

Edited by  
**GARTH AMUNDSON**



# **PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL STUDIES OF JUNG'S TELEOLOGY**

The Future-Orientation of Mind

Philosophy and Psychoanalysis

ROUTLEDGE

---

# Psychological and Philosophical Studies of Jung's Teleology

---

This important new volume addresses an underappreciated dimension of Jung's work, his concept of the teleology, or "future-orientation", of psychic reality.

The work, authored by an international group of Jungian scholars, expands upon the socio-cultural, psychological, therapeutic, and philosophical import of this key pillar of the Jungian oeuvre, offering a compelling alternative to current, culturally dominant ideas about how change occurs. The book addresses varied aspects of his teleological thought generally, and its application to the psychotherapeutic endeavor specifically, engaging Freudian, neo-Freudian, and related theoretical orientations in an informed dialogue about the critical issue of the emergent unfolding of subjectivity in treatment.

This is an illuminating read for those interested in the study of Jungian theory, psychoanalysis, social psychology, religion, transpersonal psychology, indigenous wisdom traditions, and philosophical metapsychology.

**Garth Amundson** is a clinical psychologist in practice in Chicago, Illinois, USA. His past publications include a study of the application of Jungian theory to adolescent psychotic states and the concordance of dimensions of American philosophical pragmatism with Jung's ideas. This is his first edited volume.

## PHILOSOPHY & PSYCHOANALYSIS BOOK SERIES

JON MILLS

Series Editor

*Philosophy & Psychoanalysis* is dedicated to current developments and cutting-edge research in the philosophical sciences, phenomenology, hermeneutics, existentialism, logic, semiotics, cultural studies, social criticism, and the humanities that engage and enrich psychoanalytic thought through philosophical rigor. With the philosophical turn in psychoanalysis comes a new era of theoretical research that revisits past paradigms while invigorating new approaches to theoretical, historical, contemporary, and applied psychoanalysis. No subject or discipline is immune from psychoanalytic reflection within a philosophical context including psychology, sociology, anthropology, politics, the arts, religion, science, culture, physics, and the nature of morality. Philosophical approaches to psychoanalysis may stimulate new areas of knowledge that have conceptual and applied value beyond the consulting room reflective of greater society at large. In the spirit of pluralism, *Philosophy & Psychoanalysis* is open to any theoretical school in philosophy and psychoanalysis that offers novel, scholarly, and important insights in the way we come to understand our world.

Titles in this series:

Eternal Youth and the Myth of Deconstruction: An Archetypal Reading of Jacques Derrida and Judith Butler

by Bret Alderman

Jungian Analysis in a World on Fire: At the Nexus of Individual and Collective Trauma

Edited by Laura Camille Tuley and John R. White

Psychological and Philosophical Studies of Jung's Teleology: The Future-Orientation of Mind

Edited by Garth Amundson

---

# Psychological and Philosophical Studies of Jung's Teleology

---

The Future-Orientation of Mind

Edited by Garth Amundson

Designed cover image: © George Henry Hall (American) – A Pomegranate, Siena (1885). Courtesy National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

First published 2024

by Routledge

4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge

605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2024 selection and editorial matter, Garth Amundson; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Garth Amundson to be identified as the author of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

*British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication Data*

Names: Amundson, Garth (Psychologist), editor.

Title: Psychological and philosophical studies of Jung's teleology: the future-orientation of mind / edited by Garth Amundson.

Description: Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge, 2024. | Series: Philosophy and psychoanalysis | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2023047969 (print) | LCCN 2023047970 (ebook) |

ISBN 9781032536248 (pbk) | ISBN 9781032536255 (hbk) |

ISBN 9781003412823 (ebk)

Subjects: LCSH: Psychoanalysis. | Jungian psychology. | Social psychology.

Classification: LCC BF173 .P7767 2024 (print) | LCC BF173 (ebook) |

DDC 150.19/54—dc23/eng/20231207

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2023047969>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2023047970>

ISBN: 978-1-032-53625-5 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-53624-8 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-41282-3 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003412823

Typeset in Times New Roman

by Deanta Global Publishing Services, Chennai, India

---

# Contents

---

<i>Contributor Professional Biographies</i>	<i>vi</i>
Introduction: Jung's Teleology: Its Historical Origins and Place in His Theory GARTH AMUNDSON	1
1 Coming into Being: Telos in Jung and Bion MARK WINBORN	24
2 On Truth, Reasonable Certainty, and God: Conviction as Revelatory Process in Peirce and Jung GARTH AMUNDSON	58
3 Jung's Call to Eros: A Personal Journey TOSIA H. ZRAIKAT	117
4 The Ravenous Hydra and the Great Tree of Peace: The Teleology of Indigenous and European Civilizations SHANE EYNON	159
5 Archetype of the Machine JODY ECHEGARAY	174
6 The Dance of Limit and Possibility GIORGIO TRICARICO	217
<i>Index</i>	<i>229</i>

---

## Contributor Professional Biographies

---

**Garth Amundson, Psy.D.**, this volume's editor, is a psychologist in Chicago, Illinois, USA, where he practices both independently and in local group practices from a mixed psychoanalytic and Jungian/neo-Jungian perspective. He owned and operated his own group practice between 1999 and 2016 and currently devotes time to researching and writing about philosophical understandings and interpretations of psychotherapeutic beliefs about human nature, purposefulness, and human destiny, as well as clinical supervision. His past publications include two book chapters: *A Jungian Interpretation of the Treatment of Delusions in Adolescence* (in *Outpatient Treatment of Psychosis*, 2017) and *Jung's Answer to Job: Toward a "Sensible" Mysticism* (in *Jung and Philosophy*, 2019).

