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With the development of positivist thinking through exponents such as Kant and indeed deterministic science, the role of myth, and religion as its primary manifestation has been for some time in decline. The debate for how long humanity has been disordered similarly depends very much upon individual perspective and indeed what one terms ‘ disordered’. In his report on, modern society Lord Scarman stated that “ urban disorder is correlated to unemployment”. While this connotes an origin of the strife within society, it also deems disorder as physical action, a rebellion against the establishment.

Moreover it hints at the diverse perspectives one can assume when analysing this subject. Violence and civil unrest must be seen as the primary indicative factor of ‘ disorder’ with issues such as psychological discord within the human psyche as a contributory factor, and personal religion through myth is therefore crucial. There is, however, considerable debate over the primary and most important contributory factors. One such line of thought is that developed by Grace Jansen, advocating the belief that psychosexual discrimination against women has led to subsequent disorder within society.

Jansen argues that historically humanity has long been governed and indeed corrupted by psychosexual malice and the dominance of the male. The relegation of women to the role of gratifying the male, an existence of complimenting the male species, as shown through the inequality of Moses laws of divorce, subsequently has wider ranging ramifications on society as a whole. Jansen therefore argues that this disregard for women, in dehumanising womankind, unwittingly or indeed covertly encourages an atmosphere of intellectualism surrounding persecution of the weak, this employed dismissive logic in turn leads to disorder on a larger and wider scale. This argument seems narrow minded in primarily laying the blame of disordered Western society on the castigation of womankind, while not acknowledging the variant theme of equality in many aspects of Christianity, however it does have further reaching ramifications. This is best shown by the fact that it closely corresponds to the principles on which Rawls based his revision of Utilitarianism.

The statement that “ each person possesses an inviolability founded on justice that even the welfare of society as a whole cannot override” (Theory of Justice Ch 1) clearly surmises a principle on which both Jansen and Rawls clearly deem as important in establishing an ordered society, namely that of respect for the individual. Similarly Rawls stated that society is “ well ordered when it is not only designed to advance the good of its members but when it is also effectively regulated by a public conception of justice” (TJ Ch 7). This then correlates to the necessity of both institutions to regulate and indeed further society while still maintaining a moral order. It is therefore this moral necessity that Jansen argues has been violated or even corrupted by the psychosexual disturbance of the male mind, causing the degradation of women and subsequently undermines institutions and codes of justice. These institutions therefore must be established and upheld in accordance with modern western society’s democratic and positivist structure.

To suggest a revision of the modern ethos therefore one must both establish what is at fault in order to rectify ‘ disorder’ and subsequently find a viable alternative. Society War, famine, murder and rape. These are the traits of modern news and so perhaps modern society. Tony Benn MP stated, ‘ as last century was the dereliction of the planet, so this century with be the death of mankind’.

While this view seems extreme few would argue that the rapid changes incurred by humanity in the twenty-first century have both benefited mankind while damaging men. The Western world today is that of science, a sterile, institutionalised society in which fantasy is replaced by fact. The unravelling of DNA and space travel lets man see and explore what was before deemed impossible. Such feats have led to the displacement of religion for many, or one might say science is the new religion of the masses. The new religion however, despite its relevance in the progression of man, contains no morals or sermons and offers no guidance for those troubled in life.

This erosion of morals through the neglect of metaphysical needs and concerns, in the eyes of many, can be the only explanation for the ‘ disorganised society’ of the modern age. It must be seen therefore that, as human beings have created a climate of injustice, there is an immediate duty to oppose and indeed rectify such forces, both from within ourselves and in others. In order to find a ‘ solution’ therefore there are two clear philosophical arguments which I shall expound and explore which directly rebut the others legitimacy, Positivism and deterministic science and Jungian Psychology. It is perhaps best described in Freudian terms as the battle between the id and the superego for control of the ego. On the realisation of the appalling humanitarian cost of World War Two, Churchill stated, ‘ it is better to Jaw-Jaw than to War-War’. This simple quote neatly illustrates mankind’s preference of discussion rather than loss of life in order to restore or preserve order in our society.

