderella, forcing her into the role of servant.

The dichotomising of good and evil or victim and villain, with Cinderella embodying the former qualities and the step-mother character the latter, is depicted in these early renditions of Cinderella as irreconcilable. Cinderella is good and only good. The step-mother is bad and only bad. However, in the same manner that in Chapter Two I questioned the seeming self-evident portrayal of Cinderella as the only or main victim in the fairy tale, I aim in this chapter to further question the good/evil character dichotomising of Cinderella and the step-mother and to suggest that victim/villain or good/evil are porous, not discrete, categories.

As noted in the Introduction, in *Ever After* the step-mother character is humanised in a manner denied her in earlier literary and film renditions of Cinderella. Viewers of the film are given some glimpse into why Baroness Rodmilla is the way she is and hence reason to reflect on her character and to reappraise traditional status quo assumptions about her. In an uncharacteristic unguarded moment, Rodmilla confides to Danielle:

My mother was hard on me too you know... She taught me that cleanliness was next to godliness; She forced me to wash my face at least twenty times a day, convinced it was never clean enough...

In telling Danielle that her mother was hard on her also, Rodmilla seems to be admitting to and reflecting on her own ill-treatment of Danielle. Unfortunately however, Rodmilla excuses her mother in the next breath and thereby undermines the opportunity for a change of attitude and behaviour to take effect. Rodmilla haughtily continues: "But I was very grateful to her. She wanted me to be all that I could be. And here I am, a Baroness, and Marguerite shall be queen...". However, while Rodmilla reverts to her wicked role, the conversation that ensues between Rodmilla and Danielle, and in which Rodmilla vacillates between kindness and harshness, indicates she is suffering considerable inner turmoil. Rodmilla continues:

Pity you never knew your mother... there must be a little bit of her in you somewhere...

Danielle: (With feeling) I wish I knew what she looked like.

Rodmilla: (Harshly) Yes, well we must never feel sorry for ourselves must we! No matter how bad things get, they can always get worse!

Danielle: (Submissively) Yes, Madam.

Rodmilla: (Again with reflection and kindness) You have so much of your father in you. Sometimes I can almost see him looking out through your eyes...

Danielle: (Obviously pleased at this remark) Really?

Rodmilla: (Harsh again, though seemingly as a defence against a surge of emotion) Yes, well... your features are so masculine, and well, to be raised by a man! No wonder you're built for hard labour.

Danielle: Did you love my father?

Rodmilla: (Again evidencing a struggle to contain emotion) Well... I barely knew him. Go away, I'm tired.

Critiqued from a psychoanalytic premise, the difference between how the step-mother character is presented in early fairy tale literature and in Disney's animated film and how she is cast in *Ever After* could be posited as the difference in presentation between a behaviouristic characterisation and a dynamic characterisation. Fromm (1964) notes that "the essential point on which any theory or therapy which could be called psychoanalysis depends, is the *dynamic* concept of human behaviour; that is, the assumption that highly charged forces motivate behavior; and that behavior can be understood and predicted only by understanding these forces" (p. 65). In contrast to behaviourism, which takes outward behaviour as its datum, Fromm (1979) posits that "true insight is focused on the inner reality, which is usually neither conscious nor directly observable" (p. 100). In that *Ever After* presents Rodmilla's character dynamically, as opposed to behaviourally, it is harder to conceive of her as wholly bad.

Extrapolating from the film characterisation of Rodmilla to everyday experience, recognition of the dynamic impact of experience upon behaviour is closely related to another of the qualities that Fromm denotes as a fundamental component of productive love; the quality or component of knowledge. Fromm (1962a) notes that:

There are many layers of knowledge; the knowledge which is an aspect of love is one which does not stay at the periphery, but penetrates to the core. It is possible only when I can transcend the concern for myself and see the other person in his own terms. I may know, for instance, that a person is angry, even if he does not show it overtly; but I may know him more deeply than that; then I know that he is anxious, and worried; that he feels lonely, that he feels guilty. Then I know that his anger is only the manifestation of something deeper, and I see him as anxious and embarrassed, that is, as the suffering person, rather than as the angry one. (p. 27)

As noted, one of the aims of this chapter is to posit the categories of victim/villain or good/evil as porous. In contrast to an objective level of interpretation in which the characters

of myth are read literally as representing discrete and separate personages, critiqued subjectively, Rodmilla and Danielle – far from being diametrically opposed characters – can be read symbolically as character images representing two aspects or stages of one and the same person. If Rodmilla was victimised as a child, as *Ever After* humanises her, then she too has been in Danielle’s position.¹⁸² Further, given Rodmilla’s oppressive treatment of Danielle, it is unlikely that Danielle will easily adjust to ‘happily ever after.’ She is in fact in grave danger of following in Rodmilla’s footsteps; that is, of becoming a villain or oppressor in someone else’s life. This is particularly so if she remains unaware of and does not come to terms with the shadow aspects of her *own* personality.

In the final section of this chapter I specifically discuss the question of good and evil. However, I begin by examining related facets associated with the problem of shadow: In section one, I examine the Oedipus myth, posing for discussion whether Oedipus is wicked or wounded. In section two, I examine what I refer to as the ‘victim’s responsibility.’ In section three, I discuss the nature of and problems associated with symbiotic attachment. Along with positing victim/villain or good/evil as porous categories, a related aim in this chapter is to question whether what is referred to as evil or bad, according to a given moral code, is the result of inherent wickedness or the manifestation of psychic wounding.

Oedipus: Wicked or wounded?

In his commentary on Sophocles’ plays, James Hogan (1991) gives the following summary of *King Oedipus*:¹⁸³

Laius, king of Thebes, is warned by an oracle not to have children. When he gets a child by his wife Jocasta, he sends him away to be exposed on Mt. Cithaeron. He expects... that the child will be destroyed by wild animals, but the herdsman in charge gives the child to a shepherd tending the flocks of the king of Corinth. The child’s feet are so bound that one is swollen from the wound; his name Oedipus, ‘Swellfoot,’ comes from this incident. He is reared the only son of the rulers of Corinth. As a young man he is taunted by a drunk for being a bastard. Resolving to have certain knowledge of his birth, Oedipus goes to Delphi where he asks the oracle who his true parents are. To this the god responds that he will kill his father and marry his mother. Neither putting a second question nor the first question a second time, he hurries away,

¹⁸² Miller (1983) rightly asks: “But where will you find human beings who are only good or only cruel? The reason why parents mistreat their children has less to do with character and temperament than with the fact that they were mistreated themselves and were not permitted to defend themselves” (p. 105).

¹⁸³ In his appropriation of the Oedipus myth, Freud drew on Sophocles’ fifth century BC dramatisation. However, it is of note that Sophocles did not author the Oedipus myth, he merely dramatised a myth already well known to his Athenian audience (Hogan, 1991, p. 19; see also Taylor, 1986, p. xxxiv).

taking a road away from Corinth and toward Thebes. On his journey he meets at a crossroads Laius on his way to Delphi. Father and son dispute passage in the road; Laius strikes Oedipus; the son pays him back by killing him and others of his party on the spot. So he has killed his father. Then he travels to Thebes, at that time persecuted by the Sphinx, a terrible monster sent by Hera. This Sphinx has the habit of eating her victims, but first she sets them a riddle. Oedipus is able to answer the riddle, and in chagrin the beast destroys herself. The city is saved, in thanks for which the queen Jocasta is given as wife to the conquering hero, her son. So he has married his mother. (p. 19)

In his appropriation of the Oedipus myth as an analogical basis for his theory of the unconscious incestuous proclivities of the child, Freud focuses on the Oedipal crime; that is, on Oedipus' patricide and incest (Freud, 1954).¹⁸⁴ In contrast to Freud, who centrally emphasises the motif of incest, Fromm (1959) privileges and centrally emphasises the motif of patriarchal conflict (p. 425). Fromm bases his interpretation of the Oedipus myth on Johann Bachofen's analysis of Greek mythology, and on his central thesis that a matriarchal social order preceded the patriarchal religious and social order of ancient Greece (pp. 427-431). Fromm argues that if an examination is made of the whole Oedipus trilogy (including *Oedipus at Colonus* and *Antigone*) and not just *King Oedipus*, the main theme which "runs through the three tragedies is the conflict between father and son" (p. 426). Fromm maintains that if Freud's interpretation of the Oedipus myth as centrally symbolising incestuous desire is correct, "we should expect the myth to tell us that Oedipus met Jocasta without knowing that she was his mother, fell in love with her, and then killed his father, again unknowingly" (p. 424). However, Fromm (1959) notes that "the only reason we are given for Oedipus' marriage to Jocasta is that she, as it were, goes with the throne" (p. 424). Fromm thus poses the question: "Should we believe that a myth the central theme of which constitutes an incestuous relationship between mother and son would entirely omit the element of attraction between the two?" (p. 424).

In considering Fromm's interpretation it is necessary to note that while Fromm defends his inclusion of *Oedipus at Colonus* and *Antigone* in his interpretation of *King Oedipus*, contending that "it makes little sense to assume that Sophocles described the fate of Oedipus and his children in three tragedies without having in mind an inner coherence of the whole" (1959, p. 425n), contrary to Fromm most scholars of Greek mythology do in fact emphasise

¹⁸⁴ Both Jung (1956a, p. 1261) and Fromm (1980, p. 27) point out that the Oedipus complex, as formulated by Freud, does not explain the psychology of girls or women. Jung (1956a) comments that "although the incest complex is undoubtedly one of the most fundamental and best known complexes, it must obviously have its feminine counterpart" (p. 1261). Jung further notes that "I proposed calling it [i.e., the counterpart to the Oedipus complex] the Electra complex" (p. 1261). In Jung's view, Freud's psychology was limited in that he saw the Oedipus complex as the only archetype, instead of just one of the archetypes, of the unconscious.

that the three dramas are not to be understood as comprising a coherent sequence¹⁸⁵ (Hogan, 1991, p. 4). If Fromm's argument is limited to a critique of *King Oedipus*, which (due to its role in the Freudian interpretation) is my focus here, then applying Fromm's criticism of Freud's interpretation to his own, it is justifiable to ask whether we believe that a myth, the central theme of which constitutes a patriarchal conflict between father and son, would entirely omit the element of hatred and animosity between the two? In the same way that Oedipus' marriage to Jocasta is merely circumstantial, so too is his killing of Laius. Oedipus' own account of his murder of Laius is as follows:¹⁸⁶

I was confronted by a herald, ahead of a carriage drawn by horses and carrying a passenger... The man in front shouted at me to clear the road, and the old man [i.e., Laius] too rudely ordered me to get out of his way. The driver barged into me, so I hit him hard. I was furious by now, uncontrollable. The old man in the carriage was watching for his chance. He waited till I passed him. And then, he struck me full on the head with his two-pronged stick – the kind you use for goading the horses to make them gallop. I paid him back with interest, and double quick. I whacked him, savagely, with my staff, and knocked him out of the carriage. He fell flat in the road. The others attacked me, of course. And I killed them. Every one. (as cited in Taylor, 1986, p. 35)

Certainly Oedipus' account portrays an impassioned conflict. Yet it can hardly be construed as a patriarchal one between father and son. Neither Laius nor Oedipus recognise or know each other; they meet as strangers and the conflict which results in Laius's murder flares as a result of inconvenience and insult. Why Laius acts so obstinately and vindictively can perhaps be accounted for by the fact that he is a king, used to giving orders and not predisposed to having his will crossed. Oedipus, too, brought up as the only son of the King of Corinth, perhaps suffers from the same dispositional fault. Yet even aside from such surmising as to why the two men react so irrationally, Oedipus' reaction at least is certainly understandable given that he is fleeing Corinth to escape the oracle's prophecy and at the time of meeting Laius is in a state of intense emotional confusion and agony. Taylor (1986), who commentates that Oedipus was provoked and that he acted in self-defence, argues that though Oedipus' "actions are certainly morally questionable by our terms, if not by the Greeks' own, they hardly seem to justify the massive retribution they bring down on Oedipus' head" (p. xxxviii). In fact, as to Fromm's analysis that the central theme of the Oedipal drama is essentially one of a conflict between father and son, it is of note that Oedipus in fact loves

¹⁸⁵ Taylor (1986) notes that "in Sophocles' case, one thing is clear. The three plays... although they are often referred to as the *Theban Trilogy*... were not written as a trilogy..." (p. xx; see also Hogan, 1991, p. 4).

¹⁸⁶ Throughout this section, I refer to Don Taylor's translation (1986) of *King Oedipus* when quoting dialogue from the play.

Polybus and Merope, whom he has known as his parents, and that when confronted with the oracle's prophecy that he will cause them harm, Oedipus recounts: "I ran, as fast and as far from Corinth as any man could" (as cited in Taylor, 1986, p. 34).

Despite this criticism of Fromm's analysis however, the conclusion he draws from his critique closely corresponds to what I posit below could be regarded as the central meaning of the Oedipus drama. In contrast to Freud, who views the kernel of neurosis as that of incestuous fixation and sexual repression, Fromm (1941) considers the kernel of neurosis "as well as of normal development... the struggle for freedom and independence" (p. 178).

Fromm (1941) writes of Freud's appropriation of the Oedipus myth that "in seeing the Oedipus complex as the central phenomenon of psychology Freud... made one of the most important discoveries in psychology. But he has failed in its adequate interpretation..." (p. 178). There is no shortage of commentaries on the Oedipus drama. However, I suggest that the central requirement of any interpretation of the myth is that it discerns what it has to contribute to consciousness today. Therefore, my purpose in what follows is not primarily to defend a particular "right interpretation" of Oedipus in comparison with other interpretations, but rather to highlight what it is that seems psychologically significant and in what way the myth can be viewed as compensatory within the context of the wider issues addressed in this thesis.

Perhaps the most significant symbol contributing to an understanding of the essential meaning of the Oedipus myth resides in the name Oedipus itself, which literally translates to mean "swollen foot" (Taylor, 1986, p. 43).¹⁸⁷ The Shepherd who rescues the infant Oedipus from abandonment thus names him due to his damaged feet, which had been stabbed through and tied together. One can hardly conceive of an act more cruelly designed to circumvent an individual's life and undermine independence than the deliberate stabbing of a baby's feet. I suggest that Oedipus' "crimes" can be understood as rooted in this early act of violence against him.

If Oedipus' killing of Laius and his marriage to Jocasta are read symbolically then I suggest that what one is confronted with is not primarily the Oedipal "crime" (i.e., the crime of patricide and incest), but rather with what could be conceptualised as the Oedipal *wound* (denoted here as the inability to secure emancipation from symbiotic attachment to a primary

¹⁸⁷ Focusing on Oedipus' victimisation accords with the more recent focus within psychoanalytic circles. Stephen Mitchell (2002) notes that "many post-Freudian psychoanalytic authors have noted that Sophocles' story did not begin with Oedipus the lover and murderer but with the murderous abandonment of the infant Oedipus by Laius and Jocasta, his parents" (p. 101; see also Miller, 1985, p. 145).

caregiver/s due to extreme abuse or neglect on the part of the same). Oedipus kills Laius. I have already pointed out in my critique of Fromm's argument that Laius and Oedipus do not recognise each other when they meet, and so consciously at least the killing is not perpetuated on the basis of a patriarchal father/son conflict. Symbolically however, the killing can be understood to represent Oedipus' inability to achieve emancipation and independence from his father. Even though Oedipus has no conscious recollection of the incident, Laius' treatment of Oedipus as an infant was so cruel that Oedipus is still inexorably linked to him by the unconscious tie that Laius' actions sealed.¹⁸⁸ Oedipus then marries his mother. Interpreted symbolically he does so not because he loves her but because *he was not loved by her* at the time and in the way he needed to be and so is still symbiotically attached to her. Due to Polybus and Merope's intervention, Oedipus achieves a measure of independence; although his feet never completely heal. Yet, the psychic wounds Oedipus sustains at the hands of his parents, which necessarily accompany the physical wounds, continue to fester debilitatingly at the roots of his personality. "My birth's a mystery," Oedipus laments, and in his agony pleads: "I must know the truth" (as cited in Taylor, 1986, p. 44).

In psychoanalytic terms what I have drawn attention to is conceptualised as pre-Oedipal dependency, fixation or pathology. Mitchell (2002) explains pre-Oedipal pathology as "essentially to do with... problems of dependency and basic trust in the first several years of life" (p. 133), and as manifesting itself in pervasive "disturbances of psychological function: intense, unregulatable feeling states, extreme fluctuation in images of self and/or other, impaired capacity for steady relatedness – disturbances that characterize pathology like masochism and severe depression" (Mitchell & Black, 1995, p. 47). Mitchell and Black (1995) note that pre-Oedipally wounded individuals lack the psychological structures that "most people take for granted" (p. 56).¹⁸⁹ Oedipus movingly articulates the hellish agony of

¹⁸⁸ Janov (1970) points out that if after therapy a patient is still angry (i.e., symbolised by Oedipus' killing of Laius in the Oedipus myth) at his/her parents that the neurosis still remains. Freeing oneself from the parental matrix involves ultimately seeing one's parents objectively and being able to understand that the ill-treatment one suffered at their hands was a result of the fact that one's parents were themselves neurotic. Hating (i.e., killing) one's parents highlights (as with Oedipus) that one is still attached to them. Janov (1970) notes that after a successful therapy "what does exist in Primal patients is the great sense of tragedy over the waste of their childhood. There is at the same time a great relief that the lifetime struggle is over. These patients are not interested in revenge for the past; they are more interested in leading the lives they have now in the present" (p. 328).

¹⁸⁹ One of the criticisms that Fromm makes of Freud is that in focusing on the Oedipus complex, without adequately addressing pre-Oedipal factors, Freud missed what Fromm considers is the cause and essential matrix of neurosis and psychosis. Again, Fromm attributes Freud's failure to adequately recognise the pre-Oedipal aetiology of neurosis to Freud's patriarchal bias. Fromm (1970) notes that "the clinical experiences of many analysts have shown that the most positive influence as well as the most damaging during childhood is the mothers, not the father's, influence. Perhaps it is not correct to say that the fixation on the mother is 'pregenital.'

psychic trauma: “*Damn the man who saw my ankles bleed and cut me free from those straps! His mercy only made things worse. I should have died! Did I live for this agony...*” (as cited in Taylor, 1986, p. 54).

The same idea denoted by the psychoanalytic term ‘pre-Oedipal’ pathology is expressed in biblical terms as the state of being “wounded in spirit”: “*A man’s spirit will sustain his infirmity, but a wounded spirit who can bear?*” (Prov. 18:14).¹⁹⁰ I draw attention to this biblical parallel as I consider the term ‘wounded spirit’ or ‘wounded psyche’ expresses much more adequately and feelingly the idea conveyed than the clinical descriptor ‘pre-Oedipal’ pathology. Moreover, the biblical formulation, in drawing a distinction between ‘infirmities’ (i.e., everyday problems and setbacks) and psychic woundedness, highlights a conceptual distinction which is pivotal in order to appreciate what the term psychic woundedness refers to. The pre-Oedipally wounded individual does not just have problems. Rather, as highlighted by Christian counsellors John and Paula Sandford below, the psychically wounded individual suffers in a psychic sense the same disability and deformity one would suffer in a physical sense were one not to receive treatment for a broken arm or leg. Sandford and Sandford (1982) note:

If a little child were to fall and break a leg, and if that leg failed to mend well, [s/]he would go limping through life. We can see that fracture and its cause and easily sympathize. But emotional wounds are as real as broken legs, and a child may go limping throughout life because of them. Such fractures cannot be seen except by the X-ray of insight. Not seeing, people tend to be less aware and compassionate. (p. 168)

Jung also draws attention to the general inability to recognise and therefore to empathise with psychic injury. Jung (1940) writes that:

Our... materialistic conception of the psyche is... not particularly helpful in cases of neurosis. If only the soul were endowed with a subtle body, then one could at least say

The basis of the fixation goes deeper than the oral level; it may be established by means of the sensation produced by the contact of the two bodies through the skin, by forces of attraction operating since the day of the child’s birth, forces we could call prepregenital” (p. 74). Fromm (1966) notes that “while in patriarchal societies the fear of the father is more obvious, fright of the mother is more deep” (p. 73), and further critiques that “Freud’s idea – that the child especially fears his father – reflects... Freud’s... extreme patriarchal attitude. Freud could not conceive that the woman could be the main cause of fear” (1970, p. 73). Mitchell and Black (1995), commenting on Rene Spitz’s seminal research on the impact of maternal deprivation, write that his study of foundling home children “left no doubt that whatever inborn psychological potential humans may have, its realisation is doomed in the absence of emotional connectedness with another person” (p. 38). It is of note here that Mitchell and Black, while drawing on Spitz do not put the same emphasise on the mother that Fromm does. The infant is seen as needing a close pre-Oedipal tie with a mothering or maternal figure, but this close emotional tie does not necessarily need to be to a woman.

¹⁹⁰ Jung draws attention to the fact that along with psychologists, the religious clergy are also concerned with the cure and care of soul. Therefore it should not be surprising that parallels can be found between psychology and religion. Jung (1957a) notes that understood symbolically “religions are therapies for the sorrows and disorders of the soul” (p. 71).

that this breath – or vapour-body was suffering from a real [disease]... in the same way as the gross material body can succumb to... disease. That, at least, would be something real. Medicine therefore feels a strong aversion for anything of a psychic nature – either the body is ill or there is nothing the matter. (p. 13)

Although, in becoming King and attaining position and power, Oedipus' "success" is enviable and although he is clearly a man of intelligence and courage, as evidenced by his outwitting of the Sphinx, he is nonetheless unable to secure or experience satisfying interpersonal relationship. Moreover, the difficulties he experiences at the intrapsychic and interpersonal level eventually undermine his persona achievements. I have posited that Oedipus' interpersonal difficulties stem from the pre-Oedipal wound that lies festering at the root of his personality, which prevents him from being able to secure the independence from Laius and Jocasta he needs in order to be able to relate on an adult basis. Oedipus' marriage to Jocasta could be viewed as symbolising any number of partnerships or marriages in which the partner becomes the 'mother' or 'father' whom, due to unresolved pre-Oedipal trauma or conflict, the individual is still symbiotically bound to and therefore unconsciously seeks.¹⁹¹ Fromm (1966) makes an explicit connection between the achieving of psychological independence and the capacity to relate lovingly (p. 71). Commenting on the biblical verse: "Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh" (Gen 2: 24), Fromm (1966) writes that "the meaning of this verse is quite clear: the condition for man's union with woman is that he shall cut the primary ties to his parents, that he shall become an independent man. Love between man and woman is possible only when the incestuous¹⁹² tie has been severed" (p. 71). In sum thus far, while Freud postulated that Oedipus was unconscious of his "crime" and that this has implications in terms of psychological development, I postulate that Oedipus was unconscious of his wound and that this is the pivotal factor in terms of psychological health and relational capacity and well-being.

Before turning to a discussion of what I refer to as the 'victim's responsibility,' there is one more aspect of the Oedipal drama it seems expedient – in terms of the wider aims of this critique – to highlight.

¹⁹¹ Miller (1983) points to the social dynamics that operate to render adults who were abused as children unaware of the tragic nature of their childhood experience. Miller (1983) also draws attention to the inevitable connection between micro experience and macro consequence, commenting that the "general public is still far from realizing that our earliest experiences unfailingly affect society as a whole; that psychoses, drug addiction, and criminality are encoded expressions of these experiences" (p. xiv).

¹⁹² Fromm (1966) makes it clear that by 'incestuous' he is not referring primarily to a sexual tie but rather to "an affective tie to mother and nature" (p. 70).

The very incident upon which the entire Oedipal drama unfolds is Laius and Jocasta's reaction upon hearing the oracle's prophecy. Laius and Jocasta are warned that should they conceive a son, this son will commit patricide and incest; that is, he will kill Laius and take Jocasta as his wife.¹⁹³ Hogan (1991), in his commentary on the drama, says that Laius is not fatalistic in that by attempting to kill Oedipus he thus endeavours to forestall fate (p. 14). However, I disagree with Hogan's assessment. Laius's actions, far from vindicating him of being fatalistic, rather confirm him as such. Were Laius and Jocasta genuinely free from fatalism then they would have questioned the prophecy and consciously weighed it as to its validity. But Laius and Jocasta engage in no such critical reflection. They merely believe the prophecy and react accordingly. The central point is that the oracle's prophecy would not have become fate had Laius and Jocasta not believed it. Had Laius and Jocasta relied on their own integrity; had they trusted in their own inner strength and had confidence in their own ability to conceive and parent a child; had they developed consciousness and self-knowledge to the point where they were no longer dependent on irrational authority, then none of the tragic events that do unfold would have unfolded. That Laius seeks to escape fate does not clear him of fatalism. Indeed, by endeavouring to forestall fate in a fatalistic manner, Laius in fact seals it.¹⁹⁴

I have highlighted this aspect of the Oedipal drama because one of my objectives within the context of this discussion is to make a general argument for the importance of taking note of psychic products such as dreams and myths. Yet, as noted within the context of discussing the dream I drew upon in Chapter One, and in line with a Jungian attitude toward the numinous, I at no point endorse the uncritical engagement with the unconscious or unconscious products Laius and Jocasta display (i.e., by their uncritical acceptance of the oracle's prophecy). I am not arguing for submission to the unconscious and certainly not for the abandonment of consciousness and reason. I am of the opinion that the spiritual dimension and factors related to the unconscious psyche are disproportionately and wrongly excluded as a subject of intellectual concern and that due to the considerable level of interest in various forms of spirituality clearly evident within popular culture – not to mention the ramifications

¹⁹³ Hogan (1991) does not include in his summary of the play (quoted at the beginning of this section) the warning given to Laius and Jocasta should they conceive a child. Fromm (1988) draws attention to the oracle's warning, noting that "Laius, the King of Thebes, and his wife, Jocasta, [are warned] that if they have a son this son will kill his father and marry his own mother" (p. 32).

¹⁹⁴ Oedipus likewise makes the same mistake as his parents. When told by the oracle that he will commit patricide and incest, Oedipus does not question the oracle, but "hurries away, taking a road away from Corinth and toward Thebes" (Hogan, 1991, p. 19).

arising from religious fundamentalism – this exclusion is misguided and irresponsible.¹⁹⁵ It seems to me that there is a desperate socio-political need for the critical engagement with the unconscious that Jung pioneered, and that the university should take responsibility for this critical engagement.¹⁹⁶ Again however, the engagement with the psyche or spiritual dimension I am arguing for is a critical or informed one, not a submissive one premised on blind faith.

In drawing a distinction between an informed and submissive attitude toward factors associated with the psyche, Laius and Jocasta furnish an example of those whose relation to the extramundane is not subjectively premised or based on experience. They do not display a “conscientious regard for the irrational factors of the psyche and individual fate” (Jung, 1957, p. 514), which, as noted in Chapter One, Jung considers the mark of genuine religiosity, but in their acceptance of the religious norms of their day and their uncritical reliance on a mediatory person or institution, Laius and Jocasta adopt the mentality of the collective and are merely religious and superstitious. In contrast, what characterises the ‘spirituality revolution’ David Tacey refers to (see Introduction), and what is emphasised by Jung, is a relatedness to the extramundane which is individually premised.¹⁹⁷ This is not to espouse that individual experience itself protects one from the dangers associated in engaging with the unconscious.

¹⁹⁵ Tacey likewise makes this point. Regarding student interest in spirituality, Tacey (2004) notes “university students do not appear to want a values-free induction into ‘adult’ or disenchanted social reality. The social norms of the past are no longer adequate, and we clearly need a new understanding of ‘normal’ living. The impulses that gave rise to neutral educational policies belong to a former era that was reacting against the hegemony and power of the churches. Secular education was associated with freedom, free-thinking and liberation from ecclesiastical authorities. The free-thinkers could think their own thoughts without having to conform to official religious views. But now secular education bestows a new kind of baleful authoritarianism, in which the soul and spirit are imprisoned and never allowed to take flight. Our deepest spiritual impulses are repressed and denied by secular education. As the cycle of history turns, we discover that the freedom of one era is the oppression and tyranny of another. Students now view our academic liberation discourses with the same doubtful eye that early modern intellectuals turned towards religion and faith institutions” (p. 73).

¹⁹⁶ Jung (1959) draws attention to the sociopolitical need to take account of the psyche, noting that “it is a symptom of profound unconsciousness that our scientific age has lost sight of the paramount importance of the psyche as a fundamental condition of human existence. What is the use of technological improvements when mankind must still tremble before those infantile tyrants... in the style of Hitler? Figures like these owe their power only to the frightening immaturity of the man of today, and to his barbarous unconsciousness. Truly we can no longer afford to underestimate the importance of the psychic factor in world affairs and to go on despising the efforts to understand psychic processes” (p. 1278).

¹⁹⁷ Drawing a distinction between religion and spirituality, Tacey (2004) notes that “an interest in religion that proceeds from a spiritual awakening is essentially different from more conventional or extrinsic appropriations of religious positions. The inward or spiritual approach to religion is deeper, based on personal experience, tolerant towards difference, compassionate towards those who make different life-choices, and relatively free of ideological fanaticism” (p. 77). Tacey further notes that “in the emerging vision of youth spirituality, we see a new model in which the sacred is intimate and close, a felt resonance within the self, and a deep and radiant presence in the natural world. If the old sacredness was distant, aloof and a standard of moral perfection against which we judged ourselves to be unworthy, the new sacredness is embodied in our physicality and vital lives, an incarnational presence that asks us not to be perfect but to strive for wholeness and integration” (p. 79).

Jung repeatedly emphasises that engagement with the unconscious and the way of individuation is not without danger. However, individual experience and individual responsibility go hand in hand, and individual responsibility is what Laius and Jocasta appear to lack. Tacey (2004), distinguishing contemporary spirituality from religious fundamentalism, notes that “the choice between spirituality and fundamentalism is a choice between conscious intimacy and unconscious possession” (p. 11). It is of note that when it comes to religious matters, we live in a time when it appears no longer possible to get by with simply adopting the religion of one’s parents or relying on church authority and dogma. As one of Tacey’s students puts it: “God is certainly not dead; people are simply experiencing God in new ways and seeing God differently” (as cited in Tacey, 2004, p. 75).

In this first section, in posing for reflection whether Oedipus is a symbol of inherent deviance or a victim of psychic wounding, I have highlighted how debilitating psychic woundedness is and how little understood at present these inner wounds are. However, as I discuss in the next section, being a victim does not necessarily equate with being ‘good’ or innocent.

The victim’s responsibility

I pointed out in Chapter Two and again in the introduction to this chapter that Cinderella is not the only victim in the Cinderella fairy tale. The ‘step’ characters, whom we generally view as the villains of this fairy tale, are victims also. In this section, I examine the responsibility that a person in a situation of victimisation has to gain awareness of the victimisation s/he either had or is currently suffering, and to honestly acknowledge and react to his or her oppressive circumstances; along with the responsibility a victimised person has to pursue freedom; not only external freedom, but also internal or psychological freedom. The overall point I wish to make, and which is supported by the foregoing examination of the ‘step’ characters, is that being a victim and being ‘good’ or innocent are not one and the same thing. Nor does being a victim preclude one from taking responsibility for one’s victimisation.

In drawing attention to the necessity of a victim to become aware of his/her victimisation and of his/her responsibility to react honestly to oppressive circumstances, it is first necessary as a prelude to consider what could be regarded as the ‘immorality’ of the various moralities that form the basis of our distinctly Western moral sensibility. As noted in the Introduction, Jung (1954f) considers that “in spite of everything, the West is thoroughly

Christian as far as its psychology is concerned” (p. 771). If the West is Christian as far as its psychology, it follows that the West is also Christian as regards its morality. As already discussed, there is an evident connection between Christian morality and romantic morality. Likewise, there is a close affinity between Christian morality and the moral values of middle-class culture. C. Dallett Hemphill (1998), commenting on the conduct literature that became prevalent in the American revolutionary-era and which informed the values of the emergent middle-class, overviews that “one was to take others’ wrongs patiently, acknowledge one’s own faults, and ask pardon when one had offended” (p. 39). What, I contend here, is ‘immoral’ about Christian morality as generally understood and practiced¹⁹⁸ and the various other ‘moralities’ which bear the mark of Christian influence, is that they are moralities which, for the most part, are premised on the repression of instinct and the exclusion of feeling (see Jung, 1918, p. 32; Jung, 1957a, p. 70).¹⁹⁹ Christian morality is morality devoid of and inimical to instinct and as such, I argue, tends to procure the opposite of its intent; that is, to procure *immorality!*

This point is of significance because the first point I want to make about the victimised person’s ‘responsibility’ is not – as Christian morality would have it - that s/he should forgive the person that had or is oppressing him or her; nor – as middle-class morality would have it – that s/he should repress his/her feelings in accordance with the dictates of respectability. Rather, the *initial* responsibility of the victim entails his/her human duty with respect to his/herself and his/her well-being. I argue here that the first and foremost responsibility a person experiencing any form of victimisation has is that of gaining awareness of and acknowledging – even if only to his/herself – his or her feelings in the situation. Further, this initial step of responsibility must precede and assume priority over any other ‘moral’ claim.

It may be assumed that to make an issue over this point is both unnecessary and redundant due to the fact that, as everybody knows, a victimised person will undoubtedly

¹⁹⁸ I am referring here to the understanding the layperson has of Christian doctrine and do not purport to be representing higher criticism or accurate theology. Like Jung (1956) “I am not chiefly concerned with theology but rather with the layman’s picture of theological concepts” (p. 1634). Regarding the point I am making there are in fact passages in the Bible which encourage the expression of feeling and allow for instinctual reaction (e.g., There is “a time to love, and a time to hate” (Eccl. 3:8); “Be ye angry, and sin not” (Eph. 4:26)).

¹⁹⁹ In his *Commentary on ‘The Secret of the Golden Flower,’* Jung (1957a) notes that “the Chinese are without the impulse towards violent repression of instincts that poisons our spirituality and makes it hysterically exaggerated” (p. 69). Jung elaborates this point further, noting of the West that “we must never forget our historical antecedents. Only a little more than a thousand years ago we stumbled out of the crudest beginnings of polytheism into a highly developed Oriental religion [i.e., Christianity] which lifted the imaginative minds of half-savages to a height that in no way corresponded to their spiritual development. In order to keep to this height in some fashion or other, it was inevitable that the instinctual sphere should be largely repressed. Thus religious practice and morality took on a decidedly brutal, almost malignant, character” (p. 70).

display some instinctual or feeling based reaction to an offence, even if only a passive-aggressive one. Further, unless an individual's morality is specifically informed by a Christian ethic then ideals such as brotherly/sisterly love and forgiveness are not likely to afford constraining moral claims, and apart from the need to maintain a certain 'appearance' the individual is not likely to feel guilt over some show of retaliation. Yet, both these objections being justified, it is nonetheless so that, both within the context of interpersonal relationships and also in the sphere of social and institutional settings, emotions such as hurt and anger are often inadequately dealt with and so become problematic. The same observation that Fromm makes regarding the inner blockage that remains and which restricts the enjoyment of sensuous pleasure also applies to the expression of so-called negative emotions. Fromm (1941) writes that the "cultural taboos on pleasure and happiness... that have run through the religion and mores of the middle class since the period of the Reformation" remain as an inner blockage even though the external taboo on sensuous pleasure "has virtually vanished"²⁰⁰ (pp. 181-182). Likewise, while ideals such as "turning the other cheek" or "loving one's enemies" may no longer hold sway, the inner blockage against the expression of emotions such as anger appears to remain. Arthur Janov (1970), who observes that to be civilised too often means being excessively "in control of one's feelings" (p. 322), surmises that "perhaps the civilization process itself makes human beings so uncivilized to one another, producing frustration and hostility" (p. 322).

Assuming responsibility for victimisation by facing up to and acknowledging it is particularly important in relation to victimisation experienced in childhood. Unfortunately however, the 'silencing' that inevitably accompanies the abuse of children effectively blocks an individual from acquiring an adequate understanding of and reaction in relation to childhood trauma, even in adulthood. Silencing takes the form of forbidding the child to express his/her feeling reactions in relation to parental injustice or of 'moral' instruction which

²⁰⁰ In employing this quote, I am not sure I entirely agree that the external taboo on sensuous pleasure has vanished as much as Fromm seems to assume. For example, Tacey (1997a) argues for the need of culture to become more sexualised, and posits "what we need to solve the problem of sexual harassment in the workplace is not more prohibitions and punishments, but a new general receptivity to Eros and desire" (p. 188). In connection with this point, one area of the parent/child relationship I would liked to have addressed in Chapter Two had time permitted is the father/daughter relationship and Post-Jungian Andrew Samuels comments regarding the healthiness of incestuous desire. Samuels (1997) notes that "a Jungian perspective on child sexual abuse is emerging in which child sexual abuse is seen as a damaging *degeneration* of a healthy and necessary deployment of 'incest fantasy'" (p. 3). Samuels contends that "a degree of sexualized interest between parents and children that is *not* acted out – and which must remain on the level of incest *fantasy* – is necessary for the two individuals in a situation where each cannot avoid the other. Incest-fueled desire is implicated in the kind of human love that healthy family process cannot do without. What Jung called 'kinship libido' is a necessity for internalizing the good experiences of early life" (p. 3).

imposes unreasonable behavioural demands. Miller (1983) highlights both of these points, writing that “the child will overcome the serious consequences of the injustice he has suffered only if he succeeds in defending himself, i.e., if he is allowed to express his pain and anger” (p. 7), and – in relation to harmful moral instruction – Miller contends:

Love of one’s neighbour, altruism, willingness to sacrifice – how splendid these words sound and yet what cruelty can lie hidden in them simply because they are forced upon a child at a time when the prerequisites for altruism cannot possibly be present. Coercion often nips the development of these prerequisites in the bud and what then remains is a lifelong condition of strain. (p. 9)

It is evident that Rodmilla – through her refusal to acknowledge the abuse she suffered as a child - does not assume responsibility for her victimisation. As in the dialogue I drew attention to at the beginning of this chapter, Rodmilla rationalises her mother’s abusive behaviour: “*My mother was hard on me... but I was very grateful to her...*”. The consequence of Rodmilla’s failure to take even this first step in assuming responsibility for her victimisation is that she herself becomes her mother; that is, Rodmilla becomes an oppressor/villain. Rodmilla’s lack of critical assessment of her upbringing reflects the uncritical consciousness of individuals who make such banal statements as: “My father was a hard man, but a good man.” What exactly does this statement mean? According to his own self-appraisal, Saddam Hussein was a “just” ruler. As to the atrocities he committed? Apparently, they are attributable to the fact that he was merely “firm” (“Ace in the Hole,” 2003). Miller (1983) makes the pivotal point that when people claim that the ill-treatment they suffered as children “was good for them, they are inevitably contributing to the continuation of cruelty in the world by this refusal to take their childhood tragedies seriously” (p. x). Miller further elaborates the connection between victimisation and villainess, noting that:

I have discovered that we are less a prey to this form of the repetition compulsion [i.e., to perpetuate childhood violence] if we are willing to acknowledge what happened to us, if we do not claim that we were mistreated ‘for our own good,’ and if we have not had to ward off completely our painful reactions to the past. The more we idealize the past, however, and refuse to acknowledge our childhood sufferings, the more we pass them on unconsciously to the next generation. (p. xi)

It is worth noting here that there is a sad economy with respect to victimisation; especially when an individual has experienced victimisation as a child. As Miller (1983) notes, people who have been abused as children “frequently do not notice, even at an advanced age, when someone is taking advantage of them...” (p. 6). Further, the process of ‘silencing,’ whereby a child must repress legitimate emotional reactions to hurt, effectively strips the child of the much needed emotional defence these instinctual emotional reactions

afford. In the face of injustice it must be admitted that anger is not wrong. It is in fact a normal and very necessary protective reaction to emotional violation. Janov (1970) draws attention to the deep injury inflicted on the child who must repress his/her feelings in the face of parental injustice:

The problem often is that the child is frustrated and made angry and then not allowed to even show this feeling... Thus, a child is robbed of his wants and then robbed again of his feelings about his wants not being fulfilled; he loses twice. On top of that, if the angry child shows a sullen face, he is apt to be met with 'Smile! Why the long face?' So then he is thrice robbed and driven back further into himself to hide the feelings. (p. 327)

Perhaps nowhere is the 'immorality' of Christian-based moralities more clearly evidenced than in the biblical command that a child honour his/her parents. Fromm (1994) writes that "if you go through the life of most children, then indeed you will find that parental love is one of the greatest fictions that have ever been invented" (p. 53). If this is so, then it seems strikingly cruel that children, through having to honour their parents, have traditionally been required to accomplish an emotional feat that would challenge even the emotionally strongest adult. It is, I argue here, moral demands such as this which - predicated on the repression of normal and emotionally necessary instinct - in fact serve to perpetuate immorality. Peck (1993), commenting on the psychological implications of the Fifth Commandment, writes:

For the most part, children naturally want to honor their parents. The problem comes when their parents are, in reality, dishonorable people. All manner of self-destructive mind control – self-lying – has been practiced by children through the generations in the attempt to respect reprehensible parental behavior in the name of such biblically misdirected 'civility.' Untold neuroses have resulted. I do not think it an oversimplification to state that twice as many psychotherapeutic hours are spent attempting to deal with the ill effects of the Fifth Commandment as are spent on any other psychological problem.²⁰¹ (p. 175)

While the first responsibility of the victimised person is to acknowledge and to give emotional expression to the suffering that oppressive circumstances or oppressive treatment engenders, the second responsibility of the victim is that s/he not stay a victim; that is that s/he seek freedom. Commenting on freedom from a macro perspective, Fromm (1941) writes that "modern European and American history is centered around the effort to gain freedom from the political, economic, and spiritual shackles that have bound men" (p. 3). Historian Jacques Barzun (2001) identifies emancipation as "one of the cultural themes of the era, perhaps the

²⁰¹ See section one of Chapter Five for substantiation of Peck's argument.

most characteristic of all” (p. xix). However, both Fromm and Barzun point out that freedom entails more than just emancipation from external constraints,²⁰² arguing that the traditional emphasis on political emancipation without an accompanying understanding of and pursuit of inner or psychological freedom leads to new bondage (Fromm, 1941, p. 257; see also Sean Sayers, 1998, p. 7). Fromm (1994) maintains that freedom is not something that happens to a person after they leave an oppressive situation, but refers to a character trait or quality of personality. This same idea is expressed by Paulo Freire (1996), who maintains that “freedom is acquired by conquest, not by gift,” and that “it must be pursued constantly and responsibly” (p. 29).

The following example could be employed to elucidate the difference between emancipation (negative freedom) and psychological freedom (positive freedom). If we imagine a child that has been brought up in an abusive home environment, it is understandable that the child will seek escape at the earliest opportunity. If, at fifteen or sixteen years of age, the adolescent has the means of supporting him/herself financially, then presumably s/he is free to emancipate him/herself from his/her family. S/he is free to leave home. In so doing, the individual attains emancipation (negative freedom). However, this physical removal from an abusive situation – while necessary - by no means constitutes the attainment of psychological or positive freedom. Jung (1910) draws attention to the powerful influence of the affective atmosphere of the home, noting that attempts at estrangement have the effect of tying the individual even more firmly to the parental constellation (p. 247).

In his paper ‘The Significance of the Father in the Destiny of the Individual,’ Jung (1949b) cites case material illustrating the powerful ramifications radiating from the parental constellation, and writes that “the parental influence, dating from the early infantile period, is repressed and sinks into the unconscious, but is not eliminated; by invisible threads it directs the apparently individual workings of the maturing mind” (p. 739). If we return to our example, it is of note that the individual who has experienced abuse as a child is highly unlikely to have the psychological structures conducive to the attainment of positive freedom in that all the child’s energy – which should have been employed in the service of his/her growth and development – has rather gone into opposing the destructive forces s/he has encountered. Thus, the individual may emancipate him/herself physically from an abusive situation; yet achieving psychological freedom is a much more arduous task. Unfortunately, the individual who merely ‘escapes’ is susceptible to projecting the victimisation s/he has

²⁰² Fromm (1941) draws a distinction between ‘freedom from’ or negative freedom (as he refers to it) and freedom in its positive aspect, which he refers to as ‘freedom to.’

experienced into subsequent relationships. The individual who was abused as a child has no model of being cared for and so does not know how to care for him/herself and is unable to create caring relationships.²⁰³

Elucidating the positive aspect of freedom – ‘freedom to’ - Fromm (1966) postulates that “the goal of man’s development is that of freedom and independence. Independence means the cutting of the umbilical cord and the ability to owe one’s existence to oneself alone” (p. 75). However, Fromm writes of independence, which is concomitant to freedom, that “full independence is one of the most difficult achievements” (p. 76). Fromm (1966) elaborates this point, noting that:

Independence is not achieved simply by not obeying mother, father, state, and the like. Independence is not the same as disobedience. Independence is possible only if, and according to the degree to which, man actively grasps the world, is related to it, and thus becomes one with it. There is no independence and no freedom unless man arrives at the stage of complete inner activity and productivity. (pp. 76-77)

Thus, freedom and independence necessitate moving beyond blame and assuming responsibility for oneself. Jung (1968), commenting on a particular dream sequence, writes that when as an adult we are still blaming the “wicked father” and the “unloving mother” we lose our moral freedom (p. 152). However, while this is so, it is important to emphasise again that the attainment of positive freedom cannot be accomplished through the repression or denial of victimisation. Of neurosis, Janov (1970) writes that “the disease, I submit, is the denial of feeling, and the remedy is to feel” (p. 385). And Jung (1968), while decidedly opposed to catering to a victim mentality, nonetheless rightly comments that “it is of course impossible to free oneself from one’s childhood without devoting a great deal of work to it.... Nor can it be achieved through intellectual knowledge only; what is alone effective is a remembering that is also a re-experiencing” (p. 81).

Pursuing independence as a goal and understanding that freedom entails more than merely liberating oneself from oppressive external constraints, but also necessitates the self-responsibility involved in seeking psychological freedom, is pivotal if the experience of victimisation is to be rightly curtailed as a stage one works through rather than a state with which one permanently identifies; that is, if the individual is to work through and achieve independence from his/her victimisation rather than assume the permanent status of ‘victim.’

²⁰³ Commenting on the results of association test experiments designed to test levels of psychic identity among family members, Jung (1935) observes of a particular case: “Now the daughter has exactly the same reactions as the mother.... This participation explains why the daughter of an alcoholic who has had a hell of a youth will seek a man who is an alcoholic and marry him; and if by chance he should not be one, she will make him into one on account of that peculiar identity with one member of the family” (p. 156).

The reason Fromm is so insistent that the emphasis on outer or political liberation without an understanding of the psychological implications is damaging is due to the psychological truism that yesterday's oppressed (both at the micro and macro level) are susceptible to becoming tomorrow's oppressors (As noted, this is borne out by the foregoing examination of the 'step' characters). As Fromm (1993) notes, liberators often transform "themselves into new rulers, only mouthing the ideologies of freedom" (p. 7), and "in the long and virtually continuous battle for freedom... classes that were fighting against oppression at one stage sided with the enemies of freedom when victory was won and new privileges were to be defended" (1941, p. 3). As noted, Rodmilla's refusal to take even the first step toward assuming responsibility for her victimisation results in a mutation of character whereby she becomes the 'villain' in someone else's life; that is, in Danielle's life.

While on the theme of victimisation and the responsibility of the victim, the same point I have made – that victimisation should be regarded as a stage one works through and not a state with which one permanently identifies – is equally applicable to victimisation experienced at the macro level. I noted earlier Barzun's reference to emancipation as one of the main cultural themes of our era. In light of the argument I have made, the cultural theme of pursuing emancipation can be viewed as a positive development and achievement. However, as I have also argued, achieving liberation from external constraints is only one factor in the equation when it comes to changing one's situation, and this is equally so whether one is seeking escape from the victimisation of an oppressive interpersonal relationship or is fighting against victimisation and oppression on behalf of or as a member of a disadvantaged group. At some point or other it must be recognised that achieving emancipation from victimisation and claiming one's independence is one's own responsibility.

This point is of note because, as recognised by Fromm and as an increasing number of contemporary theorists point to also (see below), there does seem to be a disproportionate emphasis on political liberation and, in comparison, seemingly little accompanying attention given to one's personal responsibility in the equation. When only 'negative freedom' is emphasised a 'Cinderella mentality' tends to be the result – a 'Cinderella mentality' referring to a situation in which one sees oneself and one's group as good and only good, and one's opponent as bad and only bad. Initially, an 'us versus them' mentality is the only possible stance for a victimised person or victimised group to adopt. However, as I argue shortly, if such a view is persisted in, it becomes counterproductive.

What I have denoted a ‘Cinderella mentality’ has been noted as characteristic of much post-colonial discourse. On this point, Graham Good (2001) argues that in postcolonial discourse Western culture is positioned as “uniquely guilty of racism, sexism, homophobia, ecocide, and imperialism” (p. 70).²⁰⁴ Good maintains that “this kind of negative Eurocentrism would... be modified by a genuinely global outlook, which would show these abuses and prejudices as widespread in world history” (p. 70). Commenting on the lack of historical perspective characteristic of postmodern and post-colonial discourse generally, Good (2001) argues that:

Postcolonialism’s dependence on colonialism... leads to a lack of historical depth.... Roman imperialism is rarely discussed, despite its obvious importance for later European imperialism. Negative Eurocentrism (seeing Europe as the only guilty party) conceals from view non-European examples of imperialism, such as the Islamic conquests in Africa and India, the Japanese annexations of Korea and parts of China, the Chinese invasion of Tibet, and the Indonesian invasion of East Timor. (p. 68)

Keith Windschuttle (1994) argues similarly to Good, noting that students are “taught to scorn the traditional values of Western culture – equality, freedom, democracy, human rights – as hollow rhetoric used to mask the self-interest of the wealthy and powerful” (p. 10).