**Jody Echegaray, Psy.D.**, is a candidate-in-training with the C.G. Jung Institute of Los Angeles, California, USA. In this early career interest, he worked to develop technological innovations for the film industry. This expertise is evident in his contribution to the present volume, which addresses the evolution of technological or "machinic" extensions of human striving from an archetypal perspective. Dr. Echegaray has also conducted a mixed undergraduate/graduate-level seminar class at the USC School of Cinematic Arts and Pepperdine University on the challenges and pitfalls of the Hollywood entertainment industry and has conducted research into the uses of film and television in deepening the psychotherapeutic process.

**Shane Eynon, Ph.D.**, is a former psychologist with the US Marines where he served in Afghanistan and state-side treating PTSD and related conditions, and since 2018, is in independent practice in West Chester, Pennsylvania, USA. A Native American, he is an active participant as a lecturer and consultant with educational institutions serving various

tribal nations, including the Seneca and Ogalala Sioux. He is also presently serving as President of the International Institute for Psychoanalysis and Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and is a Clinical Fellow with the International Neuropsychoanalytic Society, with which he is Board Certified.

Dr. Eynon's interest in Jungian theory evolved as an outgrowth of his sense that Jung's transcultural and transpersonal emphases are among the West's most balanced and humble attempts to relate to indigenous traditions. In addition to his chapter in our volume, an expression of this interest is his position as Senior Lecturer with the Centre for Applied Jungian Studies in Cape Town, South Africa, since 2014.

**Giorgio Tricarico, Psychologist**, born in Milan, Italy, is a Jungian analyst presently living in Helsinki, Finland. He holds a Master's degree in Clinical Psychology from the University of Padua (1996) and attended post-graduate analytical training at CIPA (Centro Italiano Psicologia Analitica; Milan Institute), leading to his becoming a psychotherapist in 2008 and Jungian analyst in 2009. Mr. Tricarico is a member of the IAAP (International Association for Analytical Psychology), and one of the founders of the FEGAP (Finnish-Estonian Group for Analytical Psychology, IAAP member society), where he currently sits as its President. Since 2017, he has served as visiting supervisor for the GAAP (Georgian Association for Analytical Psychology) in Tbilisi, Georgia.

Mr. Tricarico has worked with adult patients since 1998 and lectures and offers seminars internationally on relevant issues in Analytical Psychology. Author of books and articles, he has published two books, *The Labyrinth of Possibility: a Therapeutic Factor in Analytical Practice* (2009) and *Lost Goddesses: a Kaleidoscope on Porn* (2017). The former volume represents the only book-length contribution to the study of Jung's teleology prior to the publication of this present text. Finally, he is also a devoted musician and songwriter.

**Mark Winborn, Ph.D.**, is a Jungian analyst in Memphis, Tennessee, USA. Given the vast extent of his professional affiliations and activities, it is only possible to highlight a few of these here. Dr. Winborn trained at the Jung Institute in Zurich, Switzerland, between 1993 and 1999, and has been a member of their teaching staff as well as an external supervisor since 2014. His involvement as external supervisor and educator is part of his work with numerous Jungian organizations in the USA,



the Inter-Regional Society of Jungian Analysts, the Memphis Jungian Seminar, as well as international Jungian institutions such as the Moscow Association for Analytical Psychology in Moscow, Russia. In addition to this, he has been a member of the ethics committee of the International Association for Analytical Psychology since 2016.

Among Dr. Winborn's many publications are the well-reviewed *Deep Blues: Human Soundscape for the Archetypal Journey* (2011), *Interpretation in Jungian Analysis: Art and Technique* (2019), *Beyond Persona with Jungian Analysts: Interviews on Individuation and Beginnings* (2021), and *Jungian Psychoanalysis: A Contemporary Introduction* (2023) as well as a large number of articles and book reviews in esteemed Jungian publications. Finally, he is an avid guitarist with an abiding interest in North American folk traditions, particularly those situated in the Southern United States, and regularly performs in public.

**Tosia H. Zraikat, B.Ed. & Master's degree in Transpersonal Psychology**, has a richly diverse professional and personal history in spiritual mentoring, qualitative research, meditation, self-hypnosis, creativity, consciousness, myth and symbolism, and dreamwork. She resides in Queensland, Australia, where she is involved in the application of writing to the development of spiritual understanding and psychological well-being, both independently and at the Queensland Renew You Centre for Wellbeing and Longevity. Ms. Zraikat's perspective is notably transcultural and transhistorical, as evident in her certification in Ancient Greek studies from the Coursera program of Wesleyan University and her proficiency in French, Italian, and Russian, in addition to her native English.