In essence humanity has striven to tame, what W. Golding called, the ‘ darkness of man’s heart’ (Lord of the Flies, Final Ch. ) There is a necessary quest to homogenise those parts of both ourselves, and society as a whole, that corrode the establishment. Throughout the world due to diverse regimes and ideologies the ‘ establishment’ takes a varying role and form. In our own Western democracy a form of congenial protest is allowed, while dissent is punishable by death in clandestine dictatorships such as in Iraq. Such measures are, despite their differences, justifiable under the laws of the individual state.

In essence, in all societies therefore there is simply morality relative to the community in which it exists. While the presence of these social commandments is clear in modern states, the legitimacy, in terms of citizens conforming to these laws, is often not so conspicuous. Moreover much of this is associated with a belief in a moral obligation to adhere to these principles, a fact that allows the emergence and consolidation of despots. Again here the debate widens between positivism and natural law, the latter of which advocates the belief that divine right has supremacy over mere human law.

However, whatever strain and philosophy of law one supports it is clear that society, by their existence, deems that laws, based on principles of Justice appear unavoidable in the modern state. In this light humanity has embellished and employed laws as the solution to disorder, commandments to which we must, with the rise of international law, universally embrace, and indeed, laws which designate ultimate authority to themselves. Despite the aforementioned universality of law it must observed that this positivist system of maintaining order which are assumed to have ultimate authority in our nations, has both been defined and, as principles, created by mankind. They are in this way simply the embodiment of the metaphysical concept of Justice and so, as principles empowered by men, are open to revision and indeed rejection by mankind. By the dissatisfaction shown by some members of society, reflected in its disorder, one can only conclude that the principles are not sufficient for humanity. The essential problem seem to be that while laws act as a physical guide to behaviour, man is forced to act in accordance with them, whether they are concurrent with ones individual beliefs or not.

The faults in this system are clearly and widely understood however there seems to be little practical alternative, for, as Rawls states, ‘ The only thing that permits us to acquiesce in an erroneous theory is the lack of a better one. ‘ (ToJ Ch 1) While exponents of such theories of Justice such as Bentham and Mills of Utilitarianism support human law, conversely naturalists such as Jung present other ways of ordering society. Laws inadvertently and unavoidably entrap and arguably stifle the individual, thus frustrating the self. Conversely however, naturalism and within it Jungian thought, alludes to the universality in composition of the human psyche and so perhaps is true of moral codes.

Jung therefore presents a different concept of humanity with the mergance of science and religion. Carl Gustav Jung In structure at least Jung has a moderately simple view of the human psyche, so plain indeed that Jung illustrated his concept of the psyche in a relatively crude diagram. In essence it is of the ‘ ego’ as part of the conscious self, that part of our psyche of which we are acutely aware. In the developed psyche the ego would be in “ an impregnable position…

nothing more should happen that is not sanctioned by the ego, and when the ego wants something, nothing should be capable of interfering”. The ego and indeed conscious mind is nestled within the personal unconscious underpinned eventually by the collective conscious. While the unconscious was ‘ discovered’ neither by Jung nor Freud, Jung’s contribution in terms of archetypes within the collective unconsciousness is particularly notable and indeed, it is these archetypes which are directly relevant when considering Jung’s Psychology of Religion. Jung sees the condition of the human psyche as paramount in the order of man and subsequently mankind. It must be seen that the conscious psyche is a precondition of being for, as Jung stated, ‘ the world exists for us only in so far as it is consciously reflected by a psyche’ (Essential Jung, p.

71). Thus both our interpretations and subsequently our actions are directly effected by the psyche, making an imbalance in the psyche crucial. This in term breeds Jung’s theory of individuation, the ‘ process by which a person becomes…

a separate, indivisible unity or whole. ‘ (CW, 9 i para. 490) This clearly highlights Jung’s belief on how disorder can arise perhaps through the individual. When expanding upon his controversial book ‘ The Jung Cult’; Richard Noll draws further implications of individuation.