Windschuttle cites as an example of this negative Eurocentrism the extraordinary moral outrage provoked by the 1992 quincentenary celebration of the European discovery of the Americas (p. 41). Positing the conquest of Tenochtitlan (1519-1521) as the pivotal event in the invasion of the New World, Windschuttle points out that one of the main reasons Cortes and his band of Spanish soldiers were able to outsmart a city of over 200,000 inhabitants was that he was able to get almost all the surrounding settlements of Mexico on his side.

²⁰⁴ Good (2001) also asserts that, in monolithically being portrayed as the sole historical perpetrator, the vital progress European culture “made towards social equality and prosperity is forgotten” (p. 73). Defending the philosophy and project of humanism, Good notes that “the fact that liberal humanism co-existed with a great many evils does not make it directly responsible for them. On the contrary, liberal humanist principles were working to alleviate or remedy many of them; the abolition of slavery, the emancipation of women, and the extension of democratic rights to all classes are examples. Certainly, these were slow processes, for they had to combat deep prejudices, which sometimes continued to exist in the very individuals who were furthering these changes. But to hold the Enlightenment project guilty of all those ills it had not yet cured is a fundamental mistake and a symptom of impatience with the actual nature of historical processes. Real social change takes time – the results are not instant – and to rush to condemnation and charges of hypocrisy on this account is destructive...” (pp. 3-4). Eagleton (1996), from a socialist perspective, likewise defends the contributions made by European culture: “The bourgeoisie may be on the whole a bad thing today, but it was much to be admired in its revolutionary heyday, when it fought with remarkable courage against the brutalities of the *anciens regimes* and bequeathed us a precious inheritance of liberty, justice and human rights, not to speak of a magnificent culture. (It is this culture, incidentally, which many working men and women, as well as many colonial subjects, have set out painfully to acquire so as to turn it to their own ends, and which for some postmodernists can simply be junked)” (p. 57). Good contends that while “presentism claims to have dispensed with grand narratives” (p. 73), it “has one of its own about the last five centuries, whose achievements are reduced to the twin disgraces of imperialism and patriarchy, occluding all of the period’s positive aspects” (p. 73).

Windschuttle highlights that this was not difficult given Tenochtitlan's reputation among the other Aztecs as a murderously cruel imperial power (p. 54).²⁰⁵ Windschuttle criticises theorist Tzvetan Todorov who, in his moral condemnation of the conquest of Tenochtitlan, posits European culture as 'massacre societies' and as morally worse than the native American 'sacrifice societies' (p. 61), noting that:

Todorov... wants to impose a moral judgement on the Spanish conquest, and yet he also wishes to play down the issue of human sacrifice so that his readers will still see the Aztecs as victims who have the greater virtue and who deserve the greater sympathy. To do this he is forced to argue that all human societies are guilty of systematic mass murder, only some are more guilty than others. But once the distinction between sacrifice/massacre societies evaporates, he is left with nothing but a common human nature to explain the murderous proclivity of the species. And the idea of a common human nature is something that his whole book was designed to deny. (p. 62)

A 'Cinderella mentality' is counterproductive as the equating of victimisation with 'goodness' and the belief that some individuals or groups are inherently good and others inherently bad is, as I argue in the last section of this chapter, itself an erroneous premise. The deeper issue, and the recognition of which I consider is the only grounds upon which a resolution of oppression and victimisation is ultimately possible, is the acknowledgment that the problem of victimisation is not fundamentally an us/them problem but a *human* problem in which we are all in part implicated and for which we are all responsible. In *Struggle Without End* (1990), which is an account of the colonisation of New Zealand from the perspective of the Tangata Whenua, author Ranganui Walker notes of the history of his people prior to the arrival of British settlers that "the main themes that emerge from the traditions are a search for vacant land. If there was none available, then the migrants joined existing tangata whenua groups. In subsequent generations, when there was no more vacant land, warfare and conquest was the only way to get it" (p. 48). In other words, the original inhabitants of Aotearoa were killing each other for land prior to the arrival of the British. This does not excuse the injustices wrought by the British. However, I think it does put the issue in clearer perspective. While the British, in that they had muskets, inflicted a much greater scale of oppression, their treachery was in intent little different to the same unrestrained tendencies that Maori themselves were not foreign to. I consider Walker at his truest where he notes that the

²⁰⁵ Windschuttle (1994) notes that the Mexica (inhabitants of Tenochtitlan) "exact[ed] tribute by threat of terror and retribution...each year, the agricultural harvest heralded the onset of a six-month 'season of war' in which warriors from Tenochtitlan would go out to other settlements to challenge them to battle, to bring back captives for sacrifice and to carry off women, children and slaves" (p. 54). Windschuttle continues: "One doesn't need much understanding of Mesoamerican religion to realise that such practices were bound to generate the desire for revenge" (p. 54).

struggle was one of “man’s inhumanity to man” (p. 217). I posit that the debate should not be construed as essentially one of Maori goodness and Pakeha badness. On the contrary, the historical and contemporary explanation of ‘human’ behaviour can be seen to be essentially situational and circumstantial in character.²⁰⁶

Again, my argument is certainly not that victimisation – whether at the micro or macro level - should be repressed or denied. I emphasise again that becoming conscious of victimisation and reacting to it is in fact the first step in assuming responsibility for it and achieving freedom from it. It must be acknowledged that we cannot offer the victimised the plaster of sympathy and thereby think that we have done justice by them. Perhaps the reason that victimisation is so often persisted in is because genuine understanding is never accorded the victim and therefore the extent of healing they in fact need and deserve is not effected. Nonetheless, it is perhaps so that a reaction or group formation that is right and justified at one stage of development can mutate into regression if carried too far. One can, of course, choose to be forever the victim and assume a perpetual attitude of blame. Yet while staying the victim may be easier than assuming self-responsibility, no positive freedom can ensue until one puts one’s own hand to the plough; that is, until the hard work of developing positive freedom is engaged with.

In relation to the topic under discussion, a significant scene in *Ever After* is the scene in which Danielle emancipates herself from enslavement to Pierre Le Pieu. After publicly humiliating Danielle at the ball, Rodmilla sells her to Le Pieu – a neighbouring landowner - in order to redeem the goods she has pawned to him, but also (and more to the point) to be rid of Danielle for good. Le Pieu, who claims himself in love with Danielle, nonetheless chains her because she will not stay with him willingly. Danielle is treated as a slave. “You belong to me now,” Le Pieu tells her. “I belong to no-one; least of all you!” Danielle rather contradicts. During this exchange in which Le Pieu makes an advance toward her, Danielle manages to secure a sword and, cornering Le Pieu, tells him: “My father was an expert swordsman Monsieur. He taught me well. Now, hand me that key or I swear on his grave I will split you from navel to nose.” Le Pieu is reluctantly forced to yield. Handing her the key, he grudgingly concedes: “Your freedom... My lady!”

²⁰⁶ To further make the point that the injustices wrought by the British were already occurring: In his account of Maori mythology, Walker (1990) notes that Maui is honoured as “epitomising the basic personality structure idealised by Maori society” (p. 15). Maui is described as an arch-trickster, with a penchant for deceiving his elders. In recounting the canoe traditions, Walker recounts of Tama Te Kapua, captain of the Arawa canoe, who cunningly deceived Tainui into giving up right of ownership of Whangaparaoa by prior discovery, that Tama Te Kapua, like Maui, “. . . was a trickster who was bold, cunning, assertive, and utterly ruthless in his pursuit of mana” (p. 48).

Having thus rescued herself, Danielle is just leaving Le Pieu's estate when Prince Henry arrives on the scene. Given that the last exchange she and Henry had was at the ball when Henry, upon Rodmilla's accusations, publicly rejected her, Danielle's visible disturbance at his unexpected arrival is understandable. "What are you doing here?" she asks. "I, er... I came to rescue you," Henry replies rather feebly. Considering Henry's treatment of her this appears a somewhat arrogant claim. Henry, appearing to perceive this, immediately changes his tune: "Actually," Henry more appropriately addresses Danielle, "I came to beg your forgiveness..."

This scene in *Ever After* constitutes a fundamental and centrally significant departure from traditional Cinderellaism in which the passive maiden victim is scripted as wholly dependent on and at the mercy of the rescuer knight. Danielle does not in fact need Henry to rescue her. Danielle proves to be quite capable of rescuing herself! In this respect at least, Danielle shows herself a worthy symbol of female emancipation. In *The Cinderella Complex* (1981) Colette Dowling maintains unequivocally that the day of the rescuer prince, whereby a woman could "seduce a man into being her patron and protector" (p. 26), is over. Of course, women no longer need or want a prince to rescue them; Or do they? In this age of liberation women are fully aware that they are no longer *meant* to want one. Yet surely one is not being unduly critical if one remains in doubt as to whether there is sufficient congruence between declared purpose and psychological capacity. Dowling postulates the 'Cinderella complex' as "personal, psychological dependency – the deep wish to be taken care of by others" and maintains that it is this psychological dependency which "is the chief force holding women down today" (p. 28). In Dowling's view, it is the psychological aspect of freedom and "what it is women *get* from maintaining their dependent positions in life – the goodies; what psychiatrists call the 'secondary gains,'" that the women's movement has not sufficiently come to terms with (p. 22). While the place of women within traditional marriage may be less than ideal, alongside this criticism it must be admitted that such relationships have traditionally afforded many women a certain haven from the difficult and often feared task of having to make it in the world with only one's own merits to fall back on for security. Again, drawing attention to the self-responsibility involved in attaining freedom, Dowling maintains that "we have only one real shot at 'liberation,' and that is to *emancipate ourselves from within*" (p. 28; emphasis added).

Of course, in balance, it must be noted that women are not the only ones with dependency issues. Jung repeatedly draws attention to the tendency of men to remain mother-

fixated (see e.g., 1959b, p. 20). Clearly, women are not the only ones who project the “wish to be saved” (Dowling, 1981, p. 23) into their intimate relationships. Fromm (1988), also drawing attention to the proclivity of men to remain dependent on a mother figure, critiques the covert structure of patriarchal marriage as one in which “the male remains a dependent creature but denies this by boasting of his strength and proving it through making the female his property” (p. 10).

In concluding this discussion of the ‘victim’s responsibility,’ it seems necessary to contemplate what freedom is for. What is the ontological and teleological function of freedom? Freedom for what? To what purpose and end? Again, this question takes us back to the question or problem of the individual and of individuality. Fromm unequivocally equates his concept of positive freedom with the necessity that one become who one is. Fromm (1941) writes that “freedom from external authority is a lasting gain only if the inner psychological conditions are such that we are able to establish our own individuality” (p. 241). Thus understood, positive freedom means freedom to be oneself. Nonetheless, it must be clarified that freedom to be oneself is not freedom to do what one likes; it is not freedom to please oneself without reference to what Fromm refers to as “autonomous restrictions” (see below). Nor is freedom, in its positive sense, inimical to authority in and of itself. Despite an understandable wariness of authority in general, it must be admitted that not all authority is oppressive.²⁰⁷ Indeed, while irrational authority is certainly destructive, it is paradoxically so that the absence of the ‘right’ kind of authority – that is, of rational authority (see following quote) – can in itself constitute oppression. In light of this consideration it is necessary to clarify that in speaking of freedom I am not thereby making a case for anarchy, but rather for authenticity. Fromm (1979), in reference to child-rearing, clarifies the difference between freedom and arbitrariness and comments on the function of freedom, writing that:

It must be clearly understood... that freedom is not laissez-faire and arbitrariness. Human beings have a specific structure – like any other species – and can grow only in terms of this structure. Freedom does not mean freedom *from* all guiding principles. It means the freedom *to grow* according to the laws of the structure of human existence (autonomous restrictions). It means obedience to the laws that govern optimal human development. Any authority that furthers this goal is ‘rational authority’ when this furtherance is achieved by way of helping to mobilize the child’s activity, critical thinking, and faith in life. It is ‘irrational authority’ when it imposes on the child

²⁰⁷ Terry Eagleton (1996) makes the following point concerning authority: “But power and authority are of course excellent things; it all depends on who has them in what circumstances for which purposes. The power to undo wretchedness is to be celebrated rather than derided... Normativity is to be condemned if it means sexual strait-jacketing, but defended if it means, say, the routine agreement by which workers have a right to withdraw their labour in certain situations” (p. 56).

heteronomous norms that serve the purposes of the authority, but not the purposes of the child's specific structure. (p. 85)

The attaining of positive freedom also means facing the difficult moral task of recognising that ultimately our worst enemy is in fact our own self. Unless and until we are willing to take responsibility for victimisation, we will not become different to those we hate. We merely become a reaction to other people or to oppressive circumstances, and ultimately, repeat them. While freedom – both in its negative and positive aspects – is necessary, psychological freedom is possible only when we face up to our own un-lived life and our own lack of productivity. Positive freedom does not mean forgetting the past. However, it does necessitate that at some point or other we move beyond blame and no longer use the past as an excuse or crutch for not living productively now.

Symbiotic attachment

Now his eyes lifted to hers, holding them in a hard and merciless gaze which was as blatantly sexual as it was chillingly cold. She quivered. All over. Inside and out. It was the most erotic thing which had ever happened to her.

Lee, 1999, p. 39

At the commencement of my PhD candidature an acquaintance of mine gave me a whole stack of Harlequin Mills and Boon paperbacks. These romance paperbacks proved useful when looking for examples of sadomasochism. Why is it that being reduced to quivering nothingness by chilling, merciless eyes might be conceived as erotic?

In *The Female Eunuch* (1971), Germaine Greer includes as an excerpt a letter in which a 39-year-old woman confides to having submitted to corporal punishment from her husband throughout the duration of their fifteen-year marriage²⁰⁸ (p. 199). The woman defends the right of people to spank their mates, writing that “our ideas are quite simple. My husband happens to believe that in marriage the husband should be the boss. I agree with him and I recognize that wrong-doing should be punished” (p. 199). It is difficult not to overlook the rationalisations this correspondent makes. One is left wondering who punishes her husband when he does something wrong. One is also left rather sceptical as to her claim that spanking is the “most effective” way of dealing with wrong-doing. If she has not learnt her ‘moral’ lessons after fifteen years this method seems anything but effective. One rather supposes that her ‘moral flaws’ are merely a foil for the symbiotic nature of the relationship. The letter

²⁰⁸ Greer (1971) cites the letter as originally appearing in *Forum*, vol. 2, no. 3 (p. 199).

concludes: “We both think that the simplest, most convenient, most effective and most natural way for a man to punish the faults of his woman is to spank or whip her; but not too severely, certainly not brutally” (p. 199).

Throughout his writings, and within the context of his argument that the goal of the individual is that s/he develop his/her human potentialities and become ‘fully awake,’ Fromm (1941) draws attention to various ‘mechanisms of escape’ (as he refers to them),²⁰⁹ whereby the individual seeks to overcome the existential dichotomy²¹⁰ of his/her existence and especially the experience of human aloneness, not by developing independence and pursuing freedom, but rather through forfeiting it (pp. 136-206). But why would anyone want to give up their independence? Why would someone choose some form of servitude over freedom? Dowling (1981) draws attention to the paradox that while freedom is desired, it also frightens. While freedom may be an ideal in principle, it is hard work in reality. Further, the pursuit of freedom confronts the individual with that one thing s/he dreads above all else: the awareness of and experience of his/her basic and unalterable aloneness (Fromm, 1962a). Fromm (1941) writes “the individual finds himself ‘free’ in the negative sense, that is, alone with his self and confronting an alienated, hostile world” (p. 151). Fromm (1941) points out that once primary ties are severed and the individual either chooses to or is forced to assume adult responsibility s/he is confronted with two basic courses of action:

By one course he can progress to ‘positive freedom’; he can relate himself spontaneously to the world in love and work, in the genuine expression of his emotional, sensuous, and intellectual capacities; he can thus become one again with man, nature, and himself, without giving up the independence and integrity of his individual self. The other course open to him is to fall back, to give up his freedom, and to try to overcome his aloneness by eliminating the gap that has arisen between his individual self and the world. (p. 140)

One of the most common ‘mechanisms of escape’ (i.e., one of the means by which an individual seeks for reprieve from loneliness and to escape responsibility for his/her existence) that Fromm draws attention to is the striving for submission or domination; or in clinical terms: masochism and sadism. The masochistic striving, as Fromm (1941) notes, is characterised by the tendency to derive pleasure from what most people wish to avoid; that is, from suffering and pain. Overviewing the symptomatology of masochism, Fromm (1941)

²⁰⁹ As noted below, I examine in this section the ‘escape mechanism’ of symbiotic attachment. However, Fromm (1941) also points to automaton conformity, destructiveness, and withdrawal as other or alternative escape mechanisms or ways of coping that the individual may adopt (pp. 136-206).

²¹⁰ Fromm (1947) uses the term ‘existential dichotomy’ to refer to the specific relationship to nature that being human engenders; the awareness of separateness that this relationship creates and the resulting need an individual has to bridge this separateness in some way (pp. 48-58).

comments that “with such people, it almost seems as if they were following advice given them by an enemy to behave in such a way as to be most detrimental to themselves” (p. 143). In contrast, the sadistic striving is characterised by the drive to dominate and the passion to control. Fromm (1941), critiquing sadomasochism as the dynamic of fusing with another in order to feel secure, contends that at the root of both these strivings is the desperate need to “escape from an unbearable aloneness” (p. 142). Fromm draws attention to the mutual symbiosis which characterises sadomasochistic relationships. While the dependence of the masochistic person is obvious, Fromm points out that the sadist – while seeming to wield control – is equally dependent on his/her partner or whoever/whatever the object/s of his/her control are. Fromm (1962a) thus writes that:

The sadistic person is as dependent on the submissive person as the latter is on the former; neither can live without the other. The difference is only that the sadistic person commands, exploits, hurts, humiliates, and that the masochistic person is commanded, exploited, hurt, humiliated. This is a considerable difference in a realistic sense; in a deeper emotional sense, the difference is not so great as that which they both have in common: fusion without integrity. (p. 21)

While sadomasochism is most frequently conceived of as a sexual phenomenon, Fromm (1941) rather views sadistic/masochistic strivings as rooted in the character structure of individuals who manifest such strivings. Moreover, Fromm (1962a) points out that usually a person displays both tendencies, although toward different people and in different situations.²¹¹ In connection with this observation, it is of note that while Rodmilla is clearly a sadistic character, she also displays masochistic traits. Rodmilla’s masochism is discernable in her reaction to Auguste’s sudden and tragic death. Danielle is heartbroken: “Papa, please come back!” she cries. Yet Danielle’s emotional reaction is of a diametrically opposed quality to Rodmilla’s anguished: “Auguste, you cannot leave me here! You cannot leave me here!” Danielle’s crying expresses: “I need you, because I love you.” Rodmilla’s reaction expresses in effect: “I need you because I cannot be alone.” Rodmilla betrays the masochistic individual’s unspoken, though clearly discerned, articulation: “I’ll be and do whatever you want, if only you’ll promise not to abandon me!”

Fromm points to the anomaly whereby sadism and masochism are rationalised as love. Of masochism, Fromm (1941) writes that “it seems that there is no better proof of ‘love’ than sacrifice and the readiness to give oneself up for the sake of the beloved person”; yet Fromm

²¹¹ Fromm (1941) notes that “people are not sadistic or masochistic, but there is a constant oscillation between the active and the passive side of the symbiotic complex, so that it is often difficult to determine which side of it is operating at a given moment. In both cases individuality and freedom are lost” (pp. 158-159).

critiques that “actually, in these cases, ‘love’ is essentially a masochistic yearning and rooted in the symbiotic need of the person involved” (pp. 160-161). Of sadism, Fromm (1941) notes that in some cases “the sadistic person quite manifestly ‘loves’ those over whom he feels power” (p. 146). However this ‘love’ is contingent on the sadist’s object/s submitting to and pleasing him/her and is apt to rapidly evaporate at any show of disagreement or self-assertion. The crux of the matter is the sadist’s object/s right to freedom and autonomy. The sadist may lavish upon those subject to his/her domination everything they desire, with the exception of this one thing. In Fromm’s view, a loving relationship – as opposed to the symbiosis of a sadomasochistic one - stands or falls on the preservation of the individual integrity of each partner. Fromm (1941) writes that “the dynamic quality of love lies in... that it springs from the need of overcoming separateness, that it leads to oneness – *and yet that individuality is not eliminated*” (p. 261; emphasis added). Fromm (1941) elaborates this point, noting that:

If we mean by love the passionate affirmation and active relatedness to the essence of a particular person, if we mean by it the union with another person on the basis of the independence and integrity of the two persons involved, then masochism and love are opposites. Love is based on equality and freedom. If it is based on subordination and loss of integrity of one partner, it is masochistic dependence, regardless of how the relationship is rationalized. (p. 161)

Fromm (1941) observes that, to some degree at least, sadomasochistic traits are characteristic of and to be found in the greater majority of people. Considering, as discussed already, that individual spontaneity – which forms the basis for the integrity of the individual self and for productive relating – is often suppressed in childhood, Fromm’s assessment as to the prevalence of sadomasochism should not strike the reader as far-fetched. If the natural instinct to be oneself and assert oneself is thwarted, this instinct becomes perverted and assumes a sadomasochistic dynamic (see Fromm, 1941, pp. 183-184). Sadomasochism can thus be understood as the perversion of individual potency. Fromm (1941) notes that “to the extent to which an individual... is able to realize his potentialities on the basis of freedom and integrity of his self, he does not need to dominate and is lacking the lust for power” (p. 162). Summarising the difference between ‘power’ as domination and ‘power’ as potency, Fromm (1941) notes that “power, in the sense of domination, is the perversion of potency, just as sexual sadism is the perversion of sexual love” (p. 162).

In relation to his discussion of sadism and masochism, Fromm (1992) is critical of Herbert Marcuse’s argument²¹² that in his visionary ‘nonrepressive’ society “such

²¹² For a full account of Fromm’s critique of Marcuse see *The Revision of Psychoanalysis* (1992, pp. 111-129). Fromm (1992) is not critical of all of Marcuse’s work. He says of *Reason and Revolution* (1941) that it is

manifestations of pregenital sexuality as coprophilia (love for feces) and sadism take on a meaning entirely different from the meaning such manifestations have in the repressive society” (p. 116). Fromm (1992) asks:

What does Marcuse mean when he says that the libido would not *simply* reactivate precivilized stages but *also* transform the perverted content? What is the perverted content of sadism and what is it transformed into? What is the ‘instinctual substance’ that, today, is distinct from the destructive forms of the perversion? Is the purified sadism not (or not *only*) sexual? Is the instinctual substance no longer characterized by the need to control, hurt, humiliate? And, if not, what is sadistic about it? (p. 118)

Fromm (1992) is particularly critical of what he refers to as Marcuse’s “misinterpretation of Freud” (p. 111), and writes that “in order to describe this new and innocent ‘polymorphous sexuality,’ he [Marcuse] postulates a metapsychological theory, changing and distorting Freud rather than discussing the clinical, experiential facts of sadism” (p. 118). Within the context of critiquing Marcuse’s work, Fromm notes of radical thought in general that “if radical thought ceases to be critical and rational, it ceases to be ‘radical’ (in the sense of ‘going to the roots’) and becomes adventurist or leads to irrational actions” (p. 111). Fromm (1992) contends that the “distorted Freud” perpetuated by theorists such as Marcuse is dangerous (p. 111), particularly when psychoanalytic theory is employed without regard to the empirical data informing it (p. 112). While Marcuse poses as avant-garde and revolutionary, Fromm argues that if one cuts through the “slippery argumentation” (p. 113) and sophisticated “intellectual embellishments” (p. 115), one finds that what Marcuse fundamentally postulates is a “vulgar materialism in which the complete satisfaction of material needs plus the satisfaction of all libidinal needs, especially the pregenital ones, constitute the final happiness” (pp. 127-128). In contrast to Marcuse, and clarifying a Freudian position, Fromm (1992) writes that:

Freud’s basic assumption was that man in any given society would have to cease being an infant and arrive at an optimum of independence. Freud’s ideal was the mature, rational, independent man who could rely on himself and his own reason. Nobody would be more shocked than he to serve as the basis for the ideal of regression as the real aim of human progress. If Marcuse had been capable of examining the problem of the new man in his relationships to others, he might have discovered that sadism, masochism, voyeurism, exhibitionism, and narcissism – all of which are characteristic of infantile experience – would disturb any form of social cooperation in the ‘free society.’ (p. 125)

“brilliant and profound” (p. 112). Fromm’s critique is limited to a discussion of *Eros and Civilization* (1955/1966) and *One-Dimensional Man* (1964). Fromm acknowledges that in Marcuse’s *An Essay on Liberation* (1969), which was written subsequently to his critique, Marcuse “presents views that are in sharp contrast to his previous writings” (p. 129). However, Fromm writes that “although I am glad that Marcuse has adopted a position that is essentially the one he criticized so sharply before, it is regrettable that he does not even comment on this change in the interests of intellectual clarity” (p. 129).

I have drawn attention to Fromm's critique of Marcuse's argument because it is likely that Fromm would be equally critical - and on much the same grounds - of the more recent comments regarding sadomasochism made by sociologist Anthony Giddens. As I overview in Chapter Four, in *The Transformation of Intimacy* (1992), Giddens conceptualises what he refers to as the "pure relationship", a relationship of sexual and emotional equality" (p. 2) and points to what he considers as the revolutionary impact of the "democratizing of the interpersonal domain" (p. 3). However, while Giddens (1992) advocates equality in the intimate and interpersonal realm, he writes of sadomasochistic sex that:

Attitudes and traits, 'prohibited' in the pure relationship can potentially be acted upon, including instrumental control and the exercise of formal power. Confined within the sphere of sexuality and turned into fantasy - rather than, as has always been usual, determined from the outside - dominance perhaps helps to neutralize aggression which would otherwise make itself felt elsewhere. (p. 144)

In contradistinction, Fromm (1992) - as already noted - points out that sexuality cannot be separated from character but rather is an expression of it. Giving a psychoanalytic viewpoint, Fromm (1992) writes that "experience has shown that the person for whom sadistic practices are most exciting sexually is also a 'sadistic character.' In other words, outside the sphere of sexual activity this person exhibits the quality of sadism in his relationships to other people" (p. 93).²¹³

It is perhaps necessary to clarify that Fromm's critique of sadomasochism is not a moralistic one. Frommian 'morality' - if it can be referred to as such - is the morality of individual development and optimal individual well-being. Fromm does not argue that sadomasochism is 'wrong' because it offends religious or social mores. Yet though Fromm is opposed to the imposition of irrational authority as such, his position is not one of ethical relativism (see next section for discussion of this point). External moral authorities aside, the individual is still subject to the "autonomous restrictions" referred to earlier, and in the same way that there are autonomous restrictions that govern biological well-being, so also are there autonomous restrictions governing psychological and relational well-being. For example, a person may eat a whole cake in one sitting. Certainly there is no religious or social law against this. Yet there are many people who would consider this behaviour destructive, not

²¹³ In making this critique, Sanford (1980) cautions against rejecting fantasy - even sadomasochistic fantasy - out of hand. Sanford writes that "we need to understand why we have this particular sexual fantasy, that is, what the fantasy symbolically expresses" (p. 89). Also along these lines, Redfearn (as cited in Samuels, 1989) notes that "it has been remarked how the so-called 'treasures of the unconscious' involve incest, sadomasochism, and all the abhorred parts of personality that are only available 'behind mother's back'" (p. 193). However, treating sadomasochistic fantasy as fantasy and endeavouring to understand it is different from the engagement with sadomasochism in the literal sense that Giddens appears to consider legitimate.

because some transcending authority or moral code postulates it as such, but solely in the interest of physical well-being. This is so, despite the fact that the person, while eating the cake, may find it very pleasurable. Fromm (1992) argues that:

If all that matters is the subjective feeling of excitement, then, of course, the satisfaction of... sadism is as good as the satisfaction of genital sexual intimacy and love. But if one's concept of human existence... transcends that of... sensuous excitement... and if one believes that such human experiences as love, tenderness, and compassion are superior to sadism... then indeed the revival of perversions, even with all of Marcuse's nice embellishments and qualifications, is a step backward from progressive human development. Marcuse's point of view is a sybaritic one whereby pleasurable excitement per se is the aim in life, hate is as good as love, and sadism is as good as tenderness; all that matters is physical thrill. (p. 124)

Fromm's argument will only hold weight with those who consider the development of self, of independence, and of freedom worthy aspirations. All of Fromm's writing and research is premised on the assumption that the maximal development of the individual and individuality is desirable. The individuation and productiveness Jung and Fromm argue for respectively is not a given, but requires immense effort on the part of the individual, and as Dowling suggests there are certainly "secondary gains" to be derived from forfeiting self-responsibility and choosing instead the seeming haven of some "escape mechanism."

In concluding this discussion, there is one more point regarding sadomasochism that I wish to highlight, and in so doing will draw on a particular case of masochism that Janov (1970) comments on. In a brief discussion of perversions, Janov refers to a patient (a man) who needed to be tied down and beaten in order to participate sexually (p. 291). Janov (1970) notes that while there were other aetiological factors involved in the case, the man's masochism "seemed to stem mainly from the relationship with his sadistic mother who beat and abused him constantly" (p. 291). Janov points out that the masochistic ritual seemed an attempt to recreate "his old mother-son relationship in an almost literal way with the same unconscious hope he held years before – to be beaten enough to find surcease, pleasure and kindness" (p. 291).

Janov's comments on this case are informative in that he seems perceptively to recognise the nucleus of psychic pain underlying sadomasochistic behaviour; that is, to recognise sadomasochism as symptomatic of psychic suffering. If a person has been treated sadistically as a child then psychologically they have sustained injury upon injury; this is particularly so if the individual has been subject to on-going sadism. When seeking relationship as an adult, the sadistically treated individual is handicapped by a gulf of psychic pain that in most cases s/he does not understand – and further – is unable to express. The

individual is unable to relate on the basis of the integrity of his/herself because his/her individual self has not been recognised or cared for. Therefore the individual resorts to sadism/masochism; not as a conscious choice, but as an unconscious drive to express symptomatically/symbolically the psychic suffering s/he cannot understand or express in any other way. As Janov (1970) notes, at the nucleus of sadomasochistic behaviour lies the hope that someone will see the suffering of the individual and “put an end to it” (p. 292). From Janov’s comments it would seem that the masochistic person wants to be humiliated (even if only unconsciously so) and hurt, because s/he cannot feel love until the inner pain s/he has sustained has been recognised and understood. Presumably, the sadistic person is in the same position, only instead of being the subject of humiliation or hurt, s/he projects his/her psychic suffering onto a person/object outside of him/herself and thereby expresses and experiences his/her psychic suffering vicariously.

It is of note that Janov’s analysis is not essentially different from Fromm’s, only Janov puts more emphasis on the psychic woundedness behind the symptomatology. In both analyses sadomasochism is seen to stem from the inability of the individual to relate on the basis of the integrity of his/her individual self.

Thus far I have discussed various facets related to shadow, including questioning whether what is denoted ‘evil’ is the outcome of inherent wickedness or the symptom of psychic wounding, problematising the tendency to assume that victimisation and innocence are one and the same thing, and the dynamic of self-negation undergirding sadomasochistic fusion. In the final section of this chapter, I specifically address the question of good and evil.

The question of good and evil

In order to examine the question of good and evil, or, with respect to evil, what Jung denotes as shadow, I will draw upon for the purpose of the preliminary illustration and elucidation of the discussion that follows two biblical myths: the myth of Creation and the myth of Adam and Eve’s expulsion from Paradise.

According to the biblical myth of Creation, God creates the world in six days. Along with creating the heaven and earth, trees, plants and animals, God also creates man (Gen. 1:1-31). However, unlike everything else God creates, God creates man, both male and female, “in his own image” (Gen. 1:27). Throughout the six days of creation, God, seemingly pleased

with how things are progressing, comments concerning creation that “it was good” (Gen. 1:1-31). However Fromm (1966), drawing upon Jewish history and tradition, points out that:

Only when God had created man did he not say, ‘It is good.’ According to a Hasidic story, God did not say that it was good, because man was created as an open system, meant to grow and to develop, and was not finished, as the rest of creation had been.²¹⁴ (p. 180)

Fromm (1964) highlights that the question of whether human nature is basically good and perfectable or evil has been a central preoccupation within Western theological and philosophical discourse. In Christian ideology, the individual, corrupted by original sin, is inherently evil, and can only become good through repentance and by endeavouring to live according to the commandments, aided by Jesus’ sacrifice, the help of God and the law of grace.²¹⁵ Bertrand Russell (1960) points to the shameful ramifications of the ‘wicked’ nature theory, and to the cruelty children have traditionally suffered at the hands of parents and educators who regarded them the “limbs of Satan” (p. 24). In contrast to the ‘wicked’ view of humankind promulgated by exponents of original sin dogma, Fromm (1964) points out that Renaissance and Enlightenment thinkers adopted the opposite stance, claiming that evil was essentially circumstantial in character.²¹⁶ However, as noted by Fromm further below, the pendulum was to swing again. Commenting on humankind’s political record as a whole, Terry Eagleton (1996) notes that:

The political record of humankind has been appalling. From the moment they emerged upon the earth, human beings have systematically injured, plundered and enslaved one another.... History, for the great majority of men and women who have lived and died, has been a tale of unremitting labour and oppression, of suffering and degradation – so much so that, as Schopenhauer had the courage to confess, it might

²¹⁴ Although I am using this commentary on the creation myth as an illustrative point for this discussion, from my own reading of the myth I am not convinced that God did not postulate the creation of man, along with everything else created, as good. In the authorised King James Version of the Bible, the creation is summed up in Genesis 1:31 with the words: “And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.” As God created man, male and female, on the sixth day, this commendation at the end of creation would seem to include a commendation of the creation of man as good. However, it could be that the Hasidic story is based on a different version of the account of creation.

²¹⁵ Fromm (1964) makes the point that the dogma of original sin “was by no means unopposed in the Church. Pelagius assailed it but was defeated. The Renaissance humanists within the Church tended to weaken it, even though they could not directly assail or deny it, while many heretics did just that” (p. 20).

²¹⁶ On the issue of whether humankind is basically good or evil, I think that Bertrand Russell makes a good point. Russell, commenting on the cruelty children have suffered at the hands of those who considered them to be inherently wicked, notes but “there is an opposite error... far less pernicious, but still scientifically an error, and that is the belief that children are naturally virtuous.... The fact is that children are not naturally either ‘good’ or ‘bad’” (1960, p. 24).

well have been preferable for many people never to have been born at all. And for 'many', Sophocles would substitute 'all'.²¹⁷ (pp. 51-52)

Although a defender of the humanist tradition, Fromm (1964) does not consider that human nature consists of or is describable in terms of a substance.²¹⁸ Hence Fromm rejects the idea that human nature generally and individuals specifically can be denoted either good or bad. Fromm considers that belief in inherent 'goodness' is naïve and untenable. However, he equally opposes the opposite view. Writing in the aftermath of World War II, Fromm (1964) noted that there existed the danger that the resulting sense of powerlessness experienced by many at the time would engender a new emphasis on human corruption and original sin and serve "as a rationalization for the defeatist view that war cannot be avoided because it is the result of the destructiveness of human nature" (p. 21).

While Fromm is not of the view that individuals are *inherently* good or evil, he recognises that both potentialities exist (see 1964, p. 123). Essentially however, Fromm equates 'goodness' with reverence for life and human unfolding and evil with its stifling and suppression. On this point, Fromm (1947) notes that:

It would seem that the degree of destructiveness is proportionate to the degree to which the unfolding of a person's capacities is blocked. I am not referring here to occasional frustrations of this or that desire but to the blockage of spontaneous expression of man's sensory, emotional, physical, and intellectual capacities, to the thwarting of his productive potentialities. If life's tendency to grow, to be lived, is thwarted, the energy thus blocked undergoes a process of *change* and is transformed into life-destructive energy. *Destructiveness is the outcome of un-lived life.* Those individual and social conditions which make for the blocking of life-furthering energy produce destructiveness which in turn is the source from which the various manifestations of evil spring. (p. 218)

While Fromm and Jung address the question of good and evil extensively, and while Jung's analysis of good and evil, in particular, is nuanced and more comprehensive than I am

²¹⁷ Eagleton (1996) balances this assessment by noting that "this is not of course to deny that there has also been a great deal of resplendent goodness, just that part of what we admire about that goodness is that it comes as something of a surprise. And most of it has belonged to the private rather than the public sphere" (p. 52).

²¹⁸ Fromm (1964) is of the view that to consider human nature as fixed is to take a non-evolutionary, ahistorical stance, which is untenable in view of the "tremendous difference to be found between our most undeveloped ancestors and civilised man as he appears in the last four to six thousand years of history" (pp. 115-116). In Fromm's view, the essence of human nature is not a fixed substance, but is rooted in the contradiction of human existence, in the individual's self-awareness, in his/her need to find meaning and to bridge the gap of separateness. Being human means being faced with a puzzle that must be solved. The human situation – being part of nature, yet transcending nature – presents the individual with a question. It is the question itself and the need for an answer which Fromm considers constitutes the essence of human nature (pp. 115-117; see also Fromm, 1947, pp. 30-34; Fromm, 1974, pp. 58-64; Fromm, 1992, pp. 24-28; Sayers, 1998, pp. 149-168).

able to do justice to here,²¹⁹ if their respective corpus of writings are taken as a whole, what both thinkers are seen to espouse overall is a morality in which ‘goodness’ rests upon, results from, and is equated with individuation (Jung) or productivity (Fromm); and this is the essential point regarding the question of human good, as opposed to immorality, that I wish to emphasise. (As noted in the Introduction, the terms individuation and productivity are employed respectively by Jung and Fromm in a similar way to denote essentially the same thing). Conveyed by both the terms individuation and productivity is the key idea that *life itself* is the “absolute, the supreme moral principle” (Jung, 1918, p. 32). Moreover, individuation or developing a productive orientation are viewed by both thinkers as a moral responsibility with moral ramifications. Noting that the primary task of the individual is to give birth to his/herself and fulfill his/her potentiality, Fromm considered virtue to equate to the level of productiveness an individual had achieved²²⁰ (see 1947, p. 230-238).

The equating of goodness or morality with individuation is not unique to Fromm or Jung. Eagleton (1996) makes the point that though Marx firmly believed in a common human nature, he considered individuation an integral component thereof (p. 117). Eagleton, referring to Marx, notes that:

It is a peculiarity of our species that we are so constituted as to live our natures differentially – not just in the sense that there are no two exactly identical tomatoes, but in the sense that this individuation is an *activity* of our ‘species’ being. It belongs to our species life to bring ourselves into being, through others, as unique individuals. (p. 117)

Existential psychologist Rollo May (1958), drawing upon Nietzsche, similarly points to the theme of individuation, noting that one of Nietzsche’s “most crucial existential

²¹⁹ Perhaps Jung’s most controversial statement regarding the question of good and evil is his criticism of the Christian conception of God as the *Summun Bonum* or supreme good. Jung (1959b), in expounding the dynamics of Gnostic symbols of the self, notes that in contrast to Christian understandings, “the Gnostics were quite familiar with the dark aspect of their metaphysical figures...” (p. 366). Jung (1956) advocated “a revision of...religious formulas with the aid of psychological insight” (p. 1595), and maintained that “a conscientious clarification of the idea of God would have consequences as upsetting as they are necessary” (1954d, p. 1551). Regarding the question of whether human nature is good or evil, Jung (1959b) writes that “so far as we can judge from experience, light and shadow are so evenly distributed in man’s nature that his psychic totality appears... in a somewhat murky light” (p. 76), and further that “the soul is paradoxical... it is black and white, divine and demon-like, in its primitive and natural state” (1954d, p. 1553). Overall however, as I note below, Jung conceives of and postulates good and evil as principles or archetypes.

²²⁰ Fromm (1947) notes concerning the usage of the word ‘virtue’: “The difference between humanistic and authoritarian ethics is illustrated in the different meanings attached to the word ‘virtue.’ Aristotle uses ‘virtue’ to mean ‘excellence’ – excellence of the activity by which the potentialities peculiar to man are realized. ‘Virtue’ is used, e.g., by Paracelsus as synonymous with the individual characteristics of each thing – that is, its peculiarity. A stone or a flower each has its virtue, its combination of specific qualities. Man’s virtue, likewise, is that precise set of qualities which is characteristic of the human species, while each person’s virtue is his unique individuality. He is ‘virtuous’ if he unfolds his ‘virtue.’ In contrast, ‘virtue’ in the modern sense is a concept of authoritarian ethics. To be virtuous signifies self-denial and obedience, suppression of individuality rather than its fullest realization” (pp. 22-23).

emphases is his insistence that the values of *human* life never come about automatically. The human being *can lose his own being by his own choices*, as a tree or stone cannot” (p. 31). May cites Nietzsche: “Individuality, worth and dignity are not *gegeben*, i.e., given us as data by nature, but *aufgegeben* – i.e., given or assigned to us as a task which we ourselves must solve” (1958, pp. 31-32). Fromm (1947), drawing attention in this respect to the uniqueness of human existence, makes this same point, noting that:

Man’s life cannot ‘be lived’ by repeating the pattern of his species; *he* must live....
Man is the only animal for whom his own existence is a problem which he has to solve and from which he cannot escape. He cannot go back to the prehuman state of harmony with nature; he must proceed to develop his reason until he becomes the master of nature, and of himself. (p. 49)

Related to the postulate that life itself and individual realisation – the goal of both individuation and productivity - is the highest moral value and moral expression, is the envisaging of a morality *beyond* the moral categories of good and evil or right and wrong.²²¹ Fromm, who traces the beginnings of humanistic thought from the biblical Hebrew Prophets, points to a Talmudic statement concerning the “end of days”,²²² which asserts that in the messianic era²²³ “there is neither merit nor guilt” (1966, p. 139). Fromm (1966) notes that “for man in the messianic time, so seems to be the idea in this statement, the problem of guilt will disappear; but with this disappears also the problem of good works. He does not need good works in order to justify himself – *because he has become fully himself*” (p. 139; emphasis added).

The second myth I draw upon in order to examine the question of good and evil is the myth of Adam and Eve’s expulsion from Paradise. In this myth, which follows the Creation myth, Adam and Eve are warned by God not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, upon the threat of death (Gen. 2:17). The serpent however, tells them otherwise, enticing them: “Ye shall not surely die, for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your

²²¹ In thus stating, I qualify that a position beyond good and evil as postulated here is conceived of as possible only as a result of the development of moral consciousness, and not a state that can be arrived at by disregarding and casting off one’s moral duties and responsibilities. While Jung sees the individual as having the capacity to attain to a position of morality beyond good and evil (see 1956, p. 1630), he also notes that “those who deem themselves beyond good and evil are usually the worst tormentors of mankind” (1959b, p. 97). Whether a morality beyond good and evil is viable rests upon the evolution of moral consciousness. This is further emphasised by Jung, who notes that “the Pauline overcoming of the law falls only to the man who knows how to put his soul in the place of conscience. Very few are capable of this... And these few tread this path only from inner necessity, not to say suffering, for it is sharp as the edge of a razor” (1953, p. 401).

²²² A biblical expression referring to the messianic time.

²²³ The messianic era refers to the vision of universal peace predicted by the biblical prophets (see e.g., Isaiah 2). Fromm (1961) makes a comparison between the messianic prophecies and Marx’s thought, noting that “Marx’s socialism, based on his theory of man, is essentially prophetic Messianism in the language of the nineteenth century” (p. 5).

eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil” (Gen 3:4-5). In Christian dogma, this myth is interpreted as representing Adam and Eve’s fall, and consequently the fall of humankind as a whole, and from this myth the concept of original sin is derived. In contradistinction however, Fromm (1966) rather interprets this myth as a symbol not of humankind’s fall, but rather its awakening (p. 23).²²⁴ The first act of disobedience is also the first act of human freedom (p. 23). By disobeying, which is the worst sin only within the context of an authoritarian ethics,²²⁵ Adam and Eve emancipate themselves from the paradisiacal (though oppressive) state of infancy or *participation mystique*²²⁶ and precipitate, not original sin, but rather the awakening of and task of attaining consciousness. In eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, Adam and Eve obtain not only the capacity for consciousness, but also the capacity to be like God.²²⁷ Fromm (1964) notes that while “in the course of the development of the Christian Church, Adam’s disobedience was conceived as sin” (p. 20), the act of eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is not how it is symbolised in the Old Testament myth (p. 20). Fromm (1964) notes that:

The Old Testament does not take the position of man’s fundamental corruption. Adam and Eve’s *disobedience* to God are not called sin; nowhere is there a hint that this disobedience has corrupted man. On the contrary, the disobedience is the condition for man’s self-awareness, for his capacity to choose, and thus in the last analysis this first act of disobedience is man’s first step toward freedom. It seems that their disobedience was even within God’s plan; for, according to prophetic thought, man just *because* he was expelled from Paradise is able to make his own history, to develop his human powers, and to attain a new harmony with man and nature as a fully developed individual instead of the former harmony in which he was *not yet* an individual. (pp. 19-20)

²²⁴ Fromm (1966) argues that “the Christian interpretation of the story of man’s act of disobedience as his ‘fall’ has obscured the clear meaning of the story” (p. 23).

²²⁵ Fromm contrasts authoritarian ethics with humanistic ethics (see below). Fromm (1947) notes that “authoritarian ethics can be distinguished from humanistic ethics by two criteria, one formal, the other material. Formally, authoritarian ethics denies man’s capacity to know what is good or bad; the norm giver is always an authority transcending the individual. Such a system is based not on reason and knowledge but on awe of the authority and on the subject’s feeling of weakness and dependence; the surrender of decision making to the authority results from the latter’s magic power; its decisions can not and must not be questioned. *Materially*, or according to content, authoritarian ethics answers the question of what is good and bad primarily in terms of the interests of the authority, not the interests of the subject; it is exploitative, although the subject may derive considerable benefits, psychic or material, from it” (p. 20).

²²⁶ Participation mystique is a term coined by the French ethnologist Lucien Levy-Bruhl, which Jung employs often. Jung (1957a) writes that what Levy-Bruhl meant by this term “is... the indefinitely large remnant of non-differentiation between subject and object... When there is no consciousness of the difference between subject and object, an unconscious identity prevails...” (p. 66).

²²⁷ Becoming like God or the gods does not imply replacing God, in the same way that becoming one’s own father and mother, which – as I argue in Chapter Five – is a necessary component of psychological maturation, does not imply that one has replaced one’s parents, only that the relationship has superseded the former parent/child role distinction (see Chapter Five for clarification and discussion of this point).

Jung similarly interprets the act of eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as symbolising the birth of human consciousness and like Fromm argues that ‘the fall’ was precipitated by God²²⁸ (1952b, p. 579). Adam and Eve are cursed. In Jung’s view however, consciousness *is* experienced as a curse. It is difficult. But this is not necessarily a bad thing (see Jung, 1931e, p. 751). In contradistinction to the Christian interpretation of the myth, Fromm and Jung regard unconsciousness the worst sin (see e.g., Jung, 1948b, p. 455). Moreover, in that the serpent’s prediction that Adam and Eve will attain consciousness (i.e., that their eyes will be open and they will become aware) follows, and not God’s prediction of death, Jung’s controversial assertion that “good and evil function together” (1954, p. 76) appears to hold weight and to be of value in understanding the meaning of the myth. In fact God him/herself is forced to admit the serpent was right: “And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil” (Gen. 3:22).²²⁹ Returning to the point of whether humankind is basically good or evil, or whether some people are ‘good’ and others ‘evil,’ it is of note that God does not say that Adam and Eve will become good or evil (or incidentally, that God or the gods themselves are good or evil), but rather, as argued, that they will *know* what good and evil are; that they will obtain consciousness and discernment. Jung (1959a) notes of good and evil that they are principles or archetypes, and as such pre-exist and extend beyond us.

Jung, who as noted distinguishes between the archetype *per se* and archetypal images or ideas, subscribes to a notion of *morality per se* and is not of the view that morality in and of itself is simply the product of culture or the Freudian superego. As an archetype, Jung (1953) notes of morality that:

²²⁸ Jung (1934a) notes that “not for nothing did the Bible story place the unbroken harmony of plant, animal, man, and God, symbolized as Paradise, at the very beginning of all psychic development, and declare that the first dawning of consciousness – ‘Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil’ – was a fatal sin. To the naïve mind it must indeed seem a sin to shatter the divine unity of consciousness that ruled the primal night. It was the Luciferian revolt of the individual against the One. It was a hostile act of disharmony against harmony, a separation from the fusion of all with all. Therefore God cursed the serpent and said: ‘I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.’

And yet the attainment of consciousness was the most precious fruit of the tree of knowledge, the magical weapon which gave man victory over the earth, and which we hope will give him a still greater victory over himself” (pp. 288-289)

²²⁹ Fromm (1966) points out that the words of the serpent prove true: “Man has eaten from the tree of knowledge; he has not died, as the serpent had correctly predicted; he has become *as God*” (p. 64), and further: “The serpent, who had said *eritis sicut dei* (‘you shall be like gods’) had been right” (p. 64). Undoubtedly Christians will argue that the death that God refers to is a spiritual one and that when Adam and Eve eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil they become dead in sin. However, Fromm (1966) notes that “man creates himself in the historical process which began with his first act of freedom – the freedom to disobey – to say ‘no.’ This ‘corruption’ lies in the very nature of human existence. Only by going through the process of alienation can man overcome it and achieve a new harmony. This new harmony, the new oneness with man and nature, is called in the prophetic and rabbinic literature, ‘the end of days,’ or ‘messianic time’” (p. 88).