---

## Introduction

# Jung's Teleology: Its Historical Origins and Place in His Theory

Garth Amundson

---

Carl Jung portrays psychic reality as unfolding according to the ends of as-yet-unrealized future states of understanding and adaptation, what in philosophical language is called its *teleology* (from the Greek *telos*, “end”, and *logos*, “reason”). In 1916 he writes, “...in my opinion the nature of the human mind compels us to take the finalistic view. It cannot be disputed that, psychologically speaking, we are living and working day by day according to the principle of directed aims or purpose as well as that of causality” (Jung, 1916/1961). And later, Jung asserts, “Life is teleology par excellence; it is a series of aims which seek to fulfill themselves. The end of every process is its goal” (Jung, 1934/1970). However, despite these forceful claims, nowhere does Jung systematically define his teleological orientation. This is utterly characteristic of his literary style, and a variation of the adage that the medium is part of the message, namely, that one can discern *what* is being communicated by examining its “how”, the form of its communication. For Jung, an idea is first and foremost a happening, a phenomenon that independently descends upon consciousness. This, I think, is why he prefers to theorize and write by the seat of his pants, as it were, from the stream of impressions forcing themselves upon him. To be carried along by the force of an idea does not lend itself to the kind of measured, rigorously consistent logic and cautious restraint we normally associate with psychological theory-making. In Jung’s view, one does not “create” a theory; rather, one allows oneself to be appropriated *by* its dynamisms, which arise from sources beyond conscious intelligence. One lends one’s ego to the *telos* of its forward-going currents, its aims, to where it is that the idea is “heading”. More specifically, Jung believes that ideas, if they are compelling personally and on a collective level, arise independently as symbols of the dynamisms of the unconscious. This is to say that

like all symbols, ideas are living, hence evolving beings. And like all living phenomena, ideas are sapped of their power to move us emotionally when inappropriately subjected to the operations of linear logic, including one-sided demands for clarity that, if achieved, render them intellectually communicable but no more.

Hence, like many of his most important concepts, Jung's teleology exists in the warp and woof of his writings, woven into the immediacy of its particular experiential "universe", and so must be teased out of its enmeshment in other ideas for its meaning and implications to be grasped more completely. This book is our modest attempt to do so while also creatively expanding upon the centrality of teleology to Jung's thought. If we have done our work properly, the power of this idea will remain intact and, beyond this, extend into a series of novel contemplations about psychic purposefulness itself. Toward this end, the *telos* of this introduction is not to simply offer a survey of Jungian thought about the mind's relation to the future, but also to provide readers with a sense of what it means to think teleologically.

This is not the imposing task that it might appear to be on first blush: at every moment (including in dreams) we are creating meaning toward certain ends that we affirm are important and even crucial. This phenomenon is so basic to our humanity and occurs so often that it tends to be "hidden in plain sight", as it were. As such, it is something we only rarely think about, if at all. Beyond the uncontroversial fact that we are goal-oriented creatures, in this introduction I also hope to convey the sense of how Jung leapfrogs from some ancient philosophical observations about how we employ goals to navigate daily life toward what I think of as his own psycho-metaphysical speculations about Being as expressing evolving purposes, speculations that invoke issues such as the meaning of consciousness itself, what its "for-the-sake-of" may be. What follows is my particular perspective on this topic, one dwelling upon the Western, specifically Eurocentric theo-philosophical background of Jung's teleology. This reflects my understanding of Jung as an essentially European thinker who addresses us largely from within the intellectual traditions of the European West. That said, Jung is a trailblazer in drawing upon the myths of diverse non-Euro-Western cultures to aid in his psychological studies, however much he is open to criticism for incorporating these into his preferred European worldview rather than allowing them to stand fully on their own. That is, his hypotheses about the universality of human experience are bolstered by his having studied and

personally met those from different indigenous groups worldwide, though generally he interprets these groups' mythologies, including their various notions of causality and purpose, through a Eurocentric lens. Personally, I think this simply attests to the fact that all of us, however erudite or intellectually receptive, cannot begin any encounter the world except by looking at it through our own eyes. The fact that Jung's cultural background and personal psychological defenses limited his understanding of other cultures should be viewed with the conviction that the perfect not become the enemy of the good.

Joseph Rychlak (1991) casts light on Jung's literary style in his account of his teleology, which he notes developed as part of his reliance upon what Jung called a "constructive-synthetic" method of understanding psychological phenomena. As the term implies, this notion of what motivates us is based on the premise that mind is actively involved in constructing the future, and that it does so under the guidance of an innate drive to synthesize disparate dimensions of experience toward a sense of wholeness, unity, or completeness. Jung differentiates this manner of analyzing psychic reality from Freud's modernist reduction of experience to a set of purely personal unconscious conflicts arising in the past. And this premise about human nature shows in Freud's writing style, which is more restrained and cautiously linear than Jung's. Throughout his writings Jung offers compelling general statements about the integrative or synthesizing quality of mind and the way he tried to conform his thinking and therapy practice to this factor. Take as an example the following: "We conceive the product of the unconscious as an expression oriented to a goal or purpose....(and therefore) the aim of the constructive method is to elicit from the unconscious product a meaning that relates to the subject's future attitude" (Jung, 1921/1969, para. 701). Rychlak defines Jung's constructive-synthetic approach as an expression of his belief in an unconscious drive to reconcile conflicting experiences and their diverse aims. This is seen in Jung's concept of what he coined the mind's "transcendent function", its capacity to situate psychological conflicts within the mind's broader, integrative movement toward new, possibly unprecedented states of coherence (Jung, 1958b/1969). Ultimately, this does not "cure" or "resolve" the dilemma but rather transcends its polarities, toward the end of finding new, sustaining meaning within what previously seemed an insoluble collision of opposites. An implication of this view is that psychological symptoms are not only expressions of inner conflicts between clashing desires, but