Jung himself states that ‘ all the highest achievements of virtue, as well as the blackest villainies are individual’, which is in turn interpreted by Noll as Jung advocating the villainies of despots such as Hitler. The point would indeed support the blackening of Jung’s character as promoting a ‘ spiritual elitism, a Neitzchean new nobility of the individuated’ (J Cult, p. 258) which is incorporated into his much criticised and perhaps hyperbolic Jungian conspiracy theory. When the passage is analysed however a very different conclusion must be found.

Clearly, as A. Storr points out, Jung was deeply interested in the individuals whose nature compelled them to reject conventional way. This interest is however simply that, it is neither an acceptance nor vindication of the individuals who carried out the ‘ blackest villainies’. Jung further and clearly illustrates throughout his work that, rather than individuation causing villainies, it is instead simply ‘ self-realisation’, the realisation of all aspects of one’s psyche. He instead suggests that villainies and so disorder is partly caused by ego-centredness, a state of mind caused due to insecurity with the surrounding world.

This insecurity in society has clear ramifications on behaviour, causing a failure to interact with society. Such anti-social behaviour can indeed be seen through figures such as Stalin and, on a smaller scale are crucial in the disorder that pervades society. Jung however insists that the self is instead ‘ infinitely more than a mere ego’ and more importantly that ‘ Individuation does not shut out the world, but gathers the world into oneself’ (CW 8 para 432). This distinction is crucial as it is the sense of cohesion with the outside world that is important in this solution to disorder. The feeling of control over events removes insecurities and thus averts behaviour that erodes social fibre, the failure of which leads to the paradox that, as Jesus taught, he who seeks to save his life shall lose it.

This development into an egotistical psyche thus both accentuates and, if disorder is minimal, creates added chaos within the psyche, exacerbating conflicts such as the psychosexual conflict highlighted by Grace Jansen. Stevens argues that Jung believed good relations with people grow out of good relations with the self, thus necessitating the realisation of the self and its latent potentialities that is individualisation. This thesis is supported by Jung’s statement that; “ Relationship to the self is at once related to our fellow man, and none can be related to the latter until he is related to himself”(CW 9 i). This aspect of Jung’s psychotherapy is however highly controversial as initially at least, even by his admission, it leads to introversion.

The border between this and ego-centredness, while clear in both Stevens and Jung’s mind, is questionable. It seems, despite statements against the state of ego-centredness, that it is the development past this state that Jung advocates, the incorporation of the ego into psyche, rather than introversion itself. Jung argues that by the trapping of the psyche due to an egotistical complex, man is reduced or restricted to the position of that of the monad, segregated from society. This in turn results in the manifestation of an ‘ I-it’ complex.

While this is intended by the egotist to protect the psyche it in fact removes the ego from a proper interaction and place in society, leading to personal frustration and tension with the outside world. This invariably produces disorder with the impersonal rationality introduced by the ‘ I-it’ complex able to justify even the most abhorrent actions. In essence it is the feeling of helplessness over events, ironically caused by ego-centreness, that results in the reduction of moral standards. It is the fear of the chaotic world that subsequently leads to further disorder.

While Jung establishes that the collective unconsciousness is formed of archetypes which dictate the nature and direction of our thought, the substance and the concepts within the psyche are personal and only realised though individuation, a process in which a personal religion or myth is crucial as an archetypal potentiality. Relationship with MythWhile individualisation is a process by which Jung suggests we gather the world in ourself, it is simply the culmination of our attempts to interpret and so exist with the surrounding world. As a species on earth, humanity seeks both to rationalise events and indeed control them. In this light therefore the interpretation of events and so the formation of morals and the realisation of our potentialities through archetypes gains significance. Thus the dominance of society by such means of interpretation, namely science and religion gain significance and thus relevance in the order of society.