It should never be forgotten – and of this the Freudian school must be reminded – that morality was not brought down on tables of stone from Sinai and imposed on the people, but is a function of the human soul, as old as humanity itself. Morality is not imposed from outside; we have it in ourselves from the start – not the law, but our moral nature without which the collective life of human society would be impossible. That is why morality is found at all levels of society... (p. 30; see also 1949, p. 1415)

As noted however, the archetype (in this case, morality) “has no fixed content; it represents the specific form which any number of different contents may take” (Jung, 1949, p. 1415). Morality may be an archetype in terms of constituting a form or category of the human psyche. However, moral content, as opposed to *morality per se*, varies from culture to culture and individual to individual.²³⁰ There is certainly no universal agreement as to what good/evil or moral/immoral is. On this point Jung (1949) notes:

For one person it is ‘good’ to kill those who think differently from him; for another the supreme law is tolerance; for a third it is a sin to skin an animal with an iron knife; for a fourth it is disrespectful to step on the shadow of a chief. (p. 1415)

Jung emphasises that human judgement regarding good and evil is relative, and that we simply do not know what good and evil are in themselves.²³¹ However, just because moral judgement is relative and fallible, it does not follow that no distinction or comparison can be made between moral codes that are better or more humane than others. Fromm (1947) is not of the view that “value judgements and ethical norms are exclusively matters of taste or arbitrary preference and that no objectively valid statement can be made in this realm” (p. 15). In contrast to ethical relativism, Fromm postulates that the study of human nature leads to the development of norms “found in man’s nature itself” (p. 19). Fromm proposes as a standard against which moral codes can be measured a humanistic ethics “based on the principle that ‘good’ is what is good for man and ‘evil’ what is detrimental... the sole criterion of ethical value being man’s welfare” (p. 22). However, in advocating a morality premised on humanistic ethics, Fromm (1947) clarifies that postulating ‘objectively valid’ norms is not the same as making a case for ‘absolute’ norms:

... ‘objectively valid’ is not identical with ‘absolute’... a statement of probability, or approximation, or any hypothesis can be valid and at the same time ‘relative’ in the

²³⁰ Jung (1958) notes that “although morality as such is a universal attribute of the human psyche, the same cannot be maintained of a given moral code. It [i.e., a particular moral code] cannot, therefore, be an integral part of the psyche’s structure” (p. 833).

²³¹ Jung (1959a) writes that “we allow ourselves so easily to be deluded by words, we substitute words for the whole of reality. People talk to me about evil, or about good, and presume that I know what it is. But I don’t. When someone speaks of good or evil, it is what *he* calls good or evil, or what *he* feels as good or evil. Then he speaks about it with great assurance, not knowing whether it really is so or whether what he calls good or evil really corresponds to the facts. Perhaps the speaker’s view of the world is not in keeping with the real facts at all, so that an inner, subjective picture is substituted for objectivity...” (p. 858).

sense of having been established on limited evidence and being subject to future refinement if facts or procedures warrant it. (pp. 25-26)

In contrast to a morality premised on humanistic ethics, Fromm (1947) notes that in authoritarian-based moralities “*a thing [or person] is called good if it is good for the person who uses it*” (p. 21). For example, an employee is considered good if s/he is an advantage to his/her employer. A child is considered good if s/he makes his/her parents proud and is a credit to them. However, Fromm (1947) points out that having to be obedient to an authority robs the individual of inner integrity and self congruence:²³² “The ‘good’ child may be frightened and insecure, wanting only to please his parents by submitting to their will, while the ‘bad’ child may have a will of his own and genuine interests but ones which do not please the parents” (p. 21).

In sum on this point, as Jung notes, moral judgements are relative and what one person or culture views as good or right, another person or culture may view evil and wrong. However, while this is so, it does not follow that ‘morality’ cannot be critiqued. As I argued in section two of this chapter, if measured against the humanistic ethics Fromm espouses, the morality we subscribe to may itself be found ‘immoral.’

In concluding this discussion, given that I am examining the shadow and the subject of morality within the context of myth, it seems applicable to briefly draw attention to historian Hayden White’s (1987) thesis that all stories – whether factual or fictional – have at their core a tendency to moralise. White contends that the moral factor is so embedded in story-telling, when it comes to narrative, morality is in fact ‘the content of the form’ - as he entitles his book on narrative and historical representation. Drawing on Hegel’s thesis of the connection between “law, historicity, and narrativity” (p. 13), White observes that:

We cannot but be struck by the frequency with which narrativity, whether of the fictional or the factual sort, presupposes the existence of a legal system.... And this raises the suspicion that narrative... from the folktale to the novel, from the annals to the fully realized ‘history,’ has to do with the topics of law, legality, legitimacy, or, more generally, authority. (p. 13)

White (1987) further comments that if every story “points to a moral, or endows events... with a significance that they do not possess as a mere sequence, then it seems possible to conclude that every... narrative has as its latent or manifest purpose the desire to moralize the events of which it treats” (p. 14).

²³² In saying this, Fromm recognises that obedience to law and lawgivers is a necessary developmental phase both historically and in the life of the individual (see 1966, pp. 72-73 for discussion of this point).

If various narrative genres are examined, White's thesis seems to hold weight. Whether the particular morality espoused in a given narrative is the morality of the defenders of law and order versus criminals, as in police/crime drama; or villains versus victims, as in the thriller genre; or the morality of the desirable versus the undesirable, as in romantic comedy, moral themes are clearly immanent.²³³ Considering, as White (1987) points out, that narrative and narration are "panglobal facts of culture" (p. 1), Jung's recognition of *morality per se* appears to hold weight.²³⁴ Whether consciously perceived or not, our stories betray a fundamental concern with the question of good and evil and reward and punishment and a fundamental psychological tendency to 'moralise' our experiences. Further, it would seem that we are imbued with a deep psychological need for reassurance that in the end all will be well and that good will win out over evil. We want "good" rewarded and "bad" punished. A thriller, such as *Arlington Road* (Pellington, 1999), which does not conform to this pattern, tends to leave the viewer insecure.²³⁵ And I have already drawn attention to the storm of protest Margaret Mitchell generated when, in *Gone with the Wind* (1936/1974), she failed to gratify the readers' demand for the expected 'happily ever after' denouement.

Finally, Jung (1954) points to the "still unresolved moral conflict in the Christian psyche" (p. 76). In the Christian myth, Christ is good and the devil or Satan, bad. Christians are encouraged to identify with Christ and to reject everything associated with shadow or evil. However, Jung (1927) maintains that the shadow "belongs to the wholeness of the personality" (p. 261), and that without shadow, "body and humanity" are lacking (1959b, p. 76). Jung (1959b) points to the "fatality inherent in the Christian disposition itself" (p. 78), whereby it must produce its opposite, "not through the obscure workings of chance but in accordance with psychological law" (p. 78). It is of note that individuals who subscribe to

²³³ This is so even if conventional morality is inverted and the story is so constructed that viewer sympathy is weighted with the 'good' criminals fighting against the 'bad' establishment. Further, while concurring in general with White's thesis, it is necessary to note that contemporary films across genres show a much greater tendency toward tolerating and privileging moral ambiguity with the moral categories of good and evil not as clearly demarcated as was perhaps previously the case.

²³⁴ Again on this point Jung (1949) notes that it should not be forgotten "that moral law is not just something imposed upon man from outside (for instance, by a crabbed grandfather). On the contrary, it expresses a psychic fact. As the regulator of action, it corresponds to a preformed image, a pattern of behaviour which is archetypal and deeply embedded in human nature. This has no fixed content; it represents the specific form which any number of different contents may take" (p. 1415).

²³⁵ As an example of the effect a movie can have on a viewer, on IMDbPro's Message Boards, one viewer of *Arlington Road* (1999), posted December 29, 2004: "I'm never seeing this movie again," writing that "I am not saying it was a bad movie, but the ending was just too down and shocking...". There was a reply to this message, posted the same day: "It's supposed to be SHOCKING!! You are supposed to think that this could actually happen, because the 'good guys' don't always win."

moralties which permit them only to be and to identify with supposed ‘good’ are eventually undermined by shadow.²³⁶ Concerning Christian morality, Jung (1952b) notes that:

But in the unconscious is everything that has been rejected by consciousness, and the more Christian one’s consciousness is, the more heathenishly does the unconscious behave, if in the rejected heathenism there are values which are important for life – if, that is to say, the baby has been thrown out with the bath water, as so often happens. (p. 713)

The same moral conflict that Jung notes as characteristic of and unresolved in the Christian psyche continues unresolved in the romantic psyche. In the Cinderella fairy tale and in romantic stories, the Cinderella characters and romantic heroines are good, and the ‘step’ or ‘other’ woman characters, bad or odious. In that, like the Christ figure, Cinderella is the symbol of identification, the Christian tendency to see oneself as and identify only with supposed good is perpetuated in Cinderella and romantic mythology. This has implications in terms of human relationship, in that without awareness of shadow, relationships are fraught with projections and lack depth. The consequences of being blind to shadow – which is a form of ‘love blindness’ – is taken up again in Chapter Five.

Although, as discussed in Chapter One, victimisation and goodness are two themes that the individual identifying with a Cinderella character or romantic heroine is subjectively identifying with, I have posited that victimisation and goodness are not one and the same thing and that it is ultimately undermining and self-defeating to view them as such. The current emphasis within much academic discourse on political emancipation (negative freedom) without an accompanying understanding of and focus on inner or psychological freedom (positive freedom) has been posited as problematic in that rather than victimisation being a stage one eventually works through, one tends to assume for oneself the permanent status and title of victim; this resulting in harmful dependency and the assuming of a perpetual attitude of blame. Again, the reason a victim mentality and the equating of victimisation with innocence is so detrimental is that perceiving oneself as good and only good – apart from being erroneous (everyone has shadow) - tends to result in a mutation of character whereby one becomes an oppressor in another person’s/other people’s lives.

In specifically addressing the question of good and evil in the final section of this chapter, I have equated morality with the supreme value of life itself. Jung (1934d) refers to

²³⁶ Jung (1952b) notes that “irritability, bad moods, and outbursts of affect are the classic symptoms of chronic virtuousness” (p. 729). Jung (1956) notes that moral focus should concern itself with human life as it can be lived, not with how it should be lived; with realities and not ideals. Jung points to the futility of inventing “an ideal scheme knowing that it will *never* be fulfilled” (p. 1676).

the necessity of being true “to the law of one’s own being” (p. 295), and of choosing one’s own way “consciously and with moral deliberation” (p. 296). It is argued that it is the expression of one’s true self – realised via individuation – that provides the basis for a morality beyond ‘good versus evil’ and ‘victim versus villain’ dualisms and is the basis for adult or productive relatedness.

Having discussed in this chapter various facets related to shadow, in the next chapter I pick up the discussion of ego again and examine in more practical terms expectations associated with romantically premised commitments.

CHAPTER FOUR

In Chapter One, I critiqued the Cinderella character as an archetypal image and symbol of the ego. Vis-à-vis the Cinderella character, the Prince character could be subjectively read to symbolise the animus, that is, the contrasexual component of personality compensatory to the conscious attitude (see discussion of anima/us below). However, in this chapter, rather than subjectively reading Prince Henry as symbolising the animus, I critique Henry – similarly to my reading of the Cinderella character in Chapter One - as a symbol of the ego also, and here position Danielle as a symbol of the anima vis-à-vis Henry.

My reason for looking at ego experience again, this time through a critique of the Prince character, is that the Prince character in *Ever After* illustrates another important aspect of ego experience. While in my focus on Cinderella as a symbol of the ego, I drew upon the themes associated with Cinderella in order to comment on ego experience, the Prince character in *Ever After* effectively symbolises Jung’s contention that “consciousness is primarily an organ of orientation in a world of outer and inner facts” (1937, p. 256), and the necessity of the ego – as a requirement of individuation - to achieve differentiation in relation to both outer and inner reality (see discussion of this point below).

My rationale for critiquing Prince Henry as a symbol of the ego, rather than as a symbol of the animus, is again on account of the dynamic manner in which the fairy tale characters in *Ever After* are presented, and accordingly, in which viewers are able to identify with characters other than the Cinderella character. As noted in the Introduction, in contrast to earlier renditions of the Cinderella fairy tale, in *Ever After* the Prince character is presented as a character in his own right and not just as the person who falls in love with Cinderella (in *Ever After*, Danielle).

In the section that follows I point to the ego’s need to achieve differentiation in terms of the inner and outer facts of experience as the prerequisite basis of relatedness. In this chapter I also discuss what relatedness ‘beyond romance’ might look like and critique the romantic notion of there being a Mr/Ms. Right. However, before turning to a discussion of these points, it is of note that Prince Henry is introduced by the narrator in *Ever After* as “a man who was still a boy in many many ways.” This observation of Henry echoes Jung’s assessment as to the level of consciousness characteristic of the Western individual generally. On this point Jung (1934a) notes: “It would be a delusion to imagine that we have attained

anything like a high level of consciousness. Our present-day consciousness is a mere child that is just beginning to say ‘I’” (p. 284).

Soul, persona, and differentiation

Jung (1939) employs the terms animus and anima to refer to the unconscious masculinity and unconscious femininity in women and men respectively (p. 512), and also as descriptors to designate male and female figures/images appearing in fantasy and imaginative products. In Jungian terminology, animus and anima are ‘soul-images’ that have a contrasexual compensating role (Jung, 1959b, p. 27).²³⁷ Thus, for Jung, the soul is not neutral (sex-less/gender-less), but either feminine or masculine depending on and contrasexual to whether one is a man or a woman. Jung, in substantiating his observations – which he emphasised were arrived at empirically²³⁸ – pointed out that the recognition of a psychological contrasexual masculine or feminine soul-imprint paralleled the findings within biology of his day:

It is a well-known fact that sex is determined by a majority of male or female genes, as the case may be. But the minority of genes belonging to the other sex does not simply disappear. A man therefore has in him a feminine side, an unconscious feminine figure – a fact of which he is generally quite unaware... I have called this figure the ‘anima,’ and its counterpart in woman the ‘animus.’.... This figure frequently appears in dreams. (1939, p. 512)

The problem with Jung’s designation and usage of the terms animus/anima is that the equating of male anatomy with psychological masculinity and female anatomy with psychological femininity plays straight into the lap of gender determinism, particularly since Jung unreflectingly equates psychological masculinity or femininity with culture-specific

²³⁷ Jungian analyst Warren Colman (1996), usefully points out that Jung’s most comprehensive definition of the anima and animus is found in a footnote in *Aion*, where Jung (1959b) draws attention to the three elements of these symbolisms, noting that the anima/animus concepts relate to “the femininity pertaining to the man and the masculinity pertaining to the women; the experience which man has of woman and vice versa; and, finally, the masculine and feminine archetypal image...” (p. 41n). Colman, who considers that within analysis the anima/animus concepts are most usefully understood in connection with the “dynamic narrative of the Oedipus complex” (p. 38), highlights that most Jungians concentrate on the first and third dimensions of Jung’s definition and tend to overlook the second – and in Colman’s view, very important – personal experience aspect of the archetypes (p. 38).

²³⁸ Jung (1959b) notes that “I do not... wish... to give the impression that these compensatory relationships were arrived at by deduction. On the contrary, long and varied experience was needed in order to grasp the nature of anima and animus empirically. Whatever we have to say about these archetypes, therefore, is either directly verifiable or at least rendered probable by the facts. At the same time, I am fully aware that we are discussing pioneer work which by its very nature can only be provisional” (p. 27).

stereotypes.²³⁹ On the issue of gender, Jung assimilates without question the socio-political attitudes of his day; he thus views the archetypal through the lens of the socio-political, and not vice versa. This results in Jung espousing views that within academia today are viewed as painfully anachronistic. For example, Jung (1959b) writes that “eros is an expression” of woman’s “true nature,” and that logos in a woman “is often only a regrettable accident” (p. 29). Moreover, “it seems a very natural state of affairs for men to have irrational moods and women irrational opinions” (p. 35). Perhaps the statement that best sums up Jung’s overall position regarding the naturalness of the sex/gender equation is: “A man should live as a man and a woman as a woman” (1927, p. 243). In Jung’s view, ‘men *are* from Mars and women from Venus’; that is, men and women are different creatures, not only anatomically, but psychologically also (1959b). In Jung’s schema, an individual with a female body is (or should be) ‘feminine.’

Understandably, among post-Jungians there has been considerable debate regarding how best to deal with the heritage – both the blessings and the baggage – of animus/anima symbolism.²⁴⁰ Samuels (1989) argues that if the idea of a ‘feminine principle’ based on female anatomy is retained, then due to the relatively stable and fixed nature of anatomy over time, what it is to be a woman – in accordance with ‘a feminine principle’ – must likewise remain fixed.²⁴¹ Samuels (1989) maintains that:

The argument that innate psychological differences between the sexes are based on the body has serious and insidious difficulties in it. It sounds so grounded, so reasonable, so common-sensical, so different from social or ideological styles of exploring gender

²³⁹ I am not discounting that culture-specific stereotypes aside, there may be such a thing that could perhaps be designated masculine and feminine in terms of a biologically situated and based substrate of behaviour. However, this accounted for, I take Samuel’s view that “we still cannot assume that psychological *functioning* is different in men and women, *though we know that the creatures ‘man’ and ‘woman’ are different*” (1989, p. 96).

²⁴⁰ It is of note that despite the problematic nature of animus and anima symbolism, these concepts are not generally viewed negatively within post-Jungian discourse. For example, Tacey (1997a) makes a distinction between Jung’s theory and his personal equation which colours his theory. Tacey considers that the Jungian animus and anima concepts make “strong gestures toward archetypal androgyny or structural bisexuality” despite their radical counter-cultural implications being undermined by Jung’s immersion in and holding to the very rigid gender stereotypes of his day (p. 30). Perhaps from what I have said it is difficult to see how anything ‘radical’ can radiate from Jung’s animus and anima formulations. However, it is of note that gender stereotyping aside, the concepts – as Tacey points out - lend themselves to an androgynous view of men and women and Jung (1959b) does bring out this point, noting that the animus and anima “when withdrawn from projection, can be integrated into consciousness” (p. 40). This integration leads to a fuller and more rounded expression of personality not hampered by traditionally understood gender restrictions. Samuels (1989) also points out that while Jung’s work is characterised by a confusion between what is masculine/feminine and what are merely genderless qualities, “sometimes Jung moves beyond sex and gender qualities and even beyond complementarity: ‘Eros is a *kosmogonos*, a creator and a father-mother of all higher consciousness” (p. 189).

²⁴¹ Samuels (1989) notes that “a literal determinism has seduced those who seek to make a simple equation between body and psyche. We do not really know what the relationship between them is but it is probably *indirect*. The fact that a penis penetrates and a womb contains tells us absolutely nothing about the psychological qualities of those who actually possess such organs. One does not have to be a clinician to recognize penetrative women and receptive men – nor to conclude that psychology has projected its fantasies onto the body” (p. 101).

issues. However, if psychological activity is body-based then, as body is more or less a constant over the entire history of humanity, body-based psychological theory can only support the horrendous gender situation with which we are faced just now. For, if it is body-based, how can it be altered? (p. 101)

One of the main criticisms that Samuels proffers regarding animus/anima imagery is that it hampers development by the “insistence on contrasexuality (‘masculine’ assertion via the animus, etc.)”²⁴² (1989, p. 97). Samuels espouses instead that animus/anima symbolism be understood merely as metaphorically conveying difference (p. 97).²⁴³ In this vein Samuels, Shorter, and Plaut (1986) clarify when defining animus/anima that these principles “operate in relation to the dominant psychic principle of a man or a woman and not simply, as is commonly suggested, as the contrasexual psychological counterpart of maleness and femaleness...” (p. 23). This idea is further elaborated by Samuels, who notes that:

It follows that animus and anima images are not of men and women because animus and anima qualities are ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’. No – here, for the individual woman or man, anatomy is a metaphor for the richness and potential of the ‘other’. A man will imagine what is ‘other’ to him in the symbolic form of a woman – a being with another anatomy. A woman will symbolize what is foreign to her in terms of the kind of body she does not herself have. The so-called contrasexuality is more something ‘contrapsychological’; anatomy is a metaphor for that. But anatomy is absolutely not a metaphor for any particular emotional characteristic or set of characteristics. That depends on the individual and on whatever is presently outside her or his conscious grasp and hence in need of being represented by a personification of the opposite sex. The difference between you and your animus or anima is very different from the difference between you and a man or woman. (1989, pp. 103-104)

According to Samuels, the animus or male figure that compensates the conscious attitude of an anatomically female individual does not represent in a psychological sense her inferior masculinity nor give her access to qualities traditionally regarded as ‘masculine,’ such as aggression. Rather, as outlined by Samuels above, the animus and anima are ‘other’ relative to a particular individual’s conscious attitude. Animus and anima in and of themselves do not denote feminine or masculine characteristics, because in Samuels’ view

²⁴² Samuels was not the first person to criticise the notion of contrasexuality. Sanford (1980) draws attention to comments made in the early 1970s by James Hillman, noting that Hillman “argues that the anima as archetype should be released from the notion of contrasexuality... for it can be seen to apply to the psychology of women as well” (p. 106).

²⁴³ In considering animus/anima symbolism, Samuels (1989) writes that “I am referring to the fact, image, and social reality of difference *itself*. Not what differences between women and men there are, or have always been; if we pursue that, we end up captured by our captivation and obsession with myth and with the eternal, part of the legacy from Jung. I am interested in *what difference is like*, what the experience of difference is like... Not what a woman *is*, but what being a woman is *like*. Not the archetypal structuring of woman’s world but woman’s personal experience in today’s world. Not the *meaning* of a woman’s life but her *experience* of her life. Each person remains a ‘man’ or a ‘woman’, but what that means to each becomes immediate and relative, and hence capable of generational expansion and cultural challenge” (p. 97).

characteristics such as reflection or aggression are not sexed or gendered qualities anyway. Thus, animus and anima are again projection-bearers for difference or ‘otherness’ in relation to a particular individual, whether male or female, and hence have only individual and not gendered significance and applicability.

Samuels’ argument is not without its critics. Tacey (1997a) contends that Samuels “appears to be advocating an abandonment of, or at least a relaxation of, the use of universal psychological principles in Jungian therapy” (p. 34). Yet despite disagreement among post-Jungians over whether to ‘rescue the feminine or masculine principle’ or abandon it, mutuality exists in the acknowledgement that men and women are not only men and women, and nor should they be thus pigeonholed. For example, Samuels might take issue with Tacey’s reference to “feminine men and masculine women” (1997a, p. 30), since the wording Tacey employs implies that there are specific feminine and masculine qualities.²⁴⁴ Yet Samuels no doubt would be in agreement with Tacey that “what ‘compensates’ the conscious lives of these new men and women may be the opposite of what Jung envisaged” (p. 30). Commenting on the apparent “dramatic rise in homosexuality and lesbianism in...society,” Tacey (1997a) notes that:

Our task is not to think about ways of reversing this process and of re-establishing the conventional heterosexual norm, but rather to accept the changes as they take place and to shift our theoretical and moral positions accordingly. The truly modern therapist instinctively knows this, and realizes that his or her task is not to churn out a more conventional citizen but to obey the dictates of the patient’s psyche. If this means moving in a more androgynous direction outside the normal images of society, so be it. The processes of the soul, rather than the norms of society, have become the new locus and source of moral authority. (p. 31)

Thus far I have looked at the gendered aspect of animus and anima; this starting point providing pause for a brief look at developments within post-Jungian theorising. However, more pertinent to this discussion at this point, and even more so shortly when I introduce the concept of persona, is Jung’s observation of the role that animus and anima play in providing a link between ego-consciousness and unconscious psyche (1953, p. 336). Noting the function of animus/anima, Jung (1957a) explains that “I have defined the anima as a personification of the unconscious in general, and have taken it as a bridge to the unconscious, in other words, as a function of relationship to the unconscious” (p. 62).²⁴⁵ While Jung speaks here of the anima

²⁴⁴ Again, Samuels clarifies that in Jung’s work “there is a confusion between references to qualities that anyone might possess (which *might* be named masculine or feminine for whatever reason) and real men and women” (1989, p. 189).

²⁴⁵ Of course, by inference, the same applies to animus.

(or animus) being a personification of the unconscious, it is important to note that a distinction nonetheless remains between the psyche, which Jung (1923) defines as “the totality of all psychic processes, conscious as well as unconscious” (p. 797; see also 1954, p. 58), and soul, which is defined as “a clearly demarcated functional complex that can best be described as a ‘personality’” (1923, p. 797); hence the anthropomorphic descriptors animus/anima. Though the wording Jung employs to describe animus/anima sometimes gives rise to confusion (see e.g., 1959b, p. 33), Jung clarifies that the unconscious is not only animus/anima. Of the anima, Jung (1954) notes that “she is not characteristic of the unconscious in its entirety. She is only one of its aspects” (p. 58).

It is of note that while Jung refers to animus and anima as ‘soul-images’ and oft-times simply as soul (see e.g. 1923, p. 279; 1954, p. 55), Jung does not hereby postulate animus or anima as having affinity with a Christian or philosophical conception of soul. Ever at pains to emphasise that he is documenting, and not theorising speculatively, Jung draws a clear divide between his empirical animus and anima and the Christian soul, which Jung considers is premised, for the most part, on dogma and abstraction. Jung (1954g) notes that animus and anima refer to a “group of related or analogous psychic phenomena” (p. 114). Elaborating the delineation between animus/anima and Christian or philosophical soul, Jung (1954g) notes that:

The anima... is meant to connote something that should not be confused with any dogmatic Christian idea of the soul or with any of the previous philosophical conceptions of it. If one wishes to form anything like a concrete conception of what this term covers, one would do better to go back to a classical author like Macrobius, or to classical Chinese philosophy, where the anima (p’o or kuei) is regarded as the feminine and chthonic part of the soul. A parallel of this kind always runs the risk of metaphysical concretism, which I do my best to avoid, though any attempt at graphic description is bound to succumb to it up to a point. For we are dealing here not with an abstract concept but with an empirical one, and the form in which it appears necessarily clings to it, so that it cannot be described at all except in terms of its specific phenomenology. (p. 119; see also 1954, p. 57)

Again delineating between his own usage of soul and a philosophical one, Jung (1959b) writes that the terms animus and anima indicate “something specific, for which the expression ‘soul’ is too general and too vague” (p. 25). Even so, it is of note that when Jung defines these ‘soul-image’ concepts (see 1923, pp. 797-811), for the most part he employs the gender neutral term soul (‘seele’ in German). While the editors of the English translation of the *Collected Works* translate ‘seele’ as animus or anima, they note that this is due to an editorial decision and not a reflection of Jung’s original wording. The editors, justifying their

translation, explain that discerning whether Jung is using animus/anima in a gender specific or neutral way is not always easy, and they advise that “the reader may prefer to translate anima/animus back into ‘soul’ on occasions when this would help to clarify Jung’s argument” (see Jung, 1923, p. 803n).

I have drawn attention to this point because while in the following discussion I will employ the specific Jungian ‘soul-image’ terms animus/anima where failure to do so would detract from a Jungian critique, for the most part I will take the same liberty that Jung often allows for himself, referring to animus/anima simply as soul. My rationale is premised on my accord with Samuels’ critique that viewing animus/anima as contrapsychological to one’s individuality and as metaphorically representing difference, as opposed to contrasexual to one’s sex, is perhaps the best means of redeeming Jungian masculine/feminine soul theory. However, this being so, I think there are two points that should be borne in mind and for which the terms animus/anima maintain applicability. First, the personified terms animus/anima maintain the focus – important to Jung – on the empirical and experiential nature of soul. Second, the terms animus/anima convey the fundamental and important linkage between soul and interpersonal relationship in a way that ‘soul’ in and of itself cannot. Animus/anima draw attention to the psychological interplay between the intrapsychic and the interpersonal.

Having reviewed the notion of soul as employed within a Jungian framework, I would now like to introduce the opposite though related concept of persona, and subsequently to look at both of these ‘functional complexes’ – as they are referred to within Jungian literature - in relation to the character of Prince Henry. However, before doing so it is perhaps needful to again highlight what is, within the sphere of a Jungian analytical paradigm, an axiomatic postulate: Namely, the postulate that ego-consciousness is situated within and confronted not only by the material realm of the senses, but also by the equally objective realm of psyche. Elaborating this point, Jung (1951a) notes that:

Just as I find myself moulded by external and objective social influences, so also I am moulded by internal and unconscious forces, which I have summed up under the term ‘the subjective factor.’ The man with the extraverted attitude bases himself primarily on social relationships; the other, the introvert, primarily on the subjective factor. The former is largely unaware of his subjective determinacy and regards it as insignificant; as a matter of fact, he is frightened of it. The latter has little or no interest in social relationships; he prefers to ignore them, feeling them to be onerous, even terrifying. To the one, the world of relationships is the important thing; for him it represents normality, the goal of desire. The other is primarily concerned with the inner pattern of his life, with his own self-consistency. (p. 241)

In this passage, along with emphasising the objectivity of psychic reality or the subjective factor, Jung also highlights the implications of individual attitude-type – whether extraverted or introverted – in relation to facilitating attunement or effecting comfortability in relation to one or the other realm. Yet despite whether one’s attitude-type inclines one more toward the social or the subjective, the inescapable fact of both realities necessitates the individual be equipped with the means of adaptation to both material objectivity and unconscious objectivity. I have already noted the function of soul as a means of adaptation to the unconscious. Likewise, Jung (1923) defines the persona as a functional complex that facilitates adaptation to external reality, mediating between the ego and the material world of the senses (p. 801).

While the word persona conjures up associations of falseness and also the idea of ‘mask,’²⁴⁶ to thereby view the persona as something negative is not helpful. The ego – confronted by external factors that are often hostile – needs the protection of a mask and, rightfully employed, the persona facilitates relatedness while also usefully and when necessary protecting one’s privacy. An appropriate understanding and use of persona is accompanied by an understanding – commented on in Chapter Two - that it is neither possible nor desirable to form intimacy with every person one meets, and that a vast number of daily interactions are best kept within the confines of role and conventionality. For example, when the local shopkeeper asks a customer how his/her day is going, the person whose persona is intact knows that regardless of how s/he is genuinely feeling, a conventional reply is appropriate and that the shopkeeper does not expect or want him/her to launch into a detailed monologue regarding his/her pending divorce. Emphasising the necessary adaptive function of persona, Whitmont (1969) rightly points out that the person without an adequate persona “will suffer from lack of poise, unnecessary defiance and overdefensiveness” (p. 158).

The persona therefore has an important place in terms of guarding individual intimacy requirements while also enabling relating. The persona could be likened to the foyer of a house. If a person has a good persona then everyone feels welcome and all social contacts are respectful. However, while friends and those with whom one has established trust are able to be admitted into the more intimate spheres of one’s house (i.e., life), acquaintances and casual contacts – while treated respectfully – are not necessarily invited in. The persona serves this important relational function and also enables an individual to abide by social norms and appropriately perform the various social roles to which s/he is committed.

²⁴⁶ The word ‘persona’ in fact means mask. Jung (1923) notes that the persona “was the name for the masks worn by actors in antiquity” (p. 800).

However, while the persona functions well when viewed in this light, it becomes problematic when a person thinks that his/her role is who s/he in actuality is; that is, where no distinction is made between persona as mask and persona as being. Optimally, the individual uses persona and soul as the means of adaptation to material reality and the unconscious respectively, but does not identify with either. Jung (1923) cautions as to the loss of psychic balance that ensues where either ego/persona or ego/soul identification exists, noting that:

Wherever an impassioned, almost magical, relationship exists between the sexes, it is invariably a question of a projected soul-image. Since these relationships are very common, the soul must be unconscious just as frequently – that is, vast numbers of people must be quite unaware of the way they are related to their inner psychic processes. Because this unconsciousness is always coupled with complete identification with the persona, it follows that this identification must be very frequent too. And in actual fact very many people are wholly identified with their outer attitude and therefore have no conscious relations to their inner processes. (p. 809)

The idea of ego/persona or ego/soul identity is perhaps difficult to grasp. The Western individual tends to view him/herself as a self-contained ego, and is an individual in the ‘individualistic’ sense of the word. Perhaps the idea of ego/persona identity can be entertained without too much difficulty, but not so readily that an ego/soul identity might also exist and that this might be problematic in relation to personality development and interpersonal relatedness. However, from a Jungian point of view, without recourse to persona and soul and an understanding of their respective adaptive functions within the psychic economy, the ego or individual is connected or identified with other people via persona associations and soul-ties, but not related in the sense that I am employing the word and arguing for in this thesis; this despite the fact that the heighty esteem of being well-connected and the compulsive nature of soul-ties may feel sensational and genuine in every sense of the word. In contradiction to the astro-like feelings of the ‘in-love’ state, Jung (1959b) observes that “the language of love is of astonishing uniformity, using the well-worn formulas with the utmost devotion and fidelity, so that once again the two partners find themselves in a banal collective situation. Yet they live in the illusion that they are related to one another in a most individual way” (p. 30).

The point is that in order to ‘be oneself’ – as argued here, the prerequisite for authentic relatedness – one must be sufficiently differentiated from one’s environments (sensual and suprasensual) and from other people, in order to view oneself and others with sufficient detachment and objectivity, rather than subsisting in a state of social and soulish enmeshment (the pre-differentiated state of identification). Hence, persona and soul assist with personality differentiation and individuation, and therefore with relatedness. For example, in the area of

interpersonal relationships, the differentiated individual stops acting the part of a romantic stereotype and gets to know his/her partner in his/her particularity. S/he can view others outside of the confinement of convention and role.²⁴⁷ In this respect, relationships – being neither persona-identifications nor soul-identifications – manifest an organic quality and are dynamic in character. Of course, in thus critiquing, I do not hereby mean to imply that anyone ever reaches some perfect differentiated and individuated state. Differentiation and individuation are a continual process, not something that one arrives at and obtains once and for all.²⁴⁸ Consciousness, at least for the time being, is but a small island on the vast sea of a seemingly limitless unconscious. Emphasising again that we are all citizens of an inner as well as an outer reality and the type of paradoxes that occur where either ego/persona or ego/soul identity exists, Jung (1923) notes that:

And, just as the unconscious world of mythological images speaks indirectly, through the experience of external things, to the man who surrenders wholly to the outside world, so the real world and its demands find their way indirectly to the man who has surrendered wholly to the soul; for no man can escape both realities. If he is intent only on the outer reality, he must live his myth; if he is turned only towards the inner reality, he must dream his outer, so-called real life. (p. 280; see also 1959b, p. 126)

Having looked at both soul and persona and their functions within the psyche as mediators between ego-consciousness and material reality and the unconscious respectively, I now turn to an examination of these concepts or functions in relation to Prince Henry.

The character of Prince Henry furnishes a rich example of the yearning the ego has for a sense of place and belonging, not only within the sphere of persona reality, but also for at-

²⁴⁷ An example from my own experience is in the area of men opening doors for women. For the most part – particularly in corridors – I consider door opening a courteous act regardless of which sex does the door opening. However, I myself dislike it if a man opens a door for me when I am getting in and out of a car. I do not mind at all if I am a passenger and the person who is driving unlocks the passenger door for me before opening his/her own door. I think this is respectful. However, I dislike it intensely if a man stands and waits for me to get into a car and then closes the door after me. I consider that I am quite capable of doing this for myself and would prefer to do so. One would think that there would be no problem with this. However, I have had occasion to ask two different male friends not to open car doors for me - explaining that it made me uncomfortable - and on both occasions the men reacted condescendingly and refused to change their behaviour. In their view, their behaviour was chivalrous and what is more, I should appreciate it, since – supposedly – many women still like being treated this way (I am sure this is true, since I have two female friends who do still enjoy and expect this practice). However, from my point of view – which, by the way went unheeded despite my great lengths to explain – no matter how respectful or appropriate a behaviour may be from a social standpoint, if it is not appreciated at a personal level, then a person should be able to express this and expect a friend to consider their personal preferences above social or romantic convention. I consider it would have been far more respectful for these friends to adjust their behaviour to the preference of the individual relationship rather than maintaining a collective practice I find irksome. In my view, both men displayed a persona identification (i.e, dictating their behaviour based on a collective ideal) that prevented them acting as individuals and also treating me as one. Consequently, the relationships remained superficial. It is impossible to have satisfying relatedness with someone who cannot take even simple individual preference into account.

²⁴⁸ At one point, Jung (1950) describes the process of individuation or the actualisation of the self, as involving the realisation of “that other person who we also are and yet can never attain to completely” (p. 235).

homeness and connectedness in relation to the suprasensual realm of the unconscious. Of course, *Ever After*, as an adaptation of the Cinderella fairy tale, is a love story. However, as I have argued throughout this critique, that which is ostensibly interpersonal has very significant intrapsychic implications. Thus, in relation to Henry, Danielle is a woman he desires interpersonal relatedness with. However, she also corresponds to the intrapsychic struggles Henry grapples with, and a large part of Henry's attraction to Danielle can be perceived as premised on this association between the outer and inner facts of Henry's experience. In this respect, Danielle symbolises the anima or soul-figure in relation to Henry.

In what follows, in referring to an example which is a stereotype - that is, a man, caught up in position and power, who is in need of relatedness - I do not thereby mean to imply that I share the common prejudice that women are better equipped for or better at relatedness than men (I discuss in Chapter Five why I do not thus agree), or that men are inferior in terms of knowledge of and relatedness to their soul or to unconscious factors. Sanford (1980), alluding to a point already made above and drawing on Hillman's early views that "the anima as archetype should be released from the notion of contrasexuality" (p. 106), agrees with Hillman that due to the increasing demands upon women to achieve academic and career success, "many women today... suffer... from exactly the same problem as men: loss of anima or soul" (p. 106). Hence, I wish to clarify that while using a gendered example and by referring to soul or the unconscious as 'she' in what follows, I do so merely for poetics' sake and not from the premise of endorsing stereotypical notions of gender.

As noted, Prince Henry is aptly introduced as "a man who was still a boy in many many ways." Perhaps at the outset it is worth noting that there is nothing wrong with being a boy. We are all rightly a mix of young and old, female and male, weakness and strength. Moreover, is it not so that weakness is sometimes stronger than strength? Linear development is by no means the only way of conceptualising development, nor necessarily the best one. To return to our example, one in fact hopes that Henry retains his boyhood, in the same way that men in general need to. However – given the context of this discussion - though boyhood is not something to be negated, and certainly not denigrated, there is something here that seems to impose itself for understanding. Hence, in what respect is Henry still a boy and why does it matter?

Henry's 'boyness' primarily manifests itself in the lack of congruence Henry experiences between the demands put upon him by his parents and his position (i.e, persona demands) and the intrapsychic strivings of soul. Henry, reminded constantly that he has "been

born to privilege and with that comes specific obligations,” is in no doubt of what is expected of him in a social sense. Yet Henry is also strangely moved by an inner yearning to find his own way and to discover his individual self. Indeed, one would not be dramatising to say that Henry is haunted by this inner necessity. The first thing we hear Henry say is “I wish for nothing more than to be free from my gilded cage.” Henry’s need to break free reaches a crescendo when faced with the prospect of an arranged marriage. Henry looks into a prescribed future which he contemplates as dismal and from which he wants to escape. Understandably, discussions between Henry and his father during this time are heated:

King Francis: Do not mock me boy for I am in a foul disposition and I will have my way...

Henry: Or what? You’ll send me to the Americas like some criminal! All for the sake of your stupid contract!

King Francis (exploding): You are the Crown Prince of France!

Henry (equally adamant and explosive): And it is my life!

(Dialogue where Queen Marie tries to intervene)

King Francis: You will marry Gabriella by the next full moon, or I will strike at you in any way I can!

Henry (mocking): What’s it to be father: Hot oil or the rack?

King Francis (floundering for words): I will simply deny you the crown... and... live... forever...

Henry (storming out of the room): Good. Agreed. I don’t want it!

The scene ends with King Francis turning on his wife and fuming: “He’s your son!”...

This heated exchange is typical or archetypal (in Jungian parlance).²⁴⁹ It is the eternal senex-puer²⁵⁰ conflict between the parent figure who wants to lay down the law and the child figure who wants to do things his/her way. Before continuing however, an interesting point about senex-puer competition is that the conflict is not necessarily, or only, generational. Samuels (1989) notes that “even old women and men can be seen to have puer (or puella) characteristics. Similarly, the senex can be seen even in the character of babies” (p. 3). This point is of note in relation to the observation I made above that becoming a man or woman (i.e., what is commonly referred to as maturing) ideally should not negate the youthful and vital aspects of oneself. Viewed this way, neither boyhood nor manhood are privileged, but rather the goal is to bring the qualities of both senex and puer to full fruition within oneself

²⁴⁹ Archetypes relate not only to typical psychic figures but also to typical experiences: “Archetypes are complexes of experience that come upon us like fate, and their effects are felt in our most personal life” (Jung, 1954, p. 62).

²⁵⁰ That is, conflict or tension between the old and new.

without negating either.²⁵¹ Thus understood, the boy in Henry needs to develop and so does the man. There is room for both. If one or the other wins, neither do.

In *Ever After* the senex-puer conflict is certainly generational. However, it is not only generational. King Francis lays down the law, but he is not only law. And strangely enough, Don Juan Henry displays very senex-like characteristics when the going gets tough. When the relationship between King Francis and Henry reaches a deadlock, King Francis offers Henry a compromise: “I’ve decided to throw a ball in honour of Leonardo da Vinci” he announces, “at which point you and I will strike a compromise.” Henry sulkily interjects: “Compromise? You?” Overlooking this, King Francis continues: “...if love is what you seek, then I suggest you find it before then – for five days hence, at the stroke of midnight, you will announce your engagement to the girl of your choice; or, I will announce it for you. Are we agreed?” “What of your treaty?” Henry asks, still sulking, but with a trace of hope. “Let me worry about Spain,” King Francis replies resignedly, “you’ve got bigger problems.” Capping off the conversation, Queen Marie advises: “Choose wisely Henry, divorce is only something they do in England.” For her efforts, King Francis directs her a ‘look’ that is probably better viewed than described.

In this exchange, King Francis is still senex and Henry, puer. However, during the following week, change occurs on both sides. Henry takes full advantage of his father’s loosening of the reins, fully intent on honouring soul and self and finding ‘true love.’ Yet what is meant to be easy and what apparently one merely “falls into” proves elusive and problematic. Henry emerges from his adventure to defy tradition and scripting not free, but wounded and weary, and what is more – betrayed!²⁵² He no longer wants to fight. Following his heart has not paid off. Soul has failed him, so be done with her cruel fating.

But what is King Francis up to during this week of brooding over his son’s future and welfare and also – undoubtedly – considering how his son’s decisions will affect the future of the monarchy? Viewing between scenes and reading between the lines, it seems that during this time King Francis becomes acutely aware of his son’s disappointment. What seems to play the upper hand in King Francis’ mind during this time is not whether Henry will fit in with his political ambitions and do the right thing, but whether his treatment of his son has

²⁵¹ See discussion of dependence and independence in Chapter Five.

²⁵² When Henry first meets Danielle, she is dressed as a courtier and acting the part of a lady. She is doing this in order to rescue a servant who is being shipped to the Americas. Henry is attracted to Danielle straight away; however, because she cannot reveal her true identity, a number of misunderstandings occur. Added to these misunderstandings is Rodmilla’s interference. Rodmilla wants Henry to marry Marguerite and when Rodmilla discovers that Henry and Danielle have been seeing each other she does everything in her power to prevent Henry and Danielle’s budding relationship.

been fair and whether perhaps Henry's irksome behaviour is not without some grounds after all. Perhaps stemming from reflection and reminiscence on his own puer disappointments, King Francis' attitude toward Henry changes to one of empathy:

Listen Henry, perhaps it was unfair of me to put so much pressure on you as I did about the marriage contract... I just thought it was time to make some changes in your life. You seem to be a bit floundering and, ah well, I just wanted to say that this university thing... is a brilliant... idea. We don't have to announce anything tonight...
Henry (cutting in): I've made my decision.
King Francis (sadly): Oh...

In Chapter Two I argued the point that parents who seek to live their lives through their children and who force upon them unrealistic expectations and demands are guilty of inflicting incorrigible psychological damage. However, a delineation needs to be made between such parents and those who, like King Francis, are genuinely concerned for their son's/daughter's welfare and who accordingly seek to walk the tightrope between letting their offspring find their own way, and protecting them from making mistakes that will be to their detriment in the long run. Would it really have benefited Henry if during his time of testing the limits, King Francis had merely indulged his whims and allowed him to believe that social responsibilities will take care of themselves? Imagine if King Francis had given way under pressure and said: "Hey, forget the crown. Forget your responsibilities. Go do what you like!" Henry would not have been helped by this laissez-faire attitude; he would have become more lost than he already was. Though outwardly Henry strongly resents his father's 'interference,' at some level his father's holding of the tension and carrying the senex archetype for him is the very thing Henry needs in order to explore what is 'other' in himself safely. When all is said and done it is King Francis' 'holding' of the situation which in the end is the very thing that enables Henry to gropingly find his way.

I noted above Henry's senex characteristics when put under pressure. The main way that the 'senex' aspect of Henry manifests itself is in his ambivalent attitude toward the persona. As seen, on the one hand, Henry strongly resents being seen for "what he is rather than for who he is," as he intimates to Danielle, describing such a situation as "insufferable." However, while Henry wholeheartedly resists the persona, preferring instead to court soul and self, he also uses the persona when it suits his purpose and when his relationship with Danielle becomes problematic. Above, I noted that Henry is betrayed by Danielle or by 'soul,' which she symbolises in relation to Henry. However, this is not quite accurate. Henry merely thinks – due to being led to believe so (and notably, due to not thinking for himself!) – that he is betrayed by soul in the person of Danielle. In reality, Danielle is framed. If Henry has been

betrayed by anything or anyone it is by the persona and persona-devoted and motivated people; in particular, Baroness Rodmilla.

During his wooing of Danielle, Henry repeatedly tells her: ‘Just call me Henry.’ But at the ball, when misunderstanding between them has reached its height and when – in an effort to explain - she appeals to him by addressing him as ‘Henry’ (as he has encouraged her to time and again) he turns on her in front of everyone and, bringing to bear upon the situation the full weight of authority and privilege that being the King’s son entitles him to, harshly and rejectingly admonishes her: ‘Do not address me so informal, Madam!’ Here, we see, as I have noted, a boy/man who resists persona on his own behalf, but who contradictorily uses persona to guard himself from soul and relationship when these things become emotionally difficult. Later, when seeking reconciliation, Henry rightly tells Danielle: “I offered you the world and at the first test of courage betrayed your trust.”

The second point I wish to highlight in relation to Henry’s ego-attitude toward persona and soul is that despite Henry’s resistance to being defined by his role, he nonetheless displays the morality of a persona-identified individual. This furnishes another example of the way in which Henry uses or adheres to persona when it suits his purposes. On his initial meeting with Danielle, Henry asks her for her name and when she refuses to give it, Henry baits her: “Pray then, tell me your cousin’s name, so that I might call upon her to learn who you are, for anyone who can quote Sir Thomas More is well worth the effort.” The bait works and Danielle, in spite of herself, is drawn into conversation: “The Prince has read Utopia?” she questions with surprised interest. Having aroused her interest, Henry immediately puts his foot in it: “I found it sentimental and dull” he moralises, and continues: “I confess the plight of the everyday rustic bores me.” Not exactly the way to impress someone who herself is a servant and who has just risked time in the stocks saving one! Despite the precarious circumstances in which this exchange takes place, Danielle’s inhibition is overcome by her sense of justice, and she addresses Henry: “A country’s character is defined by its ‘everyday rustics’ as you call them. They are the legs you stand on and that position demands respect.” Far from repelling Henry, Danielle’s forthrightness has the effect that Fromm observes frequently occurs when a person gives an authentic response rather than a cliché opinion. While Fromm (1962a) advises his readers to stay away from the company of those he refers to as zombies – who speak in clichés rather than thinking – he advises that if this is not possible “if one does not react in the expected way... but directly and humanly, one will often find that

such people change their behaviour, often helped by the surprise effected by the shock of the unexpected” (p. 82).

A further example of Henry’s persona-based morality is portrayed in the scene where Henry and Danielle meet by chance while she is swimming in the lake. Henry, still not aware of her true identity, asks her: “Where are your attendants?” Unable to speak plainly (i.e, she has no attendants) without reaping the consequences that her previous rescuing act would incur, Danielle improvises: “I decided to give them the day off.” “The day off?” Henry exclaims laughing, “from what! Life?” Again, Henry is not yet aware that his elitism is undermining his intentions to impress. Danielle asks: “Don’t you ever tire of having people wait on you all the time?” “Yes,” Henry replies matter-of-factly, “ but they’re servants, that’s what they do!”. Danielle is unable to conceal her irritation: “Well I wish I could dismiss mine as easily as you do yours.”

To Henry the world and its injustices are not unfair, they are commonsense. Henry’s attitude is typical of one who has never been on the receiving end of social injustice. Yet his ongoing dialogue with Danielle serves as a repeated challenge to his commonsense world view. The numerous clashes of opinion between Henry and Danielle are symptomatic of a clash between persona morality and soul morality. In contrast to persona morality, soul morality is not concerned with or interested in what everyone does and everyone thinks but rather speaks on behalf of what is ‘right’ from the perspective of the human and the particular. Indeed, one definition of morality could be that morality is the quality of being able to think and judge for oneself. The necessity of finding one’s own morality is emphasised by Whitmont (1969), who comments of the individual who subscribes to a persona based morality that “he has no conflicts of conscience because everything is settled beforehand in a stereotypical fashion” (p. 158). Whitmont continues that “it is hard for this kind of person, who usually thinks of himself as abiding by the highest principles, to realize that he is really immoral” (p. 158). Jung, highlighting the connection between receptivity to the unconscious and the effect this has on morality, similarly notes that:

The unconscious has a special significance in this case as a corrective to the oneness of the conscious mind; hence the need to observe the points of view and impulses produced in dreams, because these must take the place once occupied by collective controls, such as the conventional outlook, habit, prejudices of an intellectual or moral nature. The road the individual follows is defined by his knowledge of the laws that are peculiar to himself, otherwise he will get lost in the arbitrary opinions of the conscious mind and break away from the mother-earth of individual instinct. (1935a, p. 12)

Until meeting Danielle, Henry has patterned his morality on persona values. Yet his meeting with Danielle and his own intrapsychic resistance to being defined according to his social role is instrumental in evoking in Henry a questioning of status quo conventionality.