signifiers of some future set of meaningful realizations and adaptations to life striving to break through the ego's natural preference for the pedestrian, the taken-for-granted, and the known. This is implied in Jung's assertion that, as he writes, "(Neurosis) must, ultimately, be discussed as the suffering of a soul that has not discovered its meaning" (1932/1970); and, speaking directly to the futural direction of all psychological problems, he later writes, "Neurosis is teleologically oriented" (1943/1966, para. 40). Further implied in this vision of the *telos* of symptoms is Jung's notion of the "objectivity" of the unconscious and its purposes. We are "visited" or set upon by the dynamisms of the unconscious, often enough in the form of symptoms, this because of the inherently forward-looking direction of mind itself, its constant striving to forecast and/or bring to fruition a "may-be", a possibility, from states of division and conflict.

We might consider Jung's teleological outlook as of form of protest against domination by the faculty of memory itself, which selectively ensconces the forward-going flow of experience in static mental representation. This quality of memory has a highly conservative, "memorializing" function, in which meanings are rendered frozen in time, much like a statue on any Euro-American village green. This "statuesque" quality of memory, its seeming solidity as an object in mind that orients us as experiencing subjects within the movement of time, is essential for our thriving, including that involving possibilities of development toward the future: after all, growth, in all its forms, does not originate in a vacuum but from within the settled facts or "givens" of an established legacy, a psychic inheritance that pays tribute to, eulogizes, or and/or celebrates the past. But herein we see that memory properly exists in a dynamic dialectical relationship with possibility, in the first place so as to exist at all: the memorialized legacy of time, instantiated within the mind's dynamisms as memory, once existed as a movement toward something not-yet-actual. To recall one's past is to remember oneself as imagining a future yet to exist.

Neurosis is symptomatic of disruptions in this past-future dialectic, and hence, in the nature of time itself. We can and often do become unduly and even pathologically dominated by the past, a circumstance that unfolds as we engage in idealizing what we imagine to be its guarantee of structure and certainty. In neurosis, such idealization reveals its dark side, as memory overtakes us with rigidified, constricted vision of ourselves and the world itself. These then become ensconced within our subjective experience of time in static and "monumentalized" forms that are mentally "set in stone",

as it were, forcing themselves on consciousness as the unhappy givens of life. By dwelling in the shadow of what has been handed to us by prior experience there is no possibility of experiencing oneself in a revelatory or novel manner, that is, there is no relating to oneself and the world itself as a “happening”. Our capacity for innovation, hence personal identity and relation to the world become distilled to a staid collection of fixed traits whose nature we feel we already know. To indulge in a pun, the noble mental statuary reminding us of our relation to time past can easily become “statutory” in the legal sense. Here I am thinking of Sigmund Freud’s concept of the law-giving cultural superego, specifically its tendency to impose an enfeebling, one-sidedly backward-looking and fetishistically worshipful relationship to personal and collective history. Here, the cultural “must-be” overshadows and obscures our natural inclination to envision the “may-be”.

Anticipating later trends in post-modernism, Jung asserts that values and purposes change throughout the course of individual and group history. This perspective informs his paradoxical understanding of the archetypal images underlying our engagement with reality as eternal yet continually evolving. This evolution occurs, in part, due to the influence of the human being to realize common human purposes (and the urge itself to live purposefully) parochially, within the context of singular, time-bound, “local” strivings. Writes Jung...

The original structural components of the psyche are of no less surprising a uniformity than are those of the visible body... They are eternally inherited forms and ideas which have at first no specific content. Their specific content only appears in the course of the individual’s life, when personal experience is taken up precisely in these forms.

(Jung, 1958a/1969)

In the foregoing, teleology is implied rather than directly stated. However, without too much trouble we can discern his point that the archetypes, while trans-cultural and eternal in and of themselves, seek to express themselves in the domain of temporality. That is, they naturally seek to enter into the realm of space and time and establish residence within the nitty-gritty specificity of everyday human lives. In this way the archetypes evolve toward fuller realizations of their natural ends, evolving teleologically from non-specific, contentless eternal forms to content and context-specific phenomena in daily life. Furthermore, and at the risk of reading into Jung something that he does not mean to say, it would seem that herein we may

speculate that the archetypes themselves evolve as they become manifest in the particularity of a given life and its unique historical exigencies. Hence, the timeless archetype of, say, war necessarily expresses itself very differently in the mind of a Ukrainian foot soldier in the current conflict with Russia than in that of an Aztec warrior battling the Spaniard Cortes in 1519. The archetype itself is empty of definite content: it is a potential “space” that becomes “filled in” with a complex amalgam of interrelated parochial personal dispositions, group moral values and allegiances, and so forth.