Jung perceives the psyche as a self-regulating organism that seeks both inner and outer harmony and as such the prevalent means of accomplishing this in the modern age is of great significance. A. Stevens suggests that in his development from Kantonian agnostic logic, Jung is particularly innovative in surpassing Kant’s concept that man can know only the phenomena of religion and not the objective or metaphysical truth of religious beliefs. Jung, in turn, developed this and so viewed religion as an illustration of universal human nature in which all mankind participates.

While this, as the projection theory of religion developed by atheists such as Marx, seemingly undermines the value of religion in society Jung does, on the contrary place considerable value upon even institutional religion (by this I mean the established Church and other such faiths). It is in this field that Jung was particularly influential. As a psychiatrist Jung therefore only presumes that religious beliefs are ‘ psychologically true’ and aid the formation of an integrated personality. Thus what is important is the God, or at least his image, within the psyche, not the objective truths of one or another religious faith. For; “ Religious experience is absolute, it cannot be disputed.

You can only say that you have never had such an experience, whereupon your opponent will reply: ‘ Sorry, I have. ‘ And there your discussion will come to an end” (CW 11, para 167). This can therefore be true for the atheist as no belief in the physical manifestation of God is required. As Jung states, it is not simply institutionalised religion of which he speaks but rather the personal concept of religion by which we shape our lives, the concept and need for instructive mythology embedded in the collective unconsciousness.

Religion therefore springs from the innate propensities to conceptualise myth and symbolism that are common to all man by virtue of the archetypes that are the foundation of the developing psyche. As expressed earlier it is this process of confronting the unconscious and so realising the latent potentialities of the self that leads to individualisation This thesis then suggests that modern disorder is derived by, as Don Cupitt states, the relegation of religion due to its confrontation with science. Today though, when science has secularised external reality, religious meaning and value have been sucked back into the psyche. ‘(Sea of Faith, p. 85) This is then a modern phenomenon due to increased levels of self-awareness and so as Cupitt puts it, ‘ internalisation’.

Jung therefore interprets dreams and fantasies as the spiritual, religious archetype seeking fulfilment through recognition, hence, ironically adding value to the religious imperative that God is to be found within. Cupitt also implies that, by Jung’s logic, ‘ the felt need to seek him [God] is itself evidence’ of his existence. This similarly reflects the theory of Konrad Lorenz (1977), as revealed by Stevens, that ‘ archetypal reality must mirror cosmic reality’, based upon the theory that there must ultimately be an origin to archetypes. Initially Jung seems to agree with this as; ‘ when I say as a psychologist that God is an archetype..

. , an archetype presupposes an imprinter'(CW 12 para. 15) however he similarly expresses a belief that God can only be experience and not proved, stating that, ‘ belief… comes into collision with knowledge, and it turns out that the irrationality of the former is no match for the ratiocinations of the latter'(CW 10 para.

532). This seems to be Jung’s greatest conflict, integrating a psychological structure that does not depend on the objective reality of God’s existence with the ‘ irrationality’ that, as he told Frederic Sands ‘ I know He exists’. This conviction can however also be taken as not the knowledge of a God of Classical theism but the assurance that through the acceptance of the God archetype, Jung’s psyche possesses a God of sorts, thus he ‘ knows’ God. Furthermore, the description of Jung’s understanding of God in the book ‘ Answer to Job’ of having ‘ divine savagery and ruthlessness’ (Answer to Job CW 11) further undermines the Classical view of God. Alternatively the insight that ‘ God needs man in order to become conscious of Himself and His creation’ (MDR p. 32) in the analysis of the Christian faith, along with the literal interpretation of ‘ I know He exists’ suggests Jung’s positive conviction to God’s existence.

As a work-ethic however much of Jungian psychology is based on the premis that one cannot prove the reality of God but rather His existence as a psychological entity. Jung also placed much importance on the view of religion as the expression of myths, explanations of man’s existence. Here he talks not of widespread creeds but the ‘ mythical symbolism’ (CW 10) that is simply expressed in different ways by the various creeds. Jung stated that ‘ among all my patients.