An acute example of the clash in values between persona morality and soul morality is furnished by Robert Johnson (as cited in Sanford, 1980) in his critique of Parsifal, the hero in the tale of the legend of the Holy Grail. Just at the point Parsifal reaches the pinnacle of worldly and material success, he comes face to face with that inner 'other' that in his pursuit of fame and fortune he has repressed. At a feast held to celebrate his success, the 'hideous damsel' - metaphorically symbolising the soul or anima - appears. In contrast to the congratulatory accolades bestowed upon Parsifal by all those it has seemed so important to impress, the 'hideous damsel' - privy to the state of Parsifal's inner life - heaps upon him a vial of rebukes. Sanford (1980), drawing attention to Johnson's critique, notes:

The mere sight of her [the hideous damsel] casts a pall on the knightly company. The feasting and self-congratulating stop, a hush comes over everyone, and then the hideous damsel begins a recitation of Parsifal's sins. On she goes about the failures of his life, the damsels he has left weeping, the children who have been orphaned because of him, and when she is through she says, 'It's all your fault.' (p. 57)

The soul's (anima's) appearance here as old, ugly, and crippled is symbolic of the neglect Parsifal's soul has suffered while he has been out doing more 'important things.' Sanford (1980) notes that "she is dark and monstrous in direct proportion to the man's outer success, and inner denial of the things of his soul" (p. 57). While this is undoubtedly so, I think it necessary to clarify that outer success does not necessarily equate to inner or spiritual poverty. Problems occur only where there is imbalance and one-sidedness. Moreover, as previously noted, it is important to reflect that one-sidedness is not always on the side of persona. An individual can be just as neglectful of his/her social responsibilities as of neglecting his/her soul; this is particularly so of those individuals whose attitude type is especially introverted, as Jung (1951a) notes:

When we come to analyze the personality, we find that the extravert makes a niche for himself in the world of relationships at the cost of unconsciousness (of himself as a subject); while the introvert, in realizing his personality, commits the grossest mistake in the social sphere and blunders about in the most absurd way. (p. 242)

In considering Prince Henry's ego-position in relation to the mediatory functions of soul and persona, the final point I wish to highlight is the aspect of meaning. In the biblical proverbs of Solomon, there is an interesting verse which reads: "House and riches are the inheritance of fathers: and a prudent wife is from the Lord" (Prov. 19:14). I draw attention to

this verse because I consider it illustrates in a salutary manner what perhaps could be postulated as the differing operative laws governing the world of persona and the world of soul. ‘House and riches are the inheritance of fathers’: To a very significant degree, one’s material provision is dependent and premised upon the political and social order of the country or economy into which one is born; that is, whether one is born into a first or third world economy, and, at the more micro level, whether one is the son or daughter of a lawyer or a labourer or peasant. Certainly, social mobility operates. However, as sociologist Anthony Giddens (1993) points out, individual agency is dependent upon opportunity to a significant degree. Yet, whether one achieves material success by way of inheritance or as a result of one’s own efforts, the point I wish to make here is that commodities such as material wealth and position belong to the world of persona and are acquired and conferred accordingly. These things are the ‘inheritance of fathers’ (i.e., of the macro and micro political and economic order).

Solomon continues: “...a prudent wife is from the Lord.’ This is certainly a novel idea; novel, at least, to the contemporary mindset. And, despite the wackiest ideas perpetuated by the self-help relationship industry, it is doubtful that such a caption would make a best-seller listing. However, despite rationalistic resistance to the ‘weirdness’ of the idea that our need for love and interpersonal connectedness with others might be dependent upon or somehow connected with what religions postulate as God, or upon what Jung (1956), on one occasion, refers to as the “original behind our images” (p. 1589), it is worthy of comment that this very idea in fact infuses the entire romance genre; that is, the idea of fate, of providence, of unseen powers operating behind the scenes, of destiny and of meetings being ‘meant-to-be.’ In sum, romantic literature/film is permeated by the idea that romance is ‘fairy-godmother’ dependent, and in this respect is closer to reflecting Solomon’s ‘proverbial wisdom’ than we are wont to admit.

I think it is worthy of comment that those things which are of the most import to the majority of people are things that cannot be provided for and that do not issue from the world of persona. Things such as the need for love and relatedness, for meaning and purpose, are not the “inheritance of fathers.” Rather, these things seem ultimately related to unfathomable factors beyond human volition. Moreover, the immanent preoccupation within romantic literature/film with the theme of fate gives rise to the suspicion that at some level we all know this.

Contemplation of the differing realms of persona and soul is relevant in that a great deal of unhappiness and disillusionment seems to be premised on the idea that not only material things have economic value and can be bought, but things such as love and meaning also. Of course, there is a paradox here. Fromm's take on the contemporary problem of love is that love relations do in fact mirror consumer practices, and in this respect it seems that love is indeed a marketable commodity that can be bought. Yet, as Fromm would agree, this is only ostensibly so. Certainly one can 'buy' the appearance of love, but not 'the real thing,' to borrow Coca Cola's famous caption. Without soul, persona is all appearance. It lacks substance; like a beautifully wrapped gift-box, but with nothing inside.

To return to our example: Prince Henry has "house and riches." He has title and status. Yet he is not satisfied. In fact, Henry is so despondent, so desirous of something that all the privilege and wealth in the world has not been able to compensate for, he is prepared to give up everything 'persona' has to offer in order to pursue whatever it is that is missing; whatever it is that will fill the existential void of 'nothingness' he appears to suffer from. What Henry essentially appears to want is a sense of individual purpose; something to give his life meaning. His intrapsychic yearnings and growth – encouraged in part by his relationship with Danielle – eventually effect this. Henry tells his parents: "Mother, Father, I want to build a university, with the largest library on the continent, where anyone can study, no matter their station. Oh, and I want to invite the gypsies to the ball." Later Henry addresses Danielle: "Oh, last night I had a revelation. I used to think that if I cared about anything, I would have to care about everything, and I'd go stark raving mad... But, now I've found my purpose! It's a project actually inspired by you, and I feel the most wonderful... freedom!" Of note is Henry's considerable change of moral sensibility (in that he wants to build a university where anyone can study and to invite the gypsies to the ball).

In the foregoing discussion I have highlighted as part of the process of individuation and as a prerequisite of productive based relatedness the task the ego has to pursue differentiation both in relation to material or social reality and also in relation to the unconscious or psychic realm. I have further drawn attention to the role the persona and soul or animus/anima play in their respective capacities as functions of adaptation in facilitating ego differentiation. I now turn to a discussion of what love and relatedness beyond the paradigm of romantic love might look like.

Relatedness beyond romance

In *The Transformation of Intimacy* (1992), sociologist Anthony Giddens puts forth the thesis that the romantic love complex, which, within Western culture, has held sway since the late eighteenth century,²⁵³ is giving way to what he terms the ‘pure relationship.’ Of the pure relationship ideal, Giddens notes that:

A pure relationship has nothing to do with sexual purity... It refers to a situation where a social relation is entered into for its own sake, for what can be derived by each person from a sustained association with another; and is continued only in so far as it is thought by both parties to deliver enough satisfactions for each individual to stay within it. (p. 58)

In contrast to romantic love, which, Giddens acknowledges “has always been imbalanced in gender terms”²⁵⁴ (p. 62), the pure relationship – which is made possible by the emergence of what Giddens refers to as ‘plastic sexuality’ - is premised on confluent love; that is, upon sexual and emotional equality. Giddens (2006) notes that:

With plastic sexuality, sex can be untied from reproduction. This is partly due to improved methods of contraception... However, it is not only technological developments that led to the emergence of plastic sexuality, but crucially the development of a sense of the self that could be actively chosen. (p. 241)

Giddens (1992) sees the pure relationship as part of a “basic transition in the ethics of personal life as a whole” (p. 96), affecting not only intimate relationships, but extending “in a fundamental way to friendship relations and, crucially, to the relations of parents, children and other kin” (p. 182).²⁵⁵ Giddens posits a link between the democratisation of personal life and democracy in the public domain, espousing that “the advancement of self-autonomy in the context of pure relationships is rich with implications for democratic practice in the larger community” (p. 195).

²⁵³ As noted in the Introduction chapter, Giddens distinguishes between romantic love and passionate love. Giddens (1992) notes that “passionate love is a more or less universal phenomenon... [whereas] romantic love... is much more culturally specific” (p. 38).

²⁵⁴ However, as noted below, Giddens recognises that romantic love is a contradictory phenomenon with both positive and negative implications. Giddens (1992) notes that “romantic love has long had an egalitarian strain, intrinsic to the idea that a relationship can derive from the emotional involvement of two people, rather than from external social criteria. *De facto*, however, romantic love is thoroughly skewed in terms of power. For women dreams of romantic love have all too often led to grim domestic subjection” (p. 62).

²⁵⁵ Regarding the parent/child relationship, Giddens (1992) asks: “Can a relationship between a parent and young child be democratic? It can, and should be, in exactly the same sense as is true of a democratic political order. It is a right of the child, in other words, to be treated as a putative equal of the adult. Actions which cannot be negotiated directly with a child, because he or she is too young to grasp what is entailed, should be capable of counterfactual justification. The presumption is that agreement could be reached, and trust sustained, if the child were sufficiently autonomous to be able to deploy arguments on an equal basis to the adult” (pp. 191-192).

From the perspective of this critique the transformations, posited by Giddens on the basis of sociological analysis, can be seen as archetypally prefigured. Giddens (1992) points to romantic love as furnishing conditions which have provided a context for the emergence of the pure relationship: “The romantic love complex helped carve open a way to the formation of pure relationships in the domain of sexuality, but has now become weakened by some of the very influences it helped to create” (p. 58). Similarly, though I approach romantic love from the perspective of the archetypal, I too point out that while romantic love may be inadequate as a model of love in and of itself, it nonetheless contains the seeds of future modes of relatedness. Accordingly romantic love is viewed not as something negative, but rather as something contradictory; something to be worked with and fathomed.²⁵⁶

However, the primary correspondence between Giddens’ argument and my own is in the emphasis Giddens places upon self-identity and self-autonomy as the basis for the democratising of the interpersonal sphere. Reviewing the literature on psychosexual development and acknowledging the unconscious psychic factors which impact upon whether the individual will develop the psychological structures necessary to find satisfaction in love, Giddens appreciates how fraught with contradictions and how complicated the achieving of autonomy is. Nonetheless, similarly to Jung and Fromm who point to the individuation of the self as the basis of psychological relatedness, Giddens points to the autonomy of the self as the indispensable undergird of the pure relationship. Giddens (1992) notes that:

Self-autonomy permits that respect for others’ capabilities which is intrinsic to democratic order. The autonomous individual is able to treat others as such and to recognise that the development of their separate potentialities is not a threat. Autonomy also helps to provide the personal boundaries needed for the successful management of relationships. (p. 189)

The recognition of the primacy of the self as the basis upon which emotional intimacy can be achieved is where the depth perspective can significantly contribute to discussions, such as those forwarded by Giddens, of what relatedness beyond the paradigm of romantic love might look like. As argued, at the subjective level of interpretation, romantic love – as deriving from the depth realm and as containing images of archetypal processes - is regarded primarily a depiction of intrapsychic processes, rather than a story about or model for

²⁵⁶ Again, Giddens points to the contradictory nature of romantic love: “The ethos of romantic love has had a double impact upon women’s situation. On the one hand it has helped to put women ‘in their place’ – the home. On the other hand, however, romantic love can be seen as an active, and radical, engagement with the ‘maleness’ of modern society. Romantic love presumes that a durable emotional tie can be established with the other on the basis of qualities intrinsic to that tie itself. It is the harbinger of the pure relationship, although it also stands in tension with it” (p. 2).

interpersonal love. Giddens (1992) points to the projective nature of romantic liaisons: “Projection... creates a feeling of wholeness with the other...” (p. 61). Yet, Giddens continues, “projective identification cuts across the development of a relationship whose continuation depends upon intimacy” (p. 61). The depth perspective provides the basis for understanding the unconscious dynamics, which, activated by archetypal activity, are associated with projection, and the means by which individuated relatedness can be entered into. For example, instead of projecting onto other people or one’s environment one’s intrapsychic needs and problems, one discovers one’s own dark or inhibited aspects (shadow), and one’s own potentiality (Prince/Princess, or in Jungian terminology: animus/anima).

Subjectively read, the fairy tale romance *Shrek* (1998) provides a symbolic allegory of the link between the intrapsychic and the interpersonal, as well as highlighting the necessity of the individuation of the self as the basis for democratic relatedness (Giddens) or psychological/mature relatedness (Jung/Fromm). Though he has assumed for himself the position of ruler of the Kingdom of Duloc, Lord Farquaard is told by the magic mirror that he cannot technically be king until he marries a princess. Subjectively interpreted: Without the integration of the unconscious components of the self, the ego cannot attain individuality and the fullness and authority of selfhood. The mirror presents Lord Farquaard with three princesses, one of whom he must choose. Subjectively: The unconscious confronts the ego with the people and situations needed for his/her individuation. Lord Farquaard chooses Princess Fiona. The mirror, though congratulating Farquaard on his choice, tries to balance Farquaard’s fairy tale expectation of what his future with Fiona will be like by warning him that Fiona has a shadow side. However, Farquaard silences him. Having commissioned Shrek with the task of rescuing Fiona and delivering her safely to him, Farquaard sits at home replaying the videotaped recording of Fiona and dreamily musing: “Ah Princess Fiona, she’s perfect.” Because Farquaard does not undertake the journey (subjectively symbolising the process of individuation) to rescue Fiona himself, and accordingly does not confront the dragon (symbolising his own shadow), Farquaard misses the opportunity afforded him for psychological maturation. Farquaard shields himself from danger, but also from the experience necessary to attain self-knowledge and the ability to relate humanly and lovingly to others.²⁵⁷ Accordingly, it is Shrek and not Farquaard who wins Fiona’s love. Farquaard can only relate to a fantasy image, not to a real complex person. Duloc is a perfect land the audience is told, and Farquaard is only interested in the “perfect bride for the *perfect king*.”

²⁵⁷ Jung points out that the shadow belongs to the wholeness of the personality and must be engaged with if one is to understand others. This point is discussed in Chapter Five.

As noted, Giddens (1992) sees not only intimate and wider social relations as being under transformation, but significantly parent/child relationships also. In this regard, Giddens points to the value of therapy and its role in the democratising process. Giddens notes that:

In therapeutic discussions of codependent or fixated relationships, almost without exception, individuals who wish to develop close personal ties with others are advised to 'heal the child within'. The relations between parents and young children here reappear in a fundamental way as relevant to the pure relationship and the model of confluent love. (p. 99)

In Chapter Two I discussed the parent/child relationship at some length. In the first section of Chapter Five, I focus further on the parent/child constellation, looking at the shift from parental fixations to the mature dependence and mature independence needed to relate on an adult level. Again, the rationale for the concentrated attention given to the individual's first relationship/s is because of the impact these relationships are seen to have on personality development and the capacity of the individual to engage in adult relatedness. The major difference between parent/child or caregiver/child relationships and adult relationships is that the parent/child constellation is characterised by marked power imbalance. How this power imbalance is handled has major consequences in terms of the maturing personality. Ideally the child's early relationships impart to him/her a positive sense of self and the capacity to trust. However, even in the best of circumstances, the power imbalance necessarily factored into the child's earliest experiences of his/herself and others, means that issues of authority are unavoidably inscribed upon the psyche. As noted below, this has consequences not only for intimate and interpersonal relationships, but for wider social relations generally.

As a consequence of the helplessness of the child during the early years of his/her development and the power imbalance associated with early experiences of love and relatedness, there is a tendency for therapeutic practitioners and for individuals themselves to draw a sharp distinction between the 'villain parent' and the 'victim child.' However, as argued in Chapter Three, the victim/villain dichotomy should rightly be viewed as porous, not fixed, and at some point or other it is the task of the individual – as a requirement of psychological adulthood - to assume responsibility for his/her circumstances; however wounding these circumstances have been (Though the distinction – drawn in Chapter Three - between everyday problems and psychic wounding, for which therapeutic intervention is usually necessary, remains pertinent). As noted in Chapter Two, while parental responsibility should not be downplayed, Jung makes it clear that the 'parental imago' is not a mirror reflection of objective circumstances, but is coloured to a significant degree by the pre-existent

parent archetype in the child's own psyche and his/her reactions.²⁵⁸ Jung thus argues that upon adulthood the individual must come to see that it is no longer his/her parent/s that are standing in his/her way, but the image of the parent/s s/he has introjected.²⁵⁹

The recognition by Jung, emphasised in his work, of the complicity of the child in the particular parent/child constellation engendered and experienced makes a significant contribution to the discussion of democratic relatedness in that in order for the equal engagement with others Giddens argues for to be realised, a certain degree of self-knowledge and self responsibility must be attained. As noted, Giddens posits a direct link between the micro and macro or the personal and political; that is, between individual relationship issues and wider societal democratic order. Giddens (1992) notes that "differential power, which is sedimented in social life, is likely to stay unchanged if individuals refuse reflexively to examine their own conduct and its implicit justifications" (p. 193). As Giddens recognises, the therapeutic setting provides one context in which individuals can engage in a reflexive examination of self. Again, the particular relevance of Jung's work and of analytical psychology is that it is a body of work/therapy which emphasises and provides the empirical basis for mature independence and selfhood.

I noted that the pure relationship is characterised by confluent love. Giddens (1992) notes that confluent love is "active, contingent love, and therefore jars with the 'for-ever', 'one-and-only' qualities of the romantic love complex" (p. 61). While the idea of a Mr/Ms. Right and 'until death do us part' expectations are central to romantic love, within confluent love the emphasis is on the right relationship and the understanding is that the relationship will continue 'until further notice'; that is, so long as each person "gains sufficient benefit from the relation to make its continuance worthwhile" (p. 63). Confluent love is further distinguished from romantic love in that heterosexuality is not privileged and relationships are not necessarily monogamous. Concerning these points, Giddens (1992) notes that "confluent love has no specific connection to heterosexuality" (p. 63), and "is not necessarily monogamous, in the sense of sexual exclusiveness.... Sexual exclusiveness... has a role in the relationship to the degree to which the partners mutually deem it desirable or essential" (p. 63). Giddens points to a significant change in the language of everyday discourse: People "talk of

²⁵⁸ Noting that contemporary psychology "has been limited by the premise that all adult neurotic behavior is motivated by childhood or adolescent experience" (p. 6), Joel Whitton and Joe Fisher (1986) credit Jung with recognising the limitation of this viewpoint and making a significant contribution to its mitigation.

²⁵⁹ On this point, Jung (1948e) notes that "the maturing personality must assimilate the parental complex and achieve authority, responsibility, and independence" (p. 36).

relationships rather than marriage as such” (p. 58).²⁶⁰ While traditional relationship norms still hold sway, Giddens notes that marriage,²⁶¹ where it is still entered into, “has veered increasingly towards the form of a pure relationship” (p. 58).²⁶²

The proposition that love relationships should be entered into upon the understanding of contingency runs counter to the ethos of romantic love. Giddens (1992) points to the implicit contradiction unavoidably factored into the negotiation of pure relationships, noting that:

There is a structural contradiction in the pure relationship, centring upon commitment... To generate commitment and develop a shared history, an individual must give of herself to the other. That is, she must provide, in word and deed, some kind of guarantees to the other that the relationship can be sustained for an indefinite period. Yet a present-day relationship is not, as marriage once was, a ‘natural condition’ whose durability can be taken for granted short of certain extreme circumstances. It is a feature of the pure relationship that it can be terminated, more or less at will, by either partner at any particular point. For a relationship to stand a chance of lasting, commitment is necessary; yet anyone who commits herself without reservations risks great hurt in the future, should the relationship become dissolved. (p. 137)

The viewpoint I forward here supports the notion of contingency. While it may appear selfish to espouse that a relationship should be sustained only so long as it offers enough personal satisfaction for its continuance, the converse could also be argued. From the symbolic/archetypal perspective, relatedness ‘beyond romance’ is premised on the individuated self. Hence a relationship rests not primarily upon the commitment of another person, but first and foremost upon the commitment of the individual to his/herself and his/her own development. Without this ‘self’-commitment, symbiosis, or what Giddens – drawing on

²⁶⁰ Giddens (1992) notes that “the term ‘relationship’, meaning a close and continuing emotional tie to another, has only come into general usage relatively recently” (p. 58).

²⁶¹ On the issue of whether marriage is a ‘natural’ state of affairs or not, Guggenbuhl-Craig (1977) interestingly comments that “among certain animal species there exists a family structure that is everywhere found to be identical. This structure is created instinctively among these animals over and over again in exactly the same way. But among humans this is unequivocally not the case. Marriage and family structure are something ‘unnatural’, not instinctive, an artificial product of human effort. Marriage is anti-natural, an *opus contra naturam*. This is why we find so many different forms of marriage in the course of history and among various cultures” (p. 15).

²⁶² Regarding marriage, Giddens (1992) notes that “so far as heterosexual relationships go, the marriage contract used to be a bill of rights, which essentially formalised the ‘separate but unequal’ nature of the tie. The translation of marriage into a signifier of commitment, rather than a determinant of it, radically alters this situation. All relationships which approximate to the pure form maintain an implicit ‘rolling contract’ to which appeal may be made by either partner when situations arise felt to be unfair or oppressive. The rolling contract is a constitutional device which underlies, but is also open to negotiation through, open discussion by partners about the nature of the relationship” (p. 192).

therapeutic literature – discusses as ‘codependence,’ tends to be the result.²⁶³ And while the romantic notion of the immutability of ‘true love’ may appear more kind-hearted and ‘Christian,’ and much more attractive than the admission of contingency, this is only ostensibly so. Recognising the precariousness of the ‘romantic’ version of love, Simon De Beauvoir (1953) acutely observed that “there are few crimes that entail worse punishment than the generous fault of putting oneself entirely in another’s hands” (p. 630). Having to account for the prospect of contingency entails assuming a great deal more responsibility for oneself than is encouraged by the romantic fantasy, but it also gives one a greater sense of control and, as noted above, protects one from emotional shipwreck “should the relationship become dissolved” (Giddens, 1992, p. 137).

In the aim section, I pointed to feminist criticisms of the argument that romantic love may be giving way to a more egalitarian model of relatedness.²⁶⁴ Pointing to the seemingly insatiable demand for entertainment of the romantic variety, Stevi Jackson (1995) argues that “the purveyors of romantic fiction are not suffering a contraction of their markets...” (p. 60). And, “their more assertive, less virginal heroines are still seeking Mr. Right” (p. 60). Giddens acknowledges that there persist social and political inequalities which hamper the development of the pure relationship ideal. Nonetheless, though the ‘transformation of intimacy’ may still be in its preliminary stages, Giddens maintains that the transitions taking place within the sphere of intimate and family forms are so significant they constitute a revolution in progress.

The symbolic perspective supports Giddens’ thesis that fundamental changes are taking place at the level of intimate and interpersonal relationship. Before leaving the discussion, however, further comment seems warranted concerning the issue of monogamy and marital or relationship faithfulness.

As noted, Giddens posits that sexual monogamy is not necessarily a feature of the pure relationship. From the symbolic perspective, individuation is recognised to be an organic process. Accordingly, the forms of relatedness emerging from individuated awareness – which, as argued, romantic love symbolically conceived facilitates - will be organic also.

²⁶³ Giddens (1992) notes that “the shared history that a relationship develops can serve to screen off troubles in the outside world; one or both individuals may become dependent, not so much upon the other, but upon the relationship and its routines in a fixated way, as a means of insulating themselves from a full engagement with other social tasks and obligations” (pp. 139-140).

²⁶⁴ It is of note that a certain ‘division of labour’ between individuals is not abolished by the pure relationship. However, whatever division of labour emerges is based on individual differences and requirements and not gender norms. Giddens (1992) notes that “a division of labour might be established, but not one simply inherited on the basis of pre-established criteria or imposed by unequal economic resources brought to the relationship” (p. 195).

Therefore it is not possible to predict in advance or in concrete terms what these new forms of relatedness will look like. However, as I discuss below, drawing upon a recent image from within the genre of romantic entertainment to highlight the point, at the level of archetypal critique there are subtle indications that in the future monogamy may be understood in more symbolic terms. The difference, however, between Giddens' sociological analysis and the psychological analysis forwarded here is in the demarcation the archetypal perspective draws between ego-based (i.e., preindividuated) connections and relationships contracted upon the basis of the individuating self. In espousing self-autonomy as the basis of the pure relatedness ideal, the ego/self or preindividuation/individuating distinction is hinted at in Giddens' analysis. However, the implications thereof are not developed in any comprehensive way. As a consequence, it is difficult to see how the licence to engage in sexual relations with more than one person simultaneously can contribute to equality and greater trust within the intimate and interpersonal sphere.

While at the level of archetypal critique there is some support for the idea that monogamy could potentially be conceived in more symbolic terms, if monogamy – as understood and practiced within romantic love - is not central to emerging forms of relatedness, this must come about via the route of psychological maturation and not sexual licence.²⁶⁵ Otherwise, as noted, it is difficult to see how advocating greater sexual freedom is more than merely an endorsement of promiscuity and in what manner this is an advance in terms of current understandings of love and relatedness. The rationale for the conjecture that intimacy may come to be viewed as something able to be experienced variously with many different people²⁶⁶ is that if the self (which, as noted previously, in romantic liaisons tends to be projected onto the other) is introjected and if the basis for relatedness is within oneself, one does not require any specific 'one other' upon whom to project one's soul image and hence is not dependent upon or restricted to one other person for one's intimacy needs. Nor, if the basis of relatedness is within oneself and not projected outward, does the desire to relate with various different people on various different levels constitute a betrayal of any one person. However, conceiving that monogamy may come to be regarded in more symbolic terms is not

²⁶⁵ I had originally coined the term 'symbolic monogamy' to conceptualise what – based upon a subjective reading of romantic love - love and relatedness beyond romance might look like. However, upon revision, I dropped this term to avoid the error of *literalising* what is best understood symbolically.

²⁶⁶ I refer to intimacy in the broadest sense of the term and not necessarily to sexual intimacy. It could be argued that the craving for sexual intimacy is symptomatic of the inability to experience intimacy in more general terms. Stein (1973) argues that "most of the sexuality which goes on nowadays" is compulsive "because there is so little Eros and connection between people" (p. 162). Of intimacy, Giddens (1992) notes that it is "above all a matter of emotional communication, with others and with the self, in a context of interpersonal equality" (p. 130).

an endorsement of polygamy, which is simply literal monogamy multiplied and no advance on romantic love. Based on individuated awareness and self-knowledge, what potentially emerges from an archetypal reading of romantic love is a greater capacity for love and relatedness generally.

In his analytical work, one of the observations Jung made was that dream-series seemed to be directed toward a goal or purpose: The goal or purpose of ‘individuation.’ In reference to dreams, Jung (1948) notes that:

...with deeper insight and experience, these apparently separate acts of compensation arrange themselves into a kind of plan. They seem to hang together and in the deepest sense to be subordinated to a common goal, so that a long dream-series no longer appears as a senseless string of incoherent and isolated happenings, but resembles the successive steps in a planned and orderly process of development. I have called this unconscious process spontaneously expressing itself in the symbolism of a long dream-series the individuation process. (p. 550)

In the same way that dream-series serve the goal of individuation in individuals, so also the development of myth promotes ‘cultural-individuation’ or a general widening and embodying of consciousness at the cultural level. On this point, Jung (1931) notes that “just as the one-sidedness of the individual’s conscious attitude is corrected by reactions from the unconscious, so art represents a process of self-regulation in the life of nations and epochs” (p. 131). If, in the same way dreams are documented and meditated upon in analysis, a chronological documentation and analysis were made of every instance of the Cinderella fairy tale since its introduction into Western culture, it would be evident that alongside the familiar themes, there co-exist many subtle departures from script; the same observation is applicable to romantic literature/film. From an analytical stance, these seemingly inconsequential ‘scriptural’ departures and inconsistencies are pregnant with psychological meaning and significance.

In providing a rationale for the suggestion that in the future monogamy may be conceived in more symbolic terms, one romantic ‘scriptural departure’ that occurs within the context of the familiar is the blatant statement: “I don’t think couples are the future,” made by twelve-year-old Marcus in the romantic comedy/drama *About a Boy* (Weitz & Weitz, 2002). Of course, this statement – made in all seriousness, and not as a joke – is blasphemy from a romantic point of view; or would be so considered were it registered. However, given that the film culminates with everyone suitably paired up, the radical nature and implication of the statement is contained and perhaps largely unnoticed; that is, unnoticed by consciousness, though undoubtedly registering at a subliminal level. However, again as noted, the seemingly meaningless - inconsequential, fleeting - is of central meaning from an analytical perspective.

Within the context of individual analysis, were such a left-field statement or image relative to the individual's conscious attitude or expectations to appear in a dream, analyst and analysand would be forced to take note. Following suit, radical statements or images appearing or staging within cultural imaginative and fantasy products are likewise worthy of 'analysis'; of careful and mindful consideration.²⁶⁷

We do not tend to think of cultural stories as being 'educational'; or if we do, it is with an eye to their indoctrinatory implications. Stories are merely entertainment, while education is what happens in the classroom. However, from an analytic perspective imaginative and fantasy products are viewed as having educational significance. Again however, attunement to the archetypal realm requires openness to other than currently accepted ways of knowing. Modes of knowing such as intuition²⁶⁸ need to be given a place alongside reason and the intellect if we are to "find our way back to the deepest springs of life" (Jung, 1931, p. 130), and if ego-consciousness is to benefit from its connectedness not only with the material world of consciousness, but also the world of psyche and soul: If the ego is to find balance and not exist in the homeless and alienated state of 'disensouled or disembodied intellect.'²⁶⁹ Jung (1953) highlights the inadequacy of an education predicated on reason alone, and also the different nature and logic of 'soul discourse,' along with the different perception functions required to perceive this realm. Similarly to Jung, Moore (1994) notes that:

One of the central difficulties involved in embarking on care of the soul is grasping the nature of the soul's discourse. The intellect works with reason, logic, analysis, research, equations, and pros and cons. But the soul practices a different kind of math and logic. It presents images that are not immediately intelligible to the reasoning mind. It insinuates, offers fleeting impressions, persuades more with desire than with reasonableness. In order to tap the soul's power, one has to be conversant with its

²⁶⁷ Of course, I cannot here prove my argument in a way that would satisfy the requirements of reason or logic. Jung (1963) rightly comments that "an interpretation can hardly ever be convincingly proved. Generally it shows itself to be correct only when it has proved its value as a heuristic hypothesis" (p. 189). A couple of comments Jung makes when discussing how he goes about understanding a dream may also be of relevance here. Jung (1931h) notes that "seen purely theoretically, this dream image can mean anything or nothing. For that matter, does a thing or a fact ever mean anything in itself? The only certainty is that it is always man who interprets, who assigns meaning. And that is the gist of the matter for psychology" (p. 93); and "no harm is done if now and then one goes astray in this riddle-reading: sooner or later the psyche will reject the mistake, much as the organism rejects a foreign body. I do not need to prove that my interpretation of the dream is right (a pretty hopeless undertaking anyway), but must simply try to discover, with the patient, what *acts* for him – I am almost tempted to say, what is actual" (p. 95).

²⁶⁸ I discuss intuition in Chapter Six.

²⁶⁹ Jung (1928) points to the inadequacy of mainstream education in terms of preparing people to cope with the most important and significant issues and concerns of life, noting that "at present we educate people only up to the point where they can earn a living and marry; then education ceases altogether, as though a complete mental outfit had been acquired. The solution of all the remaining complicated problems of life is left to the discretion – and ignorance – of the individual. Innumerable ill-advised and unhappy marriages, innumerable professional disappointments, are due solely to this lack of adult education. Vast numbers of men and women thus spend their entire lives in complete ignorance of the most important things" (p. 109).

style, and watchful. The soul's indications are many, but they are usually extremely subtle. (p. 122)

In concluding this section, it seems apt to draw attention to Fromm's reflections (1962/1966) concerning the role that suffering plays in the development of consciousness and the evolution of new forms of social organisation.²⁷⁰ Fromm reflects that while the socio-economic structure of society forms an important determinant in shaping the social character of a society, it is not the sole influence thereof: Needs such as the longing for happiness and love are also factors that shape historical process. Fromm (1962) thus argues that "if a social order neglects or frustrates... basic human needs beyond a certain threshold, the members of such a society... try to change the social order so as to make it more suitable to their human needs" (p. 81).²⁷¹

There is no question but that our present forms or "containers" for human relationship are largely inadequate and that romantic love, despite its many promises, just does not work as a literal pattern or basis for relatedness. Johnson (1987) rightly comments that "despite our ecstasy when we are 'in love,' we spend much of our time with a deep sense of loneliness, alienation, and frustration over our inability to make genuinely loving and committed relationship" (p. xii). Yet, like Fromm, Johnson sees the paradoxical and indeed beneficial side of suffering. Johnson (1987) thus reflects that:

...if you find the psychic wound in an individual or a people, there you also find their path to consciousness. For it is in the healing of our psychic wounds that we come to know ourselves.... If Westerners will free themselves from their automatic servitude to their unconscious assumptions and expectations they will not only find a new awareness in their relationships but a new awareness of their own selves. (pp. xii-xiii)

Indeed, it would appear that the refusal to suffer or the denial of it precludes the very panacea that ultimately leads a person or culture beyond a state of servitude and suffering. Greer (1999) comments that it is often extraordinarily hard for a woman to admit, even to herself, let alone to others, that she is unhappy in a relationship: "A woman who has worked hard at being a wife for year on year has made an investment in her marriage that will be irrevocably lost the moment she admits defeat" (p. 260). The discrepancy between the expected and the actual - between how things ought to be and how things actually are - is often a source of angst. In the

²⁷⁰ While as noted below, suffering can be seen to play a role in social change, Fromm (1966) also comments that suffering which exceeds a certain limit can be so undermining as to altogether damage the human capacity or will to maintain hope: "There is a degree of suffering that deprives men even of their wish to end it" (p. 100).

²⁷¹ Fromm (1947) reviews that "human evolution is rooted in man's adaptability and in certain indestructible qualities of his nature which compel him never to cease his search for conditions better adjusted to his intrinsic needs" (p. 32).

movies the protagonists get to live ‘happily ever after.’ However, in everyday life, we do not appear able to follow suit. Here we recognise romantic love’s shadow; the ‘dark side of love’ (see Chapter Five for further discussion). Yet, as noted, it is perhaps just this shadow that contains light illuminating a new direction, a hitherto unknown way and as yet unexplored territory. Again, reflecting on the role of suffering in effecting change, Fromm (1966) notes that:

The beginning of liberation lies in man’s capacity to suffer, and he suffers if he is oppressed, physically and spiritually. The suffering moves him to act against his oppressors, to seek the end of the oppression, although he cannot yet seek a freedom of which he knows nothing. If man has lost the capacity to suffer, he has also lost the capacity for change. (p. 92)

But man’s suffering does not mean that he knows where to go and what to do. It creates only the wish that the suffering may stop. And this wish is the first and the necessary impulse for liberation. (p. 107)

Having looked at what relatedness beyond romance might look like, I now turn to a discussion of the romantic expectation and ideal of there being a Mr/Ms. Right.

Mr/Ms. Right

“He loves me, he loves me not...”. It is in the very nature of romantic love that one’s happiness is conceived of as being dependent upon another person, and it is perhaps here that the pathology of a literal – as opposed to symbolic/psychological - understanding of romantic love is most evident. Shulamith Firestone (1979), discussing the connection between romantic ideology and the oppression of women, highlights how exhausting and precarious the romantic object-dependent notion of happiness is: “It takes one’s major energy for the best portion of one’s creative years to ‘make a good catch’, and a good part of the rest of one’s life to ‘hold’ that catch” (p. 131). Shere Hite (1987), similarly underscoring the undermining aspects of romantic aspirations, cites the following comments made by female respondents when questioned about their dating experiences: “Instead of working on my career, I am obsessed with our phone calls and meetings. I feel weak” (p. 223). And: “I have to accept his coldness... his draining my emotional energy to keep on giving him love when he leaves me so insecure” (p. 225). Yet do experiences such as these put one off the notion of there being a Mr. Right? Well... seemingly no! As one of Hite’s interviewees put it: “Life isn’t fair; love relationships with men aren’t fair – but I still want one!” (p. 224). As one would expect, Greer

considers this type of logic and resignation – along with Mr/Ms. Right expectations generally – self-defeating. Greer (1999) notes that:

The absurdity of the notion that there is someone ‘out there’ for everybody is obvious to anyone who has thought about it for more than five seconds. Women’s lives would be a lot easier if they started from the opposite premise, that there is nobody ‘out there’ and they might as well get on with life and work. (p. 246)

Thus in Greer’s view, taking “rescuing prince” and “happily ever after” fantasies literally engenders passivity and harmful dependence. If a woman so depends – as traditionally women have been encouraged to - she is unlikely to make a concerted effort to take care of and provide for herself. Such “rescuing” fantasies – engaged in by either sex – undermine independence and self-respect and set a trend in the direction of disempowerment.

The notion of there being a Mr/Ms. Right is the central tenet of romantic ideology. Implicit to the ‘belief system’ of romantic ideology, and assuming ‘article of faith’ status, is the expectation that one will experience paradise found, when either by one’s own effort, or – more usually – by a conjuring of magic and fate, cupid’s arrow strikes and by a stroke of serendipity ‘the One’ finally materialises. Given the ubiquitous preoccupation within romantic ideology and romantic entertainment with the object of desire, it is apt that *Ever After* stages the following dialogue between Prince Henry and Leonardo da Vinci, who in *Ever After* plays the ‘fairy’ or fate figure role:

Henry: Do you really think there is only one perfect mate?

Leonardo: As a matter of fact I do!

Henry: Well, how can you be certain to find them? And if you do find them are they really the one for you or do you only think they are? Then what happens if the person you’re supposed to be with never appears or... she does but you’re too distracted to notice?

Leonardo: You learn to pay attention!

Henry: Then... let’s say... God... puts two people on earth and they are lucky enough to find one another, but one of them gets hit by lightning... well then, is that it? Or per chance you meet someone new and marry all over again... was that the lady you’re supposed to be with or was it the first? And if so, if the two of them were walking side by side - were they both the one for you and you just happened to meet the first one first, or was the second one supposed to be first? And is everything just chance or are some things meant to be?

Leonardo: You cannot leave everything to fate, boy, she’s got a lot to do! Sometimes you must give her a hand.

Henry’s question: Do you think there is only one perfect mate? Is there a right person for me? This is the conundrum posed by the romantic myth.

In seeming contradiction to my argument thus far, I am of the view that the romantic notion of Mr/Ms. Right is valid. However, the Mr/Ms. Right that one cannot live without is not this or that external person upon whom one has projected one’s soul image, but rather

one's own self and wholeness in potentia, as yet unknown and unrealised. What is at stake is not whether the object of one's desire returns one's love, but whether – through the maze of romantic elations and disappointments – one progressively discovers and becomes acquainted with soul and with one's own unique and peculiar self. In Jung's words: "Each of us carries his own life-form within him – an irrational form which no other can outbid" (1931h, p. 81). Subjectively conceived, it is one's own life-form - initially discovered through projection - that constitutes the essential meaning and goal of Mr/Ms. Right symbolism and desire. Therefore, one's Mr/Ms. Right can be understood to symbolise not this or that particular external person, but ultimately and most correctly: *One's own self*. Johnson (1987) notes that "the truth hidden in the morality of romance is that of the soul, the inner world, the true 'enchanted orchard'; it must be lived inwardly" (p. 104).

I am aware of the 'unromantic' nature of such a viewpoint, and that this interpretation is likely to leave one cold. To be human is to desire relatedness, indeed to need to relate. Espousing that desire for the other is merely a foil for the knowledge of self is a let-down to say the least; this despite romantic love's bad track record. Such theorising denudes romance of its central attraction; that is, of the wholly fascinating preoccupation with another. Before continuing therefore, I want to point out that understanding the projective nature of much that passes under the guise of romantic love in no way negates relationship. In fact, such understanding enhances relationship.

I noted earlier Jung's contention that while romantic involvement seems very individualised, in fact romantic encounters tend to be formulaic and banally collective in quality. Understanding romantic love, rather than simply falling for it, serves the purposes and requirements of individual becoming; that is, of individuation. The advantage of a symbolic understanding of the dynamics of the archetypal underpinning or implications of ideologies and discourses such as romantic love is that one is less susceptible to becoming the pawn of the numinous, but rather benefits from it. One turns fate's oft-times or seemingly cruel tricks back on itself, and in so doing finds fate – which appears to want to be found out – a friend rather than a foe intent on trickster antics.

As noted throughout this discussion, the phenomenon of romantic love is pregnant with psychological meaning and understood symbolically its central role is to widen consciousness and facilitate individuation. As noted however, individuation is not to be understood as legitimating self-sufficient isolation. To individuate is not to be cut off from people, but to be in possession of the self-understanding that enables relating. Jung (1946)

makes it clear that individuation and relationship are interconnected. I discuss in detail the relational aspects of individuation in Chapter Five. However, it was perhaps necessary to clarify here that my ‘unromantic’ interpretation of romantic love does in fact have a happy ending, or at least an optimistically teleological view.

Having thus clarified, it is perhaps expedient to illustrate how projection can manifest or operate within the context of love relationships by referring to a particular case that Jungian analyst John Sanford relates. Sanford (1980) refers to a young woman who divorced her husband because she fell in love with another married man. Both the woman and her lover had planned to divorce their respective spouses and marry each other. However, while Sanford’s analysis carried through with their plan, her lover did not; eventually telling her that he did not love her enough to marry her after all. While the man did later divorce his wife, he married someone else. It was at this point that the woman sought analytic help. Sanford (1980) further relates:

[The woman] reported several dreams in which the man with whom she had fallen in love came to her as a lover. She took these dreams literally, as personifications of the love relationship between the two of them. In doing this, she missed their inner, psychological meaning, for the man in the dream can be understood as her creative animus, a personification of her own creative powers that now want union with her.... If [the woman] had understood these dreams properly she would have realized that had her creative powers been awakened, the projection of these creative powers onto the outer man could have been resolved, and her life would have taken a different direction. By choosing instead to live out her longings concretely, through the man who carried for her the projected image of the creative animus, she chose an unconscious path instead of a conscious one, and this almost always results in a disaster or, at least, in some kind of mischief. (p. 26)

This example makes lucid the counterproductive nature of being unable to distinguish between projection and reality. The woman, by not understanding fantasy, lives in a fantasy world. She wants literally what she literally cannot have. Her lover, having chosen someone else, most certainly is not entertaining hope in relation to her, and so there is no chance of her affection being reciprocated and of her ‘dreams coming true’ in a literal sense. However, as Sanford makes clear, if the woman could see the psychological significance of her projection and gain an understanding of her dreams in this light, she would have the opportunity of developing latent potentialities within and related to herself, instead of being the subject of false hope. From this Jungian point of view, it is not that the dreams are wrong, only that they are wrongly understood.

It is important to point out that there is a projective aspect to all human relationship.²⁷² Sanford (1980) notes that “projections can never be withdrawn completely, for they are out of our conscious control; nor can we ever become so conscious of the inner images of the anima and animus that projections do not occur” (p. 83). Projections just happen. Moreover, projections do not always ensure that we will feel positively toward another person. As often as not they arouse negative feelings or feelings of ambivalence. In and of themselves projections are simply happenings; neither good nor bad. What is important is how projections are understood and what is done with them. From a Jungian perspective, projections – if understood – can aid subjective knowledge; that is, knowledge of our self or psyche. Sanford (1980) notes that “each time projection occurs there is another opportunity for us to know our inner, Invisible Partners,²⁷³ and that is a way of knowing our own souls” (p. 20).

In the example referred to above, an objective relationship with the person who is the projection-bearer of the woman’s soul-image is out of the question. The projection can only be understood as relating to and serving the woman’s own potential for self-realisation and individuation; and of course subsequently, her potential for relationship (although as noted, not in this case with her ex-lover). Yet, where a projection is mutual, as in the case where two persons ‘fall in love’ or in a transference/countertransference situation (characteristic of the analytic encounter), projection, if correctly understood, serves not only the important purpose of individual personality development and differentiation, but simultaneously facilitates and forms the basis for what Sanford refers to as human love, or what Jungian analyst Mario Jacoby (1984) refers to as ‘I-thou’ relatedness (Jacoby here borrowing Buber’s term).²⁷⁴ If a relationship is to be formed, this is the desirable outcome of projection. If projection does not thus translate, relationships tend to display the collective and banal characteristics referred to

²⁷² Jacoby (1984) notes that “since we are all motivated by unconscious as well as conscious factors, I would say that transference exists in all close human relationships – transference in the sense that we unconsciously experience the other person as an object for our own needs. Human relationship *itself* is a general basic need which seeks objects in order to be fulfilled. We just need other people for our own sake. We even need them as objects for our own psychic growth, for the process of individuation. We need to interrelate with other people in order to constellate our complexes and so become conscious of them – otherwise we escape from real life. As Jung rightly said, ‘There is no possibility of individuation on the top of Mount Everest where you are sure that nobody will ever bother you. Individuation always means relationship’” (p. 67).

²⁷³ Sanford uses the term ‘Invisible Partners’ to refer to the animus and anima. Sanford (1980) notes that “the anima and animus are the Invisible Partners in every human relationship, and in every person’s search for individual wholeness” (p. 6).

²⁷⁴ While Jacoby (1984) draws on and uses Buber’s terms, he understands them somewhat differently, and makes the point that “many of Buber’s thoughts and speculations... are not too convincing to me because his psychological knowledge does not seem differentiated enough. Indeed, to a large extent he rejects depth psychology. Nevertheless, his concept of I-It and I-Thou attitudes can be very much to the point for a psychologist reflecting about human relationship” (p. 61).

earlier. Ultimately such relationships (if they can be labelled such) are unsatisfying. Jacoby (1984) notes that “without knowing, there is fusion or identity but not relationship between a separate I and a separate Thou” (p. 64). Jacoby also points out that it is this lack of differentiation “that creates most relationship problems and difficulties” (p. 64).

In balance to the case of projection referred to above, in which the projection did not eventuate in a concrete relationship with the projection-bearer of the woman’s animus, is another analytic case – also referred to by Sanford - which does illustrate the double aspect of the individuation process. Sanford (1980) refers to the case of a married man who had suffered impotency for several years. The man entered analysis due to this problem, and also because he was disturbed by his erotic interest in another woman (p. 83). In discussing this case, Sanford (1980) relates that:

After [the man] had talked for a few hours it became clear to him that he simply did not like his wife. It was not a matter of loving or not loving her, he did not like her, and really did not want to be with her. It was the first time he had allowed himself to face this fact. Once he faced this honestly, he sought out the other woman and immediately his impotence vanished. It was as though his penis did not lie; it was telling him all along that he simply did not want the woman to whom he was married. (p. 83)

Sanford points out that people often experience projections and particularly sexual fantasies about others as disturbing. This is particularly so when an individual is already in a committed relationship. From a Judeo-Christian perspective such fantasies are sinful: “Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart” (Mat. 5:28). However, Jungians tend to hold the opposite view, and instead emphasise understanding over repression (see e.g. Stein, 1973; Searles, 1965). This way of perceiving is another example of what I consider to be one of the major contributions of a Jungian purview; that is, the ability to see life and meaning in what is generally considered merely shadow. It is worth considering that had Sanford’s analysis not reflected on the meaning of his erotic fantasies for another woman, he perhaps would have continued indefinitely in a state of self-deception about his marriage and his feelings for his wife and thereby have missed an important opportunity for effecting much needed changes.²⁷⁵

While romantic love aims at relationship by means of facilitating self-knowledge, it is not a viable model of satisfying relationship in and of itself. Dreams and myths – as products

²⁷⁵ It must be noted that cases such as this are never straightforward and usually evoke much suffering. Sanford (1980) comments that “this man had to go through all kinds of hell in separating from his wife, and he had to carry a certain burden of guilt, for, as could be expected, his wife felt unwanted and rejected. There are no simple solutions to love problems in life, and every love relationship requires a price from us” (p. 83).

of the unconscious – relate first and foremost to the psyche and to the internal world of soul, and should be understood in this light. Otherwise, as illustrated in the case of the woman referred to earlier, the individual is condemned to live what s/he will not understand.²⁷⁶ The advantage of learning about the world of the psyche and of becoming aware of one’s soul and the way it projects is that one is then in a position to evoke and experience genuine I-Thou understanding and meeting. Highlighting the advantage of self-knowledge in terms of the quality of one’s relationships, Jacoby (1984) notes that “to relate to the otherness of Thou, I have to know who I am” (p. 63). Sanford (1980) similarly observes that:

The fault in romantic love is not that we love ourselves, but that we love ourselves wrongly. By trying to revere the unconscious through our romantic projections on other people, we miss the reality hidden in those projections: We don’t see that it is our own selves we are searching for. (pp. 194-195)

Before leaving this discussion, it is perhaps of note to reflect that the proclivity mainstream Western consciousness displays to turn away from and shun issues of soul serves to place a great deal of strain upon relationships; particularly intimate ones. The West may be heroes in terms of technological capacity (although our technological ‘herosim’ seems more shadow than achievement), but we are infants in our understanding of the psyche, and this immaturity certainly reflects in our human connections, which depend upon depth of soul for their health. Highlighting the burden that lack of self-knowledge and soullessness places upon relationships, Johnson (1987), comparing Western intimate relationships with his observations of Hindu marriages, notes that:

Hindus take the inner world on a symbolic level; they translate the inner archetypes into images and external symbols through temple art and allegorical ritual. But they don’t project the inner gods onto their husbands and wives. They take the personified archetypes as symbols of another world and take each other as human beings; as a result, they don’t put impossible demands on each other and they don’t disappoint each other...[Hindus] don’t try to make the outer relationship serve the role of the inner one. (p. 199)

In this chapter, I have discussed the necessity for the ego to achieve differentiation both at the intrapsychic and interpersonal level. Unless this occurs, the individual is identified with or attached to other people but cannot be related. As discussed in Chapter Five, psychological relatedness necessitates being able to view oneself and others objectively, and is based upon the capacity to think for oneself.