Jung is not alone among the first modern psychotherapists to assert a future-orientation to mind. Some of the original members of Freud’s circle cite the notion of mind as directed toward an as-yet-unrealized future (see Adler, 1921; Maeder, 1910). However, they remain true to the modernist narrative of human development, its purposes and aims, as explainable solely within personalistic, interpersonal, and sociocultural contexts. If Jung had followed their example he would not have been saying anything terribly novel. However, he is critical of what he deemed the limited understanding of time within such modernist narratives, which he finds insensitive to its transpersonal, existential dimension. His constructive-synthetic approach goes far beyond the limits of the personal and sociocultural, to posit a meaningful and possibly redemptive continuity between the individual and a cosmos striving toward the goal of becoming conscious of itself (Jung, 1958). This frankly metaphysical assertion is informed by Jung’s insistence that pre-modern narratives can reanimate and deepen personal and collective modernist consciousness (and we might note that here too he finds a continuity, this time that of an enduring if subtle historical constancy between the discourses of the ancient and contemporary worlds, rather than what is often assumed to be a sharp break between these two eras occurring with the Enlightenment). This stance is the one most “Jungian” dimension of Jung’s theory, a view of the psyche that dramatically sets it apart from Freudian perspectives and from most of the core premises underlying normative modernity itself.

This is a metaphysical central pillar of Jung’s thought that emerged quite early in his work. Hence, in the 1896 Zofinga lectures, he speaks of this manner of understanding the course and meaning of human life as both a method of inquiry and a reflection of a transpersonal process, one that as such is both external to, and the immaterial intrapsychic foundation of, the human being (1896–1899/1984, para. 142). The priority that Jung ascribes to the mind’s future-orientation is one that has long preoccupied near-Eastern and Western thinkers from diverse religious, social, and intellectual

sources. Jung's transpersonal teleology, though proximally derived from early 19th century German Romanticism and its rejection of reductive modernist models of the human condition, has a long and complex history pre-dating modernity.

While the fascination with purposes and ends is more prominent in Euro-Western cultures, it is also a not-uncommon feature of many indigenous mythopoeic worldviews. I am no anthropologist, although my limited understanding of indigenous teleologies is that they generally tend to be informed by the notion of time as circular rather than linear, as in the West. Further, they depict human purposes as properly defined from a position of intimate connection and cooperation with Nature. Here Nature is understood as an essentially intelligent and beneficent, if mysterious, guide, one that alerts us to our destinies through dreams, the wisdom of elders, shamanic visions, and revelatory encounters with the rascally spirits of fields and forests. Despite having been reared in Europe, with its Christianized eschatology of creation as progressing toward a defined and final state of fulfillment, Jung takes pains to separate himself from this cultural bias. Hence, Renos Papadopolous (2006) states that, "Jung repeatedly emphasized the *process* of individuation instead of the final product of individuated state itself" (Papadopolous, 2006, p. 31). Jung's vision of Nature as inviting us to become aligned with its perpetually repeating cycles, minus the usual Euro-Western emphasis on an ultimate consummation of time, transcends the limits of his personal background, and is a preliminary although imperfect point of contact with many indigenous concepts of human ends. Hence, for example, he seeks to define his use of the idea of finality (implicit in Eurocentric teleologies) more precisely, by stressing the importance of the *path* of goal-directed query while avoiding the implication that this finally arrives at a fixed, immutable, and unchanging terminus. Writes Jung,

I use the word finality intentionally, in order to avoid confusion with the concept of teleology. By finality, I mean merely the immanent psychological striving for a goal. Instead of 'striving for a goal' one could also say 'sense of purpose'. All psychological phenomena have some such sense of purpose inherent in them.

(Jung, 1957/1977)

In this volume, Shane Eynon's chapter on the teleology of North American woodlands native societies may help readers think more deeply about this



issue, including the benefits and limitations of viewing indigenous and non-Western cultures through a Jungian lens.

In the Western tradition of metaphysics that most directly influence Jung, teleology emerges at least as far back as the ancient mythology of the Middle East with the Hebrews, whose descendants later became known as the *Yehudim* (in English, the Jews). Their *mythos* was a teleology of collective destiny, the protracted, alternately tragic and humorous story of a people ambivalently devoted to the purposes of a god who reveals himself in the unfolding of parochial human history, sometimes beneficently, at other times violently. This, of course, eventually became the mythic basis of the Christian narrative of the deity as revealing himself most perfectly in the personage of Jesus, the Christ, whose appearance among us became interpreted by the early church as signaling the beginning of a trans-cultural (and not solely Jewish) salvific historical movement toward the end of time itself, culminating in the moral victory of good over evil.

It is generally recognized that Plato was the first Western philosopher to systematically spell out a cosmic teleology. In two essays, first in the *Phaedo* (1892/2017) and later in the *Timaeus* (1888/1988), he set forth a teleology that is a generative, metaphysically holistic property of the cosmos and individual life, the latter being a microcosmic expression of the dynamisms of the former. Here Plato, addressing us through different literary characters, argues that the movement of individual beings to realize their proper ends reflects the larger processes of the *kosmos* (in Greek, “ordered whole”). These proper ends are oriented toward the penultimate, eternal, and transcendental Form of the Good. In this we see the equation of reason with the Good, an expression of the ancient Grecian captivation by a view of aesthetics as related to geometric proportion and balance, toward a cosmology in which the striving for an arithmetic cohesion and orderliness is the overarching principle binding all things together.