.. there has not been one who’s problem in the last resort was not that of finding a religious outlook on life’. Jung clearly views religion as vital in a stable psyche and he thus derives an explanation for the disordered society from the fact that, as Macquarrie states, ‘ Christianity has lagged behind the mental development of mankind’ (20th CRT p111).

Thus the numinosum (primary religious experience) has departed from the rituals and creeds of religion and so the myths that western society bases itself upon is left invalid. As this is happening in our own society, similar events can be seen from the past, for, as J. Campbell reflects, ‘ you’ve seem what happens when primitive societies are unsettled by white man’s civilisation. They go to pieces, they disintegrate, they become diseased. Hasn’t the same thing been happening to us since our myths began to disappear? Jung believes that the scientific discovery of astronomical laws ‘ was the first stage in the despiritualisation of the world’ (CW 11), and this may indeed be the case, thus science is portrayed as a destructive and expansive parasite. The sciences are however, as are positivist laws, simply different methods by which we complete and expound upon our inherent archetype.

The religious archetype is accounted as that which gives man a sense of spiritual meaning and relationship with the outside world. In the modern age however, while there are many people whose natural home is still within the church, science has undermined much of western religion’s creed and so its objective plausibility. Thus science forms the majority of the religious archetype of man, the personal unconsciousness is therefore answering the religious demands of the collective unconsciousness with science. It offers an explanation for man’s relationship with the world but does not afford the spiritual meaning and behavioural guidance affiliated with myth and, as a sub-division, religion.

This then is seen by Jung for the origin of modern disorder for, ‘ When the god is not acknowledged, egomania develops, and out of this mania comes sickness’ (CW 13, para. 55). The Jungian solution to this is in the return of myth to mankind and the personal religion that Jung advocated in his predictions that men would discount collective dogmatic forms of religion in preference to the individual working out solutions to the religious problem independently (Macquarrie p. 111). This is the afore mentioned combination of science and religion. While science drives the progresion of mankind, religion, whether personal or as the church, guides humanity.

As the Logical positivists argued, it may well be pointless to consider the reality of the external God however a personal consideration of religion is necessary for the human psyche. However, as J. Campbell observes, ‘ the moral order has to catch up with the moral necessities if actual life in time, here and now. And that is what we are not doing.

The old-time religion belongs to another age, another people, another set of human values. By going back you throw yourself out of sync with history. ‘(Power of Myth, p13) Campbell states that both the scientific ethos and the fact that ‘ Lawyers and law are what hold us together’ are major contributory factors to this loss of mythology which once helped man relate to the world and events, both empirical and metaphysical, that surround him. The SolutionThus, as the malfunction of individualisation leads to egotism and disorder, so the loss of an important part of the psyche, namely the religious archetype, has catastrophic ramifications upon society. While laws bind us to a social contract, its basis is accepted by many of its advocates as erroneous. Furthermore while science aids the materialistic development of humanity, they are but one aspect of mankind’s needs.

As religious fanaticism alone would not improve the physical condition of man upon the earth, so positivism through science and law fulfil only part of humanity’s needs. The unification of the psyche through individualisation, in Jungs view, harmonises man with the self and so with his surroundings. It is therefore crucial in maintaining order both in the individual and so also society. While individuation is often criticised as simply the personal religion by which Jung independently worked out his own solutions (Noll states that ‘ Jung is offering himself as the imago of individualisation’ [Jung Cult Ch 12]), the universality of the need for guidance through a religious outlook is clear.

Similarly due to its emphasis on the personal unconsciousness Jung seemingly is simply just suggesting that we may draw our own myths and conclusions from many sources in individuation, it is not the cult following of Jung’s religious viewpoints that he places emphasis upon. Thus both the rediscovery and realisation of the psyche is vital in repairing the disordered fabric of society. Without morality through myth, whether personal of a religious creed in nature, there can be no stabilisation of the psyche nor positive progression for mankind in the modern age.