²⁷⁶ Jung (1959b) makes the point that “the psychological rule says that when an inner situation is not made conscious, it happens outside, as fate” (p. 126).

In the foregoing, I have also examined what 'relatedness beyond romance' might look like, comparing Giddens' sociological analysis with an archetypal critique. Based on a subjective level of interpretation, I have argued that one's 'true love' be understood not to denote an external Mr/Ms. Right, but to symbolise the ego's felt need for and desire to experience the self; that is, the individual's desire to discover and develop his/her own capacity for wholeness. I continue this line of argument in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FIVE

It is significant that in *Ever After* the helping figure is not a fairy godmother or a magic helper, but appears in the person of the Renaissance genius and painter Leonardo da Vinci. Da Vinci does not wave a wand or influence by magic, but rather gives counsel and is a role-model of what Kahlil Gibran (1972) refers to as wisdom based on lovingness and faith.²⁷⁷ Fromm (1962a) makes the point that what is vital in education and for the development of personality is the “teaching which can only be given by the simple presence of a mature, loving person” (p. 84).²⁷⁸ In *Ever After* Da Vinci fulfills this role in relation to Henry, and to a lesser extent, Danielle.

However, as in all relationships that are meaningful and impact to any depth, the relationship between Da Vinci and Henry is not without friction. During a heated exchange in which Da Vinci challenges Henry concerning his ill-treatment of Danielle, Henry accuses Da Vinci of knowing nothing about life. Da Vinci replies with the passion and conviction that the maturity of years and a life well lived affords him: “*I know that a life without love is no life at all.*” Here Da Vinci serves the role of what Fromm (1966) refers to as the humanistic conscience, which “expressing the demands of life and growth... summons us back to ourselves, to *become* what we potentially are” (p. 55). In *Ever After* Henry’s self-righteous idealism is contrasted with Da Vinci’s capacity for tolerance and ability to perceive the wider picture. Da Vinci exemplifies in character the religious attitude Jung (1932) refers to: “The truly religious person... knows that God has brought all sorts of strange and inconceivable things to pass and seeks in the most curious ways to enter a man’s heart. He therefore senses in everything the unseen presence of the divine will” (p. 519).

In what follows, I begin by examining the negative impact that remaining symbiotically fixated has in terms of being able to relate well. I identify the tendency – common within Western culture - to remain dependent upon parental figures and make a practical recommendation that I consider would significantly contribute to a reduction of this problem. In sections two and three, I discuss productive love.

²⁷⁷ Gibran (1972) notes that “the teacher who walks in the shadow of the temple, among his followers, gives not of his wisdom but rather of his faith and his lovingness. If he is indeed wise he does not bid you enter the house of his wisdom, but rather leads you to the threshold of your own mind” (p. 50).

²⁷⁸ On the same note, Jung (1932) asks: “Where are the great and wise men who do not merely talk about the meaning of life and of the world, but really possess it?” (p. 500).

Home: origin and destination

In the following passage, intimated via voice-over at the commencement of the fact-based drama/comedy *Patch Adams* (Shadyac, 1998), Patch (played by Robyn Williams) reflects on the universal longing for and symbol of ‘home.’²⁷⁹ Hunter ‘Patch’ Adams muses:

All of life is a coming home. Salesmen, secretaries, coal miners, beekeepers, sword-swallowers, all of us. All the restless hearts of the world, all trying to find a way home. It’s hard to describe what I felt like then. Picture yourself walking for days in the driving snow; you don’t even know you’re walking in circles. The heaviness of your legs in the drifts, your shouts disappearing into the wind. How small you can feel and how far away home can be. Home. The dictionary defines it as both a place of origin and a goal or destination. And the storm? The storm was all in my mind. Or as the poet Dante put it: In the middle of the journey of my life, I found myself in a dark wood, for I had lost the right path. Eventually I would find the right path, but in the most unlikely place.

As the film depicts, the “unlikely place” Patch Adams finds “the right path” (as he refers to it) or a renewed sense of home, is Fairfax hospital, where – as a teenager – he is hospitalised for a brief period due to being suicidal (Adams, 1993). Patch reflects concerning this difficult time that he was “a soul in pain, not insane” (p. 7), and that this event precipitated a major turning point in his life: “After leaving the hospital, I knew I wanted to perform some service and decided to go into medicine” (p. 8).²⁸⁰ Later, Patch founded the *Gesundheit Institute* (literally translated: the ‘good health’ institute); a community based medical centre which operates on an ‘open door’ philosophy and is dedicated to providing holistic health care free of charge.

To return to Patch’s reflection on the meaning of home, his comment that home is not just the place we are from, but also “a goal or destination,” is significant. While I have posited the romantic myth an individuation myth, in its preoccupation with the dualisms of alienation

²⁷⁹ Psychoanalytic theorist Stephen Mitchell (2002) notes that despite it being “hazardous to speculate about cross-cultural, universal features of human nature; everything is local, culturally specific, we are told... if I were forced to select an essential, wired-in aspect of human psychology, the sense of ‘home’ would be high on my list. It is difficult for me to imagine a person – or a human culture, for that matter – who doesn’t orient himself around some sense of home: my place, where I am from, where I belong, where I long to return” (p. 36).

²⁸⁰ Patch enrolled at the Medical college of Virginia in 1967. He did not have an easy time in medical school due to being vocal in his opposition to what he considered as the ‘inhuman’ treatment of patients. Patch (1993) recounts of his medical training that “reductionism dominated in classes and on the wards. People were called by the names of their diseases, as if the disease were more important than the human who suffered from it. We were taught to ask the patient quick, penetrating questions in order to ascertain which tests to order and which medications to prescribe. We learned to gather this vital information in five or ten minutes at the most. All other facets of the patient’s life – family, friends, faith, fun, work, integrity, nutrition, exercise, and much more – were considered virtually irrelevant to medical practice. Most discouraging of all, patients seemed endlessly willing to submit to this approach. In fact, whenever one dared to question a physician’s action or decision, he or she invariably was labeled a ‘problem patient’” (pp. 10-11).

and belonging, losing and finding, misunderstanding and reconciliation, rejection and commitment the romantic myth could just as easily be interpreted as a story or myth centrally concerned with the (oft-times ambivalent) feelings and experiences associated with the symbol 'home.' Patch's reflection that home is, in part, "a goal or destination," something one journeys toward and finds, aptly captures what individuation – in essence – denotes; that is, the process by which the individual becomes him/herself; or, worded more to the point: The intrapsychic and interpersonal striving for and process of attaining 'at-home-ness' with oneself and in relation to one's "fellow men" (see Fromm, 1947, p. 49).

Due to the 'literalist' reading of the romantic myth, being 'at-home' and being romantically connected are often seen as one and the same thing. If one either cannot obtain or loses the object of one's affection and desire, what one tends to feel and experience is the disoriented and dejected state of being barred or expelled from paradise; that is, of being 'homeless.' There is no-one safe and strong and there is no-where warm and happy. In *Ever After* (1998), the emotional devastation of being homeless is vividly portrayed in the scene just subsequent to Henry's rejection of Danielle at the ball. This scene, which shows Danielle cast out and alone, images par excellence what being 'homeless' feels like. Patch reflects that we are all "restless hearts... all trying to find a way home." The romantic myth's appeal is hence understandable; it is in tune with and strikes at this fundamental chord for 'home' and belonging. However, while romantic love ostensibly promises that the experience of homelessness can be alleviated via a romantic connection, it is argued here that symbolically read the romantic myth denotes 'at-homeness' is achieved via the harder, but certainly surer, path of personal individuation.

The idea of home as a goal or destination, along with the associated idea that one must psychologically emancipate from primary ties in order to experience a fuller sense or experience of home is a recurrent theme throughout Fromm's body of work. By 'home' Fromm refers to more than is usually denoted by the everyday usage of the word. 'Home,' as employed by Fromm, refers to a state of being in which one is at home with oneself, at home in one's connections with others, and at home in relation to the world at large. As noted, the idea of 'at-homeness' is also embodied in the concept of individuation. In fact, individuation could be conceived as denoting 'at-homeness' in the fullest sense possible.

The recurrent theme of 'home' in Fromm's body of work is particularly of relevance in connection with what in psychoanalytic literature is referred to as the pre-Oedipal stage of development. As noted in Chapter Three, Fromm (1964) disagreed with Freud with respect to

the importance of the Oedipal attachment, regarding instead ‘pre-Oedipal’²⁸¹ strivings as the pivotal factor impacting upon psychological maturation. While the term ‘pre-Oedipal’ could be defined in more scientific terms, at root pre-Oedipal fixation refers to a tenacious attachment to and inability or refusal to leave home. The ‘pre-Oedipally’ fixated individual knows and conceives home only as origin, s/he cannot conceive of home as a ‘goal or destination.’ Elaborating upon the pre-Oedipal developmental phase, Fromm (1964) notes that:

This ‘incestuous’ striving, in the pre-genital sense, is one of the most fundamental passions in men or women, comprising the human being’s desire for protection, the satisfaction of his narcissism; his craving to be freed from the risks of responsibility, of freedom, of awareness; his longing for unconditional love, which is offered without any expectation of his loving response.... If human beings – men and women – could find ‘Mother’ for the rest of their lives, life would be relieved of its risks and of its tragedy. Should we be surprised that man is driven so relentlessly to pursue this *fata morgana*?²⁸² (pp. 97-98)

In the above passage, Fromm highlights how enticing the pre-Oedipal state is and how prodigiously difficult it is to give up the paradise one either knew or wishes one had known as a child, and for which one still longs. Home as ‘origin’ is the symbol and experience of safety and warmth. Of course, not everyone’s pre-Oedipal experience is a safe one. In an abusive home, a crying baby is just as likely to get a slap as s/he is to be picked up and cuddled. Yet, as Fromm (1964) notes, regardless of one’s individual experience of home, pre-Oedipal desire constitutes a fundamental human passion.²⁸³ Jung (1959b) also makes this point, noting the regressive tendency to seek childhood and mother which wars against independent aims and responsibilities.

To recap thus far, and employing Patch’s home as ‘origin’ and home as ‘goal or destination’ distinction as a metaphor for psychological development: Pre-Oedipal strivings equate with home as origin, while individuation equates with home as a goal or destination. Pre-Oedipal striving and individuation are generally viewed and postulated as oppositional to

²⁸¹ Also referred to as pre-Genital fixation or strivings.

²⁸² The sorceress of Arthurian legend.

²⁸³ It is readily understandable that the individual who has been subject to abuse during the pre-Oedipal developmental phase will have pre-Oedipal issues. However, Fromm points out that the over solicitous parent is also likely to produce a pre-Oedipally fixated individual. Fromm (1947) notes of such a parent that “while she consciously believes that she is particularly fond of her child, she has actually a deeply repressed hostility toward the object of her concern. She is over concerned not because she loves the child too much, but because she has to compensate for her lack of capacity to love him at all” (p. 136). The individual who is least likely to have pre-Oedipal issues is the individual who has experienced this phase of development in a genuinely positive sense. Fromm (1947) notes that “if one has a chance to study the effect of a mother with genuine self-love, one can see that there is nothing more conducive to giving a child the experience of what love, joy, and happiness are than being loved by a mother who loves herself” (p. 137).

and in conflict with each other (see e.g., Mitchell, 2002, p. 37). This is the line of argument I take here. However, I think it should be clarified that it is the shadow side of home as origin and not home as origin in and of itself that is in conflict with home as goal or destination; that is, with individuation. The shadow side of home as origin is that paradise can become prison if psychological development and maturation are not pursued. Fromm (1947) makes the point that while physical growth “proceeds by itself, if only the proper conditions are given, the process of birth on the mental plane, in contrast, does not occur automatically. It requires productive activity to give life to the emotional and intellectual potentialities of man, to give birth to his self” (pp. 97-98).

The distinction between pre-Oedipal strivings (home as origin) and individuation (home as destination) is important in that one of my major objectives is to argue that relationship – as conceptualised and argued for here – is only possible post-individuation. Actually, the term ‘post-individuation’ is somewhat misleading in that a fully realised post-individuated state is more a conceptual ideal than a realisable possibility. Individuation is better regarded as the journey in the direction of a goal or destination, rather than the destination itself, since individuation is an ongoing process.²⁸⁴ However, the point is that the path of individuation has at least to be embarked upon if one’s connections with others are to progress beyond the level of convention and role play, and further, if one’s connections are to be a matter of choice rather than premised on compulsion.²⁸⁵ Apart from individuation, there is no basis for Fromm’s productive conception of love, or what Jung (1931g) similarly denotes as a ‘psychological relationship’ (p. 326), in which unconscious motivations are recognised and the capacity for objectivity is developed.²⁸⁶ Jung (1931g) questions whether conventional or role premised liaisons should rightly be referred to as ‘relationships’ at all, noting “if we can speak here of a ‘relationship’ ... it is, at best, only a pale reflection of what we mean, a very distant state of affairs with a decidedly impersonal character, wholly regulated by traditional customs and prejudices, the prototype of every conventional marriage” (p. 329).

As argued throughout, interpreted at the subjective level, the romantic myth images the principle and process of individuation; of home as destination. Yet, in that the symbolic and

²⁸⁴ Jung (1946) notes that “the goal is only important as an idea; the essential thing is the *opus* which leads to the goal: *that* is the goal of a lifetime. In its attainment ‘left and right’ are united, and conscious and unconscious work in harmony” (p. 400).

²⁸⁵ Jung (1931g) points out that where sufficient differentiation is lacking one’s freedom to exercise choice is seriously curtailed: “The greater the area of unconsciousness, the less is marriage a matter of free choice, as is shown subjectively in the fatal compulsion one feels so acutely when one is in love” (p. 327; see also Peck, 1993, p. 134).

²⁸⁶ Jung (1931g) notes that “in order to be conscious of myself, I must be able to distinguish myself from others. Relationship can only take place where this distinction exists” (p. 326).

hence psychological implications of the romantic myth are not generally recognised or understood, romantic relationships tend in practice to follow a pattern in which each partner – still psychologically fixated at the home as origin stage of development – displaces onto the other his/her undifferentiated attachment needs, merely replacing or exchanging one set of primary ties for another. Jung, commenting on the “childish gestures of all lovers” (1931g, p. 330),²⁸⁷ makes this point, noting that the less conscious and individuated the respective partners are, the more likelihood there is of either one partner or each of them taking on and playing a parental role in relation to the other. Fromm, who, as noted, considers the “fantasy of absolute protectedness” (1992, p. 40) a fundamental passion, nonetheless comments that due to its incompatibility with general cultural norms, “the deep longing to remain an infant is usually repressed” (p. 37). Yet, everything repressed seeks expression or manifestation somewhere, and it is just within the context of a romantic relationship – which ostensibly promises the ‘paradisical existence’ Fromm refers to – that repressed infantilism is most prone to stage an appearance. The reason for yet again belabouring this point is because if there is no progression beyond home as origin (i.e., beyond relationships predicated on pre-Oedipal dynamics) then neither is there any basis for individuated relatedness. In making – in this section - further comments concerning the connection between childhood experience and the capacity for adult relating, I am essentially concerned with what could be referred to as the alchemical transformation from archetypal parent/child identifications to individual and particular relationship.

Before continuing, with respect to the point that a contradiction exists between the literal practice of romantic love and the symbolic or psychological implications thereof, in one sense the denoted contradiction is only a surface one in that, due to the influence of active archetypes, any kind of romantic involvement necessarily implicates one in the drama of individuation to some degree regardless of whether one is aware of the deeper implications of the romantic myth or romantic love or not. Jung points out that though it is better to understand the processes of the unconscious and, for example, the significance of one’s dreams, a dream will still have an influence even if it is not understood; to a certain extent at least. The same is so of myths. Jung (1953) notes of the individuation process – which dreams and myths activate - that it is a “natural process, which may in some cases pursue its course without the knowledge or assistance of the individual, and can sometimes forcibly

²⁸⁷ Of note here is how frequently the object of erotic desire is referred to as ‘baby’ in popular love songs and ballads.

accomplish itself in the face of opposition” (p. 186).²⁸⁸ The advantage of understanding products of unconscious derivation is that the widening of consciousness such enunciations seem aimed at procuring is likely to occur with less upset if consciousness lends a hand and contributes a fair share of labour to the process; although – on the question of whether understanding makes things easier or not – the difference between hard and harder is perhaps a more honest way to put it, since by anyone’s standards, individuation is a difficult process. Jung (1931g) by no means exaggerates when he observes that there “is no birth of consciousness without pain” (p. 331).

Having postulated individuation as the basis for relatedness in general terms, I want to suggest that part of the process of developing objectivity and of individuating, and a major factor in relatedness ‘beyond romance,’ is having awareness of and actualising the subjective father and mother components of one’s personality. To explain what I mean by this, it is perhaps easier to begin by considering how one achieves physiological individuation or autonomy, and from this surer ground to work back to the more shaky or unfamiliar point regarding actualising one’s subjective father and mother personality components.

Concerning physiological maturation: In normal circumstances, the human infant is born in miniature detail with everything that in the course of physiological maturation will develop into adult limbs and organs. While the new-born infant does not possess the co-ordination to perform even basic tasks such as feeding or washing, and requires someone else to accomplish these tasks on its behalf, the infant nonetheless already possesses the physiological and anatomical features that will enable it to progressively become fully capable of performing tasks it wishes to accomplish in an independent and self-sufficient manner, without the help of mother/father or caregiver. The point I wish to make here, and in relation to what follows, is this: Parents or other people perform tasks on behalf of and for the child not because the child does not have, for example, arms or legs, but because the child’s arms or legs have not yet developed to the point whereby the child has autonomous command of their employment. Initially, parents are the child’s eyes, ears, arms and legs. However, if a timely transfer of responsibility in which the child progressively learns to take care of itself is not effected, atrophy of development is likely to result. Moreover, most people would consider, for example, the parent who still spoon feeds a six-year-old to be engaging in indulgent behaviour, harmful to the child.

²⁸⁸ Though overall Jung (1951a) argues for the necessity of endeavouring to understand psychic manifestations. He notes that “a dream that is not understood remains a mere occurrence; understood, it becomes a living experience” (p. 252).

Relating this point to emotional or psychic maturation: In the same way in which human offspring are fully equipped at birth with the anatomical and physiological features that will enable them to become physically independent, so also – in normal circumstances – is the infant fully equipped psychically with everything required to develop emotional or psychological autonomy. Included in this ‘psychic equipment’ are the psychic components of father and mother, which are unconscious constituents of the child’s *own* personality, even at birth.²⁸⁹ While the idea may strike the reader as strange, a major point I wish to make – and one that, as I hope to convince my reader, has significant ramifications in terms of one’s capacity to love productively – is that while we understand fathers and mothers as those who have children and that perform these roles, and while bearing offspring activates parent/child archetypes,²⁹⁰ nonetheless people in and of themselves are neither fathers nor mothers and should be regarded so only in a functional or limited sense. I argue here that ultimately and rightly viewed ‘father’ and ‘mother’ are components of each individual’s *own* personality and functions every adult should perform for him/herself, or should perform on behalf of children only during the symbiotic and dependent stage of their development; that is, only pre-individuation. To relate this point comparatively to physiological maturation: As noted, to begin with, father/mother or caregiver lend the child his/her physiological competence in that the parent accomplishes on behalf of and for the child tasks the child is not yet able to accomplish for his/herself. However, the parent/s’ limbs are their own, not the child’s limbs, and in the course of the child’s maturation the parent/s’ ‘loan’ is no longer necessary. Likewise, initially a father or mother, in performing a parental role in relation to the child, ‘loans’ the child the image and experience of father and/or mother. However, in the same way that the child has the same physical limbs as his/her parents, so also does the child have the same psychic components, including the psychic components of father/mother. Hence, ideally – in the course of psychological maturation – a transfer takes place in which the parents’ ‘loan’ of the parental image and experience is no longer necessary in a literal or objective sense; the former parent/child relationship is gradually replaced and matures into one premised on equal and individual dynamics. Fromm (1962a) refers to the necessity of becoming one’s

²⁸⁹ Jung (1946b) notes: “As we know, the parental imago is constituted on the one hand by the personally acquired image of the personal parents, but on the other hand by the parent archetype which exists *a priori*, i.e., in the pre-conscious structure of the psyche” (p. 212n). Jung similarly notes that once projections are withdrawn, they “fall back into the individual psyche, from which indeed they mainly originated” (p. 212). Further, Jung (1953), discussing that “real therapy begins when the patient sees that it is no longer father and mother who are standing in his way, but himself” (p. 88), refers to the “unconscious part of... personality which carries on the role of father and mother” (p. 88).

²⁹⁰ Regarding this point, Jung (1949b) notes that “the child possesses an inherited system that anticipates the existence of parents and their influence upon him” (p. 739).

“own father and mother” (p. 60), noting that “the mature person has become free from the outside mother and father figures, and has built them up inside” (pp. 36-37; see also 1956, p. 47). Before proceeding, it is of note that one could not become one’s own father or mother if fathers and mothers are understood only in the limited literal sense, and not in the more fundamental sense as psychic personality components.

The problem with comprehending the comparative correspondence between physiological and psychological individuation and maturation rests upon the fact that while we have no difficulty in perceiving the physiological autonomy of our self and others (i.e., we can all see that even from infancy each person has his/her own arms, legs, etc.) we conversely have a great deal of difficulty in perceiving our own and others’ psychic autonomy. The subjective psychic components of father/mother and child that are part and parcel of each and every individual person’s psychic structure are not physically perceptible. Hence, we view father/mother and child, which *are* objective functions of relationship but *also* subjective psychic components, only in the former terms. However, if the subjective archetypal components upon which objective relationship rests are not understood, individuation is preempted in that the subjective psychic components of one’s own personality remain projected onto external persons and perpetually fixated upon these persons long after the developmental purposes of the objective relationship should have served its purpose. Jung (1931h) refers to the “originally normal dependence on... parents” which “grows into an incest-relationship inimical to life” (p. 75). The point is that what is necessary and healthy at one stage of development can be restrictive and harmful at another. Due to current cultural norms, parental or father/mother fixations are very common, and most of the time – if perceived at all - nobody questions this situation. It is considered normal.²⁹¹

Unawareness of or the inability to perceive the subjective factor²⁹² is inimical to healthy relatedness. For example, while parental fixations are common, so too are projections in the opposite direction; that is, where a parent, unable to perceive and unrelated to the subjective child component of self, projects this component of personality onto his/her child/ren.²⁹³ It appears a truism that a parent can only love his/her objective child to the extent

²⁹¹ See Fromm’s discussion of the difference between normal and healthy (1970, pp. 66-67). Just because something is considered normal from a social standpoint does not mean it is healthy in terms of individual well-being.

²⁹² The subjective factor refers to internal and unconscious forces (Jung, 1951a, p. 241).

²⁹³ Jung (1934d) refers to parents who “set themselves the fanatical task of always ‘doing their best’ for the children and ‘living only for them.’ This clamant ideal effectively prevents the parents from doing anything about their own development and allows them to thrust their ‘best’ down their children’s throats. This so-called ‘best’ turns out to be the very things the parents have most badly neglected in themselves. In this way the

s/he understands and loves the child component of his/her own personality. Whether the objective child is undisciplined or over disciplined is a direct mirror objectification of how the parent relates toward the child component of his/her *own* personality or self. If the child aspect of the parent is undisciplined, then the parent's objective child will be undisciplined also. Though, according to the psychological principle of compensation, the equation does not conform to straightforward logic; that is, the undisciplined parent will tend to over discipline his/her objective child, but it will be undisciplined over discipline. Likewise, the parent whose subjective child component is neglected will tend to over indulge his/her objective child, but it will be neglectful over indulgence (see Jung, 1934d, p. 286). The point is that the parent cannot escape his/her own personality. Nor can his/her child.

In making a point, particularly one that goes against the grain, the temptation is to overstate one's case. I clarify that in arguing that ultimately father or mother are components of personality and not literal people, this in no way negates the importance of the objective parent/child relationship, nor overrides the fact that children need parents or caregiver figures *literally*. Mario Jacoby (1984) draws attention to the fact that we need others in order to individuate (p. 67), and this is particularly so of parents or parental figures. Ideally, the child is awakened from childhood like Sleeping Beauty; that is, gently. If the objective parent/child tie is severed too early or severed abruptly (e.g., in the event of death or due to parental incompetence or neglect),²⁹⁴ the child will suffer and as Stein (1973) notes, ego development is likely to be seriously effected (p. 55).²⁹⁵ In order to individuate, a child or individual must have an objective experience of parental or caregiver figures before subjective introjection can take place. In this respect, the interpersonal precedes intrapsychic integration; although individuation is best conceived of as a differentiation occurring within and resulting from the interdependent cyclic interplay between the archetypal, the objective or interpersonal, and the subjective or intrapsychic respectively.

In closing this section, I wish to make a practical suggestion or recommendation in relation to what I have been arguing. Fundamentally, I have argued that in order to experience

children are goaded on to achieve their parents' most dismal failures, and are loaded with ambitions that are never fulfilled" (p. 288). Jung counsels that "if there is anything that we wish to change in our children, we should first examine it and see whether it is not something that could better be changed in ourselves. Take our enthusiasm for pedagogics. It may be that the boot is on the other leg. It may be that we misplace the pedagogical need because it would be an uncomfortable reminder that we ourselves are still children in many respects and still need a vast amount of educating" (p. 287).

²⁹⁴ See, for example, Sandford and Sandford's (1982) discussion of what they refer to as 'parental inversion' (p. 319).

²⁹⁵ Jung (1946b) cautions that the withdrawal of projections is a delicate matter and not without danger and hence that the parental "projection can and should be withdrawn only step by step" (p. 218).

adult relatedness and to love productively one must emancipate from primary tie related fixations and embark upon the path of individuation; home must be conceived of not only as ‘origin,’ but also as ‘goal and destination.’ Unless psychological maturation follows physical maturation²⁹⁶ - unless one becomes adult not only in body, but also psychologically - one simply transfers and projects the parent/child constellation onto the adult relationship, and particularly onto romantic partners. Stein (1973) draws attention to how prevalent the problem of parental fixation within Western culture is and to the negative impact this has in terms of engaging in adult relatedness: “If the archetypal projections are not eventually withdrawn from the parents, the individual tends to fall into the role of either the archetypal child or parent in all his relationships; this makes it extremely difficult for him to experience an equal and individualized relationship with anyone” (p. 55).

A change of perspective that I consider would significantly reduce the current cultural problem of widespread and pervasive parental fixation would be if the roles of father/mother were viewed more as a fixed term contract, rather than a lifelong career, as is currently the case. Logically, if being a father or mother is a lifelong career, the complementary balance to the equation is that the offspring of such fathers and mothers must remain – at least at some level – perpetually children for as long as their father or mother are alive; this is so even if one is a mother/father or even grandmother/grandfather oneself. At present the tendency to remain father or mother fixated for the duration of one’s life is the norm, and because such fixations are common, they are not considered an anomaly or pathology. Moreover – as I make a case for below – such fixations are culturally encouraged and sanctioned. It is difficult not to be father/mother/parent/caregiver fixated, even if one is conscious of the problem and would prefer not to be.

A change that I consider would significantly reduce the cultural problem identified would be if it were cultural practice for children to address their parents by their given or first names, at least by the time they left home, but ideally sooner. In Western culture – and perhaps in most contemporary cultures worldwide – the majority of people continue to call the people who raised them mum or dad (or the particular cultural equivalent) as long as the parent is still living, and even after the parent is deceased. This means that 20, 30, or 40 year old ‘adult’ men and women are still addressing a particular person by names or titles

²⁹⁶ I say ‘follows’ rather than parallels, which perhaps would seem more appropriate, due to the observation that psychological maturation tends to take much longer and is far more vulnerable to inhibiting factors than physical maturation. Jung (1957) notes that “the spiritual transformation of mankind follows the slow tread of the centuries” (p. 583).

associated with primary ties. Senior (1997), in reference to discourse theorising, points out that “language trains people’s minds to think in a particular way” (p. 223). The person who refers to another by the primary tie referents ‘mum’ or ‘dad’ and the person who is thus referred to, are both influenced by and locked into the parent/child role pattern these terms denote. This is perfectly acceptable and necessary during the pre-individuated and developmental phase of the child’s development. Again however, what is necessary and right at one stage of development, is not necessarily so at another. While the recommendation I am making may seem inconsequential, a mere quibble over words, I am of the opinion that if put into practice this shift in discourse – along with the paradigm shift argued for in which parenting were viewed in more temporary terms – could set in effect ramifications which are much needed. Sociologist Anthony Giddens (1992) contends that if parent/child relationships were viewed “as just one relationship... individuals form and from which they move out” it would become “apparent that many parent-child relationships would be regarded, from a therapeutic point of view, as severely defective – if the children were not intrinsically dependent upon their parents, one would expect them to leave” (p. 104).

One advantage of the practical recommendations I am advocating is that if parent/child relationships were considered past tense (e.g., “This is John, he *was* my father”) it would be much easier for those whose primary tie connections have been predominantly negative or abusive to achieve the emotional distance needed from such relationships in order to emotionally heal. Currently, it is much easier to put behind oneself – to relegate to the past – an unhappy marriage than it is an unhappy childhood. While, due to the greater power imbalance between parents and children, an unhappy or abusive childhood is likely more traumatic than an unhappy and abusive marriage, the latter is considered socially acceptable to leave, while the former generally is not. Moreover, on the subject of abuse, were the recommendations I am proposing adopted I consider that it is less likely that abuse would be perpetuated to begin with. It seems likely that the parent prone to abuse would think twice about abusing his/her offspring and would be less likely to do so if the parent/child tie were deemed a temporary one rather than an until ‘death do us part’ arrangement. In fact, current cultural expectations concerning the sanctity and immutability of the parent/child relationship tend to legitimate abuse in that parents are encouraged to view their children as possessions. Compounding and complicating even further the parent/child tie is the carry over of the biblical idea that children are to honour their parents no matter what.

But what of the parent/child or caregiver/child connection that has been predominantly positive? What advantage is there in emancipating from someone or from primary circumstances that have been happy or predominantly so? Whether an individual's experience of parents/caregivers and home has been predominantly positive or predominantly negative, it is still necessary to psychologically leave home. However, before furnishing a rationale for why it is still necessary to forgo primary tie relatedness even when circumstances have been favourable, I want to clarify that I am *not* arguing for a negation of relationship between parents and children. What I am endeavouring to make a case for is a cultural understanding of the parent/child connection that allows for and facilitates the maturing of what is a collective and archetypally prefigured and role based connection into an equal and individualised relationship.²⁹⁷ I am arguing that role based connections – or connections patterned on collective roles – should always be viewed as functional arrangements which are necessary for a time, but which must be discarded or matured beyond when their functional purpose is served. Stein (1973) points out that if the child is not given permission to own his/her independence and must cut off all connection with his/her parent/s in order to break free from oppressive parental control, this is not only painful for the child – and no doubt for the parent also – it is also “a destructive loss of an essential bond” (p. 56). Hence it is clear that in the numerous places Stein argues for the maturation of the parent/child connection beyond its role based beginnings; he is not arguing for its negation. The argument I am making here – far from being inimical or opposed to the individuals comprising the parent/child connection remaining warmly attached – is the very condition that enables the relationship to continue on an integrity-based footing and foundation. Hence, I am arguing on behalf of relatedness. I am certainly not opposed to it. The question or problematic continually posed by this discussion however, and the one which is posed again here, is not the issue of whether one is or should be connected with others or not; we all have a compelling need for relatedness. Rather, the question or problematic stands or falls on the issue of *how* one is related.

The parent/child tie must mature beyond its primary tie beginnings even if parent and child have been happy and the childhood experience a positive one: Prevalent in both Jung and Fromm's work is the idea that primary ties are merely a shadow of the individual's capacity and responsibility to take his/her place in the family of humanity as a whole (see e.g., Fromm, 1962a, pp. 38-39). At present, any sense of wider community or responsibility for

²⁹⁷ What Jung observes of anima/animus projections is also so of parent/child projections: They are “at bottom collective and not individual” (1931g, p. 341).

others beyond one's immediate sphere is generally facilitated through social or charity programmes: One gives money to Red Cross, one becomes a World Vision sponsor, one volunteers at the local community centre. Essentially, as Fromm points out, wider social relations are premised upon and operate, at best, according to the principle or ethic of fairness. However, as Fromm (1962a) notes, fairness is a far cry from and falls far short of the human love a productive conception of relatedness necessitates. In theological terms, the distinction Fromm makes between the principle of fairness and the principle of love is expressed thus: *"Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing"* (1 Cor. 13:3). The individuated individual – one who knows him/herself and is him/herself – adopts and practices a related, as opposed to alienated attitude in terms of his/her wider social connections. This does not require that the individual become over involved, but it does necessitate that in his/her wider sphere of contact and influence s/he relates authentically. Echoing Glover's contention (as cited in Chapter One), Fromm (1962a) emphasises that 'family' refers to more than the nuclear or the micro, noting that:

If to love means to have a loving attitude towards everybody, if love is a character trait, it must necessarily exist in one's relationship not only with one's family and friends, but towards those with whom one is in contact through one's work, business, profession. There is no 'division of labour' between love for one's own and love for strangers. On the contrary, the condition for the existence of the former is the existence of the latter. To take this insight seriously means indeed a rather drastic change in one's social relations from the customary ones. (p. 92)

To return to the practical recommendations I am advocating, while I have not heard or read of these elsewhere, I consider that the propositions I am making are archetypally prefigured as well as historically foreshadowed in the idea of and practice of initiation ceremonies and rituals, and hence I do not consider my propositions original in more than a surface sense.

Jung (1935) notes of initiation ceremonies, which historically have been practiced among all cultures, that their purpose is to transfer psychic energy from one stage of development to the next. With regard to initiation ceremonies enacted to effect the transition from puberty to adulthood, "boys are made men, and girls women" (Jung, 1953, p. 384), and the former parent/child connection is severed: The individuals are "no longer the children of their parents" (Jung, 1935, p. 363). Jung (1953) points to the absence within the modern system of education of anything parallel to or comparative with initiation ceremonies. While within Western culture there are various legal markers of adulthood (e.g., the age at which one

can leave school, live independently of one's parents, marry, etc.), and also social norms generally associated with adulthood (e.g., owning one's first car or obtaining full-time employment), there nonetheless exists no generally recognised psychological equivalent of initiation, and this has a tremendous impact on and ramifications in terms of being able to relate on an adult level. Of initiation ceremonies, Jung (1935) notes that "when a girl marries, she ought to be detached from the parental images and should not become attached to a projection of the father-image into the husband" (p. 365). Jung (1953) comments concerning the absence of any psychological equivalent to 'initiation' within modern civilisation that:

The consequence is that the anima, in the form of the mother-*imago*, is transferred to the wife; and the man, as soon as he marries, becomes childish, sentimental, dependent, and subservient, or else truculent, tyrannical, hypersensitive, always thinking about the prestige of his superior masculinity. The last is of course merely the reverse of the first. The safeguard against the unconscious, which is what his mother meant to him, is not replaced by anything in the modern man's education; unconsciously, therefore, his ideal of marriage is so arranged that his wife has to take over the magical role of the mother. Under the cloak of the ideally exclusive marriage he is really seeking his mother's protection, and thus he plays into the hands of his wife's possessive instincts. (p. 316)

In conclusion on this point, initiation ceremonies and rites of passage could be conceived as a culturally instituted forerunner and pattern of psychological individuation. While I am not advocating a return to literal initiation ceremonies, I am proposing that the practice of viewing the parent/child tie as temporary would facilitate the necessary separation from parents and serve the function of what initiation rites have traditionally been designed to procure; that is, psychological individuation.

Finally, I want to close by commenting on the dependence/independence dualism or juxtaposition and its relation to individuation. While most people conceive that the process or goal of maturation consists of or entails moving from a position of 'immature' dependence to a position of 'mature' independence, this is not the position I take in this critique, nor is such an understanding of psychological development or maturation in correspondence with or consonant with the concept of or process of individuation. From the point of view of this critique, neither dependence nor independence are morally good or bad or better or worse in and of themselves and in relation to each other. At every stage of development from early infancy to old age every individual has *both* dependency and independency needs. If, in order to be adult, one only allows oneself to be independent, one's independence is gained via the harmful process of repression, since dependency needs can not be gotten rid of. Contrary to

having to be exorcised in order to be ‘adult,’ dependence *as well as* independence are complementary facets or components of personality and indispensable factors of relatedness.

Instead of the divide in which dependence is equated with immaturity and independence with maturity, individuation is based on the premise that there is both immature dependence *and* mature dependence; and correspondingly, both immature independence and mature independence. Hence it is not a case of either/or, but of quality. The goal of psychological development or of individuation is that one moves from a position of immature dependence to a position of mature dependence and that one moves from a position of immature independence to a position of mature independence; both/*and*. The individuated individual is one who is both dependent and independent, but whose dependence and independence is mature. This point is succinctly made by Jungian therapist Polly Young-Eisendrath (1997): “One is not more independent, but is more mature in one’s dependence on others” (p. 165).

Having emphasised again the necessity to achieve individuation as the basis of productive or adult relatedness, I now turn to a discussion of productive love and symbolic monogamy.

Productive love: God or idols

In an exposition of Old Testament themes, Fromm (1966) points out that from the biblical perspective the central sin is idol worship. While Fromm is not a theist and certainly does not believe the Bible to be the “Word of God,”²⁹⁸ he nonetheless considers that the Old Testament expresses “many norms and principles that have maintained their validity throughout thousands of years” (p. 7). Fromm (1966) sees the Bible as contemporaneously relevant in that it proclaims a vision for humankind that is “still valid and awaiting realization” (p. 7). Elaborating what he purports to be the central tenets of biblical philosophy, Fromm (1966) states that:

The Old Testament is a *revolutionary* book; its theme is the liberation of man from the incestuous ties to blood and soil, from the submission to idols, from slavery, from

²⁹⁸ Qualifying his position, Fromm (1966) writes that “the Old Testament is a book of many colors, written, edited, and re-edited by many writers in the course of a millennium and containing in itself a remarkable evolution from primitive authoritarianism and clannishness to the idea of the radical freedom of man and the brotherhood of all men.... I do not look at it as the ‘word of God,’ not only because historical examination shows that it is a book written by men – different kinds of men, living in different times – but also because I am not a theist.... It was not written by one man, nor dictated by God; it expresses the genius of a people struggling for life and freedom throughout many generations” (pp. 6-7).

powerful masters, to freedom for the individual, for the nation, and for all mankind. (p. 7)

To return to the point of idol worship, Fromm (1966) notes that “the history of mankind up to the present time is primarily the history of idol worship, from the primitive idols of clay and wood to the modern idols of the state, the leader, production and consumption – sanctified by the blessing of an idolized God” (p. 43). To follow from his thematic exposition, Fromm (1966) proposes the study of ‘idology’; that is the science of idols, noting that:

We need an ‘idology’ that would examine the *effective* idols of any given period, the kind of worship they have been offered, the sacrifices man has brought them, how they have been syncretized with the worship of God, and how God himself has become one of the idols – in fact, often the highest idol who gives his blessing to the others.²⁹⁹ (p. 48)

I am drawing attention to Fromm’s critique of Old Testament biblical themes because I consider Fromm’s claim as to the contemporaneous relevance of Old Testament philosophy and, in particular, his observations regarding idolatry, to have a direct bearing on the particular approach to the discussion of love I take here. However, before making the connection between these seemingly unrelated topics, it is necessary to elaborate the distinction Fromm makes between the worship of God and the worship of idols; to grasp why this distinction is important; and also, of course, to justify how contemplation of these – so regarded – ‘primitive’ concepts can be considered in any way meaningful and of relevance to this discussion.

Perhaps at the outset it is necessary to clarify that when speaking of God, Fromm is not referring to a supernatural deity. Fromm uses the word ‘God’ symbolically.³⁰⁰ Therefore, when Fromm (1966) makes statements such as: “The affirmations ‘I love God,’ ‘I follow God,’ ‘I want to become like God’ – mean first of all ‘I do not love, follow, or imitate idols’” (p. 43), he should not thereby be interpreted as implying that all those who do not have a theistic conception of God are necessarily idol worshippers, any more than he should be interpreted as condoning theistic believers as saints. To the contrary, Fromm (1966) critiques:

²⁹⁹ Fromm (1966) makes the important point that “knowledge of idols and the fight against idolatry can unify men of all religions and those without any religion. Arguments about God will not only divide men but substitute words for the reality of human experience and eventually lead to new forms of idolatry. This does not mean that the adherents of religion should not continue expressing their faith as faith in God (provided they have cleansed their faith of all idolatrous elements) but that mankind can be spiritually united in the negation of idols and thus by an unalienated common faith” (p. 49).

³⁰⁰ Fromm (1966) notes that “I believe that the concept of God was a historically conditioned expression of an inner experience” (p. 18), and continues that while “I can understand what the Bible or genuinely religious persons mean when they talk about God... I do not share their thought concept” (p. 18). Ultimately, Fromm posits that “‘God’ is one of many different poetic expressions of the highest value in humanism, not a reality in itself” (pp. 18-19).

“How often has the worship of God been nothing but the worship of one idol, disguised as the God of the Bible?” (p. 43). It is important to bear the above clarification in mind in what follows. Fromm’s reference to God and idols is symbolic only. His critique is concerned with what God and idols – interpreted symbolically – mean and denote, and with the relevance of these symbols within the wider body of Western humanistic thought. For example, Fromm (1962) points to the connection between Marx’s concept of alienation and the biblical idea of idolatry, noting that “the concept of alienation has its roots in a still earlier phase of the Western tradition, in the thought of the Old Testament prophets, more specifically in their concept of *idolatry*.... *The idol represents his own life-forces in an alienated form*” (pp. 57-58). Distancing himself generally from any particular conceptualisation regarding religious experience, Fromm (1966) rhetorically asks:

Is religious experience necessarily connected with a theistic concept? I believe not; one can describe a ‘religious’ experience as a human experience which underlies, and is common to, certain types of theistic, as well as nontheistic, atheistic, or even antitheistic conceptualizations. What differs is the conceptualization of the experience, not the experiential substratum underlying various conceptualizations.... If one analyzes the experience rather than the conceptualization, therefore, one can speak of a *theistic as well as of a nontheistic religious experience*. (p. 57)

Having clarified Fromm’s usage of the word ‘God,’ it is perhaps possible to discuss ‘God’ and ‘idols’ symbolically and hopefully to do so without generating conceptual confusion.

Perhaps Fromm’s first and central point about ‘God’ is that it is a symbol which primarily represents and denotes evolution. In contrast to idols, which are static and lifeless entities, God is *living* and dynamic (1966, p. 44). Tracing the development of the God symbol throughout Old Testament chronicling, Fromm (1966) notes that:

The concept of God is at first formed according to the political and social concepts of a tribal chief or king. The image is then developed of a constitutional monarch who is obligated to man to abide by his own principles: love and justice. He becomes the nameless God, the God about whom no attribute of essence can be predicated. This God without attributes, who is worshipped ‘in silence,’ has ceased to be an authoritarian God; man must become fully independent, and that means independent even from God. In ‘negative theology,’ as well as in mysticism, we find the same revolutionary spirit of freedom which characterized the God of the revolution against Egypt. (p. 62)

While initially a marked juxtaposition exists between “an authoritarian God and an obedient man” (p. 225), Fromm (1966) critiques that “even in this authoritarian structure the seeds of freedom and independence are already to be found” (p. 225). Fromm elaborates this point,

noting that “from the very beginning God is to be obeyed precisely in order to prevent men from obeying idols. The worship of the one God is the negation of the worship of men and things” (p. 225). Ultimately, Fromm (1966) considers God to symbolise fully realised freedom and independence; emancipation from all forms of enslavement, whether internal or external:³⁰¹ “Man, trying to be like God, is an open system, approximating himself to God; man, submitting to idols, is a closed system, becoming a thing himself” (p. 44). While Fromm emphasises that the difference between God and idols “is not primarily that there is only *one* God and *many* idols” (p. 43), noting that “if man worshipped only one idol and not many, it would still be an idol and not God” (p. 43), Fromm nonetheless considers the biblical idea of monotheism in relation to the God symbol significant, and central to the distinction between God and idols. Drawing a connection between monotheism and human evolution, Fromm (1962) notes that:

The principle of monotheism... is that man is infinite, that there is no partial quality in him which can be hypostatized into the whole. God, in the monotheistic concept, is unrecognizable and indefinable; God is not a ‘thing.’ Man being created in the likeness of God is created as the bearer of infinite qualities. In idolatry man bows down and submits to the projection of one partial quality in himself. He does not experience himself as the center from which living acts of love and reason radiate. He becomes a thing, his neighbour becomes a thing, just as his gods are things. (p. 58)

I noted that I consider Fromm’s analysis of the God and idol symbols significant to the discussion of love. I will now endeavour to make the connection I see explicit.

To summarise the distinction between the God symbol and idols: The central dynamism conveyed by and embodied in the idol symbol is loss of self, resulting in passivity, the atrophy of one’s human powers,³⁰² dependence and submission. The central dynamism conveyed by and embodied in the God symbol is the “capacity for...evolution of which the limits are not set” (Fromm, 1966, p. 70), resulting in the productive unfolding of one’s human powers, self realisation and expression, totality, forward movement, independence and freedom. To make a link between these symbols and romantic and productive love respectively: Perhaps the statement that best summarises Fromm’s central contention regarding the romantic conception of love is that for most people “love... is not an expression of their being; it is a goddess to whom they want to submit” (1979, p. 53). Throughout his writings, Fromm makes a direct link between what we generally think of and refer to as the ‘in

³⁰¹ Fromm (1966) endorses the above point repeatedly: “God’s authority... guarantees man’s independence from human authority” (p. 75); “...obedience to God is... the negation of submission to man” (p. 73); “Idolatry, by its very nature, demands submission – the worship of God, on the other hand, independence” (p. 47).

³⁰² The word power is used here to refer to power “in the classical sense of *potential, dynamis*” (see May, 1958, p. 31).

love' state and idolatrous attachment and dependence (see eg, 1947, pp. 103-104; 1962, pp. 63-64; 1962a, pp. 20-21; 1979, pp. 51-54). In contrast to romantic love or symbiotic attachment, the central defining characteristic and hallmark of mature or productive relatedness is that it is relatedness premised firmly and squarely on the solid foundation of self-knowledge, affirmation and respect. As noted in the Introduction, Fromm (1962a) conceives mature love as relatedness which permits a person "to be himself"³⁰³ (p. 21; see also 1947, p. 103). Similarly to Jung, Fromm's basic argument is that to relate well we need integrity of person and the God-image symbolises this. The central distinction between passive or idolatrous identification and productive love is that idolatrous attachment is premised upon the submission or negation of self, whereas productive relatedness is premised on self strength. In what follows, the theme of 'self' as the basis upon which productive relatedness is premised is the implicit unifying thread.

In Chapter Four, I argued that the notion of Mr/Ms. Right and the romantic desire to find one's 'true love' is a symbol of the ego's felt need for self-realisation and is expressive of the individual's own desire and capacity for wholeness. It has been argued that one's Mr/Ms. Right refers to and symbolises not an external person, but most correctly: One's own self.³⁰⁴ However, in arguing for a reading of romantic love that espouses knowledge of self as the basis of relationship, and in further arguing that intimacy need not be seen as dependent upon and limited to one person, I am not thereby arguing against specificity and particularity within the sphere of relatedness. Gina Cerminara (1963) recounts the following ditto, cited in a college paper, during her school days:

Boy: Do you love me?
 Girl: I love everybody.
 Boy: Leave that to God. We should specialize. (p. 113)

Commenting, Cerminara (1963) notes: "The boy was right, of course; we must specialize" (p. 114). However Cerminara, though somewhat cynical concerning those who think they can or

³⁰³ Regarding this point, Fromm (1947) notes that "human existence is characterized by the fact that man is alone and separated from the world; not being able to stand the separation, he is impelled to seek for relatedness and oneness. There are many ways in which he can realize this need, but only one in which he, as a unique entity, remains intact; only one in which his own powers unfold in the very process of being related. It is the paradox of human existence that man must simultaneously seek for closeness and for independence; for oneness with others and at the same time for the preservation of his uniqueness and particularity. As we have shown, the answer to this paradox – and to the moral problem of man – is *productiveness*" (pp. 102-103).

³⁰⁴ Stein (1973) points out that we tend to seek who we are - in Stein's words, 'our soul' - outside of ourselves "because we have no idea at first that it is lying deeply within the center of our own being" (p. 152) and that subsequently "we become largely dependent on our connections with other human beings for our own sense of wholeness" (p. 152).

do love everybody,³⁰⁵ notes that “none the less we must all ultimately come to the point of really loving all living creatures, and it would seem that the many vicissitudes of love have this end in view” (p. 114).