As is well known, Jung is heavily indebted to Plato. His assertion of the mind’s future-direction may even be considered a contemporary addition to Neo-Platonic teleology, particularly in the way he applied the Platonic Forms to his concept of the archetypes as eternal, contentless psychic predispositions informing the general structure of our conscious interpretations of reality. Jung’s (1916/1967) forays into Gnosticism, the “underground” interpretation of Christian doctrine strongly influenced by Greek Neo-Platonism, are among his unusual and creative uses of this philosophical tradition. Gnosticism is a syncretic product of a vast number of historical influences, including Jewish

Kabbalistic thought and Greco-Roman mystery religions. It is attractive to Jung because it embodies a religious orientation that is also a proto-psychology, yielding an unusual spirituality of inwardness and attention to personal experience in place of adherence to creeds. As such, Gnosticism presages his own syncretic, phenomenological vision of human nature and destiny (Ribi, 2013) and emboldens him in his belief of the continuity between pre-modern and modern models of our nature. Drawing upon the Gnostic wisdom traditions from 100 CE and thereafter, Jung posits that the process of treatment has parallels with the Gnostic account of the fall and progressive return of the alienated soul to its true source in the divine *Pleroma*, the transcendent realm of unity metaphorically “above” the deceptions of the temporal, material world. As such, he sees in Gnostic dualism a transformative telic journey of cosmic fall and redemptive return matching his own sensibilities and concerns.

The second major influence upon Jung’s notions of purposefulness is found in his uses of Immanuel Kant’s thought, which in many ways is a modernist addendum to Plato. Early in his life Jung became deeply attracted to Kant’s writings, stating enthusiastically, “Kant is my philosopher!” (Jung, quoted in Colacicchi, 2021, p. 15). This is understandable because, like Jung himself, Kant was a religious person seeking to affirm the concept of God in a post-Enlightenment, increasingly secular world. Kant begins philosophizing in modernist fashion by outlining the necessary conditions for thought to occur at all, an aspect of which involves an exploration of the limits of what we may reasonably claim to know. This is a “negative” point of departure that is a consequence of the demise of religious certainties brought on by the Enlightenment. Specifically, Kant (1781/2000) argues that we are epistemologically constrained by innate, *a priori* mental categories (humbler, “this-worldly” and “subjectivized” versions of Plato’s Forms) that dictate the structure of how we experience and interpret reality, and which we cannot transcend. However, he asserts, the fact that we are capable of reasoning accurately about reality, and that we do so in a manner that consistently conforms to the inborn, *a priori* lawfulness that constitutes the nature of thought itself, provides grounds upon which to affirm the probability, though not the certainty, of an intelligent suprasensible Creator who has authored such a structure to our reasoning. And it is in the affirmation of the relative freedom from brute necessity made possible by the transcendence of the categories, that the modern person may come into accord with the divine, whose essence is unbounded creativity, rather than by unreflectively parroting ancient creeds.

This is a “psychologized” re-visioning of religious life, one in which Christian, particularly Protestant, morality becomes a personal concern that is self-responsibly “worked on” privately rather than thoughtlessly accepted as a matter of loyalty to tradition. This, I presume, is one reason why Kant’s analysis is intuitively appealing to Jung. In Kant, the *telos* of human life is to become able to affirm our moral freedom in relation to the natural limits imposed by the givens of the categorical structures of knowledge. Jung appropriates this idea, reframing the Kantian mental categories in his concept of the archetypes, which, similar to Kant’s *a priori* cognizing structures, are eternal, unconscious and contentless mental templates propelling us, irrespective of our conscious intentions, toward general modes of comprehending experience. Individuation, his term for the process of becoming the singular human being that one is meant to be, is partly a process of becoming relatively free from the fateful determining power of archetypal forms. Hence, for Jung, achieving this state is a matter of moral fidelity to the unfolding of one’s individuality, and as such is the ultimate goal of psychotherapy. As Giovanni Colacicchi (2021) states, while Kant addresses the autonomy of practical reason from necessity in terms of a “consciousness of duty”, Jung, he notes, “emphasizes a duty to be conscious” (p. 15). This is to say that one takes up a self-reflexive position toward oneself, toward the end of becoming a defined and differentiated subject. This does not at all mean that one renounces one’s grounding in the “givens” of the unconscious, as we often do when we earnestly and one-sidedly seek the dubious neo-liberal goals of “positivity”, “self-mastery”, or “personal growth”, now very much in vogue in therapies such as Positive Psychology. Rather, one engages in a dialogical relationship with the unconscious and its dynamisms, a paradoxical act in which one realizes one’s individual destiny (which includes the ability to skillfully discern, interrogate, and sometimes challenge what the unconscious is “up” to) as a function of having given oneself over to its dynamisms. Finally, this would seem to suggest another manner in which the archetypes are not simply fixed in time but evolve; namely, that, in a Kantian vein, these innate cognizing structures can and do respond to our having engaged them dialectically, as self-reflective, conscious agents. As such, they are simultaneously eternal and changeable, metamorphosing in response to our self-responsibly considering the fateful paths upon which they have set us. These are teleological byways upon which we at least have the power to progress at our own pace, self-reflectively developing the possibilities of some elements of

what we find along the way and turning away from others. We are “given” a world, not ready-made and complete, but as a general and flexible set of rules within which we may work, a structure within which we can mold the preexisting givens of reality into particular, possibly unprecedented forms.