Fromm is of like persuasion, yet without the cynicism regarding whether an inclusive love can be arrived at. As noted, in arguing for productive love, Fromm (1947, 1962a) is not arguing against specific relatedness, only that specificity in love is not possible – or lacks integrity - without the character base or foundation of generality. However, while Fromm considers productive love the necessary basis underscoring and permeating all forms of relatedness, Fromm is not of the view that it is possible to form an intimate connection with just anybody or everybody. Fromm (1962a) notes that:

This view seems to neglect the paradoxical character of human nature... We are all One – yet every one of us is a unique, unduplicable entity. In our relationships to others the same paradox is repeated. Inasmuch as we are all one, we can love everybody in the same way in the sense of brotherly love. But inasmuch as we are all also different, erotic love requires certain specific, highly individual elements which exist between some people but not between all. (pp. 44-45)

The idea that individual love relationships require the basis of a more general capacity for love is also intimated by Greg Behrendt and Liz Tuccillo in their self-help book *He's Just Not That Into You* (2005), popularised by the ardent endorsement of American talk show host Oprah Winfrey, who considers the advice contained therein revolutionary. I will refer to this book again later in this section; like Oprah, I consider that the book makes a valuable contribution. However, significant here is Behrendt and Tuccillo's advice that women (to whom the book is directed, but the same advice equally applies to men), when deciding whom to date, should adopt as one of the measures for “a dignified bar... to exist at” (2005, p. 183) the motto: “I will not be with a man who is not clearly a good, kind, loving person” (p. 184). In Behrendt's view, no matter how ‘hot’ a guy appears, he is *not* a good partner choice if he lacks fundamental moral perspective. This point accounted for however, it is so that love is manifested at the level of individual relatedness. If the individual self is the basis of relatedness, and if the defining characteristic of the individual is his/her individuality, it stands to reason that every relationship manifests and is characterised by individuality also. A person may have an intimate friendship connection with five different people, yet each relationship

³⁰⁵ Cerminara (1963) comments “but the girl was right, too. She ‘loved everybody,’ she said, though in all probability she only *thought* she loved everybody... “Loving everybody” is an illusion common among idealists, churchgoers, and metaphysicians, and one that is quickly shattered when put to any truly rigorous test” (p. 114).

will be distinct in its own right. No two people, even if each knows and is related to the same person, is related or connected to this same person in the same way.

An expression used to describe the ‘larger-than-life’ projection and mutual inflation of each other made by people newly ‘in love’ is that ‘love is blind.’ Sometimes this state of affairs is commented upon with warmth and sentimental identification. Sometimes however, the observation registers with some alarm; particularly if one happens to be a concerned parent or friend. In *About Schmidt* (Payne, 2002), Warren Schmidt (Jack Nicholson) reflecting on his daughter’s choice of partner and forthcoming marriage, muses via voice-over: “*I think she could have done better*”; thus putting into words what many parents – when first confronted with a prospective son/daughter-in-law - have perhaps felt. Yet, particular contexts and reactions aside, the expression ‘love is blind’ essentially conveys the idea that when ‘in love’ people tend to overlook or literally ‘not see’ what – in a less beguiled and inflationary state - would annoy, irritate or alarm them. Certainly there is much to be said for the willingness to overlook the faults of others, and particularly the faults and shortcomings of those closest to us. However, ‘love’s blindness’ also has its shadow side, particularly in that it tends to engender self-abnegation and masochistic subservience – as is expounded below – and hence to undermine productive relatedness.

Perhaps at the outset, the self-defeating and undermining shadow side of ‘love blindness’ is best elucidated by contemplating a fictitious, though undoubtedly ‘true to life,’ example. Consider the following: A man is rude to his partner all week. But then on Friday evening, wanting to pre-empt the inevitable emotional outburst that his actions have been incurring, he stops on the way home from work and buys her flowers. The woman, whose self-esteem is eroded due to years of self-negating submission, is elated. She tells all her friends. Her husband is wonderful, she consoles herself. He really *does* love me, and inwardly she chides herself for having doubted this. It is not difficult to discern the more sinister aspects of ‘love blindness’ here. The woman overlooks what is obvious: that her husband is bored with her and fundamentally despises her. The flowers in fact prove nothing. If her husband loved her – as she self-deceptively clings to despite all evidence to the contrary - he would sincerely apologise and either endeavour to effect genuine change or make an honest break from her.³⁰⁶

³⁰⁶ In relation to this example is the comment that what is important in relationship is consistency and not a sentimental clinging to islands of kindness in-between a sea of hurtful reactions, disappointments, and bad behaviour.

I referred above to the self-help relationship book *He's Just Not That Into You* (2005), co-authored by Greg Behrendt and Liz Tuccillo. Throughout their book, Behrendt and Tuccillo repeatedly emphasise that there is nothing virtuous about being 'love blind'; that blindness in love is self-defeating and masochistic, and that it undermines one's sense of integrity and self well-being. Tuccillo cautions that in contrast to the usual commonsense advice to look on the bright side and to be optimistic (p. 3), when it comes to relationships one should rather "look on the dark side" (p. 3). Analysing relationship behaviour, and seeking to justify her rather cynical viewpoint, Tuccillo (2005) overviews:

This is what we do: We go out with someone, we get excited about them, and then they do something that mildly disappoints us. Then they keep doing a lot more things that disappoint us. Then we go into hyper-excuse mode for weeks or possibly months, because the last thing we want to think is that this great man that we are so excited about is in the process of turning into a creep. We try to come up with some explanation for why they're behaving that way, any explanation, no matter how ridiculous, than the one explanation that's the truth: He's just not that into me. (p. 3)

Behrendt and Tuccillo's main message is that regardless of how much we may like or want to be with a particular other person, if that person is either not interested in us or has lost interest, the only dignified and ultimately successful course of action is to own up to this and to focus one's attention elsewhere. Behrendt and Tuccillo advise that the earlier a person acknowledges that love is unrequited or that a partner is ill-treating him/her the better. Behrendt (2005) maintains that, if one practices self-honesty and is committed to self-responsibility, it is not difficult to discern when a relationship is not working, noting regarding unrequited love that "even though we may not be saying it we are *absolutely* showing you all the time. If a dude isn't calling you when he says he will, or making sure you know that he's dating you, then you already have your answer. Stop making excuses for him, his actions are screaming the truth: He's just not that into you" (p. 7). Certainly it is difficult to let go of a relationship that initially seemed promising. Yet is there a dignified alternative? D. H. Lawrence is quoted as saying: "People must love us because they love us – you can't *make* them" (as cited in Mitchell, 2002, p. 172). This is exactly Behrendt and Tuccillo's point.

What is promising about Behrendt and Tuccillo's short treatise and what sets it apart from other relationship self-help books is that in encouraging readers to refuse to be blind in terms of their relationship practices and expectations and to face facts squarely, it is primarily a book which endorses self-honesty and promotes self-responsibility. If one considers the usual self-abnegating and manipulative advice on how to 'win' and maintain partners or spouses that self-help authors are wont to subject their readers to, *He's Just Not That Into You*,

with its absence of pat formulas, is in fact worthy of the ‘self-help’ genre it occupies. Behrendt and Tuccillo do not preach relationship at all costs. Rather, they passionately contend that there are some things – for example, one’s self-respect – which most definitely are not up for barter. One would think this obvious. Yet it is the simple things that tend to elude, and this is particularly so with respect to matters of the heart. Unfortunately, the desire for love can be so strong that fantasy can be superimposed upon reality and harmful relationship practices overlooked for the sake of relatedness; hence the tenaciousness one sometimes observes of romantic attachments long after self-respect has been all but eroded. While I am not quite as enamoured with Behrendt and Tuccillo’s advice as Oprah Winfrey, nor of her opinion that this book alone could revolutionise dating practices or the quality of relationships (in my view, it will take a lot more to change the status quo than this one book, which essentially consists of just one theme). Yet, though limited, what Behrendt and Tuccillo say *is* indeed of utmost importance, and in that their advice closely accords with what I myself am highlighting as central concerns, is certainly worthy of mention here.

I comment further below on the destructive nature of endeavouring to achieve relatedness via the negation rather than the affirmation of oneself. However, before doing so, I will elaborate upon the point, noted in Chapter Four, that I do not consider the supposition – based on Eros/Logos dualism – that women are by nature more loving or innately more gifted with the capacity for relatedness than men, valid.³⁰⁷ As noted in Chapter Four, given that the notion of women’s innate superiority over men in terms of their capacity to relate intimately is one that seems to continue to persist within relationship discourse and to enjoy – for the most part - ‘taken for granted’ status, it appears necessary to subject this issue to closer scrutiny.

Perhaps at the outset it is worth contemplating whether Eros – regardless of whether or not Eros equates with the feminine (NB: in mythology Eros is a male figure [see Whitmont, 1969, p. 170]) – is a valid model of relatedness anyway. One analytical theorist who has given careful consideration to this point and who argues that Eros needs to be superseded by a more holistic symbol of love and relatedness is Edward Whitmont. Whitmont (1969) critiques that Eros – while serving to unite individuals – is based upon subjective feeling rather than knowledge. While Eros symbolises contact and involvement between individuals it is “indifferent to understanding, to the basic ‘knowing’ in its Biblical sense of loving understanding” (p. 175). Whitmont critiques that while Eros or the urge toward involvement is a necessary part of interpersonal and intimate relatedness “a chasm exists between blind,

³⁰⁷ This notion arises from the classic psychoanalytic Eros/Logos split in which women are seen as bearers of Eros and hence relatedness and emotion, while men are denoted the proprietors of logic and reason.

passionate involvement and that love which is able and willing to give of itself, to understand and even to renounce its claims if this should be called for by the deepest needs of loving” (pp. 175-176). Following from his critique of Eros, Whitmont (1969) makes the following observation, which I consider centrally valid in terms of this discussion: He points out that “the principle of conscious I-Thou relatedness, of a loving relationship in mutual conscious acceptance and understanding which would include the other’s shadow and aggressive aspects – hence not only attraction but also contradiction – seems to have hardly any representation in ancient mythology” (p. 176). Whitmont (1969), who argues that genuine love “requires confronting distance as much as connecting nearness, creative understanding as well as emotional involvement, aggressive challenge as much as patient inaction, waiting, caring, and bearing”³⁰⁸ (p. 175), goes on to note that:

A more elaborate mythologem [of relatedness] appears for the first time in the symbolism of medieval alchemy, in the still relatively confused imagery of the *coniunctio*; there, out of the original chaos arises an *agens*, sulfur (Yang), and a *patiens*, sal (Yin), as well as an ambivalent Mercurius in the middle, having the tendency to unite the other two. This alchemical Mercurius is also Hermes Trismegistus, the ‘Three Times One,’ and the male-female Hermaphroditus. Mercurius not only unites like Eros but is also a trickster and confounder, and is aggressive and capable of anger; he is also capable of irrational, gestating wisdom, hence unlike Eros he represents a really comprehensive drive toward integration and relatedness. (p. 176)

Brought to the fore here is the important observation that a holistic or productive conception of love must account for and include what Jane Goldberg (1999) refers to as “the dark side of love” (p. 12).³⁰⁹ Again however, are women innately superior to men in terms of their capacity for intimate relatedness, or not? In my view, this notion is a fallacy based on two misconceptions: a misconception of the nature of women, and a misconception of the nature of Eros and also of love. In his critique, what Whitmont is at pains to emphasise is that love is something embodied and robust that encompasses knowledge and intellect - and yes, even shadow - and that the traditional Eros-based “pretty and nice” take on love is not an adequate model or conception of relatedness. If love *is* all sweetness and light and only “pretty and

³⁰⁸ Regarding the point that aggression is also an aspect of love and relatedness, Samuels (1989) notes that “for aggression, so characteristic of debates between analysts, often contains the deepest needs for contact, dialogue, playback, affirmation” (p. 4).

³⁰⁹ Commenting on the importance of understanding and accounting for love’s shadow side, Goldberg (1999) notes that “not all of the lessons about love that we received in our childhood serve us well as adults. As part of our love training, we are taught to fear the shadows in love’s dark side – the aspects of relationships that we think will impede love or destroy it altogether. We didn’t learn, for instance, that with love comes hurt and rage, pain and resentment, loss and vindictiveness – all of the hateful feelings that constitute love’s other side – and that this underside of love is as inevitable and as necessary for the growth of love as the setting of the sun and the dark of the night are for the growth of plants” (p. 4).

nice,” it is easy to see how being a woman and being loving have come to be equated. Traditionally, women have had to be pretty and nice also. It is worth contemplating that while men have undoubtedly suffered from having to be “little toughies” and from the cruel admonition “Boys don’t cry!,” women have equally suffered from being denied the expression of aggression: “Little girls,” so the nursery rhyme goes, “are made of sugar and spice and all things nice.” Goldberg (1999), who like Fromm and Whitmont argues for a more holistic understanding of love, gives short shrift to a ‘love is nice’ theory, noting that “mature love... needs a full range of feeling. Without justified, honest hate, there can be no love” (p. 58).

The misconception about what love is, arising no doubt from the cultural and religious repression of love’s ‘bad’ aspects, perhaps engenders and accounts for much of the suffering experienced in relationships. Perhaps an example will make this point clearer. If one peruses psychoanalytic case studies, one comes across ample material indicative of the destructive impact and consequences of a ‘disembodied’ or shadowless notion of love. One such illustrative case is presented by Brian Weiss concerning a woman patient who rapidly gained weight after marrying. Weiss (1992) comments concerning the woman, whom he refers to as Sharon, that:

The explosion to three hundred pounds did not begin until shortly after her marriage. During their courtship, she had idealized and fallen deeply in love with her husband. Meanwhile, her subconscious mind was denying (not allowing her to see or bring into awareness) some of his less perfect personality traits, such as his compulsive flirting with other women. Soon after they were married, however, Sharon could no longer ignore reality. An affair of her husband’s became public knowledge, and with this disclosure had come the onset of Sharon’s severe obesity. (p. 120)

From a psychological stance those ‘bad’ emotions we are wont to suppress for the sake of love are in fact integral components of honest and productive relationship. Far from requiring extermination or repression, love’s ‘dark side’ and dark emotions need rather to be understood and allowed to perform their particular emotional balancing and maintaining function and assume their rightful place alongside other character qualities we generally consider more virtuous. For example, there is no doubt Weiss’s patient felt anger and jealousy when her fiancé flirted with other women. However, it seems rather than admitting and allowing these ‘bad’ feelings to enter consciousness, she repressed them. Yet when a person has a headache or suffers stomach pain, does s/he become angry at the symptoms and repress them? Or does s/he rather treat these symptoms as useful indicators pointing to an underlying problem that needs to be addressed? Certainly, a person may feel annoyed at him/herself if a stomach ache results from eating too much food. But it is the *behaviour* which contributed to

the symptom (i.e., the stomach ache) and not the stomach ache itself that is the problem and that needs to be addressed or to change. The stomach ache is just doing its job, so to speak; reminding a person to take care of his/her physical well-being.

Exactly the same self-regulating function operates on the emotional plane. If something is wrong, a symptom appears. We then have two choices: ignore the symptom to our peril, or find out what is causing the symptom and take some constructive action. Had Weiss's patient taken her jealousy seriously, instead of berating herself for it or seeking to cover it up, she may have arrived at some hard – but ultimately, healing – facts. Instead of repressing her jealousy, she could have asked herself: “What does this symptom mean and what is it trying to show me? Why do I feel uncomfortable and in pain? What is wrong?” She then might have admitted to herself that she did not like being treated by a man who purportedly ‘loved’ her in a way that made her feel ashamed and inferior in front of other people. Taken seriously and faced honestly, the symptom of jealousy could have been the impetus to a thoughtful appraisal of whether in fact she wanted to be with such a man, let alone make a lifelong commitment to him.

Putting up with or ignoring disrespectful behaviour within the context of relationship is literally ‘unproductive’; it is not good for oneself, nor – incidentally – is it beneficial to the other person. Certainly there is a time and place to overlook faults and let things pass, but love requires honest confrontation as well as forbearing patience. In fact ‘what’s up’ expressed straightforwardly is usually welcome within a relationship and conducive to its health.³¹⁰ If someone is angry with you or you are angry with him/her, the offended party (s/he or you) are going to show it anyway, and if not able or permitted to do so openly, then in some underhanded and hurtful manner. While dishonest or repressed anger *is* hurtful and destructive, honest anger conversely serves to detonate conflict and heal. Most importantly, *relatedness must be premised upon self-strength and integrity, not self-abnegation*, and those ‘bad’ emotions we are wont to self-flagellate ourselves for are the very symptoms that responded to appropriately guard self-integrity. If we love someone we confront his/her weaknesses and bad behaviour. If we love our self we take steps to remove our self from a person or relationship where respect is not present. Tuccillo (2005) asks: “What would happen if all the women in the world... started insisting that men keep true to their word, treat

³¹⁰ Fromm (1962a) notes that “real conflicts between two people, those which do not serve to cover up or to project, but which are experienced on the deep level of inner reality to which they belong, are not destructive. They lead to clarification, they produce a catharsis from which both persons emerge with more knowledge and more strength” (pp. 74-75).

us with respect, shower us with the appropriate amount of love and affection?” (pp. 200-201). Answering her own question, Tuccillo surmises: “I think there would be an awful lot of better-behaved men in the world” (p. 201). Of course, it works both ways: No doubt there are many men who justifiably wish that women were better behaved in terms of their relational integrity also.

I will be continuing the discussion of productive love in the next section. However, in conclusion here, were it necessary to define or sum up what productive love is in just one word or idea, I would argue that primarily productive love equates with knowledge. By knowledge, I am not referring to the impersonal or objective Aristotelian mode of knowledge employed by the natural sciences (see Fromm, 1992, p. 20) – though the capacity for objectivity and objective knowing is also a character requirement of productive love - but rather to a quality of “deep understanding” (p. 20). Fromm (1994) thoughtfully asks and reflects: “Who sees another person really? Hardly anybody. We are all satisfied and happy to see and to show only our surfaces. That’s why our contacts are poor, just poor, or hardly exist against this poverty of contact, it is covered up by a kind of camaraderie and friendliness and smiling, smiling, smiling” (p. 170). In contrast to the vacuous relating or “poverty of contact” Fromm comments on here, is Fromm’s insistence that “all love is based on knowledge of the other” (1966, p. 184; see also Jung, 1954a, p. 391). In fact, at root, the desire for love seems inextricably to equate with the desire to be genuinely seen, known and respected for who one is.

I began this section by reviewing Fromm’s analysis of the symbolic significance and relevance of the Hebraic God and idol concepts, making a link between the God symbol and productive relatedness and the idol symbol and passive or symbiotic attachment. The definition of idols, given by one of the biblical psalmists, is illustrative – in a contrasting negative sense – of the connection between productive love and knowledge. Elucidating the nature - or rather naturelessness - of idols, the psalmist notes that:

They [idols] have mouths, but they speak not: eyes have they, but they see not: They have ears, but they hear not: noses have they, but they smell not: They have hands, but they handle not: feet have they, but they walk not: neither speak they through their throat. They that make them are like unto them; so is every one that trusteth in them. (Ps. 115:5-8)

The psalmist’s dismal descriptive in fact resounds as uncannily redolent: Many people make the same complaint and observe the same characteristics in partners or in those close to them that the psalmist observes concerning idols. ‘I am invisible to him,’ a wife laments. ‘She is

always on the phone, we never talk, she doesn't listen to me,' a man complains of his partner. Fromm, quoting Paracelsus, cites that "... he who understands also loves, notices, sees.... The more knowledge is inherent in a thing, the greater the love" (1962a). How can one know another if one does not see, listen, notice, take interest in and spend time with that other? And if one does not take the time and make the effort to know, how can one love? Moreover, is it not so that love necessitates and presupposes the capacity to see and hear at a level deeper and more profound than ordinary sensual perception; that to love necessitates the employment of what psychic and medium Jane Roberts (1970) refers to as the 'inner senses' (pp. 275-288). In Chapter Two, I cited Fromm's defining of responsibility as the quality of being able to respond to both the expressed and unexpressed needs of another. It is evident that if knowing and loving presuppose the ability to comprehend and respond to unexpressed need then a perception beyond ordinary seeing and hearing is required. Kahlil Gibran (1972) notes that "it is well to give when asked, but it is better to give unasked, through understanding" (p. 16).

However, while, as noted, the desire for love seems inextricably to equate with the desire to be genuinely seen and known, paradoxically there appears to exist a deep-seated fear of or inability to relate at more than a surface level, even within the context of intimate relatedness. The fear: "If you really knew me, you would not love me," is perhaps one that hovers hauntingly in the background of many people's psyches. However, Stein (1973) counsels otherwise, advising that it is the fear of being known itself which obstructs love because such hiddenness is perceived as threatening to the other person, and that "the exposed and naked soul always evokes love" (p. 169). I think Stein's advice needs to be balanced by the caution that one should be careful where and with whom one exposes one's soul, and that appropriate propriety and privacy are also aspects of relatedness (cf. Jung's discussion 1953, p. 318). Nonetheless, Stein's point that one has to risk being known if one is to experience love and intimacy seems valid.

To sum up this final point of the interplay between love and knowledge, Fromm stresses the necessity of seeking to emulate or arrive at what he refers to as a 'central relationship' (see definition below). Fromm (1962a) strongly opposes the idea that 'correct' sexual technique leads to a happy relationship, along with the idea that 'marriage is a team,' noting that "love as mutual sexual satisfaction, and love as 'teamwork'... are the two 'normal' forms of the disintegration of love in modern Western society, the socially patterned pathology of love" (p. 69). Explaining and justifying his opposition to technique or method based relatedness, Fromm (1962a) further contends that "all this kind of relationship amounts to is

the well-oiled relationship between two persons who remain strangers all their lives, who never arrive at a ‘central relationship’, but who treat each other with courtesy and who attempt to make each other feel better” (p. 65).

In concluding this section, the theme of proper self-regard as the basis of productive relatedness has been the primary thread that has weaved its way into and has undergirded every point I have made. Hence the following passage from Fromm, in which he explains what he means by a ‘central relationship’ and in which he also highlights the importance of self-regard as the basis of relatedness, seems an apt note on which to briefly pause before taking up the discussion of productive love again in the next section. Concerning the ‘central relationship,’ Fromm (1962a) notes that:

Love is possible only if two persons communicate with each other from the centre of their existence, hence if each one of them experiences himself from the centre of his existence. Only in this ‘central experience’ is human reality, only here is aliveness, only here is the basis for love. Love, experienced thus, is a constant challenge; it is not a resting place, but a moving, growing, working together; even whether there is harmony or conflict, joy or sadness, is secondary to the fundamental fact that two people experience themselves from the essence of their existence, that they are one with each other by being one with themselves rather than by fleeing from themselves. There is only one proof for the presence of love: the depth of the relationship, and the aliveness and strength in each person concerned; this is the fruit by which love is recognized. (p. 75)

Self-love: The undergird of productive relatedness

And Hana moves possibly in the company that is not her choice. She, at even this age, thirty-four, has not found her own company, the ones she wanted.

Ondaatje, 1992, p. 301

I once attended an English class in which *The English Patient* (1992), by Michael Ondaatje, was the topic of discussion. The short passage cited above, which is part of Ondaatje’s final comments regarding the character Hana, was referred to by the lecturer taking the class. It seemed to me poignantly sad that someone should not have “found her own company, the ones she wanted” (p. 301).

Employing Ondaatje’s poignant observation of the character of Hana as a springboard for discussion, in this concluding section the discussion of further facets associated with productive love will begin with a brief examination of the association between aloneness or separateness and love and relatedness. In this section, I also discuss altruism and its relation to productive love, the shadow side of the desire for specificity in love, and the question of love’s

‘morality.’ As will be observed, the topics comprising this section represent somewhat of a mixed bag. However, as in the proceeding section, the unifying thread is again the theme of self-love as productive love’s indispensable authenticating undergird.

While relationship is prodigiously important³¹¹ and while as Jung (1955) emphasises, individuation is not only a subjective intrapsychic process but equally necessitates interpersonal engagement (p. 448), part of the self-development involved in learning to relate well is the ability to live productively and enjoy life even when one is alone.³¹² Fromm (1962a) postulates that being “able to be alone with oneself... is precisely a condition for the ability to love” (p. 81). On this point, while the Bible advises: “*It is not good for man to be alone*” (Gen 2:18), it does not necessarily follow that it is good for “man” or woman to be in company. Psychiatrist M. Scott Peck (1993), who comments that the longevity of a relationship is no indication of its health, notes that the sickest marriages “are often the most stable. They occur between partners whose psychopathology fits together hand and glove, who may murder each other daily though they cannot be pried apart with a crowbar” (p. 134). If one cannot be alone, and must be with someone – anyone – at all costs, one cannot make a choice; to use the symbols of God and idols, one cannot choose a good relationship over a bad one, nor separate oneself from an idol (i.e, from someone who neither sees, notices, nor treats one with respect). Further, if one cannot be alone with oneself, one cannot tolerate or respect the boundaries, decisions, free-will and privacy of other people. Fromm (1962a) notes that “if I am attached to another person because I cannot stand on my own feet, he or she may be a lifesaver, but the relationship is not one of love” (p. 81).

While the capacity to accept periods of aloneness is necessary when for whatever reason the opportunity for intimate connectedness is not present, the ability to be alone is also an important aspect of love and relatedness even when a person does have the opportunity to be with the person or people s/he wants to be with. Peck (1993) comments that when taking couples’ group therapy sessions, he often found himself telling his participants: “You’re too much married” (p. 133): That relationship or marriage also necessitates separateness was something Peck observed many of his clients did not seem to understand. Peck thus notes that “for psychotherapists the greatest problem in treating marriages is not too much separateness

³¹¹ Jung (1953) notes that “in spite of all indignant protestations to the contrary, the fact remains that love, its problems and its conflicts, is of fundamental importance in human life and, as careful inquiry consistently shows, is of far greater significance than the individual suspects” (p. 14).

³¹² While, as noted, Jung (1946) considers that relatedness is a very necessary and indispensable component of individuation, commenting that neither subjective integration and relatedness “can exist without the other” (p. 448), he nonetheless acknowledges that “sometimes the one and sometimes the other predominates” (p. 448).

but too much togetherness” (p. 133). This point seems significant. Throughout this critique, I have implicitly argued that the quality of a person’s relationships is a direct reflection of the quality of his/her own person.

I have noted that Fromm regards human love as the foundation and primary cornerstone of all other types of love and relatedness. The individual who loves productively not only refrains from blatantly injurious acts such as murder or theft, but also from the subtler ways in which injury can be inflicted (e.g., through gossiping about someone or humiliating another). Jung (1942) rightly observes that laws which regulate human behaviour are no prevention against the more masked forms in which injury can be inflicted upon another (p. 230), and “that not fidelity to the law” but the “advanced and more psychologically correct view” of “love and kindness are the antithesis of evil” (1963, p. 207). In fact, on the point of whether humiliating another person is a lesser evil than a legally criminal offence such as murder, Fromm (1966), commenting on Jewish rabbinical law, notes that: “The Talmud says: ‘He who makes his neighbour ashamed in the presence of others is as if he had shed his blood’” (p. 192). In sum, ‘productive loving’ entails more than being merely law-abiding in relation to others. The individual who is committed to loving productively is *care-full* and *thought-full* in all his/her encounters with others; and this is so whether s/he personally likes or is related to these others or not.

However, to endorse productive love is not to advocate uncritical altruism. Unfortunately, altruism, which is generally defined as regard for the welfare of others, often falls short of its aims (that is, presuming the aim of altruism is to effect genuine and beneficial social change) in that, instead of being based on a productive conception of love with affirmation of self as its indispensable undergird, altruism tends rather to be associated with and practiced according to the notion of self-abnegation, self-denial and self sacrifice. No doubt altruism’s ‘weakness’ – as conceived here - derives from the misconception discussed in Chapter One of regarding love of oneself and love of others as contradictory.³¹³ Tracing a brief historical summary of the notion that self-love and love for others are contradictory phenomena, Fromm (1947) draws attention to the continuance of this idea in Freud’s theory of narcissism: “According to Freud, the more love I turn toward the outside world the less love is left for myself, and vice versa. He [Freud] thus describes the phenomenon of love as an

³¹³ Fromm (1947) notes that in Calvin and Luther’s teaching denial of self and love for others is emphasised, while in philosophies such as those of Stirner and Nietzsche the premise is reversed: Love for self is promulgated at the expense of love for others. However, though addressing the subject from different ends of the scale, what is the same about both extremes is that neither can accommodate a both/and stance in relation to the problematic (see pp. 124-131).

impoverishment of one's self-love because all libido is turned to an object outside oneself" (p. 133). Hence, according to this view one can either love oneself or love others, but cannot do both; or at least not simultaneously.

Unfortunately, the well-meaning individual who sincerely endeavours to live according to the principle of charity will soon find him/herself in a somewhat miserable state if s/he is influenced by this erroneous view. Highlighting altruism's 'dark' side, Jung (1941) comments that although self-interest, being omnipresent, does not need to be preached, "it should not be needlessly slandered; for when the individual does not prosper neither does the whole. And when he is driven to unnatural altruism, self-interest reappears in monstrous, inhuman form... for the instincts cannot be finally suppressed or eradicated" (p. 1355). Commenting elsewhere on the "monstrous, inhuman form" that the uncritical practice of altruism tends to engender, Jung (1955) notes (somewhat cynically) concerning public benefactors of 'spotless' reputation, that in very many instances the spouses of such people "would have a pretty tale to tell" (p. 307). In pointing to the weakness inherent in the idea of altruism and accordingly delineating productive love from the same, the point I wish to emphasise is that in espousing productive love I am not thereby prescribing or advocating 'do-goodism.' Again, and most importantly, self-love is central to a definition of productive love and is not conceived of as in competition with or an obstacle to loving others. As argued, the contradiction lies squarely with the contrary rationale.

I noted in the previous section that the desire for specificity in love is a legitimate human need, and not incompatible with a productive conception of love. However – as perhaps everyone implicitly knows – the desire for specificity in love potentially carries with it some very disagreeable baggage. In the previous section, I drew attention to Lawrence's observation: "People must love us because they love us – you can't *make* them." However, the converse is also true: "I must love another person because I love him/her – I can't *make myself* love another person." I clarify that I refer here to specific and particular connections and relationships. As argued, human love - as Fromm defines it – is mandatory if one is committed to and is to develop a productive orientation. However, to return to the potential shadow problems associated with the desire for specificity in love is what could be denoted as the head/tail problematic; that is, problems are potentially present when either our desire for relatedness with another person is unrequited, or the desire of another person for relatedness with us cannot be returned.

On the whole, there appears to be more sympathy for the individual whose desire for specific relatedness with another is unrequited: “*There’s nothing worse than unrequited love...*,” the song lyric goes.³¹⁴ However, the flip side of the coin - that is, being the recipient of affection we cannot return - has its difficult aspects also. This is particularly so if the other person, not able to secure his/her ends in a straightforward manner, resorts to manipulative means in an attempt to make us feel responsible for his/her happiness. In fact, in relation to this point it is worthy of comment how very unloving a person who purportedly would lay down his/her life for us can be if we do not or will not fit in with his/her expectations.³¹⁵ Sanford (1980), in discussing anima/animus projections, notes that while it can be flattering to be liked or pursued by another person (p. 14), if the other person does not stand on his/her own two feet or if s/he becomes possessive then the situation can become very uncomfortable. Employing, for example’s sake, a circumstance in which a woman is the object of a man’s anima projection, Sanford (1980) notes that:

The woman usually regrets the situation in time, however, as she experiences the disagreeable side of being the carrier of another person’s soul. She eventually will discover that the man begins to suffocate her. She may find that he resents it when she is not immediately and always available to him, and this gives an oppressive quality to their relationship.... So she may find herself living in his box, fenced in by his determination that she fulfill his projection for him, and she may discover that the shadow side of his seeming love for her is possessiveness and restrictiveness on his part that thwarts her own natural tendency to become an individual. (p. 14)

The only factor that can safeguard against the denoted ‘head/tail’ problematic is the stability of self as the factor upon which relationship is premised and made possible. As argued, the desire for specificity in love and relatedness – so central to romantic notions of love - is a legitimate component of human love and relatedness; with, however, the fundamental qualification that the desire for specificity is firmly and securely premised on the basis of respect for the freedom and boundaries of the other person. Ideally, love relations are free from the twin (fear derived) oppositions of possessiveness and control: The mark of mature love could perhaps be conceptualised as the ability to give without seeking to control

³¹⁴ Lyric from the song *Love to Love You*, by the Corrs.

³¹⁵ Soap operas, in particular, repeatedly stage the theme of unrequited love and the bad – indeed pathological - behaviour of the spurned party. On a personal note, I find these staged dramas particularly sad and think such plot enactments insensitive. From a psychological point of view, the individual who cannot tolerate his/her love being unreturned – and who subsequently resorts to very pathological behaviour - is usually a very wounded individual with very serious pre-Oedipal issues. Within soap operas, and to a just lesser degree within romantic fiction, such characters are the subject of ridicule and humiliation. One can only surmise that this translates into the ridicule and humiliation of people who in real life suffer from these problems. What I am trying to say is that popular entertainment makes fun of and light of problems which are serious, which a lot of people suffer from, and that this no doubt contributes to the evident general ignorance and intolerance with respect to matters of psychological import.

the recipient of one's love and the ability to receive without seeking to possess the one extending love. Again, this is only possible upon an individuated basis whereupon one has adopted an attitude of self-responsibility that enables one to remain open and vulnerable, yet simultaneously realistic and self-reliant. Until this point is arrived at, one is likely to feel and to experience periodic or continual betrayal. Stein (1973) notes that "we only experience love as a betrayer when we are dependent on another person to keep us connected to it. Your love will never betray me if I have a firm connection with my own love" (p. 124). Here, Stein raises the point I raised in Chapter Four that – in contradistinction to romantic conceptions – perhaps it is love itself that should be trusted and not this or that particular person. But if this is so, is love worthy of trust? Is there any morality associated with love?

In order to ascertain whether love could be said to have a morality and whether or not the phenomenon of love is dependable and trustworthy, there are perhaps two factors to consider. First, central to Fromm's discussion of love is his contention that love is a quality or character trait; an art one can learn and develop and, through application and practice, become increasingly skilled in and proficient at. Hence, as also noted by Stein (see quote above), love is dependable and trustworthy because it is a character trait that one develops oneself, and in this respect one is self-reliant and responsible and not other-reliant and dependent. However, surely this is only one factor in and of the equation; something seems to be missing. In complete contradiction to Fromm, Whitmont (1969) reflects on the phenomenon of love: "I do not attempt to say what that which we call love is or is not. The experience of love seems to me an experience that defies psychological analysis – it is neither an art to be learned nor an instinct to be defined. Like God, love is a *mysterium tremendum*, capable at best of a symbolic characterization" (p. 175). Though I intend to do so, I have not yet addressed the very important – indeed central – aspect of love's mystery. I think Whitmont is right; I think love does defy definition and that it is ultimately mystery. Love is better experienced than defined; better practiced than talked about. But just because no attempt to explain or understand the phenomenon of love will ever do it justice or capture the ultimate nature of the thing contemplated, it does not follow that no attempt at understanding should be embarked upon. Nor do I think that the fact of love's mystery discounts – as Fromm argues – that love is also an art. Fromm postulates love as learnable art; Whitmont as unknowable mystery. I think both positions can be accommodated; that love is both/and.

Again though, the question of love's morality? Taking the lead from the two different stance points Fromm and Whitmont respectively bring to bear upon the subject, in what

follows I examine the question of love's morality from both perspectives; that is, from the perspective of love as practice and also from the perspective of love as phenomenon in and of itself.

First the former premise: I have noted that Fromm regards love primarily as a faculty. However, as Fromm (1962a) contends, this is not the romantic or contemporary take on love: When it comes to matters of love and relatedness, romantic thoughts and desires gravitate about the orbit of an object; one's focus is on winning a love object, not upon developing a loving character or being a loving individual.

On the question of morality from the perspective of love as art: If love is a faculty and essentially emanates from one's commitment to and practice of love, it follows that love is moral and dependable to the extent that the individual him/herself is moral and dependable. There is much support for this view; that is, for the rationale that our experience of love and the quality of our relatedness primarily depend on our self and not on other people, nor on a phenomenon objective/external to and of oneself.³¹⁶ Ian Stevenson (1987), whose extensive body of research into the question of reincarnation I draw attention to in Chapter Six, notes that "there is a deep truth in a remark made by Friar Giles, one of St. Francis of Assisi's close companions: 'Everything that a man doeth, good or evil, he doeth it to himself' (p. 259). Sanford (1980), similarly pointing out that it is our own character and actions which determine our happiness and well-being, notes that: "We cannot try to find happiness... at someone else's expense without damaging our own souls in the process. In more metaphysical language, an attempt to find happiness at the expense of others develops a bad 'karma' within us, that is, it causes retribution from within" (p. 85). Fromm (1947), seconding Friar Giles' contention that "whatever you do to others, you also do to yourself" (p. 226), further elaborates upon the connection between one's actions and one's self well-being, noting that:

Even if a person seems to be destructive only of others, he violates the principle of life in himself as well as in others.... *'Do not do to others what you would not have them do to you'* is one of the most fundamental principles of ethics. But it is equally justifiable to state: *Whatever you do to others, you also do to yourself.* To violate the

³¹⁶ Perhaps the most well known expression of this idea is contained in the biblical maxim: "For whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" (Gal. 6:7). Huston Smith (as cited in Head & Cranston, 1977) notes that another way the West has put this same point is: "Sow a thought to reap an act, sow an act and reap a habit, sow a habit and reap a character, sow a character and reap a destiny" (p. 13). The idea of the causal connection between action and experience is also conveyed by what is generally referred to as the Golden Rule: 'Do unto others as you would have them do to you'. Fromm (1962a) discusses how a filtered down and distorted application of the golden rule is characteristic of the 'social character' typically produced or engendered by a capitalist socio-economic system of governance: "Fairness ethics lend themselves to confusion with the ethics of the Golden Rule [i.e., as quoted just above]... The maxim... can be interpreted as meaning 'be fair in your exchange with others.' But actually, it was formulated originally as a more popular version of the Biblical 'Love thy neighbour as thyself.'" (pp. 92-93).

forces directed toward life in any human being necessarily has repercussions on ourselves. Our own growth, happiness, and strength are based on the respect for these forces, and one cannot violate them in others and remain untouched oneself at the same time. The respect for life, that of others as well as one's own, is the concomitant of the process of life itself and a condition of psychic health. (pp. 226-227)

In all of these passages what is endorsed is self responsibility. The focus is not on how other people treat me, but on how I treat other people. The focus is not on being loved, but on being loving. Drawing again upon Stevenson's observations regarding this point, Stevenson (1987) notes of the Greek philosopher Pythagoras that he is said to have written to a friend: "You complain of being treated unjustly. Console yourself. Real unhappiness lies in acting unjustly" (p. 260). Of course, other people's unkind attitudes or actions hurt us and there is no use and no virtue in stoically denying this. But examining the question of love's morality from the perspective of 'love as practice' it would appear that ultimately it is our own attitudes and actions which are the major determinants that impact on our happiness and fate.

Now the trickier task of contemplating love's morality in relation to Whitmont's inference that love is a phenomenon in and of itself. In order to examine this question, I will draw upon the biblical account of King David's affair with Bathsheba. As noted, Whitmont (1969) posits love "capable at best of a symbolic characterization" (p. 175). It follows that an examination of the question of whether the phenomenon of love in and of itself is dependable and trustworthy can only be approached symbolically also.

The main threads of the storyline of King David's involvement with Bathsheba run thus: King David observes from the rooftop of his palace a beautiful woman bathing. He is so taken by her beauty that he enquires who she is. Even though Bathsheba is married, David sends for her and sleeps with her. Bathsheba becomes pregnant and sends word to David. David then hatches an elaborate cover up plan. He sends for Uriah, Bathsheba's husband, who is on the battlefield, and under the pretence of enquiring how the battle is going, gives Uriah the opportunity of returning to his house and wife. If Uriah engages in sexual relations with Bathsheba, David and Bathsheba's adultery can go undetected; it will look as though the child is his.

However, Uriah refuses David's offer to return to his home and instead sleeps outside with David's servants in readiness to return to battle. When David enquires why, Uriah replies: "...*the servants of my lord, are encamped in the open fields; shall I then...eat and drink, and... lie with my wife? as thou livest... I will not do this thing*" (2 Sam. 11:11). David again urges Uriah to return to his home, trying to overcome his resistance by getting him

drunk. But again Uriah refuses. David's benign attempt at cover up having failed, he has Uriah sent to a dangerous battle zone where it is certain he will be killed. After Bathsheba has mourned her husband, "David sent and fetched her to his house, and she became his wife, and bare him a son" (2 Sam. 11:27).

The biblical drama has all the potential makings of a block buster movie: lust, the abuse of power, deception, betrayal and murder. However, for the elucidation of the point under discussion, it is what happens next which is significant.

After David takes Bathsheba as his wife, the very next line of the biblical account reads: "But the thing David did displeased the Lord" (2 Sam. 11:27). From a Jungian perspective, the statement that David's actions displeased the Lord could be read or interpreted to symbolise that David's actions set in motion a series of events that procured a reaction from the self or the unconscious. The 'Lord' sends the prophet Nathan, who tells David a story. Or symbolically interpreted: Unconscious activity in reaction and compensatory to the one-sidedness of the ego or conscious attitude results in a significant dream. Nathan's 'prophetic' story runs as follows:

There were two men in one city; the one rich, and the other poor. The rich man had exceeding many flocks and herds, but the poor man had nothing, save one little ewe lamb.... And there came a traveler unto the rich man, and he spared to take of his own flock and of his own herd, to dress for the wayfaring man that was come unto him; but took the poor man's lamb, and dressed it for the man that was come to him. (2 Sam. 1:1-4)

When David hears this story, he is indignant: "*And he said to Nathan... the man that hath done this thing shall surely die*" (2 Sam. 12:5). Nathan replies: "*Thou art the man*" (2 Sam. 12:7). The prophetic story is not a literal event, as David initially takes it to be, but a statement of David's actions in symbolic form. When Nathan unexpectedly and shockingly pronounces: "*Thou art the man!*," David does not argue. In an instant he knows. Everything is suddenly and hauntingly crystal clear.

In the previous chapter, I posited that the process of individuation may result in monogamy being understood in more symbolic terms and that this potentially increases the individual's capacity to experience intimacy. Hence, from the perspective of my argument it could be construed that David – at least as far as concerns his adultery – has essentially done nothing wrong. Why should he not act upon impulse and take every opportunity that presents itself? After all, you only live once! However, I have qualified my argument by clarifying that the freer expression of intimacy I am arguing for is only possible upon the basis of the individuating self. Until this point is arrived at the individual has no basis or premise from

which to conduct his/her relationships with integrity; that is, s/he will hurt others. From the perspective of this critique and of the symbolic interpretation I am proffering, David's crimes centre upon the fundamental issue of his basic inhumanity.

In conclusion on this point, my aim was to examine whether 'love' both from the perspective of love as art and love as phenomenon is trustworthy and dependable. Is there any moral element to love? From the perspective of love as art it has been proposed that whether or not love is dependable is based upon one's own actions. However, based upon the biblical account of King David and Bathsheba, practicing love does not automatically protect one from being hurt or betrayed. What defence then does the individual have? Is Whitmont right? Is love more than just art but also something in and of itself? Based upon a symbolic reading of the account of King David's affair there appears justification for this view. David fails to practice love and as a result he wreaks havoc in other people's lives. However, from an unconscious source there issues vengeance for Uriah's betrayal. Jung (1953) points to the relational implications of increased self-knowledge effected by engagement with the unconscious, noting that "if men can be educated to see the shadow-side of their nature clearly, it may be hoped that they will also learn to understand and love their fellow men better. A little less hypocrisy and a little more self-knowledge can only have good results in respect for our neighbour" (p. 28). And further:

Treatment by dream-analysis is an eminently educational activity, whose basic principles and conclusions would be of the greatest assistance in curing the evils of our time. What a blessing it would be... if even a small percentage of the population could be acquainted with the fact that it simply does not pay to accuse others of the faults from which one suffers most of all oneself! (1946a, p. 192)

I began this chapter by referring to the argument between Da Vinci and Henry and to Da Vinci's reproach of Henry: "A life without love is no life at all." But what is love? In this chapter I have examined various facets of productive love and relatedness and have argued that productive love is possible only upon the basis of self-respect and self-love. This follows the line of argument I made in Chapter One in which I posited respect for the individual and love to be one and the same thing and in which I argued that where there is respect for the individual there will also be love and vice versa. In Chapter Six, I briefly draw attention to investigations concerned with examining whether there is any empirical substantiation for the notion that consciousness survives death and particularly for the notion of reincarnation and make a link between this research and the romantic idea of 'fate.'

CHAPTER SIX

Other people are established inalienably in my memories only if their names were entered in the scrolls of my destiny from the beginning, so that encountering them was at the same time a kind of recollection.

Jung, 1963a, p. 18.

While it would be possible to relay a number of ways in which my engagement with Fromm and Jung's work and related reading has influenced me personally, I consider that by far the most significant shift in my thinking – which centres around the question of whether or not the soul is immortal³¹⁷ - has occurred very recently, in the latter stages of my writing. In particular, my interest in the subject of immortality has centred around the question of whether or not there is any substantiation for the notion of reincarnation; interestingly, an idea or belief regarded historically and contemporaneously by many as fact.³¹⁸ As noted in the Introduction, given that Jung (1963a) writes in his autobiography that underlying all his works are “attempts, ever renewed, to give an answer to the question of the interplay between the ‘here’ and the ‘hereafter’” (p. 278) it is perhaps to be expected that this stated latent inner groping of his would influence anyone engaging with his writing for any length of time. Moreover, on the question of immortality, it would appear that reincarnation was the mode of soul or consciousness continuance Jung considered most likely and most favoured; toward the end of his life at least.³¹⁹ Jung (1963a) writes that:

³¹⁷ Jess Stearn (1984) defines the soul as “the intangible psychical and spiritual essence of the Universe and the individual, the animating and actuating foundation of life” (p. 2). The idea of ‘soul’ is perhaps the oldest conceptualisation of what Jung refers to as the self. Astronomer and Physicist Gustaf Stromberg (1882-1962) described the soul as that “which gives unity to the mental complex of a man” (as cited in Head & Cranston, 1977, p. 421). Stromberg notes “that such a unity should be recognized and given a name was felt very early in the history of mankind” (p. 421).

³¹⁸ Ian Stevenson (1987), whose case investigations of the “reincarnation type” - as he refers to them - I will refer to shortly, notes that “nearly everyone outside the range of orthodox Christianity, Judaism, Islam, and Science – the last being a secular religion for many persons – believes in reincarnation” (p. 26). Head and Cranston (1977), in their comprehensive anthology on the subject, refer to the reincarnation renaissance – stimulated in part by theosophical thinking – occurring in intellectual circles in the West from the late nineteenth century onwards. I will cite later in this section statistics which suggest that belief in reincarnation is well and alive in the West today.

³¹⁹ Concerning his reflections upon and interest in the idea of reincarnation, Jung (1963a) notes that “the question of karma is obscure to me, as is also the problem of personal rebirth or of the transmigration of souls. ‘With a free and open mind’ I listen attentively to the Indian doctrine of rebirth, and look around in the world of my own experience to see whether somewhere and somehow there is some authentic sign pointing towards reincarnation. Naturally, I do not count the relatively numerous testimonies, here in the West, to the belief in reincarnation. A belief proves to me only the phenomenon of belief, not the content of the belief. This I must see revealed empirically in order to accept it. Until a few years ago I could not discover anything convincing in this respect, although I kept a sharp lookout for any such signs. Recently, however, I observed in myself a series of dreams which would seem to describe the process of reincarnation in a deceased person of my acquaintance. But I have never come across any such dreams in other persons, and therefore have no basis for comparison. Since

I could well imagine that I might have lived in former centuries and there encountered questions I was not yet able to answer; that I had to be born again because I had not fulfilled the task that was given to me. When I die, my deeds will follow along with me – that is how I imagine it. I will bring with me what I have done. In the meantime it is important to ensure that I do not stand at the end with empty hands. (p. 294)

Besides the influence that engaging with Jung's work has undoubtedly had on my thinking, my interest in the question of reincarnation was precipitated by an intuitive experience. Therefore, before looking at what is currently known on the question of reincarnation and then explaining its relevance within the wider discussion of this critique, it is perhaps of benefit to preliminarily preface the following discussion with a short defence of intuition as a valid mode of knowing.

In terms of the various modes of acquiring knowledge, perhaps particularly problematic to the conventional mindset is “knowing” claiming intuition as its source or premise. Jung (1939) refers to intuition as “perception via the unconscious” (p. 504), and in his definition of this function type notes that “intuitive knowledge possesses an intrinsic certainty and conviction, which enabled Spinoza (and Bergson) to uphold the *scientia intuitiva* as the highest form of knowledge” (1923, p. 770). Given these two defining characteristics of intuition - that is, that intuitive thoughts or ideas are conveyed spontaneously via the unconscious and that intuitive knowledge is accompanied by a sense of certainty - prejudice against giving intuition a place alongside other modes or functions of knowing is certainly understandable. To give intuition a place – it appears – is to endorse as legitimate the kind of fanaticism and bigotry that any thoughtful observer of human affairs rightly views as sickening and as a matter of grave concern. For example, self-appointed prophets legitimate lording it over others on the premise that they are the bearers of special knowledge or ‘truth’ revealed to them by a higher source and moreover on the premise that they are thereby infallibly *right!* Obviously a fine line exists between intuition and deception. However, I think that the distinction resides mainly in one's understanding and application of what is intuitively perceived. I wish to point out that there is a great deal of difference between knowing something with certainty and dogmatically demanding that others subscribe to and adopt – on the basis of faith or forced submission – one's *right* point of view. While the latter

this observation is subjective and unique, I prefer only to mention its existence and not to go into it further. I must confess, however, that after this experience I view the problem of reincarnation with somewhat different eyes, though without being in a position to assert a definite opinion” (p. 295). Roger Woolger (1990) writes that Jung wrote more extensively about reincarnation in his autobiography but that pressure was put on Jung both by his family and his editors “to tone down the specific reincarnational content” (see pp. 343-349 for further discussion of this point).

is most definitely harmful, the former may merely act as the impetus or motivation to thoroughly search out and investigate the thing intuitively perceived. Hence one's intuition may contribute to an increase in understanding in that it provides the direction and passion to investigate a problem one might otherwise have missed or been reluctant to explore.³²⁰ Moreover, it would appear that intuition has been much more active and much more the precipitator of scientific and intellectual advance than this 'inferior' function has heretofore been given credit for.³²¹ Concerning the source of creative endeavour, Jung (1934a) asks questions: "Why do we always forget that there is nothing majestic or beautiful in the wide domain of human culture that did not grow originally from a lucky idea? What would become of mankind if nobody had lucky ideas any more?... We never appreciate how dependent we are on lucky ideas – until we find to our distress that they will not come" (p. 305).