From the above we see that in considering teleology, as in other matters that capture his interest, Jung’s vision of human nature is situated in larger concerns about meaning itself, including questions of personal and collective fate, freedom, and destiny. That said, as a philosophical method of analysis teleology is not confined to such lofty matters. Rather, it is an approach whose perspectives are applicable to understanding *all* dimensions of human life, including the most mundane (which, after all, are the elements out of which a grand penultimate direction in life is constructed). The utterly ordinary decisions we make on a daily basis express the omnipresence of a sense of moving purposefully toward end-points or goals. This is a process that can be studied within the framework of temporality in all its expressions, including the very ordinary. When at the grocery market we might pause for a moment in the produce aisle to consider whether we should buy spinach or head lettuce. We happen to prefer spinach, but our children like head lettuce, and to buy both means that one will eventually rot in the back of the refrigerator. What should we do? Instantaneously a variety of imagined outcomes pass through our minds, a series of hypothesized “if-then” accounts in which vast amounts of information emerge from memory to flood consciousness and become organized with reference to what we project into the future as an ultimately “good” outcome. Perhaps we want to satisfy our children and provide them with a token of our concern for their wishes, in which case we will forego our desire for spinach; or, alternately we may reason that we deserve to treat ourselves for once, knowing that being overly deprived deteriorates our parenting skills, and/or that it is beneficial for children to try new foods. In the latter case, we opt for spinach. In both cases we deliberate with an emphasis upon an abstract concept, arguably a Platonic Form of what is ultimately the best for all concerned, what form of the Good may best fulfill an archetypally determined and future-directed striving toward harmonious balance in the politics of family relationships. Once established, the logical structure of whatever course we settle on as an end determines the unfolding of choices and events “in reverse”, as it were, as an as-yet-unrealized future metaphorically “reaching back”, *a posteriori*, into the present to organize our thoughts and actions so that they may become organized toward

achieving a specific actual form. This is viewed by some, though far from all, philosophers as a veritable creation of something out of “no-thing”, the unforeseeable product of an immaterial interpenetration of emotional impulse and lightning-fast anticipatory reasoning. It exemplifies Aristotle’s (1983, Book III) category of *final causation*, the concept that what we ultimately intend to accomplish supervenes upon our current experience from the mind’s construction of a desired future, to suggest how the diverse elements of experience may be arranged so as to lead to this purely imagined end becoming tangibly or “actually” present over time.

In following the promptings of the mind’s future-orientation, we do not simply dispense with the past. In Jung, consciousness is not located “inside” the head but is non-localized, reaching out to effect measurable changes in the world including the nature of time itself. As such, there is every reason to believe that a renewed vision of one’s present, as a process moving toward the open horizon of a future may-be, quite literally changes the objective nature of the past (as well as problematizing what we call “objective” reality). This may be called a “retrospective creative teleology”. This weighty term simply means that the “actual” meaning of what befell us at a prior time is, to a greater extent than we realize, dependent upon the position of our conscious stance as an observer/interpreter in the *present*. Life, as a progressive revelatory process, does not simply serve up meanings to us while we sit idly by. The “is-ness” of phenomena is, within limits, up to us. We have the option, if we summon courage, of intentionally asserting ourselves toward influencing their *telos*, as Kant and Jung imply in their respective treatises on human freedom. Life’s unfolding is bi-directional: it opens, not only toward an as-yet-unactualized horizon of the future, but also toward the as-yet-unactualized significance of the past, which has its own distinctive phenomenological horizon. So, the way forward is simultaneously the way back, and vice-versa. And by progressing in either direction we simultaneously become the authors of certain potentialities within its counterpart. Ultimately, this is to become reacquainted with our immersion in the ontological structure of time itself. Our being as beings-in-time embraces our proper role in defining the “is-ness” of the nature of temporality, which is to say its actual, objective structure, assuming we do not refuse our role as co-creators of reality.

Research into how new possibilities in nature, society, and human consciousness arise continues to add compelling new ways of interpreting Jung’s teleology. Prominent among these venues of theorizing are, in philosophy, Emergentism (Broad, 1925) and, in empirical science, quantum

mechanics (Planck, 1915; Bohr, 1934/1987). Both these fields are concerned with understanding potentiality in human thought, behavior, and the basic structure of the material world from new perspectives. It is appropriate that I touch on them here, however briefly.

Emergentism originated in England in the 1920s, and ever since has been hotly debated by philosophers and cognitive scientists. In its strong forms it holds that, as D.J. Chalmers (1990) states, a “high-level phenomenon arises from (a) low-level domain, but truths concerning that phenomenon are not deducible even in principle from truths in the low-level domain” (p. 1). In contrast, what he terms weak Emergentism simply explains more sophisticated permutations of phenomena, while unexpected, as nevertheless logically explainable by the elements already present in the conditions giving rise to an end result. While Jung does not directly involve himself in philosophical Emergentism, with which he was probably unacquainted, at different points in his theorizing about the archetypes, he implies that these become actuated in human life in a manner that some contemporary Jungians, such as George Hogenson (2004), believe are interpretable in terms of a strong Emergentism. Among the passages he uses to support his argument are Jung’s (1947/1969) suggestive reflections on the forward-going nature of the process of amplifying inner, archetypal images:

The (archetypal) images are not to be thought of as a reduction of conscious contents to their simplest denominator, as this would be a direct road to the primordial images which I said previously was unimaginable; they make their appearance only in the course of amplification.