Despite the very real threat of claims to intuitive knowledge being used for abusive ends,³²² there seems little question that this function type exists and moreover that it is a legitimate and fruitful means of advancing human understanding, particularly in terms of shedding light on areas of knowledge conventional science or intellectual endeavour is not equipped to address and tends to shy away from. Elaborating on the dynamics of intuition or intuitive knowing, Jung (1963a) refers to the experience of "inner prompting" (p. 282), and of the way the unconscious has of "informing us of things which by all logic we could not possibly know" (p. 281). Roger Woolger (1990) refers to the "profound sense of 'yes, this is how it is'" experienced by many people, particularly in relation to ultimate concerns such as the question of the soul and the soul's immortality (p. 332). Illustrative of the certainty characteristic of intuitively apperceived knowledge, Jung – when asked by an interviewer whether or not he believed in God - replied that he did not *believe* God exists; "I *know* that He

³²⁰ Brain Weiss (1992) makes this point, noting that "understanding does not always begin with reading accounts of studies in libraries. It can also come from exploring one's own experience. Intuition can lead one to intellect" (p. 42).

³²¹ Jung (1964) notes that "...many artists, philosophers, and even scientists owe some of their best ideas to inspirations that appear suddenly from the unconscious... We can find clear proof of this fact in the history of science itself. For example, the French mathematician Poincare and the chemist Kekule owed important scientific discoveries (as they themselves admit) to sudden pictorial 'revelations' from the unconscious. The so-called 'mystical' experience of the French philosopher Descartes involved a similar sudden revelation in which he saw in a flash the 'order of all sciences'. The British author, Robert Louis Stevenson, had spent years looking for a story that would fit his 'strong sense of man's double being', when the plot of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* was suddenly revealed to him in a dream" (p. 38). Jung (1953) also draws attention to the creator of the idea of the conservation of energy, Robert Mayer, whose discovery was arrived at intuitively. Concerning Mayer, Jung (1953) notes that "in his book on energetics, Helm expresses the view that 'Robert Mayer's new idea did not detach itself gradually from the traditional concepts of energy by deeper reflection on them, but belongs to those intuitively apprehended ideas, which, arising in other realms of a spiritual nature, as it were, take possession of the mind and compel it to reshape the traditional conceptions in their own likeness" (p. 107).

³²² As noted below, I think this threat only manifests if intuitive knowledge is thought of as superior to other modes of knowing, rather than used in conjunction with reason and logic, which is what I am arguing for.

exists” (1977, p. 251).³²³ In the context of talking about religious experiences – which could also be viewed as intuitive or revelatory experiences – Jung (1957) notes that anyone who has had such an experience is “*seized* by it and therefore not in a position to indulge in fruitless metaphysical or epistemological speculations. Absolute certainty brings its own evidence” (p. 566). Also making the claim that it is possible to know something based on the premise that it is ‘intuitively right,’ J. Paul Williams – on the question of whether or not the soul exists - notes that:

There are two ways to prove a thing. One is to show how it follows logically from other things that [are true]. The other is just to point and say, ‘There it is.’ I am among those who feel that they must believe in souls simply because they experience them. It may be that my family, the students I meet on the campus, are just bodies, machines, not essentially different from the images I see on a movie screen. But I find that a very hard position to accept. It is much easier to account for one’s experience of people and for one’s knowledge of himself on the assumption that the essential human being is more than just a physio-chemical reaction. Is man a living soul? For answer observe people: watch a group of boys playing football; read Shakespeare; look into the eyes of one beloved.... It may be that this human carcass, full of aches and diseases, produces things like ‘Hamlet,’ the theory of evolution, psychoanalysis, and the fortieth chapter of Isaiah, but it is a great deal easier for me to believe that these things are the work of living souls who used bodies as instruments. (as cited in Head & Cranston, 1977, pp. 5-6)

In drawing attention to intuition as a mode of knowing and in making a case for the legitimacy of knowledge arrived at intuitively,³²⁴ I am not arguing that anyone base his/her understanding on intuitively acquired insight alone, only that intuition has an important role alongside and in conjunction with more conventional modes of knowing. Danger arises only from one-sidedness. Jung (1977) makes this point regarding over reliance on logic (p. 420).

³²³ Concerning the distinction between Jung’s tenor in his scientific endeavours and his more personal writings, Aniela Jaffe (as cited in Jung, 1963a) notes that “In his scientific works Jung seldom speaks of God; there he is at pains to use the term ‘the God-image in the human psyche.’ This is no contradiction. In the one case his language is subjective, based upon inner experience; in the other it is the objective language of scientific inquiry. In the first case he is speaking as an individual, whose thoughts are influenced by passionate, powerful feelings, intuitions, and experiences of a long and unusually rich life; in the second, he is speaking as the scientist who consciously restricts himself to what may be demonstrated and supported by evidence. As a scientist, Jung is an empiricist. When Jung speaks of his religious experiences in his book, he is assuming that his readers are willing to enter into his point of view. His subjective statements will be acceptable only to those who have had similar experiences – or, to put it another way, to those in whose psyche the God-image bears the same or similar features” (pp. 14-15).

³²⁴ Emphasising that by referring to intuition or intuitively arrived at knowledge one is referring to something concrete and not something abstract, Jung (1940) notes that “my psychological experience has shown time and again that certain contents issue from a psyche that is more complete than consciousness. They often contain a superior analysis or insight or knowledge which consciousness has not been able to produce. We have a suitable word for such occurrences – intuition. In uttering this word most people have an agreeable feeling, as if something had been settled. But they never consider that you do not *make* an intuition. On the contrary, it always comes to you; you *have* a hunch, it has come of itself, and you only catch it if you are clever or quick enough” (p. 69).

Emphasising that intuition does not negate intellectual knowing, but rather complements it, Raymond Moody (2001) notes of Plato that:

Plato believed strongly in the use of reason, logic, and argument in the attainment of truth and wisdom, but only up to a point, for in addition he was a great visionary who suggested that ultimately truth can only come to one in an almost mystical experience of enlightenment and insight. He accepted that there were planes and dimensions of reality other than the sensible, physical world and believed that the physical realm could be understood only by reference to these other, 'higher' planes of reality. Accordingly, he was interested mainly in the incorporeal, conscious component of man – the soul – and saw the physical body only as the temporary vehicle of the soul. (p. 109)

Having given a brief defence of intuition as a valid mode of knowing, and before drawing a connection between the implications of reincarnation – if it occurs – and the wider discussion of this thesis, I will now turn to a discussion of what evidence there is from an intellectual or empirical viewpoint for the idea that there is more to who we are and our life than meets the eye.

The foremost researcher employing scientific criteria to investigate “‘cases suggestive of reincarnation’ or ‘cases of the reincarnation type’” (Stevenson, 1983, p. 742) – as they are referred to³²⁵ – is Ian Stevenson of the University of Virginia.³²⁶ Stevenson (2000), whose research centres primarily on investigating the spontaneous memories and statements of very young children who claim to have lived before, notes that occasional reports of children claiming to remember previous lives began appearing in books and magazines from the late nineteenth century onwards.³²⁷ In 1960, Stevenson published an analysis of 44 of these cases,

³²⁵ Stevenson (1983) clarifies that “these phrases describe what the cases appear to be without commitment to any interpretation of them” (p. 742n). Hence these cases are so referred to because this is what they seem to *suggest*, not what they are purported to *prove*.

³²⁶ I refer to Stevenson’s research as being current as while Stevenson, now in his 80s, formerly retired from his academic post in 2002, he is still closely associated with the University of Virginia’s Department of Psychiatric medicine and is still writing and publishing on the subject of reincarnation cases (see Tucker, 2005, pp. 17-22). Stevenson has held a number of academic posts since 1949. He has been part of the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Virginia since 1957 where he was first appointed Professor and Chairman and also Psychiatrist in Chief at the University of Virginia hospital. The Division of Perceptual Studies unit (formerly the Division of Personality Studies) – where the main foci of his research has centred - currently consists of nine staff members investigating various aspects of paranormal phenomena including near-death experiences, out-of-body experiences, apparitions and after-death communications and deathbed visions. Along with Stevenson, also investigating cases of the reincarnation type are Jim Tucker (Assistant Professor of Psychiatric medicine) and Lori Derr (M. Ed., Research specialist). Among other researchers who have published cases suggestive of reincarnation are Satwant Pasricha, a psychologist in India, Erlendur Haraldsson, a psychologist at the University of Iceland, anthropologist Antonio Mills, and Jurgen Keil, a psychologist at the University of Tasmania (Tucker, 2005, p. 21; see details of these publications in Stevenson, 2000, p. 658).

³²⁷ Such accounts are now widely available in numerous publications. Jung (1977) refers to one such case he came across when in India. A doctor gave him “a whole dossier about a child of four, a little girl who remembered her previous life” (p. 382). The child knew what her name had been, where she had lived, her husband’s name and the name of her children. Upon the little girl’s insistence, her father finally took her to the

and, finding “evidence in some cases persuasive of a paranormal process, by which I mean that a child had shown knowledge about the life of a deceased person unknown to its family, which knowledge it seemed not to have obtained by normal means of communication” (2000, p. 652), proposed that research on the subject be undertaken. Stevenson subsequently undertook this research himself. Stevenson (2000), who gives due consideration to and thoroughly reviews alternative explanations (both normal and paranormal)³²⁸ that could account for the phenomenon of children claiming to have lived before, notes that “the investigation of these cases has progressed to the point where the hypothesis of previous lives offers at least a plausible interpretation of many cases, and for some it seems to be the strongest one” (p. 653).

To date Stevenson and his colleagues have investigated over 2,500 cases of the reincarnation type (CORT) (1990, p. 244) from “south and southeast Asia, western Asia, west Africa, Brazil, and northwest North America” (2000, p. 652), as well as “Western Europe and North America” (1990, p. 245). A number of these cases have been published as detailed case studies/reports.³²⁹ Stevenson (1983) notes that while the cases display some culturally specific features, overall they share several characteristic features in common.³³⁰ Including the more particular and individually related statements the child subjects investigated make, usual or typical statements include: “‘You are not my mother/father’ or ‘I have another

city she said she had lived, a city distant from their home, and being led by the little girl to the house she had lived in, found everything as he had told her (p. 382). In 2005, ABC 20/20 ran the story of James Leininger, a six-year-old American boy who remembered the life of a Navy fighter pilot killed in combat in the 1940s (“Could Little Boy be Proof,” 2005). For further such accounts see Head & Cranston, 1977, pp. 395-416.

³²⁸ Other normal explanations for the observed phenomenon of spontaneous past life memories and statements that have been considered are fraud, fantasy, faulty memory by informants, and genetic memory (this last straddling the normal/paranormal divide). Alternative paranormal explanations considered are telepathy, clairvoyance, superpsi and possession (see Stevenson, 1987; Tucker, 2005, pp. 30-51). However, concerning the various alternative explanations, Tucker (2005) notes that “even if one does accept the possibility of telepathy, clairvoyance, or superpsi, the ESP explanation, like many of those in the normal group, can only account for part of a case” (p. 45).

³²⁹ I have listed in the reference section only the material I have personally cited. A complete list of Stevenson’s publications can be viewed on the University of Virginia web page. Some of the earlier detailed studies are no longer in print, but can be obtained directly from the Division of Perceptual studies unit.

³³⁰ For example, in the main American cases closely resemble Indian ones. Similarities include “the age of the child’s first speaking about the previous life; a high incidence of violent death in the previous life...; the average number of statements made; and unusual behaviour on the part of the child corresponding to the statements about apparent memories” (Stevenson, 1983, p. 745). One feature that varies widely between cultures is the claim “to remember a life as a person of the opposite sex” (Stevenson, 2000, p. 653). Regarding the features of cases which appear to be culture bound, Stevenson (1983) notes that “the differences can often be related to other features of the cultures in which the cases developed. For example, in some cultures, certain features of the cases seem to reflect the different roles of men and women in these cultures. Some features of the cases seem to vary according to the beliefs about reincarnation held by different groups of people.... The cases of the various cultures reflect, to some extent, the variations in the beliefs about reincarnation. We cannot yet explain these correlations. Two interpretations are obvious: first, the beliefs may influence the development of the cases; and second, if reincarnation occurs, the beliefs may influence what actually happens from one life to another. But there may be other explanations also” (p. 743).

mother/father'; 'This is not my home'; 'When I was big/older/a daddy'; 'I have a wife/husband/children'; 'I died...(in a car accident/after I fell, etc.)'" ("Types of experiences," 2006). Along with such statements, "many of the children show behaviours that seem related to the previous life, such as phobias related to the mode of death or repetitious play mimicking the previous personality's occupation" (Sharma & Tucker, 2005, p. 102).³³¹ In relation to these cases Stevenson (1993) also studies birthmarks and birth defects and their correspondence to wounds on deceased persons.³³² Furnishing a brief description of the features of a typical case, Stevenson (1983) notes that:

In a typical case, the child begins, soon after he first speaks coherently, to say that he remembers a life in another family. (The mean age for this event is 37 months.) He states various details, often giving proper names of persons and places figuring in the life apparently remembered. In most cases he describes the mode of death in that life. The child usually continues to make statements about the previous life until he is about 6 or 7 years old and then gradually ceases to refer to it. Most children of this type have completely forgotten about these apparent memories by the time they are 8 to 10 years old. (p. 742)³³³

Regarding the method of investigation along with the success of researchers in locating the 'previous personality' the child seems to be referring to,³³⁴ Stevenson (2000) notes that:

The principal method of investigation is interviews, often repeated, with firsthand informants for both the child's side of the case and that of the concerned deceased

³³¹ Stevenson (1990) notes that their findings suggest that a child is much more likely to recall a previous life if s/he died violently in that life (p. 245). In a paper specifically pointing to the relation between phobias and the statements children make, Stevenson notes that "in numerous instances the child has manifested the phobia before it has spoken about the previous life from which the phobia seemed to derive" (p. 248). Furnishing an example of this, Stevenson (1990) notes that "one baby of Sri Lanka struggled so much against being bathed that it took three adults to hold her down for this. Also, before she could speak she had manifested (at the age of 6 months) a marked phobia of buses and cried when transported in one. The life she later described was that of a young girl (of another village) who had been walking on a narrow road that crossed flooded paddy fields. A bus had come along, and this girl, stepping back to avoid it, had fallen into the flood water and drowned..." (p. 248). Along with phobias, other behavioural traits children show "that is unusual in their family but that accords with what can be known or reasonably conjectured about the deceased person of whom the child is speaking" (p. 245) include specific "aversions, phobias, untaught skills... and strong attachment to the family of the deceased person" (p. 245).

³³² Stevenson (1993) notes that "about 35% of children who claim to remember previous lives have birthmarks and/or birth defects that they (or adult informants) attribute to wounds on a person whose life the child remembers.... In cases in which a deceased person was identified the details of whose life unmistakably matched the child's statements, a close correspondence was nearly always found between the birthmarks and/or birth defects on the child and the wounds on the deceased person. In 43 of 49 cases in which a medical document (usually a post-mortem report) was obtained, it confirmed the correspondence between wounds and birthmarks (or birth defects)..."

³³³ Regarding the point that children of this type usually forget such memories and statements by late childhood: Professor J. G. Pratt (as cited in Head & Cranston, 1977) notes that a friend of his was told "that when she was about three she frequently made such comments as, 'When I was old – when I was eighty, before I was born...' She had no recollection of this, and since her mildly puzzled parents never pressed their little girl for an explanation, whatever memories she may have had were never explored" (p. 436).

³³⁴ Stevenson (2003) notes "we use the term *previous personality* for the deceased person – actual or presumed – to whom the subject's statements refer" (p. 3).

person, if one has been identified. We emphasize independent verification of the child's statements. Written documents, such as postmortem reports, are always sought, examined and copied when feasible.

In the majority of cases (67% in a series of 856 cases) a person has been identified, the facts of whose life and death correctly corresponded to the child's statements. Such cases are considered 'solved', and the others (33% in the same series) are said to be 'unsolved'. In a small number of cases adults have identified a child as a deceased person reborn, usually on the basis of birthmarks and dreams, even though the child has never made statements about a previous life. Such 'silent cases' may comprise 5-10% of all cases. (pp. 652-653)

Stevenson points to the markedly differing cultural attitudes to his research: "In the West people say, 'Why are you spending money to study reincarnation when we know it's impossible?' In the East they say, 'Why are you spending money to study reincarnation when we know it's a fact?'" (as cited in Shroder, 1999, p. 140).³³⁵ Apart from resistance to investigating phenomena suggestive of reincarnation on the basis that it is a preposterous notion to begin with and therefore not worthy of empirical investigation, perhaps the primary contention most Westerners have with taking such research seriously is that the bulk of the cases currently on file centre on investigations carried out in Asian or West African countries. Tom Shroder, an editor at the Washington Post, who, in 1997, accompanied Stevenson on field trips to India and Lebanon, notes that when - upon his return - he spoke with friends/acquaintances of his first-hand observations of Stevenson's investigations, the question he was most frequently asked was: "Why aren't there any cases *here*?" (1999, p. 216). In fact, along with including European cases in previous papers, Stevenson published a paper in 1983 in which he analysed 79 American CORT³³⁶ and one of his more recent books focuses entirely on European subjects.³³⁷ To return to the question asked of Shroder: "Why aren't there any cases *here*?" Shroder (1999) notes that although this was the question he was most often asked, a surprising number of people also began to recount stories similar to the cases Stevenson investigates. One of the most significant of these was told to Shroder by a co-

³³⁵ It should be noted that persons from cultures in which reincarnation is accepted or believed as fact are often just as resistant to a child's statements of a previous life and just as likely to suppress children from talking about such memories as persons or parents from cultures within which reincarnation is not regarded as a possibility. Parents of children who make such statements who do not believe that reincarnation is possible may suppress a child from talking about his/her memories because they are "nonsense"; however, parents who do accept reincarnation may also suppress the talk of previous lives due to superstitious beliefs; for example, the superstition that those who remember a previous life will have bad luck or will die at an early age (Head & Cranston, 1977, pp. 436-437).

³³⁶ *American Children Who Claim to Remember Previous Lives* (1983).

³³⁷ *European Cases of the Reincarnation Type* (2003). Tucker (2005) notes that "dozens of... American cases exist, many of which involve parents who had never given reincarnation a second thought before their children started talking" (pp. 50-51).

editor.³³⁸ In Shroder's book *Old Souls: The Scientific Evidence for Past Lives* (1999), which he wrote subsequent to his field trips with Stevenson, Shroder notes that despite the differing circumstances in each case investigated, their "basic sameness... thud home" (p. 131). "The certainty with which a child, in his first words, insisted: I am not Bashir or Suzanne or Daniel; you are not my parents; this is not my home" (p. 131). The story told Shroder by his work colleague conformed to this familiar pattern. Reflecting on this, Shroder (1999) notes that "it certainly began to answer the question, 'Why aren't there any cases here?' There *are*. If I just came across these by chatting with people I know, what would a systematic search turn up?" (p. 218). My own experience has been similar. Over the past months I have spoken to only a handful of people on the subject of reincarnation, yet – similarly to Shroder's experience - two of these people recounted incidents very similar to the ones Stevenson reports.³³⁹

³³⁸ Due to the fact that this material is perhaps unfamiliar to readers, I will include in full Shroder's (1999) account of the story or incident. Shroder recounts that "I was telling these stories to my friend Gene Weingarten, a *Washington Post* writer and editor and one of the most sceptical individuals I have ever known.... Gene let me finish. Then he said, 'You remember that story about Arlene's brother, right?'"

Arlene, Gene's wife, had been raised in Connecticut, the daughter of multigenerational Northeasterners. However, as soon as her younger brother, Jim, could speak, he would say, 'I was born in Dixie.'

No, his parents would correct him, you were born in Bridgeport, Connecticut. But Jim would insist: 'I was born in Dixie.'

'It wasn't just that he kept saying it,' Arlene told me when I asked her about it. 'It was that word – *Dixie*. We didn't know anybody who used that word. Who would use that word in Connecticut in the 1960s?'

I asked her whether she or her parents ever thought that it might have anything to do with a previous-life memory.

'Are you kidding?' she said. 'We just figured it was more evidence he was a weird kid.'

Then the family took their first road trip south, to Florida.

Arlene only had a foggy memory of the trip, but thought that her mother would probably remember it clearly. I called her mom, Phyllis Reidy, who now lives just up the Florida coast from Miami.

'I remember we had a real load – my husband, my mother-in-law, the two kids, and myself.... Arlene was nine and Jim was six. One of the first things Jim had ever said was, 'I'm from Dixie.' He said it all the time. And he spoke oddly, too. We always said it sounded like he had some kind of accent. We used to ask him if he was from Boston, and he said, 'No, I'm from Dixie.'

'We may have said something like, 'What do you mean you're from Dixie?' But it never really went any further than that. We didn't question kids in those days.

'Then, when we drove into the South, he got all excited, started talking a mile a minute about how his grandmother... came from Dixie and his mother and father did, too, and I said, 'We're your mother and father,' and he said, 'No, you're not,' just flatly, like that...." (pp. 216-217).

³³⁹ I did not ask either of these two people if I could recount details of the experiences they referred to here. It was a privilege that they told me of the incidents in the first place and I consider it would have been a breach of trust to have asked to refer to them here. One of the individuals was a Christian who did not believe in reincarnation. The other individual is highly educated and in professional employment. He was open to the idea of reincarnation but did not have any particular views on the subject. Besides these two people, another person told me that she had a friend who had had a stroke and who at the same time recalled a previous life he was convinced he had lived. Although spontaneous recall in adults does not seem as common as spontaneous recall in childhood, Stevenson does refer to at least one case of adult recollection (2003, pp. 32-42) and also writes about this in a more general sense as one of the types of evidence for reincarnation (1987, pp. 53-54). Given that I have spoken to only a handful of people on the subject and was not specifically looking for confirmatory information but just came by it, the number of people who have recounted incidents seems remarkably high.

Along with those endeavouring to investigate reincarnation via conventional means – or as conventional as the study of a paranormal phenomenon will allow³⁴⁰ – another area or field within which the question of whether or not reincarnation occurs has come to the fore is within the sphere of psychotherapeutic practice. A growing number of psychiatrists and therapists are employing what is known as ‘past life regression therapy,’ and there is now a substantial body of literature containing ample specific case reviews on the subject (see e.g., Fiore, 1978; Whitton & Fisher, 1986; Weiss, 1992, 1996; Woolger, 1990). The majority of practitioners utilising regression therapy emphasise that they stumbled, as it were, upon reincarnation as a result of experiences with clients; that initially it was something neither they nor their clients invited or were seeking, and that they are only gradually coming to terms with the idea.³⁴¹ Psychologist Edith Fiore (1978) expresses a sentiment which is echoed by many others employing past life regression therapy: “At this point I am neither a staunch believer nor nonbeliever in reincarnation. However, each day as I watch more and more patients and subjects explore past lives, I find myself increasingly convinced that these are not mere fantasies” (p. 2; see also Weiss, 1988, p. 4; Woolger, 1990, p. 33). What seems the pivotal factor for therapeutic practitioners is that past-life therapy purportedly *works* (Woolger, 1990, p. 88),³⁴² and many therefore tend to view the theoretical question of reincarnation in and of

³⁴⁰ Tucker (2005) qualifies regarding this research that “these cases are not about ‘proof,’ they are about evidence. Since this work has taken place in the messy real world rather than a tightly controlled laboratory, proof is not possible. This is often the case in science and medicine. For example, many medications are judged to be helpful, because evidence indicates that they work even though they have not been absolutely proven to do so. Our work also involves an area, the possibility of life after death, that does not easily lend itself to being researched. Some people even say that researchers should not try to study the subject of life after death scientifically since it is so far removed from usual empirical areas of investigation. Nevertheless, there is no bigger question in the world than whether we can survive death, and researchers have attempted to collect the best evidence possible to answer it” (pp. 6-7).

³⁴¹ For example, Psychiatrist Brian Weiss, who has now written a number of books on the subject of past life regression therapy containing numerous case reports, was first confronted with the idea of reincarnation – which he initially resisted – when, while under hypnosis, one of his patients regressed to a previous life. Neither he nor his patient had any particular knowledge of, belief in, or interest in reincarnation. Concerning this experience, Weiss (1988) recounts: “For eighteen months I used conventional methods of therapy to help her [his patient] overcome her symptoms. When nothing seemed to work, I tried hypnosis. In a series of trance states, Catherine recalled ‘past-life’ memories that proved to be the causative factors of her symptoms. ... In just a few short months, her symptoms disappeared, and she resumed her life, happier and more at peace than ever before” (p. 4). Concerning his previous scepticism, Weiss (1988) notes that “years of disciplined study had trained me to think as a scientist and physician, moulding me along the narrow paths of conservatism in my profession. I distrusted anything that could not be proved by traditional scientific methods. I was aware of some of the studies in parapsychology that were being conducted at major universities across the country, but they did not hold my attention. It all seemed too far-fetched to me” (p. 4).

³⁴² Woolger (1990) notes that “more and more hypnotists and psychotherapists – doctors Joe Keeton, Morris Netherton, Edith Fiore, to name the better known – have published their accounts of therapeutic past life regression and their strong belief that this is the most thorough and effective therapy known to them” (p. 88).

itself – and also the belief factor - of secondary importance.³⁴³ Regarding the efficacy of past life therapeutic work, Woolger (1990) notes that “I know of nothing other than psychedelic work that operates at so many levels in so short a period of time. Generally no more than five to ten... sessions are necessary to work through major issues therapeutically” (p. 30). Comparing this to conventional analysis, Woolger continues that “this is... a radical departure from longer psychoanalytic methods of treatment, which are very often slow because they fail to engage experientially and remain at an intellectual and interpretive level only” (p. 30).

In relation to my earlier defence of intuition and also in order to highlight that what constitutes ‘evidence’ or counts as ‘proof’ for a given phenomenon differs widely among different people and is perhaps largely determined by one’s dominant attitude and function type: Though Stevenson is generally viewed as the most conscientious and critical investigator working within the field of reincarnational research, Woolger is in fact critical of Stevenson on the very grounds that many people would view as the strength of his work.³⁴⁴ Woolger (1990) notes that “my... discomfort with Stevenson’s and similar investigations is that they are excessively mental and abstract” (p. 70). Woolger asks: “Why does the investigator himself not try to remember a few past lives of his own? Why not reserve the objective question of truth until later, and then decide on the basis of his own experience?” (p. 70).³⁴⁵

³⁴³ For example, Woolger (1990) comments that “as a therapist and not a philosopher I am perhaps fortunate in that I am not shackled by the problem of belief or disbelief; I am not obliged to delay my sessions until the learned jury of parapsychologists and metaphysicians is in on these matters. Not that they do not have important observations to make... but for the therapist there is another kind of truth, psychic truth: *that which is real for the patient* (p. 39). Weiss (1992) similarly notes that “as a therapist or a patient, you don’t have to believe in past lives or reincarnation for past life therapy to work. The proof is in the pudding. As more than one fellow psychotherapist has said to me, ‘I still don’t know if I believe in this past life stuff, but I use it, and it sure does work!’” (p. 55).

³⁴⁴ Though Stevenson’s work does not hold weight and is discounted by many mainstream scientists solely on the basis of a prejudice against the investigation of a phenomenon that is considered *a priori* not to exist, I have come across a number of independent references to Stevenson’s integrity as a researcher. I will cite only one of these: Dr. Harold Lief, “a well-respected figure in the field of psychiatry” is cited in a 1977 issue of the *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* as describing Stevenson as “a methodical, careful, even cautious investigator...”, and who writes regarding his research that “either he is making a colossal mistake, or he will be known... as ‘the Galileo of the twentieth century’” (as cited in Tucker, 2005, p. 20).

³⁴⁵ In fact it is likely that Stevenson has had personal experiences that have subjectively convinced him of the validity of reincarnation. Shroder (1999) recounts that when he asked Stevenson if he had had “any personal experiences that reinforced the idea reincarnation occurred” (p. 190), Stevenson “just sat up a little straighter, got that shuttered expression on his face and said, ‘None that I care to discuss’” (pp. 109-110). Notice that Stevenson did not say he had not had any such experiences – which it is likely he would have had he not – only that he did not wish to discuss them. My view – which Woolger in his criticism of Stevenson on this point does not seem to appreciate - is that, given that Stevenson has dedicated considerable effort now (over 40 years of painstaking research and investigations) to put the question of reincarnation on an empirical footing, it would be extremely unwise for Stevenson to make any subjective claims. Moreover, Stevenson is of the view that it is unimportant what his personal views are; people must study the evidence for themselves. One does detect in Stevenson a certain exasperation though: “After you have read my detailed case reports, I do not think that you will say that

Of course, criticism is a two way street: If Woolger is critical of Stevenson on the grounds that his research is too “mental and abstract,” Stevenson is generally critical of the employment of hypnosis – the method utilised by past life therapists³⁴⁶ - as a means of activating or retrieving past life memories, even for therapeutic purposes.³⁴⁷ However, despite disagreement over the legitimacy of hypnosis as a means of past life memory retrieval, what both Stevenson and therapeutic practitioners seem to agree on is that reincarnation, if it occurs, is a plausible third explanatory factor in the ongoing genetics/environmental debate (1987, pp. 202-205). Perhaps a significant implication of the rejection of tabula rasa orthodoxy, which is foreshadowed in Jung’s work, and accentuated by the experiences of past life therapists, is that the weight of responsibility currently resting upon parents is somewhat mitigated. Making this point, Woolger (1990) notes that “when children’s problems are seen to originate from previous lives, these problems can no longer be solely the result of parental abuse, neglect, or absence” (315). And further: “What this amounts to is that every psychological quirk from

there is *no* evidence for reincarnation, although you may certainly say that you find what we have unconvincing. If you reach that point, I think it fair to ask you: ‘What evidence, if you had it, *would* convince you of reincarnation’ (1987, p. 158).

³⁴⁶ Regarding the use of hypnosis within a therapeutic context: While both Freud and Jung, in their early work with patients, employed hypnosis as a means of accessing the unconscious and as a therapeutic tool, both men – and likely, following suit, many of their colleagues – later abandoned it in their practice. However, Fiore, who is critical that hypnosis did not feature during her extensive training as a psychologist, notes that Freud “at the end of his long career... stated that hypnosis, because of its efficiency, was the key to helping people” (1978, p. 3).

Further on the topic of hypnosis, and specifically in relation to past-life memory retrieval, one of the criticisms levelled against memories retrieved via this way is that some discrepancies in terms of historical detail have been noted in the case studies reported. For example, Shroder (1999) makes this criticism of the case Weiss presents in *Many Lives, Many Masters* (1988). In fact, if Shroder took into account all the various contributions to the subject of reincarnational research, including, for example, the contributions of psychics, the inconsistencies he notes could arguably be accounted for (e.g., the Seth series of books by Jane Roberts: Seth is a trance personality who manifests through the mediumship of Jane Roberts and who points to the phenomenon of soul splitting and multi-dimensional existence 1970; see also Michael Newton, 2000, on the topic of soul splitting). Woolger (1990) notes regarding those who disclaim memories retrieved via hypnosis “by saying that they cannot be authentic because they contain certain historical inconsistencies” that “these sceptics probably would not dismiss the ‘reality’ of their own childhoods simply because certain details of their memory of it proved to be false” (p. 31). For example, just because a person cannot remember exactly how old he was when he went with his family on holiday to Fiji and may say that he was nine when in fact he was ten, this slight inaccuracy in recount (i.e., historical inconsistency) does not discount that the holiday took place or mean that his other memories of it are not accurate.

³⁴⁷ However, despite Stevenson’s criticism as to the reliability and legitimacy of hypnosis and, in particular, as constituting ‘evidence’ for reincarnation, at least one of Stevenson’s case studies - involving an instance of xenoglossy (the ability to speak a language one has never learned) – is based on a subject who under hypnosis remembered the life of a Swedish peasant and began to speak in Swedish: That the language the subject was speaking was Swedish was confirmed by Swedish linguists who were called in to verify this and who also translated what the subject was saying (Head & Cranston, 1977, pp. 437-440). Moreover, Stevenson also recommended hypnosis to one of the subjects of his investigations who said that she recalled details from more than one life and wanted to learn more about the life previous to the previous life memories Stevenson and his colleagues were investigating (see Shroder, 1999).

ticks to colic, from incest to sadism need no longer be blamed simplistically on feeding schedules, hospital incubators, or those universal scapegoats, the parents” (p. 315).³⁴⁸

Returning to the more general discussion of this chapter, if reincarnation does occur - and statistics suggest that the number of individuals in the West holding this view has been steadily increasing since the late 1940s³⁴⁹ - it has significant ramifications in terms of interpersonal relatedness and exponentially enlarges the nature of relationship discourse. It is to a discussion of this point I now turn.

As I have noted, the idea of fate and of love relations being foreordained and “cosmically meant to be” - as historian David Shumway (1998) words it - is an essential feature of Cinderella and romantic mythology and influences and imbues romantic expectations and notions of ‘true’ love. Viewing from a Jungian lens of understanding, it is unlikely that the notion of fate would be able to be entertained if it were not one that corresponded in some way to psychic reality; that is, to something archetypal. Referring to the character of fate, Jung (1948b) notes “how often in the critical moments of life everything hangs on what appears to be a mere nothing!” (p. 408). Romantic entertainment capitalises on this theme; that is, on the coincidental; on chance occurrences and meetings.

If, as the CORT cases referred to suggest, birth and death do not signify the beginning and end of existence, but are rather transitions, I would like to suggest that what is imaged as ‘fate’ within Cinderella and romantic mythology and what is popularly conceptualised and understood as such according to popular notions of the phenomenon could be perceived as a way of endeavouring to express, using the limited paradigm of experience available to us, a deeper relatedness to others we are unable to consciously formulate but nonetheless at some level intuit. If one reads the now numerous case reports furnished by researchers and therapists working within the paradigm of past-life regression experimentation and therapy, what is striking about these regression experiences is the number of subjects who report

³⁴⁸ This accounted for, this is not to adopt or give licence to the opposite extreme in which parents are in no way to blame or responsible for the welfare and psychological well-being of their children. For a discussion of this point see (Noel Langley, 1967, pp. 108-109).

³⁴⁹ Stevenson (2003) notes that the earliest survey known to him was conducted in 1947 in London. The sample size was small; 500 persons. Four percent of those questioned said they believed in reincarnation (p. 9). A 1968 survey “carried out in eight countries of West Europe” reported that an average of “18% of respondents believed in reincarnation” (p. 9). By 1986, a survey of ten European countries showed that the average of persons believing in reincarnation had increased to 21% (p. 9). Figures further increased in the 1990s (p. 9). Regarding current statistics, Tucker (2005) notes that, depending upon which poll one bases one’s figures, “between 20 and 27 percent” of Americans “and a similar percentage of Europeans” believe in reincarnation (p. 4). A 2003 Harris Poll, based on a sample size of 2,201 persons, showed that while 27% of the general population believed in reincarnation, this figure increased substantially for persons aged 25-29, 40% of whom held reincarnation to be a fact (“Religious Beliefs of Americans,” 2003).

recognising people they currently are related to or know during regression. In one such experiment conducted by Helen Wambach, eighty-seven per cent of 750 subjects regressed “reported knowing parents, lovers, relatives and friends of the current lifetime in varied relationships both in past lives and in the state between lives” (as cited in Fisher, 1984, pp. 36-37).³⁵⁰ Fiore (1978), remarking on what all those employing past-life regression as a therapeutic measure seem to observe, notes that “I have been fascinated by the revelation in past-life regressions that the people we are relating to in our present lifetime we have been with before – often many times and in different roles.... Instant attractions, dislikes, feelings of familiarity or distrust have been explained by events in former lives” (p. 8). If one takes this into account, then the popular term ‘soulmate’ seems apt. Though we have a particular experience of our self and others in a particular body, the source of our relatedness may be more deeply rooted. Fiore (1978) notes regarding the effect on her patients of making the link between current relationships and past-life connections that: “For most, it dispelled the fear of death, a fear that seems really to be the fear of the pain of dying, the fear of leaving loved ones behind and ultimately, the fear of the unknown” (p. 238).

In the Introduction, I said that I would comment here on what Jung is said one time to have referred to in conversation with M. Esther Harding as relationships characterised by the ‘Golden Thread.’ Harding recounts of the conversation with Jung:

There is a third kind of relationship, the only lasting one, in which it is as though there were an invisible telegraph wire between two human beings. He said, ‘I call it, to myself, the Golden Thread.’ This may be masked by other forms of relationship. And other forms may be present without any such thread in them. It is only when the veil of *maya*, of illusion, is rent for us that we can begin to recognize the Golden Thread.... And just as it is impossible to individuate without relatedness, so it is impossible to have real relationships without individuation. For otherwise illusion comes in continually, and you don’t know where you are. (as cited in Jung, 1977, p. 31)

Again the idea espoused by the term ‘Golden Thread,’ similarly to that of soulmate, is that there are certain people to whom we are connected in a deeper way and which in some respects appears timeless. In his autobiography, in the chapter ‘On Life After Death,’ Jung (1963a) comments that “in our relationships to other men, too, the crucial question is whether an element of boundlessness is expressed in the relationship” (p. 300).

³⁵⁰ This study was conducted by Dr. Helen Wambach in 1978. The 750 subjects “were hypnotized and guided back to a state just before birth” (as cited in Fisher, 1984, pp. 36-37). Commenting on the study, Fisher (1984) notes that “as farfetched as the idea of group reincarnation might seem to some people, the meeting of cells in all the right places within the human body is surely no more miraculous a proposition. Time and time again, Dr. Wambach’s subjects emerged from their trance to relay the same story – that we come back with the same souls to share a variety of relationships not only with those we love but also with those who inspire fear and hatred” (p. 37).

In closing this section it is necessary to qualify that ultimately a discussion of love and relatedness is a discussion of the unfathomable. It is of note that while Freud is famously quoted: “The great question that has never been answered, and which I have not been able to answer, despite my thirty years of research into the feminine soul, is what does a woman want?” (as cited in Fromm, 1959a, p. 31), the question that perplexed Jung was the very one that has been the subject of this thesis; that is, the question and nature of love. On this point, Jung (1963a) intimates: “In my medical experience as well as in my own life I have again and again been faced with the mystery of love, and have never been able to explain what it is” (p. 325). In closing, Jung (1963a) notes that:

It is important to have a secret, a premonition of things unknown. It fills life with something impersonal... A man who has never experienced that has missed something important. He must sense that he lives in a world which in some respects is mysterious; that things happen and can be experienced which remain inexplicable; that not everything which happens can be anticipated. The unexpected and the incredible belong to this world. Only then is life whole. For me the world has from the beginning been infinite and ungraspable. (p. 328)

CONCLUSION

At the very beginning of this critique I cited a passage from D. H. Lawrence in which he exegeses upon the question and nature of love. When I first happened upon this meditation, I felt I had stumbled upon in poignant summary everything I was endeavouring to articulate and argue for. Lawrence espouses that the experience of love must embrace the whole of humanity. However, he also ardently defends the claims of individuality, arguing that ‘love for humanity’ is not possible unless individuality is provided full expression. Indeed, while love for others and love for oneself have been conceived as contradictory aims by theologians and philosophers alike, the opposite rationale has been defended here. It has been argued that without a ‘self’ and self-love, love for others is not possible. There is simply no basis for integrity-based relatedness or for what in Chapter Five I referred to as ‘psychological relatedness.’

Undergirding this critique of Cinderella and romantic mythology - and the practice of romantic love patterned upon this mythology - and providing the theoretical basis for an examination of what may lie ‘beyond’ romance’s utopia, have been the core themes of individuation and productivity; central concepts in Jung’s and Fromm’s body of writings respectively. While individuation and productivity denote the process via which the psychological individuality of the individual is realised, these terms concomitantly denote the process via which productive-based or psychological relatedness with others is possible, as opposed to persona-based connections or compulsive soul-tie identifications, including symbiotic attachments. In discussing what love and relatedness ‘beyond romance’ might look like, I have proposed that at the level of archetypal critique there is support for sociologist Anthony Giddens’ observation that monogamy may not be central to emerging forms of relatedness. However, I have qualified that the freer expression of intimacy I have suggested may potentially emerge from a symbolic understanding of romantic love can only be realised upon the basis of the individuating self and necessitates the practice of greater – not less – integrity in one’s relationships.

Following on from this argument, I have noted that while the desire for specificity within the sphere of interpersonal and intimate relations is compatible with productive love, the nature of love and friendship after symbolic comprehension and psychological maturation is different to the nature of love and relatedness before this occurs. In a practical sense, I have argued that ideally intimacy need not be restricted to and something for which one is

dependent upon one other person for, but can be experienced with many different people at many different levels. Espousing that intimacy need not be restricted to one other corresponds with Fromm's contention that 'to love' primarily rests upon growing in one's own capacity to love and relate well. The primary difference between romantic love and productive love is that while romantic love is object focused and dependent productive love is faculty based.

In referring to the 'self,' and in positing love for oneself as the only basis upon which one can genuinely love others, I have strongly defended the notion of there being such a thing as one's 'true self' and of the existence of individual psychic individuality as a correlate of physical individuality. I have argued that the self is not simply the effect of socialisation, but a factor in and of itself a priori and pre-existent to familial and socio-political influence. Moreover, I have argued that that which pre-exists environmental imprint and provides the ground for individual being and a defence against 'constructed self' or 'no-self' ideologies is the extramundane realm. Hence, a distinction has been drawn between individualism, which is an ego-attainment, and individuation as the process via which the self is realised and the genuine individuality of the individual comes into its own. As noted in Chapter One, while the self – as the entelechy of the individual's becoming – refers to what already is, paradoxically 'who one is' is something that must be attained.

As argued in Chapter Three, individuation contains within it the envisioning of a mode of morality beyond good versus evil dualisms, with life itself and the unfolding thereof being the supreme value and fullest expression of moral good. As such the process of 'becoming who one is' is conceived of as a moral responsibility with moral implications. As argued in Chapter Five, observance of external laws provides no defence against the more subtle forms of injury that individuals can inflict upon each other, such as unkind treatment and malicious gossip. Individuation alone provides the sole basis for integrity-based respect for and treatment of others, in that if one respects oneself and is true to the law of one's own being, one has within oneself the basis for and capacity to be true in one's relations with others also. The maxim to treat others as we ourselves want to be treated is not simply a religious nicety, but a psychological law with cause and effect implications. As argued in Chapter Five, one cannot treat others cruelly without defiling in degree one's own humanity. Moreover, it has been pointed out that a significant component of genuinely moral behaviour is the quality of being able to think for oneself rather than allowing one's thoughts and attitudes to be moulded by the opinions and prejudices of other people.

The depth approach employed here has differed from a socio-political critique in that the aim has been to understand what romantic love at the level of myth and archetype might *mean*. Hence, I have read the characters and themes of the Cinderella fairy tale subjectively as archetypal images mirroring and depicting the processes of the psyche. While it has been noted that engagement in romantically premised interactions necessarily implicates one in the process of individuation to some degree, it has nonetheless been argued that without conscious understanding, individuation will be negative rather than positive in effect. As noted, if intrapsychic problems are not addressed, they happen outside as fate. To express this idea in more concrete terms, if one does not undertake the task of individuation willingly, one is likely to attract to oneself the same hurtful experiences and to make the same mistakes repeatedly. In the area of one's relationships, one is likely to meet in others the same person over and over again, because one is meeting embodied in others a projection of oneself.

There are a number of ways in which the subjective focus informing this critique has differed from an objective or literal reading. While a literal reading tends to result in the adoption of the 'Cinderella mentality' (i.e., the assuming of permanent 'victim status') I referred to in Chapter Three, a subjective reading questions the 'victim versus villain' or 'good versus evil' divide engendered by identification with a Cinderella or romantic heroine character at the objective level, and particularly engendered by identification with the themes of victimisation and goodness. Read dynamically/subjectively/psychologically, not only the Cinderella character but the characters traditionally viewed as the 'villain' characters within the fairy tale are found to be victims also. While Western ego-experience – premised upon a literal reading of the Christian myth and more recently a literal reading of the Cinderella myth – has traditionally tended to equate victimisation and goodness together, it has been argued that while victimisation may position one as 'innocent' in a given situation, it does not follow that one is 'good' or morally superior to another person or other people generally, including one's oppressor/s. The justification for the above argument has been premised, in part, upon the recognition that gaining independence and freedom from micro and macro oppression entails more than endeavouring to secure freedom from external constraints, but concomitantly requires the pursuit of psychological freedom. As illustrated in the case of Baroness Rodmilla, the failure to deal with victimisation appropriately tends to result in a mutation of character. Those abused as children often abuse their own. Similarly, history shows that victims of one oppressive regime are often the instigators of the next.

In basing my argument on a delineation between romantic love and Fromm's model of productive love, one of the attributes of productive or mature based love I have drawn attention to is what Fromm refers to as the 'knowledge of love.' In Chapter Three, in a critique of Freud's interpretation of Oedipus, I posited Oedipus unconscious of his psychic woundedness as opposed to unconscious of his propensity to psychic perversion. Within the context of this point, I highlighted as a basis for analogy the distinction the biblical psalmist draws between infirmities and the state of being 'wounded in spirit,' and pointed out that there is a vast difference between everyday problems, which everyone experiences and must learn to cope with, and psychic suffering which results – as in Oedipus' case – from unhealed traumas, particularly relating to the parent/child relationship. The attribute of the 'knowledge of love' is based upon the awareness that people are not only surface, they also have depth, and on a recognition that surface behaviour that is offensive often conceals depth experiences that have resulted in debilitating psychic injury. The 'knowledge of love' is closely linked to the attribute of responsibility, the ability to discern and to respond to both expressed and unexpressed need. Taken together, these attributes – along with those of care and respect – encourage the practice of compassion within the sphere of interpersonal relations.

One aspect of human relatedness I have particularly drawn attention to due to the influence it is seen to have upon the individual's capacity to relate with others on an adult footing is the parent/child constellation. In Chapter Two, I defended the notion of spontaneity, the right of the child to be allowed to think for his/herself, and the right of the child to be able to make his/her own interest and later career choices. I noted that while autonomous restrictions and rational authority are not inimical to healthy development, the suppression of the child's individuality is. Hence, I have argued that children be given the opportunity to develop in congruence with their sense of themselves as individuals and be allowed to assert themselves as 'I am' and 'I feel' beings. This is important because if a child is not accorded an environment in which his/her individual unfolding is respected and provided for, s/he is susceptible to confusing love with control. If love and control are fused in an individual's experience, s/he is susceptible to forming attachments which are symbiotic in nature and that display sadomasochistic dynamics.

In relation to the parent/child constellation I have made two practical recommendations which I consider would go some way to addressing the noted cultural propensity for individuals to remain fixated at the level of 'archetypal child.' These are: First, that the role of parent be viewed as a temporary one rather than a permanent one; and second, that upon

adulthood individuals address those who *were* their parents by their first or given names rather than by the primary tie referents ‘mum’ or ‘dad’ or their equivalent. As argued in Chapter Five, the experience of ‘home’ and belonging – psychologically conceived – is something one must psychologically attain for oneself. If one does not move beyond the primary tie relatedness characteristic of the parent/child constellation, one is susceptible to projecting primary tie needs and expectations within the intimate and interpersonal sphere. While dependency is a part of relatedness, a distinction has been drawn between dependency which is mature and dependency which is immature and harmful. It has been argued that ideally all role based constellations – of which the parent/child constellation is one – must in due course mature beyond their role based beginnings if the individuals comprising the given constellation are to remain attached on an integrity-based footing.

The main argument of this critique has been that while at the manifest level of practice romantic love may not provide a viable context for productive-based relatedness, paradoxically a more robust model of relatedness is contained within the myth of romance itself. While at the manifest level, the Cinderella fairy tale and romantic stories are tales about finding one’s true love (or, from a feminist/intellectual perspective, tales in collusion with and responsible for perpetuating patriarchal ideals), at the subjective level these tales symbolically express the ego’s capacity for wholeness and the ego’s desire to experience its own totality. As archetypal images symbolising the ego, it has been posited that the individual identifying with a Cinderella or romantic heroine character is psychologically identifying with the themes of abandonment, victimisation, ‘goodness,’ and the expectation of or longing for happiness. The themes of abandonment, victimisation, and the longing for happiness are indicative of the ego or individual’s sense of incompleteness. The theme of ‘goodness’ is indicative of the limited perspective of ego-consciousness and the conscious attitude. Premised on a subjective reading, it has been argued that the romantic longing to find Mr/Ms. Right (i.e., one’s ‘true love’) denotes not a longing to find a perfect external other, but symbolises the ego’s felt need for the self. It is the self the ego looks for everywhere, but in vain, until s/he finds and realises the self within.

Lawrence poetically expresses his envisioning of a mode of love in which affirmation of the individual and love for others are in accord and balance each other as the “rose of the world which has never yet blossomed, but which will blossom from us when we begin to understand both sides and live in both directions.” Similarly to Lawrence, I have argued for a mode of relatedness beyond current conceptions and understandings of love; that is, for a

mode of relatedness ‘beyond romance.’ Again, this is in accord with a Jungian approach to the numinous, in that psychic products are conceived as being teleologically directed and as playing a pivotal role in the development and evolution of individual and cultural consciousness. In the Introduction I posited that a mythological reading of romantic love may provide the most contemporaneously relevant critique of romantic love possible. This is because the archetypes contained in numinous psychic products are living and active. Myths are not only stories of the past, but also contain visionary insight into the future.

Finally, Lawrence draws attention to the love of God. While romantic love is regarded a secular ideology, and while the focus of romantic desire is upon attaining a ‘happily ever after’ future with another person in the here and now and is not concerned with a ‘happily ever after’ which is dependent upon God and is posited to be in the hereafter, at the subjective level of symbol the Cinderella myth shows archetypal similarity to the Christian myth. Within the romantic ambience the idea of there being something operating behind the scenes of material reality, and impacting upon the human sphere, is conceptualised as serendipity or ‘fate.’ In Chapter Six, I noted that it is unlikely that the idea of fate could be entertained if it did not correspond in some way to psychic reality. The discussion of fate is therefore important in terms of understanding the symbolism of romantic love as a whole. I suggested that the idea of ‘fate’ permeating Cinderella and romantic mythology/ideology may symbolise a deeper sense of connection to others that is intuited but cannot be conceptualised or explained in solely rational terms. Within popular culture the term which has been coined to denote this perceived ‘depth’ connection is soul-tie or soulmate connection. Based upon the investigations of Ian Stevenson and his co-researchers, and also upon the experiences of those experimenting with and working within the field of past-life regression therapy, I have posited that this term is perhaps apt. I have suggested that the recognition of ‘soul’ or of the self – as Jung denotes it – and research investigating the continuance of individual consciousness beyond physicality and materiality has significant implications in terms of relationship discourse, particularly relationship discourse that endeavours to explore the roots of a more grounded, morally defensible and robust model of love.

Examining the archetypal underpinnings of romantic love and perceiving that Cinderella and romantic stories have mythic roots and are first and foremost symbolisms of intrapsychic processes impacts upon intellectual discussions of romantic love and all spheres of human relatedness generally. I have noted that critiqued subjectively the Cinderella story is conceived as more than ‘nothing but’ entertainment or ideology/discourse. The difference

between the archetypal take on romantic love forwarded here is made lucid by contrasting it with feminist discourse on romantic love. While within this discourse romantic love has generally been posited an oppressive ideology, I have argued that at the level of archetype romantic love may have contributed to emerging ideals of equality and independence.

In closing, the Cinderella themed film *What a Girl Wants* that I critiqued in Chapter Two, ends with Daphne – the main protagonist – joyfully proclaiming “sometimes things don’t always turn out how you imagine, *they turn out even better!*” While the dream of ‘utopia’ – whether at the macro or micro level – is dismissed in some theoretical positions as illusive, the perspective of this critique is that as an archetypal image ‘utopia’ – symbolised within the romantic myth as ‘happily ever after’ - *is* both fathomable and attainable. Learning the language of the psyche and its relevance in terms of human relatedness is part of the utopian project. The symbolic perspective supports Daphne’s observation that the future promises not only to be good, but exponentially so.

Appendix

Ever After (1998)

Director: Andy Tennant

Producers: Mireille Soria; Tracey Trench

Screenplay: Susannah Grant; Andy Tennant; Rick Parks

Characters and cast

Danielle (Cinderella): Drew Barrymore

Baroness Rodmilla (Step-mother): Anjelica Huston

Prince Henry: Dougray Scott

Leonardo da Vinci (Fate figure): Patrick Godfrey

Marguerite (Older step-sister): Megan Dodds

Jacqueline (Younger step-sister): Melanie Lynskey

King Francis (Prince's father): Timothy West

Queen Marie (Prince's mother): Judy Parfitt

Auguste (Danielle's father): Jeroen Krabbe

Gustave (Danielle's childhood friend): Lee Ingleby

Grand Dame (Narrator): Jeanne Moreau

Scene summary

Opening scene: Grand Dame, the narrator, gives audience to the Brothers Grimm. She presents them with a glass shoe belonging to her great great grandmother, Danielle de Barbarac. Grand Dame asks the Grimms to allow her to set the story of the Cinder girl straight. She introduces her account: "Once upon a time, there lived a young girl, who loved her father very much."

Scene one: Eight-year-old Danielle is excited at the prospect of meeting her new mother and sisters. Her nurses are dressing her for the occasion. However, when Gustav, her friend comes, she runs off to play with him. Her nurses call after her, telling her that her father will be arriving at any moment.

Scene two: Auguste arrives in a carriage with his new wife and step-daughters. All the servants are standing on ceremony to receive them. Maurice, the head-servant, welcomes Auguste home. Auguste, looking around him, comments on Danielle's absence. Rodmilla and the girls descend from the carriage. Auguste beams at them with delighted pride. Danielle belatedly arrives on the scene. Both she and Gustav are covered in mud. Auguste laughs and warmly embraces her. He then introduces her to Rodmilla and the girls. Rodmilla's dislike of Danielle is immediately apparent.

Scene three: While tucking Danielle into bed, Auguste gives Danielle a copy of Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* as a gift. Auguste comments: "We've been two peas in a pod for a long time. I suppose this will take some getting used to." Auguste asks Danielle if she likes the new additions to their family. "Very much," she replies. Auguste tells Danielle that he has to go

away on business for three weeks. She protests that he has only just got back and makes him promise that he will only go away for one. “Alright,” he finally and good-naturedly concedes.

Scene four: The day of Auguste’s departure arrives. The whole household is there to see him off. Auguste laughs at their long faces. “I’ll be back in a week,” he reassures them. Danielle is looking particularly forlorn. Auguste tells her he is counting on her to teach Rodmilla and the girls the ropes, commenting that Rodmilla does not like getting her hands dirty. As Auguste mounts his horse, it is noticeable that he is feeling unwell. As he proceeds to go, Rodmilla claps her hands, telling the girls to return to their lessons. “Wait,” says Danielle, ‘it’s tradition... he always waves at the gate.’ Rodmilla gives her a cold look and turns to go in. Danielle runs up the drive waiting for her father to wave. However, at the gate, Auguste falls off his horse. Danielle runs screaming toward where his body is lying. Rodmilla, hearing her crying, runs after her. Danielle lies sobbing by her father’s side, telling him to come back. Auguste regains consciousness momentarily – he looks briefly at Rodmilla and then turns to Danielle, telling her he loves her. He then dies. The scene ends with the narrator – the Grand Dame – saying of Danielle: “It would be ten years before another man entered her life, a man who was still a boy in many many ways.”

Scene five: King Francis is furious because Prince Henry has refused to marry the King of Spain’s daughter. Queen Marie is defending Henry, telling Francis that he needs time to make his own decisions. Francis will not listen, he goes to waken Henry, fuming: “If I can’t sleep, neither will he!” When Francis and Marie arrive at Henry’s room they discover that he has escaped, climbing out through the window. This makes Francis even more furious. Francis commands the royal guard to find Henry and bring him back.

Scene six: The now grown Danielle is gathering apples. While doing so, she sees a man stealing one of their horses. Danielle, yelling that he is a thief, throws apples at him and manages to dismount him. When the man falls off the horse, Danielle realises - based on what he is wearing - that he is the Prince. She falls on her knees, looking at the ground, and beseeches his forgiveness. She then tells him that they have better horses which he is welcome to borrow if he wishes. Henry tells her that he wishes nothing but to be free from his gilded cage. He mounts the horse again, scattering gold coins on the ground. “For your silence,” he explains.

Scene seven: Rodmilla, Marguerite, and Jacqueline are at breakfast. Danielle enters the kitchen where Paulette and Louise, their servants, are. Paulette warns Danielle that Rodmilla is in one of her moods. Danielle, while busying herself around the kitchen, shows Paulette and Louise the coins. They are astounded, warning her not to let Rodmilla see them. Danielle tells them that she is going to use the coins to buy back Maurice whom Rodmilla has sold to pay her debts.

Scene eight: Henry happens upon a carriage being robbed and is beseeched by one of the occupants to go in pursuit of one of the robbers who has stolen a painting. Henry looks behind him, spotting the royal guard who have been sent to take him back to the palace not far in the distance. Henry reluctantly goes in pursuit of the robber and recovers the painting. When he returns it, he realises that it is Leonardo da Vinci who has beseeched his help and who is on his way to the palace to take up the position of artist in residence. By this time the royal guard have arrived and Henry returns with them.

Scene nine: Danielle is dressing as a courtier in preparation to secure Maurice's release. Gustav is trying to persuade her not to go, reminding her that the punishment of dressing above her station is five days in the stocks. However, as Danielle won't yield, Gustav helps her to prepare.

Scene ten: Henry returns the horse he has borrowed. Rodmilla uses the opportunity to show off her two daughters. She hopes Henry will marry Marguerite.

Scene eleven: Danielle goes to court to rescue Maurice. She tells the prison guard that Maurice is her servant and that she is there to pay the debt against him. He refuses, and they argue. Henry and Da Vinci arrive on the scene. Henry rebukes the guard for talking so roughly to a lady and commands him to release Maurice. Danielle thanks him and goes to leave. Henry follows her. He asks her if they have met before. She replies that she does not believe so. As Danielle is pretending to be a courtier, Henry does not recognise her as the servant who threw apples at him. He asks for her name. She initially refuses to disclose it. However, due to his persistence, Danielle finally gives him her mother's name. The conversation between Henry and Danielle is interrupted when Queen Marie calls to Henry telling him that the King wants a word with him. When Henry turns again to talk to Danielle, she has disappeared.

Scene twelve: Danielle returns with Maurice to their manor. Paulette and Louise are overjoyed to see him safely home.

Scene thirteen: King Francis tells Henry that he is restricted to the grounds. They argue. Francis heatedly reminds Henry of his responsibilities. Henry retorts that he doesn't want to inherit the crown anyway. Henry storms out.

Scene fourteen: When Danielle returns home, Rodmilla pulls her by the ear and storms at her for not telling her of the incident in which Henry borrowed one of their horses. She is angry because she was surprised by his visit and did not have adequate time to prepare for when he would return the horse. However, she informs Danielle that luckily for her they made a good impression on Henry and that Henry and Marguerite spoke together. Rodmilla tells Danielle she will have to work extra hard. Rodmilla notices Maurice has returned. Maurice begins to explain, "I worked off your debt," but just in time rephrases the explanation: "I worked off my debt, and they told me to go home." Rodmilla, distracted by more pressing matters, waves him away saying: "Go catch a chicken."

Scene fifteen: Henry asks his mother if she knows the Countess Nicole (the name Danielle has given him). Queen Marie replies that she does not know her, and asks why he is enquiring. King Francis arrives on the scene telling Henry that he has decided to throw a ball in honour of Da Vinci. He tells Henry that if love is what he seeks, he must find a bride of his choice before that time. Otherwise he will have to proceed with the arranged marriage. Henry agrees to this.

Scene sixteen: Rodmilla receives an invitation to the ball. She asks the messenger for news concerning Henry's engagement. The messenger tells her it is cancelled and that it is rumoured Henry must find a bride before the ball. Rodmilla gives the messenger money to keep her informed. The messenger tells her that Henry is playing tennis the next day at noon.

Scene seventeen: Rodmilla, Marguerite, and Jacequeline are planning what to wear to the ball. Marguerite is being sulky because she cannot find anything stunning enough. Rodmilla goes to a chest and draws out a beautiful white dress and shoes. “Oh, it’s perfect,” Marguerite gleefully exclaims. Jacequeline asks where Rodmilla got it from. Rodmilla tells her that it belonged to Danielle’s mother and that it is Danielle’s dowry for her wedding. Jacequeline comments that in that case Danielle will perhaps want to wear it. However, Marguerite retorts that Danielle is a commoner and is not invited to the ball. At this point, Danielle happens upon the scene. She asks them what they are doing. Rodmilla and Marguerite say that they are airing out the dress, as they thought she might want to wear it to the ball. Danielle appears touched at their kindness. She can’t quite believe that they want her to accompany them.

Scene eighteen: Henry and Da Vinci are relaxing by a lake. Henry – obviously concerned about the prospect of finding his true love in time - asks Da Vinci whether he thinks there is only one person for everyone. Da Vinci replies in the affirmative. Henry asks Da Vinci how one recognises the person that is specifically for and suited to oneself. By chance, Danielle is swimming in the lake. Henry does not yet know Danielle’s true identity. They engage in conversation until Danielle hears Jacequeline calling her in the distance. She makes an excuse and hurriedly leaves. Henry asks Da Vinci: “Why does she keep doing that.” (Meaning why does she leave so quickly when he is trying to get to know her).

Scene nineteen: Rodmilla and the girls are at dinner. Marguerite says that she wants to know who the Courtier is that the Prince is purportedly interested in and who everyone is talking about. Rodmilla replies: “Well, we shall find out who she is and bury her.”

Scene twenty: Henry is playing tennis. A number of hopeful ladies, including Marguerite, are there watching the game. Henry talks to Marguerite and afterwards they walk together in the market.

Scene twenty-one: That night Rodmilla is elated at the attention Henry has shown Marguerite. She surmises that a quick engagement must be pressed for. She is certain Marguerite will become Queen.

Scene twenty-two: Henry comes upon Gustav painting in the field. He asks Gustav if he knows who the Countess Nicole is and where she stays. Gustav directs him to Rodmilla’s house, saying that he knows that Nicole (Danielle) is currently there alone.

Scene twenty-three: Danielle is aware that Henry is coming. She quickly prepares, removing her cleaning clothes and dressing for the occasion. Henry and Danielle go to the monastery where there is a famous collection of books.

Scene twenty-four: Rodmilla is becoming anxious that her scheming to have Henry marry Marguerite does not appear to be progressing smoothly. The messenger Rodmilla has paid to inform her of his whereabouts says that no-one has seen or heard from him.

Scene twenty-five: Henry and Danielle become lost on their way home from the monastery. They are attacked by a band of gypsies intent on robbing them. Danielle surprises Henry by engaging a sword and fighting the gypsies. She demands that they give her back her possessions. The leader of the gypsies tells her she can have anything she can carry. Danielle asks if she can have his word on that. He thinks a moment and replies yes. Danielle goes over to Henry and manages to put him over her back and proceed to slowly walk away. The

gypsies laugh uproariously and tell them to come back, saying they will give them a horse. Henry and Danielle stay with the gypsies into the night, sharing in their feast and getting to know each other better. They are clearly both in love with each other.

Scene twenty-six: Rodmilla discovers that Henry and Danielle have been meeting secretly and that Danielle is the mysterious Countess Nicole. Rodmilla confronts Danielle and locks her in the cellar. Rodmilla spreads the rumour that Nicole has left to marry a Belgium gentleman. When Henry hears of this, he thinks he has been deceived by Danielle.

Scene twenty-seven: It is the night of the ball. Da Vinci has heard of Danielle's plight and goes to free her from the cellar. He encourages her to go to the ball and assume her place alongside Henry. Danielle protests that she is unable to do so as the Prince thinks she is someone she is not. Da Vinci reassures her that it is her the Prince loves and that it will be alright. Danielle dresses and leaves in a carriage. Believing Danielle to be engaged to another man, Henry has decided that when the time comes to announce his engagement, he will choose Marguerite. However, just as he is going to do so, he sees Danielle entering the palace. With everyone staring after him, he runs to greet her. Henry is overjoyed, urging her forward to meet his parents. Danielle tries to tell him that she has something important she must tell him first, but he silences her saying that whatever it is, it doesn't matter. As Danielle is reluctantly being led forward, Rodmilla tries to intervene by accusing Danielle of being a deceitful liar. She tells the shocked gathering that Danielle is not a Countess, but her servant. At first Henry refuses to believe her and threatens Rodmilla for her impertinence. However, Danielle admits it is true. Henry is angry. "First you're married, then you're a servant?" Danielle pleads to be allowed to explain. However, Henry has heard enough and turns to leave. Rodmilla looks smugly pleased that she has managed to humiliate Danielle and ruin her chances at happiness. Danielle leaves, fleeing into the dark night. Da Vinci, who has just arrived outside the palace gates, sees her running and calls after her. Danielle trips, losing one of her shoes. However, she does not wait to explain to Da Vinci – but crying, runs away.

Scene twenty-eight: Da Vinci finds Henry sitting on a palace balcony. "What have you done!" He exclaims. The two argue. Finally Da Vinci tells Henry that if he cannot see past Danielle's station, he does not deserve her.

Scene twenty-nine: Henry and the princess of Spain are being married. The princess of Spain is crying. In the middle of the ceremony Henry starts laughing. He turns to the crying woman beside him and tells her that he knows exactly how she feels (i.e., exactly how it feels to be forced into an arranged marriage). He tells her she is free to go. Then Henry goes in search for Danielle.

Scene thirty: In the meantime, Danielle has been sold to Le Pieu. Henry goes to rescue her and to apologise. They marry. Rodmilla and Marguerite are sent to the Americas.

References

All citations to *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung* are to paragraph numbers. All citations and reference listings to the collected works are from the English translation: Publisher: Routledge in London, and the Bollingen foundation in America; Editors: H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, and W. McGuire; Translator: R. F. C. Hull. The collected works consists of 20 volumes, plus four additional supplementary volumes.

All citations to the Bible are from the Authorized King James Version.

Aarne, A., & Thompson, S. (1961). *The types of the folktale: A classification and bibliography* (Rev. ed., S. Thompson, Trans.). Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

Ace in the hole: Saddam is caught (2003, December 15). *The Waikato Times*, p. 1.

Adams, M. V. (n.d.). What is Jungian analysis. In *Jungian analysis: Archetypes, dreams, myths, imagination*. Retrieved June 30, 2006, from <http://www.jungnewyork.com/whatisit.shtml>

Adams, M. V. (1997). The archetypal school. In P. Young-Eisendrath & T. Dawson (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Jung* (pp. 101-118). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adams, P. (1993). *Gesundheit: Bringing good health to you, the medical system, and society through physician service, complementary therapies, humor, and joy*. Rochester, VT: Healing Arts.

Adamson, A. (Director). (2001). *Shrek* [Motion picture]. United States: Dreamworks.

Anderson, W. T. (1997). *The future of the self: Inventing the postmodern person*. New York: Penguin Putnam

Archer, T. (1982). The study of the Cinderella cycle. In A. Dundes (Ed.), *Cinderella: A folklore casebook* (pp. 115-128). New York: Garland.

Arends, H. (Producer/Director). (1995). *The making of Disney's masterpiece: Cinderella* [Videotape]. United States: Walt Disney Home Video.

Barzun, J. (2001). *From dawn to decadence: 500 years of Western cultural life*. New York: Perennial.

Behrendt, G., & Tuccillo, L. (2005). *He's just not that into you: The no-excuses truth to understanding guys*. London: Element.

Bennet, E. A. (1966). *What Jung really said*. London: Macdonald.

Birtwistle, S. (Producer). (1996). *Pride and prejudice* [Videotape]. Sydney: ABC Video.

- Black, E. (2002, April 27-28). Bodice rippers inc. *The New Zealand Weekend Herald*, p.G2.
- Black Eyed Peas. (2003). Where is the love? On *Elephunk*. [CD]. United States: A&M Records.
- Boswell, J. (1995). *Same-sex unions in premodern Europe*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Bronner, S. J. (1998). *Following tradition: Folklore in the discourse of American culture*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Carnegie, D. (1981). *How to win friends and influence people* (Rev.ed.). New York: Simon.
- Cerminara, G. (1950). *Many mansions*. New York: Sloane.
- Cerminara, G. (1963). *Many lives, many loves*. New York: Sloane.
- Colman, W. (1996). Aspects of anima and animus in Oedipal development. *The Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 41(1), 37-57.
- Copan, P., & Moser, P. K. (2003). *The rationality of theism*. London: Routledge.
- Could a little boy be proof of reincarnation? (2005, June 30). In *ABCNews Internet Ventures*. Retrieved December 29, 2005, from <http://abcnews.go.com/Primetime/Technology/story?id=894217&page=1>
- Covey, S. (1989). *The seven habits of highly effective people: Restoring the character ethic*. New York: Simon.
- Cox, M. R. (1892). *Cinderella: Three hundred and forty-five variants of Cinderella, Catskin, and Cap o' Rushes*. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: The Folk-Lore Society.
- Cox, P. (Director). (2000). *Innocence* [Motion picture]. Australia: Cinemedia Corporation.
- Cultural relativism. (2006). In *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopaedia*. Retrieved July 8, 2006, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page
- De Beauvoir, S. (1953). *The second sex* (H. M. Parshley, Ed. & Trans.). London: Jonathan Cape.
- De Forest, I. (1954). *The leaven of love: A development of the psychoanalytic theory and technique of Sandor Ferenczi*. New York: Harper.
- Disney, W. (Producer). (1950). *Cinderella* [Motion picture]. United States: Disney Studios.
- Douglas, C. (1997). The historical context of analytical psychology. In P. Young-Eisendrath & T. Dawson (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Jung* (pp. 101-118). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Dourley, J. P. (1995). The religious implications of Jung's psychology. *The Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 40(2), 177-203.
- Dowling, C. (1981). *The Cinderella complex: Women's hidden fear of independence*. London: Fontana.
- Dundes, A. (Ed.). (1982). *Cinderella: A folklore casebook*. New York: Garland.
- Eagleton, T. (1996). *The illusions of postmodernism*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Edinger, E. F. (1972). *Ego and archetype: Individuation and the religious function of the psyche*. New York: Putnam.
- Ettinger, R. H., Crooks, R. L., & Stein, J. (1994). *Psychology: Science, behavior and life* (3rd ed.). Fort Worth: Harcourt.
- Evans, M. (1998). Falling in love with love is falling for make believe: Ideologies of romance in post-enlightenment culture. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 15(3-4), 265-275.
- Evans, M. (2003). *Love: An unromantic discussion*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Fast, J. (1971). *The incompatibility of men and women and how to overcome it*. New York: Avon.
- Fiore, E. (1978). *You have been here before: A psychologist looks at past lives*. New York: Ballantine.
- Firestone, S. (1979). *The dialectic of sex: The case for feminist revolution*. London: Women's Press.
- Fisher, J. (1984). *The case for reincarnation*. Toronto: Collins.
- Fiske, J. (1989). Commodities and culture: Formations of the people. In *Reading the popular* (pp. 23-47). Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Forbes, J. (1995). Anti-romantic discourse as resistance: Women's fiction 1775-1820. In L. Pearce & J. Stacey (Eds.), *Romance revisited* (pp. 293-305). London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Fredericksen, D. (2001). Jung/sign/symbol/film. In C. Hauke & I. Alister (Eds.), *Jung and Film: Post-Jungian takes on the moving image* (pp. 17-55). East Sussex: Brunner-Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1976). A few notions about the word 'conscientization.' In R. Dale, G. Esland & M. MacDonald (Eds.), *Schooling and capitalism: A sociological reader* (pp. 224-227). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. Bergman Ramos, Trans.). London: Penguin.

- Freud, S. (1954). *The interpretation of dreams* (J. Strachey, Ed. & Trans.). London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from freedom*. Canada: Holt.
- Fromm, E. (1947). *Man for himself: An inquiry into the psychology of ethics*. New York: Fawcett.
- Fromm, E. (1950). *Psychoanalysis and religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fromm, E. (1951). *The forgotten language: An introduction to the understanding of dreams, fairy tales, and myths*. New York: Holt.
- Fromm, E. (1956). *The sane society*. London: Routledge.
- Fromm, E. (1959). The Oedipus complex and the Oedipus myth. In R. N. Anshen (Ed.), *The family: Its function and destiny* (Rev. ed., pp. 420-448). New York: Harper.
- Fromm, E. (1959a). *Sigmund Freud's mission: An analysis of his personality and influence*. London: Allen.
- Fromm, E. (1961). *Marx's concept of man*. New York: Frederick Ungar.
- Fromm, E. (1962). *Beyond the chains of illusion: My encounter with Marx and Freud*. New York: Simon.
- Fromm, E. (1962a). *The art of loving*. London: Unwin.
- Fromm, E. (1962b). A forward by Erich Fromm. In A. S. Neill, *Summerhill: A radical approach to education* (pp. ix-xvi). London: Gollancz.
- Fromm, E. (1963). *Dogma of Christ, and other essays on religion, psychology, and culture*. New York: Holt.
- Fromm, E. (1964). *The heart of man: Its genius for good and evil*. New York: Harper.
- Fromm, E. (1966). *Ye shall be as gods: A radical interpretation of the Old Testament and its tradition*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Fromm, E. (1970). *The crisis of psychoanalysis*. New York: Holt.
- Fromm, E. (1979). *To have or to be?* London: Abacus.
- Fromm, E. (1981). *On disobedience and other essays*. New York: Seabury.
- Fromm, E. (1988). *Greatness and limitations of Freud's thought*. New York: Meridian.
- Fromm, E. (1992). *The Revision of psychoanalysis*. R. Funk (Ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Fromm, E. (1993). *The art of being*. London: Constable.

- Fromm, E. (1994). *The art of listening*. New York: Continuum.
- Funk, R. (1982). *Erich Fromm: The courage to be human*. New York: Continuum.
- Gibran, K. (1972). *The Prophet*. London: Heinemann.
- Giddens, A. (1992). *The transformation of intimacy: Sexuality, love and eroticism in modern societies*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Giddens, A. (1993). *Sociology* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity.
- Giddens, A. (1999). *Runaway world: How globalisation is reshaping our lives*. London: Profile.
- Giddens, A. (2006). *Sociology* (6th ed.). Cambridge: Polity.
- Glover, J. (1999). *Humanity: A moral history of the twentieth century*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Goldberg, J. (1999). *The dark side of love*. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Good, G. (2001). *Humanism betrayed: Theory, ideology and culture in the contemporary university*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Gordon, D. (Director). (2003). *What a girl wants* [Motion picture]. United States: Warner.
- Greer, G. (1971). *The female eunuch*. London: Paladin.
- Greer, G. (1999). *The whole woman*. London: Doubleday.
- Guggenbuhl-Craig, A. (1977). *Marriage: Dead or alive* (M. Stein, Trans.). Dallas, TX: Spring.
- Guggenbuhl-Craig, A. (1995). Reality and mythology of child sexual abuse. *The Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 40(1), 63-75.
- Haisch, B. (2006). *The God theory: Universes, zero-point fields and what's behind it all*. San Francisco, CA: Weiser.
- Hart, D. L. (1997). The classical Jungian school. In P. Young-Eisendrath & T. Dawson (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Jung* (pp. 89-100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Head, J., & Cranston, S. L. (1977). *Reincarnation: The phoenix fire mystery*. New York: Crown.
- Heiner, H. A. (2002). Modern interpretations of Cinderella. In *SurLaLune fairy tales pages*. Retrieved February 17, 2003, from <http://www.surlalunefairytales.com/cinderella/themes.html>

- Hemphill, C. Dallett. (1998). Class, gender, and the regulation of emotional expression in revolutionary-era conduct literature. In P. N. Stearns & J. Lewis (Eds.), *An emotional history of the United States* (pp. 33-51). New York: New York University Press.
- Herskovitz, M. (Director). (1998). *A destiny of her own* [Motion picture]. United States: Warner.
- Hite, S. (1987). *The Hite report: Women and love; A cultural revolution in progress*. New York: Knopf.
- Hockley, L. (2001). *Cinematic projections: The analytical psychology of C. G. Jung and film theory*. Bedfordshire: University of Luton Press.
- Hogan, J. C. (1991). *A commentary on the plays of Sophocles*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Hogan, P. J. (Director). (1997). *My best friend's wedding* [Motion picture]. United States: Sony Pictures.
- Huang, M. (1990). *Transforming the Cinderella dream: From Frances Burney to Charlotte Bronte*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Hudson, G. A. (1999). *Sibling love and incest in Jane Austen's fiction*. London: Macmillan.
- Hussey, M. T. (2002). Silhouette romance guidelines. Retrieved August 22, 2002, from <http://www.eharlequin.com/harl/books/alcove/guides/20slrm11.html>
- Illouz, E. (1997). *Consuming the romantic utopia: Love and the cultural contradictions of capitalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jackson, S. (1995). Women and heterosexual love: Complicity, resistance and change. In L. Pearce & J. Stacey (Eds.), *Romance revisited* (pp. 9-62). London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Jacoby, M. (1984). *The analytic encounter: Transference and human relationship*. Toronto: Inner City Books.
- Jaffe, A. (1970). *The myth of meaning in the work of C. G. Jung* (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.). London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Jameson, R. D. (1982). Cinderella in China. In A. Dundes (Ed.), *Cinderella: A folklore casebook* (pp. 71-97). New York: Garland.
- Janov, A. (1970). *The primal scream: Primal therapy; The cure for neurosis*. New York: Delta.
- Janov, A. (1973). *The feeling child*. London: Abacus.

- Janov, V. (1973). Learning from my children. In A. Janov, *The feeling child* (pp. 198-206). London: Abacus.
- Jeffers, S. (1991). *Feel the fear and do it anyway*. London: Rider.
- Johnson, R. A. (1987). *The psychology of romantic love*. London: Arkana.
- Jung, C. G. (1910). The association method (A. A. Brill, Trans.). *The American Journal of Psychology*, 21(2), 219-269.
- Jung, C. G. (1918). The role of the unconscious. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW10, para. 1-48).
- Jung, C. G. (1922). The love problem of a student. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW10, para. 197-235).
- Jung, C. G. (1923). Psychological types. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW6).
- Jung, C. G. (1927). Woman in Europe. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW10, para. 236-275).
- Jung, C. G. (1928). Child development and education. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW17, para. 98-126).
- Jung, C. G. (1930). Introduction to Kranefeldt's secret ways of the mind. *The collected works of C. G. Jung*. (CW4, para. 745-767).
- Jung, C. G. (1931). On the relation of analytical psychology to poetry. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW15, para. 97-132).
- Jung, C. G. (1931a). Problem of modern psychotherapy. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW16, para. 114-174).
- Jung, C. G. (1931b). The spiritual problem of modern man. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW10, para. 148-196).
- Jung, C. G. (1931c). Analytical psychology and weltanschauung. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW8, para. 689-741).
- Jung, C. G. (1931d). The structure of the psyche. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW8, para. 283-342).
- Jung, C. G. (1931e). The stages of life. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW8, para. 749-795).
- Jung, C. G. (1931f). Archaic man. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW10, para. 104-147).
- Jung, C. G. (1931g). Marriage as a psychological relationship. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW17, para. 324-345).

- Jung, C. G. (1931h). The aims of psychotherapy. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW16, para. 66-113).
- Jung, C. G. (1932). Psychotherapists or the clergy. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW11, para. 488-538).
- Jung, C. G. (1934). The soul and death. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW8, para. 796-815).
- Jung, C. G. (1934a). The meaning of psychology for modern man. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW10, para. 276-332).
- Jung, C. G. (1934b). Basic postulates of analytical psychology. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW8, para. 649-688).
- Jung, C. G. (1934c). The practical use of dream-analysis. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW16, para. 294-352).
- Jung, C. G. (1934d). The development of personality. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW17, para. 284-323).
- Jung, C. G. (1935). The Tavistock lectures. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW18, para. 1-415).
- Jung, C. G. (1935a). Principles of practical psychotherapy. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW16, para. 1-27).
- Jung, C. G. (1937). Psychological factors determining human behaviour. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW8, para. 232-262).
- Jung, C. G. (1939). Conscious, unconscious, and individuation. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW9, part 1/para. 489-524).
- Jung, C. G. (1940). Psychology and religion. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW11, para. 1-168).
- Jung, C. G. (1941). Return to the simple life. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW18, para. 1343-1356).
- Jung, C. G. (1942). Paracelsus as a spiritual phenomenon. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW13, para. 145-238).
- Jung, C. G. (1943). Depth psychology and self-knowledge. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW18, para. 1803-1817).
- Jung, C. G. (1944). Why I am not a Catholic. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW18, para. 1466-1472).
- Jung, C. G. (1946). Psychology of the transference. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW16, para. 353-539).

- Jung, C. G. (1946a). Analytical psychology and education. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW17, para. 127-229).
- Jung, C. G. (1946b). Psychotherapy today. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW16, para. 212-229).
- Jung, C. G. (1946c). The fight with the shadow. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW10, para. 444-457).
- Jung, C. G. (1948). On the nature of dreams. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW8, para. 530-569).
- Jung, C. G. (1948a). The spirit mercurius. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW13, para. 239-303).
- Jung, C. G. (1948b). The phenomenology of the spirit in fairytales. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW9, part 1/para. 384-455).
- Jung, C. G. (1948c). General aspects of dream psychology. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW8, para. 443-529).
- Jung, C. G. (1948d). A psychological approach to the dogma of the Trinity. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW11, para.169-295).
- Jung, C. G. (1948e). On psychic energy. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW8, para. 1-130).
- Jung, C. G. (1949). Foreword to Neumann: Depth psychology and a new ethic. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW18, para. 1408-1420).
- Jung, C. G. (1949a). Foreword to Quispel: Tragic Christianity. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW18, para. 1478-1482).
- Jung, C. G. (1949b). The significance of the father in the destiny of the individual. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW4, para. 693-744).
- Jung, C. G. (1950). Concerning rebirth. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW 9, part 1/para. 199-258).
- Jung, C. G. (1951). The psychology of the child archetype. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW9, part 1/para. 259-305).
- Jung, C. G. (1951a). Fundamental questions of psychotherapy. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW16, para. 230-254).
- Jung, C. G. (1952). Religion and psychology: A reply to Martin Buber. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW18, para. 1499-1513).
- Jung, C. G. (1952a). Synchronicity: An acausal connecting principle. *The collected works of C.G. Jung* (CW8, para. 816-997).

- Jung, C. G. (1952b). Answer to Job. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW11, para. 553-758).
- Jung, C. G. (1953). Two essays on analytical psychology. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW7).
- Jung, C. G. (1954). Archetypes of the collective unconscious. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW9, part 1/para. 1-86).
- Jung, C. G. (1954a). The philosophical tree. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW13, para. 304-482).
- Jung, C. G. (1954b). On the nature of the psyche. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW8, para. 343-442).
- Jung, C. G. (1954c). Psychological aspects of the mother archetype. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW9, part 1/para. 148-198).
- Jung, C. G. (1954d). Letter to Pere Lachat. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW18, para. 1532-1557).
- Jung, C. G. (1954e). Transformation symbolism in the Mass. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW11, para. 296-448).
- Jung, C. G. (1954f). Psychological commentary on *The Tibetan Book of the Great Liberation*. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW11, para. 759-830).
- Jung, C. G. (1954g). Concerning the archetypes, with special reference to the anima concept. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW9, part 1/para. 111-147).
- Jung, C. G. (1954h). On the psychology of the trickster figure. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW9, part 1/para. 456-488).
- Jung, C. G. (1955). The theory of psychoanalysis. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW4, para. 203-522).
- Jung, C. G. (1956). Jung and religious belief. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW18, para. 1584-1690).
- Jung, C. G. (1956a). Foreword to Bertine: Human relationships. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW18, para. 1259-1263).
- Jung, C. G. (1957). The undiscovered self (present and future). *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW10, para. 488-588).
- Jung, C. G. (1957a). Commentary on 'The secret of the Golden Flower.' *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW13, para. 1-84).
- Jung, C. G. (1958). A psychological view of conscience. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW10, para. 825-857).

- Jung, C. G. (1958a). Flying saucers: A modern myth of things seen in the skies. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW10, para. 589-824).
- Jung, C. G. (1959). Foreword to Brunner: Die anima als schicksalsproblem des mannes. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW18, para. 1276-1283).
- Jung, C. G. (1959a). Good and evil in analytical psychology. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW10, para. 858-886).
- Jung, C. G. (1959b). Aion. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW9, part 2).
- Jung, C. G. (1963). Mysterium coniunctionis: An inquiry into the separation and synthesis of psychic opposites in alchemy. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW14).
- Jung, C. G. (1963a). *Memories, dreams, reflections* (R. & C. Winston, Trans.). London: Collins.
- Jung, C. G. (1964). *Man and his symbols*. New York: Doubleday.
- Jung, C. G. (1968). Psychology and alchemy. *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (CW12).
- Jung, C. G. (1977). *C. G. Jung speaking: Interviews and encounters*. W. McGuire and R. F. C. Hull (Eds.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kinkead-Weekes, M. (1962). Introduction. In S. Richardson, *Pamela* (Vol. 1, pp. v-xiii). London: J. M. Dent.
- Kolbenschlag, M. (1979). *Kiss sleeping beauty good-bye: Breaking the spell of feminine myths and models*. New York: Doubleday.
- Langley, N. (1967). *Edgar Cayce on reincarnation*. New York: Paperback Library.
- Lawrence, D. H. (1931/1976). *Apocalypse*. London: Penguin.
- Leach, M. (1949). Cinderella. In M. Leach and J. Fried (Eds.), *Funk and Wagnall's standard dictionary of folklore, mythology and legend* (Vol. 1, pp. 233-234). New York: Funk.
- Lee, M. (1999). *The blackmailed bridegroom*. Sydney: Harlequin.
- Lieberman, M. K. (1986). 'Some day my Prince will come': Female Acculturation through the fairy tale. In J. Zipes (Ed.), *Don't bet on the Prince: Contemporary feminist fairy tales in North America and England* (pp. 185-208). New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall.
- Luketic, R. (Director). (2001). *Legally Blonde* [Motion picture]. United States: MGM.
- Luthi, M. (1984). *The fairytale as art form and portrait of man* (J. Erickson, Trans.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- MacGuire, S. (Director). (2001). *Bridget Jones' diary* [Motion picture]. United States: Miramax.
- May, R. (1958). The origins and significance of the existential movement in psychology. In R. May, E. Angel, & H. F. Ellenberger (Eds.), *Existence: A new dimension in psychiatry and psychology* (pp. 3-36). New York: Basic Books.
- May, R. (1958a). Contributions of existential psychotherapy. In R. May, E. Angel, & H. F. Ellenberger (Eds.), *Existence: A new dimension in psychiatry and psychology* (pp. 37-91). New York: Basic Books.
- McGlathery, J. M. (1991). *Fairy tale romance: The Grimms, Basile, and Perrault*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- McGuire, W (Ed.) (1974). *The Freud/Jung letters: The correspondence between Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung* (R. Manheim & R. F. C. Hull, Trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Mei, H. (1990). *Transforming the Cinderella dream: From Frances Burney to Charlotte Bronte*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Michaels, E. (1986). Hollywood iconography: A Warlpiri reading. In P. Drummond and R. Paterson (Eds.), *Television and its audience* (pp. 109-124). London: British Film Institute.
- Mill, J. S. (1869/1996). On liberty. T. Griffith (Ed.), *On liberty and the subjection of women* (pp. 1-114). Hertfordshire: Wordsworth.
- Miller, A. (1983). *For your own good: hidden cruelty in child-rearing and the roots of violence* (H. & H. Hannum, Trans.). Toronto: Collins.
- Miller, A. (1985). *Thou shalt not be aware: Society's betrayal of the child*. (H. & H. Hannum, Trans.). London: Pluto.
- Mitchell, M. (1936/1974). *Gone with the wind*. London: Pan.
- Mitchell, S. A. & Black, M. J. (1995). *Freud and beyond: A history of modern psychoanalytic thought*. New York: BasicBooks
- Mitchell, S. A. (2002). *Can love last? The fate of romance over time*. New York: Norton.
- Miya-Jervis, L. (2000, June-July). Who wants to marry a feminist? *Ms.*, 10(4), 63-65.
- Moncur, M. (2005). Thomas A. Edison quotes. In *The quotations page: Your source for famous quotes*. Retrieved July 5, 2006, from <http://www.quotationspage.com>
- Montgomery, L. M. (1937). *Anne of Green Gables*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson.

- Moody, R. A. (2001). *Life after life: The investigation of a phenomenon- survival of bodily death*. London: Rider.
- Moore, T. (1994). *Care of the soul: A guide for cultivating depth and sacredness in everyday life*. New York: HarperPerennial.
- Mullahy, P. (1955). *Oedipus: Myth and complex; a review of psychoanalytic theory*. New York: Grove.
- Mumford, L. (1923). *The story of utopias: Ideal commonwealths and social myths*. London: Harrap.
- Neill, A. S. (1953). *The free child*. London: Herbert Jenkins.
- Neill, A. S. (1968). *Summerhill*. Middlesex: Penguin.
- Newton, M. (2000). *Destiny of souls: New case studies of life between lives*. Minnesota: Llewellyn.
- Noll, R. (1997). *The Aryan Christ: The secret life of Carl Jung*. London: Macmillan
- Ondaatje, M. (1992). *The English patient*. New York: Knopf.
- Opie, I. & Opie, P. (1974). *The classic fairy tales*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Orwall, B. (2003, February 19). Disney to push retail gear tied to its TV shows. In *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved May 29, 2003, from <http://80-proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz>
- Payne, A. (Director), (2002). *About Schmidt* [Motion picture]. United States: New Line Studios.
- Peck, M. Scott. (1990). *The road less travelled: A new psychology of love, traditional values and spiritual growth*. London: Arrow.
- Peck, M. Scott. (1993). *A world waiting to be born: Civility rediscovered*. New York: Bantam.
- Peck, M. Scott (1998). *The different drum: Community making and peace*. New York: Touchstone.
- Peck, M. Scott. (1999). *The road less travelled and beyond: Spiritual growth in an age of anxiety*. London: Rider.
- Pellington, M. (Director). (1999). *Arlington Road* [Motion picture]. United States: Sony Pictures.
- Powell, B. B. (2007). *Classical myth*. (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River NJ: Pearson.

- Radway, J. A. (1984). *Reading the romance: Women, patriarchy, and popular literature*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Reid, G. (2004, February 7-8). Chameleon turns a new page. *The New Zealand Weekend Herald*, p. A28.
- Religious beliefs of Americans. (2003). In *Ontario consultants on religious tolerance*. Retrieved April, 10, 2006 from <http://www.religioustolerance.org/aboutus.htm>
- Richardson, S. (1740/1962). *Pamela*. London: Dent.
- Roberts, J. (1970). *The Seth material*. New York: Buccaneer.
- Romance fiction. (2006). In *Romance writers of America*. Retrieved December 8, 2006, from <https://www.rwanational.org/eweb/StartPage.aspx>
- Rooth, A. B. (1951). *The Cinderella cycle*. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup.
- Rowe, K. E. (1986). Feminism and fairy tales. In J. Zipes (Ed.), *Don't bet on the Prince: Contemporary feminist fairy tales in North America and England* (pp. 209-226). New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall.
- Russell, B. (1960). *On education*. London: Unwin.
- Salman, S. (1997). The creative psyche: Jung's major contributions. In P. Young-Eisendrath & T. Dawson (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Jung* (pp. 52-70). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Samuels, A. (1985). *Jung and the post-Jungians*. London: Routledge.
- Samuels, A., Shorter, B., & Plaut, F. (Eds.). (1986). *A critical dictionary of Jungian analysis*. Hove: Brunner-Routledge.
- Samuels, A. (1989). *The plural psyche: Personality, morality, and the father*. London: Tavistock.
- Samuels, A. (1997). Introduction: Jung and the post-Jungians. In P. Young-Eisendrath & T. Dawson (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Jung* (pp. 1-16). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Samuels, A. (2001). *Politics on the couch: Citizenship and the internal life*. London: Profile.
- Samuels, A. (2002). *Interview with Andrew Samuels of the centre for psychoanalytic studies*. Retrieved March 1, 2005, from University of Essex Web site: <http://www.essex.ac.uk/centres/psycho/publications/ASRuthW.htm>
- Sandford, J., & Sandford, P. (1982). *The transformation of the inner man: The most comprehensive book on inner healing today*. Tulsa, OK: Victory House.

- Sanford, J. A. (1980). *The invisible partners: How the male and female in each of us affects our relationships*. New York: Paulist.
- Sargent, L. T. (2000). Utopian traditions: Themes and variations. In R. Schaer, G. Claeys, & L. T. Sargent (Eds.), *Utopia: The search for the ideal society in the Western world* (pp. 8-17). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sayers, S. (1998). *Marxism and human nature*. New York: Routledge.
- Schaer, R. (2000). Utopia: Space, time, history. In R. Schaer, G. Claeys, & L. T. Sargent (Eds.), *Utopia: The search for the ideal society in the Western world* (pp. 3-7). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schultz, D. P., & Schultz, S. E. (1987). *A history of modern psychology* (4th ed.). San Diego: Harcourt.
- Shadyac, T. (Director). (1998). *Patch Adams* [Motion picture]. United States: Universal Studios.
- Sharma, P., & Tucker, J., (2005). Cases of the reincarnation type with memories from the intermission between lives. *Journal of Near Death Studies*, 23(2): 101-118.
- Searles, H. F. (1965). *Collected papers on schizophrenia and related subjects*. London: Hogarth.
- Seifert, L. C. (1996). *Fairy tales, sexuality, and gender in France 1690-1715: Nostalgic utopias*: Cambridge University Press.
- Shaw, J. (1998). Interview with Drew Barrymore from the August 1998 issue of Seventeen. In *For ever after*. Retrieved April 9, 2003, from <http://members.aol.com/gracefalls/everafter.html>
- Shroder, T. (1999). *Old souls: The scientific evidence for past lives*. New York: Simon.
- Shumway, D. R. (1998). Something old, something new: Romance and marital advice in the 1920s. In P. N. Stearns & J. Lewis (Eds.), *An emotional history of the United States* (pp. 305-317). New York: New York University Press.
- Simpson, J. (Presenter). (2002). *Afghanistan: The dark ages* [videotape]. London: BBC.
- Smith, M. (1995). *Engaging characters: Fiction, emotion, and the cinema*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sophocles (1986). *The Theban plays* (Trans., D. Taylor). London: Methuen.
- Stacey, J., & Pearce, L. (1995). The heart of the matter: Feminists revisit romance. In L. Pearce & J. Stacey (Eds.), *Romance revisited* (pp. 11-45). London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Stearn, J. (1984). *Soul mates*. New York: Bantam.

- Stein, R. (1973). *Incest and human love: The betrayal of the soul in psychotherapy* (2nd ed.). Dallas, TX: Spring.
- Stein, R. (1986). The incest wound and the marriage archetype. In K. Gibson, D. Lathrop, and E. Mark Stern (Eds.), *Carl Jung and soul psychology* (pp. 171-187). New York: Haworth.
- Stevenson, I. (1983). American children who claim to remember previous lives. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 171, 742-748.
- Stevenson, I. (1987). *Children who remember previous lives: A question of reincarnation*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Stevenson, I. (1990). Phobias in children who claim to remember previous lives. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 4(2), 243-254.
- Stevenson, I. (1993). Birthmarks and birth defects corresponding to wounds on deceased persons [Electronic version]. *The Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 7(4), 403-410.
- Stevenson, I. (2000). The phenomenon of claimed memories of previous lives: Possible interpretations and importance. *Medical Hypotheses*, 54(4), 652-659.
- Stevenson, I. (2003). *European cases of the reincarnation type*. Jefferson: McFarland.
- Stone, K. (1975). Things Walt Disney never told us. In C. R. Farrer (Ed.), *Women and folklore*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Tacey, D. (1997). Jung in the academy: devotions and resistances. *The Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 42(2), 269-283.
- Tacey, D. J. (1997a). *Remaking men: Jung, spirituality and social change*. London: Routledge.
- Tacey, D. (2001). *Jung and the new age*. East Sussex: Brunner-Routledge.
- Tacey, D. (2004). *The spirituality revolution: The emergence of contemporary spirituality*. Hove: Brunner-Routledge.
- Taylor, A. (1982). The study of the Cinderella cycle. In A. Dundes (Ed.), *Cinderella: A folklore casebook* (pp. 115-128). New York: Garland.
- Taylor, D. (1986). Introduction. In Sophocles, *The Theban plays* (D. Taylor, Trans., pp. vii-iii). London: Methuen.
- Taylor, H. (1989). *Scarlett's women: Gone with the wind and its female fans*. London: Virago.
- Tennant, A. (Director). (1998). *Ever After* [Motion picture]. United States: Twentieth Century Fox.

- Thompson, S. (1946). *The folktale*. New York: Holt.
- Tillich, P. (1973). Critique and justification of Utopia. In F. E. Manuel (Ed.), *Utopias and utopian thought* (pp. 296-309). London: Souvenir.
- Ting, N.-T. (1974). *The Cinderella cycle in China and Indo-China*. In F. F. Communications, No. 213. Helsinki: Academia Scientarium Fennica.
- Tucker, J. B. (2005). *Life before life: A scientific investigation of children's memories of previous lives*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Types of experiences we study. (2006). Retrieved April 21, 2006, from Virginia University, Division of Perpetual Studies Web site: http://www.healthsystem.virginia.edu/internet/personalitystudies/case_types.cfm
- Von Franz, M.-L. (1964). The process of individuation. In C. G. Jung (Ed.), *Man and his symbols* (pp. 158-229). New York: Windfall.
- Waley, A. (1947). The Chinese Cinderella story. *Folklore*, 58, 226-238.
- Walker, R. (1990). *Struggle without end: Ka whawhai tonu matou*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Wehr, G. (1987). *Jung, a biography* (D. Weeks, Trans.). Boston: Random.
- Weiss, B. L. (1988). *Many lives, many masters*. New York: Warner.
- Weiss, B. L. (1992). *Through time into healing*. New York: Simon.
- Weiss, B. L. (1996). *Only love is real: A story of soulmates reunited*. New York: Warner.
- Weitz, C., & Weitz, P. (Director). (2002). *About a boy* [Motion picture]. United States: Universal Pictures.
- White, H. (1987). *The content of the form: Narrative discourse and historical representation*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- White, K. (1998). The new man and early twentieth-century emotional culture. In P. N. Stearns & J. Lewis (Eds.), *An emotional history of the United States* (pp. 333-356). New York: New York University Press.
- Whitmont, E. C. (1969). *The symbolic quest: Basic concepts of analytical psychology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Whitton, J. L. & Fisher, J. (1986). *Life between life: Scientific explorations into the void separating one incarnation from the next*. New York: Doubleday.
- Windschuttle, K. (1994). *The killing of history: How a discipline is being murdered by literary critics and social theorists*. Sydney: Macleay.

Woolger, R. (1990). *Other lives, other selves: A Jungian psychotherapist discovers past lives*. London: Crucible.

Writing guidelines: Silhouette romance (2002). Retrieved August 22, 2002, from:
<http://www.eharlequin.com/harl/books/alcove/guides/20slrm11.html>

Yolen, J. (1982). America's Cinderella. In A. Dundes (Ed.), *Cinderella: A folklore casebook* (pp. 294-306). New York: Garland.

Young-Eisendrath, P. (1997). The self in analysis. *The Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 42(1), 157-166.

Zipes, J. (1994). *Fairy tale as myth: Myth as fairy tale*. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.

Zipes, J. (Ed.). (2000). *The Oxford companion to fairy tales*. New York: Oxford University Press.