(para. 403)

Jung’s inconsistent statements about the nature of archetypes do not allow for any single definition of their nature. Yet here he seems to imply that new, archetypally informed and directed realizations are not purely the outcome of fixed antecedent properties of the archetype itself, that is, to what in philosophy is called “simples”, that are merely reordered across time in new arrangements. In such a theory the archetypes could not transcend their given, eternal structures, but would perpetually confine us to modes of knowledge of the world that may alter in form but never in their meaning-value for individuals and societies. This latter development requires the addition of human consciousness, such as that occurring in the amplification process, which is always and already embedded in the irreducibly unique concerns of a local

*lebens-welt*. Hogenson (2004) claims that in describing the way that archetypes metamorphose into conscious personal and collective symbolic images, "...Jung is not referring simply to developmental change, but also...ontological change" (p. 51). I suggest that this "ontological change" occurs, not only in the maturational *telos* of the person or group, but conceivably in the structure of the archetype itself, as its emergent *potentia* is unleashed through engagement with locally situated human consciousness.

Hogenson's thesis finds support in recent developments in empirical physics. Specifically, the novel findings of quantum mechanics have attracted the interest of interdisciplinary scholars, some of whom find them supportive of Jung's theory of the way in which human creatureliness and the physical world arise from, and remain intimately dependent on, an immaterial substrate of non-localized atomic dynamisms such as photons, electrons, neutrons, atoms, and molecules, all capable of transcending the Newtonian laws governing causality in time and space. These dynamisms are called *quanta*, the exact meaning of which remains uncertain given that thus far we know only what energy *does* but not what it *is per se*. However indeterminate the concept of *quanta* may be, they appear to form the primordial experiential background to human consciousness of reality and shift instantaneously between their purely potential state of waves to particles, a state in which they express themselves in determinate forms in space and time. For example, when attached to an atom electrons exist in their immaterial forms as waves, forming the contentless or "empty" penumbral ground of Being. In this state they do not act upon the world, but are solely potential patterns, abstract numerical possibilities that may spring into existence as localized human thoughts and/or the palpable materiality of the world. In our example, this shift occurs when electrons become detached from nuclei, a state in which they transform into discrete particles. A revolutionary paradigm change occurred in the early to middle twentieth century when one interpretation of this finding indicated that, among other variables, it is the act of engaging in observation of these phenomena of potentiality that determines whether they exhibit wave or particle forms. A startling implication of this finding is that consciousness is not separate from the emergence of the ontological structure of reality. While this view is not universally endorsed by physicists, there are a number of researchers who take it to mean that the objective structure of the world is determined, in part, by the processes of human consciousness (Bohm, 1990; Wheeler, 1987).

This, of course, is quite similar to Jung's contention: in our attending to reality, and according to the perspectives we adopt and questions we ask of it, the cosmos comes into being in specific and novel ways (Jung, 1961/1989, p. 256). D.V. Ponte and Lothar Shafer (2013) understand this cosmic structure as panpsychic, meaning that the cosmos is "mind-like", another element implied in Jung's metaphysical contemplations. While it seems that the meaning of this contention demands that we first define the difference between "minded" and "mind-like", it is clear that some investigators of quantum theory understand Being as emerging, in part, as an expression of the *telos* of human aims and hopes. In this view, we are not only embedded within an emergent reality, but participate in setting this emergence into motion in very particular directions.

We may also note that the theory of the nature of *quanta* in wave form lends support to Jung's reflections on the archetypes as contentless supra-sensible probabilities, existing as metaphysical phenomena, which become manifest within the sensible spatio-temporal domain due to the underlying unity of the knowing human subject with its cosmological origins. Here Jung is working in much the same vein as physicist Wolfgang Pauli, whom he treated for depression and alcohol abuse in 1930. Following the treatment the two men collaborated through correspondence, discussing and refining the similarities in their views. In Pauli's conjectures on the unified field of reality Jung finds a restatement, in the language of physics, of his more philosophical treatment of this matter (1992/2001). Among these is Jung's (1955/1973) controversial theory of synchronicity, what he calls an "acausal connecting principle": that immaterial psychic phenomena may become palpably manifest as mental or physical events (such as premonitions and material manifestations of the activity of mind) outside of Newtonian laws of linear, material-efficient cause-and-effect.

Now let us turn our attention to a brief summary of the contents of the volume's six chapters, each of which explains and adds to a broader understanding of the importance and novel applications of both teleology generally and its importance to Jung.

## **Our Chapters**

Chapter 1 is written by Jungian analyst Mark Winborn. Titled *Coming into Being: Telos in Jung and Bion*, the chapter explores the genesis and unfolding of psychological experience in Wilfred Bion's provocative